

IN THE NAVY

The following named lieutenant commanders of the line and staff corps of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of commander pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5787, while serving in, or ordered to billets for which the grade of commander is authorized and for unrestricted appointment to the grade of commander when eligible pursuant to law and regulation

subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

	LINE
Akers, Max N.	Erner, Eugene J.
Fuller, Robert H.	Hoel, Jack I.
Ivey, Clarence G., Jr.	Jackson, Morse R.
Klinedist, Paul R., Jr.	Knapp, Norman E., Jr.
Konkel, Harry W.	Newton, George B., Jr.
Peters, John D.	Stubb, George R.

MEDICAL CORPS

Bercier, Charles H., Jr.

SUPPLY CORPS

Cunningham, Philip T. Desmarais, Norman D.
Haver, David J. Tack, Curtis A.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Wood, William L.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BETTS RECORD EARNS "A" MARKS

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, soon after our good friend and colleague, the Honorable JACKSON BETTS of Ohio announced that he planned to retire from Congress, his hometown newspaper, the Republican Courier, ran an editorial concerning him which I am certain everyone in this Chamber would like to read. The person who wrote this editorial truly knows JACK BETTS and I wish to commend him for its excellence. The editorial follows:

BETTS RECORD EARNS "A" MARKS

Rep. Jackson E. Betts has made official his decision not to seek re-election to Congress. The Findlay legislator thus plans to bring to close a record of public elective service which is highly distinguished.

He is presently completing his 11th term in the U.S. House of Representatives, where he has risen to a position of great influence and unusual prominence. He is currently the second ranking Republican on the powerful House Ways and Means committee, regarded as one of the two or three most important committees in all Congress.

Betts' assignment to that select committee was solid evidence of the esteem in which he has regularly been held by his colleagues, and of the widespread respect throughout Washington for his ability and judgment.

Perhaps even a more significant indication of the prestigious character of Betts was his assignment a few years ago as the senior member of the House of Representatives committee on Standards of Official Conduct. His own exemplary sense of ethics and public trust was inevitably a major criterion in his selection to this post.

A major share of Betts' adult life has been dedicated to public service. He launched his political career as Hancock County prosecutor in 1933. He later served as the county's representative to the Ohio House of Representatives, reaching that chamber's highest office of Speaker of the House in 1945.

He was successful in an uphill district-wide battle for the Republican nomination for Congress in 1950, winning such a substantial majority in his home county of Hancock, that he overtook his opponents who carried every other county in the district in that initial balloting. He has since consistently received district-wide majorities and has been unopposed in several general elections.

Highly respected, even by members of the opposition party, he has enjoyed the esteem and admiration of a substantial majority of his constituents throughout the year.

Congressman Betts' history of political service is exemplary. Scrupulously honest and sincere, he has never attempted to build influence for his own benefit or glory. Rather,

he has used his considerable prestige and political power to serve what he considers the best interests of the United States.

Perhaps locally, he will be remembered particularly for his ability to maintain a genuinely modest, unassuming manner. Though he has met with Presidents, dined with diplomats, and walked with illustrious figures of modern history, he is still the calm, friendly representative of Ohio's 8th Congressional district, which he has served so well.

His amiable, gracious manner will make it easy for Jackson E. Betts to retire to Findlay and practice law. But unpretentious as he is, Congressman Betts is leaving behind him a solid record of public service which forever distinguishes him here and abroad with the well earned title, "Statesman."

SUPPORT FOR THE PRESIDENT

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the President of the United States recently revealed the far-reaching offers that have been made in the effort to end the war in Vietnam. I, for one, believe it is a most logical and honorable proposal, one that no reasonable nation could reject. It is encouragement to note that many people are in agreement with it.

The House of Representatives of the Delaware General Assembly last week adopted a resolution of support for the President's initiative. I ask that this resolution, offered by Representative Thomas L. Little, be printed at the end of my remarks.

Also, this morning I was interested to read in the Washington Post a column by Mr. William Raspberry. Mr. Raspberry, an astute observer of the American scene, offers some thoughts on the President's proposal. He is opposed to our involvement in Vietnam, but he has an interesting commentary about some forms of opposition. His column says, in part:

But it is sick to work at delivering your own comeuppance, and that is what some of those who oppose the war and Richard Nixon's handling of it are proposing.

Mr. President, I also ask that Mr. Raspberry's thoughtful column be printed.

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

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 75

Congratulating the President of the United States on his efforts for world peace

Whereas, the President of the United States

made public his long standing offer of peace to our enemy in North Vietnam; and

Whereas, these proposals include—a total cease fire throughout all of Indochina, the immediate release of all prisoners of war, the total withdrawal of all American and allied forces within six months of acceptance of this proposal by Hanoi, and the resignation of the political regime of South Vietnam to be followed by free elections including the National Liberation Front; and

Whereas, these proposals have been offered secretly in good faith for many months in direct private negotiations between the United States and Hanoi; Now therefore:

Be it resolved that the House of Representatives of the State of Delaware congratulate the President for his efforts and sincerely encourage his continued efforts to bring world peace and the safe return of all our American fighting men from North and South Vietnam as soon as possible.

Be it further resolved that the text of this resolution be spread upon the House Journal and that the original be forwarded to President Richard M. Nixon, with copies to U.S. Senators J. Caleb Boggs and William V. Roth, Jr., Congressman Pierre S. DuPont, IV, to the leadership of the North Vietnam government in Hanoi, and to the members of the North Vietnam negotiating team in Paris.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 31, 1972]

A SICK REACTION TO NIXON

(By William Raspberry)

Two of the three primary reactions to the President's recent revelation of his secret Vietnam negotiations are fairly easy to talk about. They are more or less clearcut and have more or less articulate spokesmen.

First is the reaction of triumph (or chagrin, depending on your point of view) that for the past several months Mr. Nixon was doing precisely what his most respected critics were accusing him of refusing to do: Offering American withdrawal—even by a "certain date"—in exchange for the return of American POWs.

The President's announcement embarrassed those (particular the Democratic presidential hopefuls among them) who had been demanding just that sort of proposition.

It vindicated those whose faith was that the President really did want to extricate his country from the war and was sparing no effort to do so. In either case, it must be counted a political plus for Mr. Nixon for the time being, although it may blow up in his face between now and November.

The second reaction is that the President's eight-point proposal, whether sincerely offered or not, cannot work—for the simple reason that Hanoi can gain more heavily by not agreeing to anything.

America clearly is getting out of Vietnam without the benefit of negotiation, the argument goes. In light of that irrevocable trend, Hanoi could only lose by entering into serious negotiation. The smart thing from Hanoi's point of view would be to avoid anything drastic—either at the bargaining table or on the battlefield—and simply permit the continuing withdrawal of the American forces.

The first two reactions are essentially prac-

tical, and have to do with whether this plan or that plan can work.

There is a third, more troubling position that is difficult to document because it has no respected spokesman. It is that America does not deserve a graceful exit from the war and must not be permitted to have one.

The American involvement in Vietnam was immoral from the very beginning, the feeling seems to be, and it is immoral for immorality to go unpunished.

It is the same reaction some of us have to "liberal" talk about prison reform or rehabilitation of criminals. It is the same feeling some of us would have had if Hitler had been able to negotiate an honorable end to World War II.

Someone (maybe it was Sam Smith of the D.C. Gazette) once said that the notion of America getting out of Vietnam with honor is like a prostitute getting out of her profession with her virginity intact.

Nor is it a new feeling. Its most blatant manifestation came in the chants of "Ho, Ho, Ho Chi Minh, NFL is gonna win" that used to mark the big peace demonstrations.

But it also showed up in some of the reactions to such military initiatives as the Cambodian and Laotian "incursions": not merely that the initiative couldn't work for this or that military reason, nor even that the initiative amounted to an immoral widening of the war.

Those reactions were there of course. But also there was the feeling—the fear—that these gross actions *might work*, and since their success would be vindication for immorality, they must be opposed.

I suppose it is the psychological equivalent of those sick people who keep finding new ways to fail because they subconsciously feel that they don't deserve success.

But you can treat sick people who insist on punishing themselves. A nation cannot afford to indulge in that sort of self-destruction.

I don't argue with those who say the war was—is—wrong, nor even with those who say a proper comeuppance for our folly might be a good thing.

But it is sick to work at delivering your own comeuppance, and that is what some of those who oppose the war and Richard Nixon's handling of it are proposing.

Extraction from the war—even *without* honor—is going to be difficult enough under any circumstance. The moralistic posturing of self-righteous critics won't make it any easier.

NEW THRUST IN SPACE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the editorial section of the Evening Star Wednesday, January 26, 1972, an analysis is made of the importance of proceeding with the space shuttle program. This editorial succinctly describes the important gains that this Nation will make by investing in a low cost earth orbital transportation system. The editorial further points out that the benefits and opportunities available through pursuing a space shuttle program will far out weight its relatively low initial costs. I commend this editorial to your reading:

NEW THRUST IN SPACE

Just in the nick of time, President Nixon has re-ignited the fizzling U.S. space program, and the benefits from the new venture he approved the other day promise to be substantial and stimulating.

The space shuttle program represents a new era that will appeal to many Americans as bringing more practical applications of space science and technology.

In any event, most should agree that the country's massive investment in that field cannot now be written off and the program dismantled. There already has been too strong a drift in that direction; the aerospace industry is hanging by a thread and 200,000 space-related jobs have been eliminated. With the last two Apollo moon shots scheduled for this year, the whole space enterprise has been rapidly losing speed.

That's good, some people will say. After all, Americans have kicked around on the moon enough and Mars is out of the question, so why not proclaim the conquest of space and save the money? The answers are several. Certainly much money *will* be saved, in comparison to the peak Apollo development years. The space shuttle will cost \$5 or \$6 billion over a six-year period, and that is not an exorbitant outlay, it seems to us, for the continued gleaming of knowledge from space.

Moreover, the shuttle's function also will be, in very large measure, to broaden man's knowledge of the earth. It will be an orbiting runabout, in which the crew may peer at their leisure at the natural and human phenomena below and conduct studies of potentially great value. There is, needless to say, some national security advantage in the maneuverability it will afford and the improved surveillance capability.

And in addition, the shuttle will be sort of a repair truck of the heavens, making possible the fixing of broken-down satellites and the servicing of space laboratories. It could even be an ambulance, rescuing astronauts in trouble. Like an airplane, it would soar back down for earth landings after the completion of lengthy orbital missions.

Some of the costs would, of course, be recovered through economic expansion generated by the program—mainly through restoration of 50,000 aerospace jobs and prevention of the loss of others. Perhaps, too, the administration will succeed in its laudable efforts to bring some European countries in on the endeavor, to the tune of 10 or 15 percent of the cost.

Congress should go along with this proposed investment, knowing that if the country's highly efficient space organization is killed, it will not easily be revived. There's still much work to be done on those peaceful cosmic frontiers that can spread many benefits and much inspiration on this troubled earth.

UNITED STATES SEEKS EUROMART FARM ACCORD

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OF WISCONSIN

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I read with considerable pleasure the remarks of Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz recently made on agricultural trade with the European Common Market.

Many of us in Congress have been seriously concerned over the implications of the highly protectionist and discriminatory community agricultural policy. This became particularly acute when it became evident Denmark, Ireland, Norway, and the United Kingdom would soon become members of the Common Market. To express our concern, nearly 50 Members of Congress introduced resolutions

urging the United States to demand our agricultural trade rights with the EEC. Over 50 later signed a joint letter to President Nixon expressing approval with our initial negotiations position on the issue, but cautioning against retrenchment.

Secretary Butz' remarks would indicate the administration is standing firm on American agriculture trade rights.

At this time, I would like to include in the RECORD an article from the January 27 edition of the Washington Post:

UNITED STATES SEEKS EUROMART FARM ACCORD

Agriculture Secretary Earl L. Butz suggested yesterday that the United States delay implementation of its agreement to devalue the dollar pending an agreement from Common Market countries not to post high tariffs on American agricultural exports.

Speaking to reporters over breakfast, Butz said the White House is "pressuring now" for such an understanding before sending devaluation legislation to Congress.

He said that the United States could serve as a constructive force in convincing some Common Market members, notably West Germany, to reform their domestic agricultural economies by developing larger farms.

Butz predicted a substantial rise in farm income this year and said that the Office of Management and Budget had begun releasing impounded agricultural funds appropriated by Congress.

He acknowledged that "it's the right time" to release such funds because 1972 is an election year. He also endorsed the decision of his predecessor, Clifford Hardin, to raise milk support prices last year.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO INTRODUCES NATIONAL BLOOD BANK ACT OF 1972

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the successful transfusion of blood from one human being to another stands as one of the great achievements of modern medicine. Lifesaving transfusions, however, have not always been routinely successful. Although they were tried on an experimental basis for hundreds of years, it was not until Landsteiner discovered blood groups in 1901 that transfusions could be given with reasonable assurance of safety. Today, over 6.6 million pints are collected, processed and distributed annually in this country. Sophisticated cross-matching techniques have virtually eliminated problems arising from incompatibility. Improved techniques for freezing and storage have permitted collection and retention of blood for both short and long-term storage in thousands of blood banks across the country. But the fact remains that blood, as a unique human resource, falls far short of its potential to save lives. The problem now lies in the fact that transfusion of improperly screened, contaminated blood annually causes thousands of cases of a serious and often fatal disease known as serum hepatitis.

In the past 30 years, we have witnessed the emergence of several hundred independent profit and nonprofit blood

banks throughout the country. While most of these banks have performed valuable, lifesaving services, many—in attempting to meet immediate problems of critical blood shortages—have failed to properly screen the individuals who donate their blood. This is particularly true of profitmaking blood banks which purchase blood from donors who rely on the sale of their blood as a source of income. Unlike “voluntary” donors who contribute their blood for the good of the community, these “commercial” donors are often prisoners, alcoholics and narcotics addicts who are seeking early parole or support for their various habits. All too often they are unaware or unable to relate histories regarding previous diseases or personal habits which might predispose them to be carriers of the hepatitis agent. Yet studies show that their blood is at least 10 times more likely to transmit hepatitis than is that of the “volunteers.” As a result, many unsuspecting recipients of this “commercial” blood develop debilitating if not fatal cases of posttransfusion hepatitis. According to the National Academy of Sciences, over 30,000 cases of clinically identifiable posttransfusion hepatitis occur each year and between 1,500 and 3,000 of these result in death.

The problem is obviously not insoluble and can be reduced in large part by the elimination of these paid donors. Progress in dealing with this problem to date has been hindered primarily by the lack of centralization and national regulation of the blood banking system. Inadequate inspection and supervision of the Nation's blood banks has allowed these questionable practices to continue. State laws have been inadequate to the task—in fact, 17 States have no laws whatsoever in blood banking. The part which the Federal Government has played to date in regulating these areas is negligible. Of the 7,000 blood banks in this country, the Division of Biologics Standards at the National Institutes of Health licenses only 166; and no provision is made for screening the vast quantities of blood now imported by our country.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join today with those who would correct this problem by introducing the National Blood Bank Act of 1972. This piece of legislation is essentially identical to H.R. 11828, introduced by Congressman Veysey of California whose excellent work and attention to the Nation's needs in this area will do much toward eliminating this national disgrace. To his bill I am adding two amendments which would serve to encourage both public and private employers to permit their employees to participate in voluntary blood programs and would make it easier for blood bank personnel to gain access to space in Federal buildings for the purpose of collecting blood.

The purpose of the National Blood Bank Act of 1972 is twofold: first, to encourage the donation of “voluntary” blood and to provide for donor screening and blood testing so as to insure an adequate supply of uncontaminated blood; and second, to provide for Federal oversight of the Nation's blood banks in order to see that they live up to standards established for the benefit of the entire population. In order to help stem the

hepatitis problem, the bill calls for education of the public with regard to the desirability of giving blood on a nonremunerative basis. It provides for a national program to recruit donors, and requires that the source of each pint of blood—voluntary or commercial—must be clearly labeled. The bill also calls for the establishment of a national registry of undesirable donors so that those who do not meet the requisite health standards may be prevented from contributing to the Nation's blood supply. In addition, the bill would require all blood banks to utilize the latest testing techniques for the detection of the serum hepatitis antigen. Although the present tests are only 25–30 percent effective, their application to each pint of blood collected in this country could reduce the incidence of posttransfusion hepatitis by one-third.

Mr. Speaker, under this proposal, there would also be established a National Blood Bank program in the office of the Secretary of HEW. The time has certainly come for the creation of an agency devoted specifically to the task of seeing that all blood banks are licensed and regulated. This organization will not only be responsible for licensing all of the Nation's blood banks but also for setting standards for the selection of donors. Until enough volunteers can be recruited to meet the Nation's needs, the Director of the National Blood Bank program will be able to set limits on the number of paid donors to be allowed for each blood bank. In addition, a centralized agency such as this will be able to collect hard data on the Nation's blood banking system—data which are now sadly lacking.

Mr. Speaker, the proposal which is now before you will do much toward providing the Nation with an adequate supply of safe and pure blood. I urge its early consideration.

SCHOOL CHANGES ARE LATE

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the House Judiciary Committee will soon be holding hearings on the question of constitutional amendments affecting schools, school busing, and judicial abolition of district lines.

Accordingly, I thought the views of Washington Post columnist, William Raspberry, appearing on Wednesday, January 26, 1972, should be considered.

The article follows:

SCHOOL CHANGES ARE LATE

(By William Raspberry)

America can never seem to figure out what to do about its poor and its black citizens.

It forces them into concentrations, whether through economics, commercial manipulation or outright segregation. And then it announces that it would be possible to deal with their problems if only the people weren't so concentrated.

Even when some reasonably logical solution does suggest itself, it is almost an article of American faith that no attempt will

be made to implement it until it is too late for it to be effective.

We try scattered-site public housing (or cash housing subsidies) as an alternative to public housing concentration camps, but only after the problem has grown so large that there aren't enough sites left in which to scatter the poor.

We decide to move against crime and narcotics in the ghettos only after they have become virtually intractable (and after they have become a problem for the nonblack and nonpoor).

And particularly have we moved too late in public education.

When some basic education would have been a desirable thing for blacks, white Americans made it illegal to teach blacks to read and write.

When blacks would have been ecstatic over really good segregated schools, they got schools that were separate but awful.

Local authorities are now willing to desegregate their schools, but only after the courts have said desegregation isn't enough: You have to integrate.

Always one step behind. It would be almost laughable, except for the fact that the problems keep growing worse. Remedies that would have worked a few years ago become inadequate when they are applied too late. And we've finally reached the point where no one, white or black, has any clear idea of what will work now.

Virtually no one wants busing on the level it would take to integrate the schools in most metropolitan areas.

I, for one, would be willing to take one step backward, to honest desegregation. That is, let us move forthrightly against any attempt at official discrimination. But at the same time, let us end the humiliation of chasing after rich white children.

And it is humiliating. For one thing it says to black children that there is something inherently wrong with them, something that can be cured only by the presence of white children. Some of us don't believe that.

Some of us believe that given adequate resources, financial and otherwise, black children can learn, no matter what color their seatmates happen to be.

We started off chasing after white people because that was (we thought) the sure way to get the resources we needed. Now some of us are continuing the chase although we've forgotten why it started.

As provocative as Judge Merhige's Richmond decree was, I would have preferred a ruling that said not that pupils must be bused without regard to city boundary-lines but that school money and resources must no longer stop at those boundaries.

It may still come to that. If the current trend continues, there will likely be an end to property taxes as the chief means of financing schools. And one result will be that all the schools within a state will be on equal footing, no matter whether they are in rich neighborhoods or poor.

When the white and the rich discover that they cannot finance good public schools for their own children and lousy ones for the rest, we will see the beginning of equality in public education or we will see the end of public education.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE SUPPORTS FINANCING OF PUBLIC BROADCASTING

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my

colleagues to some of the support which has been announced today for the legislation which I have introduced to provide long-range financing for public broadcasting (H.R. 11807).

As I have said many times in the past, the need to insulate public broadcasting from governmental pressure has become increasingly imperative. The bill which I have introduced and on which the Subcommittee on Communications and Power will begin hearings tomorrow is an overdue step in the direction of permanent financing—a type of financing which will provide this insulation.

I include the statement issued today by the Advisory Committee of National Organizations of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Also included is the list of separate organizations which have specifically endorsed my bill.

The material follows:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE SUPPORTS FINANCING OF PUBLIC BROADCASTING

WASHINGTON, D.C., January 31.—Representatives from 30 major national organizations have endorsed a resolution supporting long-range financing for public broadcasting.

The resolution was unanimously passed by delegates attending the meeting of the Advisory Committee of National Organizations of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting on January 11. (A list of the organizations and a copy of the resolution are attached.)

The Advisory Committee resolution specifically expressed support for H.R. 11807, legislation sponsored by Rep. Torbert H. Macdonald (D-Mass.), which contains some aspects of long-range financing.

Rev. William F. Fore, executive director of the Broadcasting and Film Division of the National Council of Churches and chairman of the CPB Advisory Committee, said the resolution was being released now to coincide with the opening of hearings by the House Subcommittee on Communications and Power on H.R. 11807 and other financing legislation. Congressman Macdonald is chairman of the subcommittee.

In addition to the action by the Advisory delegates, 13 of the member organizations have taken official action individually in support of long-range financing for public broadcasting. These include the AFL-CIO, American Association of University Women, American Bar Association, American Jewish Committee, National Association of Counties, National Council of Churches Broadcasting and Film Commission, National Council of Senior Citizens, National Council of Women, National Education Association, National Grange, National League of Cities, United Auto Workers and U.S. Conference of Mayors.

Members of the CPB Advisory Committee have been meeting with Corporation leaders regularly to provide counsel on both policy issues and programming since CPB became operational in 1969.

RESOLUTION ENACTED BY CPB ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, JANUARY 11, 1972

Whereas Congress, by enactment of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, declared that involving public broadcasting as "an expression of diversity and excellence" was a matter of national importance, that would help raise the educational level and public welfare of the nation generally, and;

Whereas, in 1967, the Carnegie Commission urged that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting be financed on a long-term basis in order to permit its operation to be free from "political interference," and;

Whereas, the full promise of public broadcasting cannot be achieved until a plan for

permanent financing is put into effect, and continued delay in providing such long-range financing threatens the very existence of public broadcasting, and;

Whereas, the Corporation has provided substantial financial assistance to all qualified public television and radio stations through its program of annual community service grants, and recognizes the need for a sizeable increase in this kind of support in order to strengthen local stations;

Therefore be it resolved that the Advisory Committee of National Organizations of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting urges Congress and the Executive Branch for Public Broadcasting possible to provide long-range financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting in order to enable CPB to effectively build and strengthen the public broadcasting system that best serves the greatest number of American listeners and viewers.

Be it further resolved that those constituent organizations which have representatives on the Advisory Committee of National Organizations and which are in a position to do so, be asked to endorse and advocate the concept of long-range financing for CPB and the adoption of H.R. 11807, "Public Broadcasting Act of 1971" or similar legislation which provides long-term financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

Delegates from the following organizations voted for the CPB Advisory Committee resolution on the Macdonald bill for long-range financing:

AFL-CIO.
American Bar Association.
American Association of University Women.
American Jewish Committee.
Associated Councils of the Arts.
Boy Scouts of America.
Consumer Federation of America.
General Federation of Women's Clubs.
Girl Scouts of America.
League of Women Voters.
National Association of Counties.
National Association of Manufacturers.
National Audubon Society.
National Conference of Christians and Jews.
National Congress of Parents and Teachers.
National Council of Churches of Christ.
National Council of Negro Women.
National Council of Senior Citizens.
National Council of Women.
National Education Association.
National Grange.
National 4-H Club.
National League of Cities.
National Legal Aid and Defender Association.
National Recreation and Park Association.
National Urban League.
U.S. Catholic Conference.
U.S. Conference of Mayors.
U.S. Jaycees.
U.S. National Student Association.

DOCK STRIKE HANGS ON

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the intolerable west coast dock strike continues to hang on. In the next few days, the Taft-Hartley injunction will expire in the east coast and gulf ports disputes. The following editorial by the Iowa Farm Bureau Spokesman entitled "Dock Strike 'Obsession'" graphically illustrates the eco-

nomic burden that these work stoppages have placed on the innocent third parties to these strikes. Legislation to bring about a permanent solution to these strikes has been introduced by me. I urge Congress to adopt such a measure as soon as possible.

The editorial follows:

DOCK STRIKE "OBSESSION"

Some have charged that Farm Bureau and others have an obsession with dock strikes and imply that this is being used as an escape from grappling with the real agricultural issues.

If you call it an obsession to being concerned with the ability to move production from 1 out of every 4 acres harvested to overseas markets, then we plead guilty.

Export markets are extremely important to agriculture. Without export markets farmers and the nation would have to retire another 35 to 40 million acres of land besides the announced goal of 50 million acres under the 1972 feed grain and wheat programs. And we would have to retire or find other uses for 45 million acres now devoted to soybean production.

Farmers know that \$1 out of every \$7 of farm income comes from the export market.

We wish we could be as complacent as some that the export movement of feed grains, wheat and soybeans will be as great as it would have been without the dock strikes.

First, this doesn't help the farmer who sold at harvest time when the dock strikes depressed prices and estimated 10 cents per bushel on corn and an estimated 25 cents per bushel on soybeans.

Second, this complacency ignores the report that our foreign customers are turning to other markets for these products because we couldn't supply them when they wanted the products and the uncertainty about future deliveries.

No one argues that the enormous production in 1971 is not a factor in the low corn prices. But that is the very reason for the extra concern about the dock strikes. With extra large production and possible stiff foreign competition, we need to be in a position to move the feed grains, wheat and soybeans when our customers want them. It is much better to sell this surplus and get it off our backs than to pile it up in government storage, have the costs of this storage charged against farmers in the federal budget and then depress the market when stocks come back on the market—as they always have.

Farm Bureau does have an obsession in doing everything possible to improve farm income, including fighting hard for legislation to put an end to the devastating and costly transportation strikes, such as the present dock strikes.

An effort is being made to make changes in the present government farm program to retire additional acreage to bring adjustments in the supply demand situation for corn. In its policy resolutions and other actions, Farm Bureau has urged the Secretary of Agriculture to use his broad authority under the 1970 agricultural act in such a manner that farmers will have economy opportunities more comparable to those of persons in other segments of our national economy.

But while there is adequate legislation if properly administered to handle the supply and adjustment in agriculture, there is not now satisfactory legislation to handle the problems of transportation industry strikes that are costly to agriculture, the public and the nation.

And we intend to be obsessed with the need for action on this issue until Congress demonstrates that it is concerned and acts.

SALUTE TO JAYCEES

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, much of the political news generated by the presidential candidates originated in Florida, at the annual meeting of the Florida Jaycees. It should come as no surprise that the candidates are sharing their views with the Jaycees and hoping for their support in return. As I, and many of my colleagues, know very well, the jaycees are among the more influential and dedicated citizens in thousands of communities throughout the Nation.

I am fortunate to have more than a dozen hard-working jaycee chapters in my district. Each year, during January, the jaycees observe the founding of their organization and I would like to take this opportunity to salute the jaycees, particularly those in the north region of Illinois.

I have attended several jaycee functions and have been deeply impressed by their hard work and their dedication to their communities. These young men, who range in age from 21 to 35, spend countless hours of volunteer time in service to their fellow men. In so doing, they not only receive great personal satisfaction, but they also are developing the important qualities of leadership and public service.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, President Nixon, a former jaycee, paid tribute to the jaycees by declaring a "National Jaycee Week." I would like to offer my best wishes to the jaycees and, for my colleagues who are not familiar with the jaycees, I include the Jaycee Creed. Its message is one I think very worth spreading.

THE JAYCEE CREED

We believe:
That faith in God gives meaning and purpose to human life;
That the brotherhood of men transcends the sovereignty of nations;
That economic justice can best be won by free men through free enterprise;
That government should be of laws, rather than of men;
That earth's great treasure lies in human personality;
And that service to humanity is the best work of life.

SECRET GOP LINK PROVEN

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, January 22, I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a series of documents that revealed the link between the Republican National Committee and the leadership of the National League of Families of American Prisoners of War and Missing in Action in Southeast Asia.

Additional information that I have received conclusively proves that the Republican National Committee had already taken command of the league's fund-raising activities before the Democratic Party was even contacted. Final arrangements for Republican fund raising management of the league were finalized 8 days before the league even requested similar assistance from the Democratic National Committee.

I believe that the belated letter to the Democratic National Committee was a Republican coverup hiding the link between the Republican National Committee and the league. The GOP took over fund raising activities for the league secretly without any notification to the general membership of the organization.

With the league receiving fund-raising advice and help from the Republican National Committee, it comes as no surprise that they followed the administration's line on the Mansfield-Boland amendment which was considered by this House in November. It was no mere coincidence that the position of the Nixon administration and the league were identical.

The connection between the league and the Republican National Committee has apparently become so close that the national coordinator of the league and Senator ROBERT DOLE, of the Republican National Committee, have made similar statements to the press.

I have renewed my call to Senator DOLE to immediately pull his advisers out of the league affairs so that the league can operate in a truly nonpartisan manner. I applaud the decision of the league to form a nonpartisan political committee to study the positions of various presidential candidates on POW issues. My only hope is that the GOP is removed from the affairs of the league so that this nonpartisan political committee can truly be nonpartisan.

The documents follow:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,

April 14, 1971.

DEAR BOARD MEMBER: The attached outline was submitted to us by Bob O'Dell and Wayne Bradley who volunteered to help us in direct-mail soliciting. Bob O'Dell is Republican National Committee (Finance) Executive Director, and Wayne Bradley is Executive Director of the American Medical Association in Washington, D.C.

Both, when we first met with them, believed that we paid very high prices for our last campaign, though the results were fairly good. We were given an outline of costs, which is as follows:

	Per thousand
Postage	\$16
Mailing services	8
Letter printing	4
Printing card (computer)	10
Enclosure	5
Lists	
Envelopes (750,000 already printed and unused per thousand)	
Total	43

Mr. Bradley will have the solicitation letter written, and we believe paper for the letters and the enclosures will be donated.

Most importantly, no one will know that we are using the lists owned by the Republican National Committee. The Committee it-

self has got to protect its donors. So the mailing will be done in such a way that the Republican donors will not know that their names have been supplied by the Republican National Committee.

Mr. Havens, Mr. Wagner, and Dr. Ladley feel that we must make another appeal for donations soon. Thus, we ask you to consider this carefully, discuss it with the other Board members, and send or phone your votes in to Jane Denton (703) 340-6349 as soon as possible.

JOAN.

APRIL 14, 1971.

Memorandum for: The League of Families.

From: Robert P. Odell, Jr.

Subject: League solicitations.

I. COMPUTER SERVICES

Maurice DuFour, President of IBM, has agreed to maintain and print the necessary documents for the past contributors to the League. Someone on the staff of the League should call Mr. DuFour at 965-5015 to make the necessary arrangements for transferring the tape from the facility that Gorman was using.

II. MAINTENANCE OF PAST CONTRIBUTOR FILE

(a) Certain statistical counts should be made of the current file including the total number of names, breakdown of individual contribution amounts, etc.

(b) The League should determine whether or not each and every individual who contributed something through the direct mail program has actually been thanked and provided with an action pack. Those who have contributed \$100 or more should be extracted from the file and a special letter of appreciation sent to them.

(c) Approximately 6 months after the initial solicitation, it would be appropriate and worthwhile to re-solicit these individuals for a contribution. The letter should indicate that the League recognizes their past support and is returning to its friends with the hope that they may be able to help out again. This solicitation should also indicate, in rather specific terms, what the money will be used for.

III. NEW SOLICITATIONS

(a) It is my suggestion that the League develop a solicitation program for new contributors. The program should include the selection and use of lists which might be made available to the group on a free basis.

(b) Copy should be developed by a professional on a no fee basis.

(c) A knowledgeable and experienced individual on a volunteer basis should purchase supplies and coordinate the physical arrangements for the mailing.

(d) A group of informed volunteers should act as a steering committee to set overall policy and direction for the mail solicitation.

It should be always understood that the solicitation mailing also spreads the word about the POW-MIA situation. Therefore, great care should be taken to insure that the message in the mail is very very clear.

IV. FULFILLMENT

(a) Each and every contributor should receive a receipt and/or thank you letter for their contribution. Those who contribute a substantial sum should receive a personal letter from the head of the League.

(b) If it is the purpose of the League to send its message to as many people as possible and to enlist support for its cause across the country, it should either on a regular or continuing basis, mail to its contributor list information on its activities. Individuals who have already contributed have indicated their support, but should be kept up to date on the problems and the work of the League on a continuing basis.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF FAMILIES OF
AMERICAN PRISONERS AND MISS-
ING IN SOUTHEAST ASIA.

Washington, D.C., April 22, 1972.

Mr. LARRY O'BRIEN,
Chairman, Democratic National Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. O'BRIEN: As you know, the League has certain expenses in its continuing efforts to remind the American people and arouse world opinion to the situation involving the prisoners of war and missing in action in Southeast Asia. While these financial needs are not great, nevertheless, they are real.

Through a groups of volunteers in the direct-mail business, we are planning to solicit funds from a wide range of the American public. In an earlier fund-raising effort, we were charged for the use of lists. Our advisors suggested that we contact you in your post as Chairman of the Democratic National Committee to ask if it would be possible to use the Committee's donor lists. We were advised by our consultants that your names can be used in such a way that the donors will be unaware that the names are furnished by the Democratic National Committee.

We would be most grateful for your consideration of this request.

Very sincerely,

JOAN M. VINSON,
National Coordinator.

CBS INTERVIEW WITH ROBERT DOLE, JUNE 29,
1971

CRONKITE. The Senate's mandate last week for an end of American involvement in Indochina—if the prisoners are released—puts new pressure on President Nixon to announce a withdrawal date. But as it was written by Majority Leader Mansfield, it is a statement of Senate policy; it is not binding law. Even if the House had not rejected it yesterday, Mr. Nixon could have refused to implement its nine-month deadline. And present indications are he will reject any such deadline.

It also now appears that the Administration is de-emphasizing the POW issue it has espoused so ardently during the last two years, and is putting more emphasis on the ability of Saigon to survive. Republican National Chairman Robert Dole indicated as much in an interview with Bob Schaffer.

DOLE. We have to be very candid about it, we don't want to stay there just for the prisoners, we don't want to get out just for the prisoners. They're very important, but they represent less than one-half of one percent of the Americans who've died in South Vietnam.

STATEMENT OF MRS. JOAN VINSON, NATIONAL
COORDINATOR

174 of our members returned Sunday after an 8-day mission to Geneva, Paris and 9 other European capitals. The main goal of the first portion of the trip, in Geneva, was to ask the representatives of some 35 countries to respect and insure respect for the Geneva Conventions of 1949 Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War. Though we have no way of knowing at this time the ultimate results of our efforts, we do know that on the first day of the conference, the matter of prisoners of war—which had not previously been on the agenda for discussion—was introduced by another country.

On May 27, in Paris, our entire group observed the arrivals of the four parties involved in the Peace Talks. Reporters present asked the North Vietnamese and the Provisional Revolutionary Government delegates if our members would be permitted an audience with either of their delegations. The PRG representative refused. The North Vietnamese representative stated that he did not feel that members of his delegation would have enough time to meet with us. He did in-

dicade that he believed a meeting could be arranged between some of our members and their embassy. Immediately thereafter, we contacted the North Vietnamese embassy, requested an appointment for five of our members, and were told that they would call us back with an answer. In toto, we contacted them seven times—each with the answer, "No appointment has yet been arranged."

Needless to say, we were extremely disappointed in the other side's refusal to see us. We believe that if they are sincere in their desire for a lasting peace, they would open their door to the people who have truly felt the effects of this tragic war.

Because the President said that he wanted a commitment from the communists, regarding the release of prisoners, we attempted to contact the North Vietnamese and the PRG to ask them to make this commitment publicly to Ambassador Bruce. We have been deeply frustrated by the reports of various congressmen and newsmen and other groups who sincerely believe that the other side has made a commitment for the release of prisoners of war. However, no such statement is on the official record, although those words would clear the way for the President to announce total withdrawal of troops from Indochina. We urge the communists to make this clarification.

In no other war in history have prisoners been used to this degree to bargain for political concessions. It seems to us that the whole question of peace in Indochina has now been focused, by both sides, on the prisoner of war issue. If the handling of the prisoners truly is the major stumbling block, then it seems to us that it can be solved very easily by relatively minor moves by both sides.

It's difficult to imagine that our relatives in Southeast Asia can survive any more extended wranglings and negotiations. The North Vietnamese have told us that they do not intend to take the first step. They do not intend to release and account for our relatives until after the date for total withdrawal has been set. We can, therefore, only hope that the President and his negotiators in Paris are prepared to initiate other means of resolving the war in Indochina and securing the release and accounting for our men.

We would like to see both sides demonstrate more flexibility and conciliation than is represented by the over-simplified "Set a withdrawal date, and we'll discuss release of prisoners," and "Promise to release the prisoners, and we'll discuss a withdrawal date." Surely there is room for negotiations somewhere between these two undeviating positions.

It has also been charged that the prisoner of war question is not the real issue. That it is being used as an excuse by one side or the other to prolong the war and avoid a settlement at this time. We resent the possibility that our men's lives have become meaningless ciphers in the manipulation of international politics. Their lives mean too much to us.

If the prisoners are not the real issue, then it is time for both sides to start talking about what may be the real problems in achieving a settlement of this war. It has been speculated that there are issues beneath the surface, beyond troop-withdrawal dates and discussion for release of prisoners. Some say the North Vietnamese will demand concessions in the area of American air power, military advisors and coalition governments as well as settlements in Laos and Cambodia.

If these are root issues, they should be dealt with directly. The prisoners should be removed from such bartering and afforded the protections dictated by humanitarian law.

We would like to have the POW/MIA issue put in its proper perspective.

We do not want the prisoners to be the

only reason we remain in Vietnam, nor do we want them to be the only reason we leave.

JANUARY 26, 1972.

HON. ROBERT DOLE,
Republican National Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOLE: It has come to my attention that the Republican National Committee finalized plans to, in effect, take on the management of the League of Families of American Prisoners and Missing in Action in Southeast Asia before the Democratic National Committee was even notified.

The memorandum from the Republican National Financial Committee giving detailed advice on fund-raising was dated April 14. On April 22 the League asked the Democratic National Committee for help only as an afterthought and as a cover up for Republican control.

The League supposedly is a non-partisan organization. How can the League pretend to be non-partisan or to represent the real views of the POW families when it is dependent on Republican funds and political advice?

I renew my call for you to immediately pull your advisors out of the League's affairs, so that it can operate in a truly non-partisan manner.

Sincerely,

LEE ASPIN,
Member of Congress.

PUBLIC OPINION POLL OF LEGION
OF ESTONIAN LIBERATION

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Legion of Estonian Liberation recently conducted an opinion poll among its members to determine their feelings about a wide variety of current issues.

Mr. Maido Kari, executive secretary of the legion, wrote to President Nixon following the compilation of the results, saying that he believed the statistics to be indicative of the general views of Estonians in the United States, and I now insert the results of the questionnaire into the RECORD:

LEGION OF ESTONIAN LIBERATION, INC.,
Gaithersburg, Md., December 14, 1971.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is a pleasure to forward for your information the results of the second annual opinion poll among the members of the Legion of Estonian Liberation, Inc. The mailed poll was conducted during the mid and latter part of November with a 21.9% return. The average age of the respondents was 54.3 years.

It is clear from the poll that our members support the recently initiated economic programs and opposed the Congressional withdrawal of funds for the SST.

Your overtures toward the Peoples Republic of China as well as your trip to Peking are opposed by the majority. The same holds true for the trip to Moscow and increasing of trade with the Soviets.

Our membership supported the administration in its policies to admit the Peoples Republic of China to the United Nations while retaining Nationalist China as a UN member.

They disapprove the Mayday demonstra-

tions in Washington, D.C. and think that the best deterrent to crime is stiffer punishment.

The respondents to the questionnaire thought that the biggest threat to the na-

tional security is from the Soviet Union and that the most pressing internal problem facing the Nation is inflation.

Your performance in office was rated either excellent or good by 66.4% of our

[In percent]

members and 55.1% would have voted for you as President during the polling period.

Respectfully,

MAIDO KARI,
Executive Secretary.

	Yes	No	No opinion	No answer		Yes	No	No opinion	No answer
1. Do you support the President's troop withdrawal program in Vietnam?.....	64.8	31.8	1.8	1.8	19. What do you think are the best 3 means to cut the crime rate:				
	Favor	Oppose	No opinion	No answer	(a) Provide better police training and selection?.....	77.6	9.3		13.1
2. Do you favor or oppose a firm deadline (Mar. 31, 1972) for complete withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Vietnam?.....	8.4	84.2	5.6	1.8	(b) Stiffer punishment?.....	92.6	3.7		3.7
3. Do you favor or oppose the President's price, wage and rent freeze?.....	86.0	10.3	3.7	0	(c) Increase the capacity of courts to handle criminal cases?.....	83.2	5.6		11.2
	Agree	Disagree	No opinion	No answer	(d) Improve rehabilitation programs in prisons?.....	43.0	28.0		29.0
4. Do you agree or disagree with the phase II of the freeze program to control inflation?.....	82.3	11.2	5.6	.9		Favor	Oppose	No opinion	No answer
	Favor	Oppose	No opinion	No answer	20. Would you favor or oppose the legalization of marihuana?.....	14.0	76.6	9.3	0
5. Do you favor or oppose a freeze on interest rates?.....	72.9	17.8	7.5	1.8		Yes	No	No opinion	No answer
6. Do you favor or oppose a freeze on corporate profits?.....	65.9	19.2	13.1	1.8	21. Do you support the concept of an all volunteer army?.....	17.7	74.8	7.5	3.7
7. Did you favor or oppose the action of Congress in withdrawing Government financial support for development of the supersonic transport (SST)?.....	21.4	62.7	13.1	2.8	22. Do you support a constitutional amendment which would allow prayer in the public schools?.....	84.1	3.8	8.4	3.7
8. Do you favor or oppose President Nixon's overture to the Peoples Republic of China?.....	32.7	51.5	14.9	.9	23. Should the U.S. Constitution be amended to guarantee equal rights for men and women?.....	59.0	22.4	14.9	3.7
9. Do you favor or oppose the President's proposed trip to Peking?.....	32.7	55.1	12.2	0	24. The biggest (rank in order from 1 to 5) threat to our national security in the next 5 years will come from:				
10. Did you favor or oppose the admission of the Peoples Republic of China to the United Nations, provided Nationalist China (Taiwan) retained its seat in the United Nations?.....	54.4	35.5	5.6	4.5	1. Soviet Union.....	53.4			
11. Did you favor or oppose the admission of the Peoples Republic of China to the United Nations, even if it resulted in Nationalist China's withdrawal or removal from the United Nations?.....	6.5	84.2	6.5	2.8	2. International communism.....	41.0			
12. Do you favor or oppose an amendment to the U.S. Constitution which would require that no public school student shall because of his race, color, or creed be assigned to or required to attend a particular school?.....	41.3	38.3	15.9	4.5	3. Peoples Republic of China.....	2.8			
	Yes	No	No opinion	No answer	4. The Middle East.....	2.8			
13. Do you believe Israel should withdraw from occupied territories as a precondition to peace negotiations?.....	30.8	56.1	13.1	0	5. North Vietnam.....	0			
14. The FBI has become the subject of recent controversy:					25. Foreign aid:				
(a) Are you satisfied with the FBI's general performance?.....	82.2	8.4	9.4	0	(a) Should the United States continue to extend military aid to non-Communist nations?.....	76.7	4.7	2.7	15.9
(b) Do you think the FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover should retire now?.....	17.7	64.6	14.9	2.8	(b) Should the United States continue to extend economic aid to other nations?.....	36.6	46.7	9.3	7.4
	Approve	Disapprove	No opinion	No answer	26. Should the Federal Government enact laws to prevent strikes by public employees?.....	88.1	2.7	6.5	2.7
15. In general, do you approve or disapprove of the Mayday demonstration against the war in Washington, D.C. this spring?.....	1.9	93.4	4.7	0	27. Do you favor or oppose stepped-up Federal spending programs to combat water, air, and noise pollution?.....	76.7	8.4	11.2	3.7
16. Do you approve or disapprove of the way the Washington police handled the demonstration?.....	84.1	4.7	6.5	4.7	28. Do you think your local newspapers (other than in editorials) report the news impartially?.....	37.6	45.6	11.2	5.6
	Too much	Right amount	Too easy	No opinion		Favor	Oppose	No opinion	No answer
17. Do you think the Washington police used too much force in handling the demonstrations, about the right amount, or were the police too easy on the demonstrators?.....	0	33.6	59.0	6.5	29. Do you favor or oppose President Nixon's trip to Moscow?.....	28.9	62.7	3.7	4.7
	Favor	Oppose	No opinion	No answer		Yes	No	No opinion	No answer
18. Do you favor or oppose Congress enacting a national health insurance program to cover catastrophic or prolonged illness?.....	73.8	11.2	10.3	4.7	30. Do you favor increasing trade between the United States and Soviet Union?.....	11.2	81.3	5.6	1.8
					31. Do you support the continuation of the space program at its present level?.....	79.8	9.3	8.2	2.7
					32. In your opinion what are the most pressing problems facing the Nation? (please number in order of importance):				
					1. Inflation.....	39.3			
					2. Crime.....	36.5			
					3. Unemployment.....	17.8			
					4. Drug addiction.....	3.7			
					5. Vietnam war.....	2.7			
					6. Pollution.....	0.9			
						Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
					33. How do you rate President Nixon's and Vice President Agnew's performance in office?	27.2	39.2	21.5	12.1
					President Nixon.....	58.0	32.7	9.3	0
					Vice President Agnew.....				
					34. If Presidential elections were held tomorrow whom would you vote for President?				
					1. Richard Nixon.....	55.1			
					2. Spiro Agnew.....	24.3			
					3. Governor George Wallace.....	14.1			
					4. Senator Jackson.....	1.9			
					5. Governor Nelson Rockefeller.....	1.9			
					6. Lyndon B. Johnson.....	1.8			
					7. Representative Wilbur Mills.....	.9			

HAVRE DE GRACE GI KILLED IN INDOCHINA

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, a fine young man from Maryland, Army

Sp4c. Ronald A. Spudis, was recently killed in action in Vietnam. I would like to commend his courage and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

The article follows:

HAVRE DE GRACE GI KILLED IN INDOCHINA
Army Spec. 4 Ronald A. Spudis, 21, son of Mr. and Mrs. Albert A. Spudis, of Havre de Grace, was killed in action in Indochina

Saturday, the Department of Defense announced yesterday.

Neither the family's parish priest nor the Army chaplain who brought the news of the infantryman's death to the family were able to furnish any details other than that "he was killed in Southeast Asia as a result of hostile action."

A native of Havre de Grace, Specialist Spudis was president of his class at John Carroll Senior High School. While there he

participated in all sports, according to his mother, and was a member of the Glee Club.

Before he was drafted in August, 1970, he was attending Harford Junior College. He was active in the affairs of St. Patrick's Church.

Specialist Spudis is survived by his parents, a sister, Mrs. Barbara Bullock, of Edgewood, Md., two nephews, David and Anthony Bullock and a niece, Claire Bullock.

YOU CAN TRUST MUSKIE

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I read a very interesting editorial in the January 22, 1972, Knoxville, Tenn., News-Sentinel. I think it provokes some deep thought about our presidential candidates and their credibility. I would like to share it with my colleagues by placing it in the RECORD. The article follows:

YOU CAN TRUST MUSKIE

So say the signs that blossom when Sen. Edmund S. Muskie of Maine takes his candidacy for the Democratic presidential nomination across the land.

Scripps-Howard's chief political writer, Ted Knap, reports Muskie braintrusters set great store by polls which show their man's credibility quotient is higher than President Nixon's.

Thus, in what has come to be known as the "packaging" of the candidate, the political packagers and the candidate himself are seeking to exploit the "down-home" image of Muskie as a man whose word is his bond.

Fair enough. Not all Administration promises have been kept.

But at this relatively early stage of the game we would suggest that the Muskie packagers supply the candidate with some words more readily bondable than a good deal of the simplistic pap he has been offering.

For example:

1. "The surest way to make jobs is to make jobs."

2. "I believe we should bring American troops home by bringing all of them home."

This sort of "wisdom" might send a Zen Buddhist into rapturous contemplation of his navel, but it's hardly adequate for the American taxpayer-citizen who wants to know precisely how these things are to be done, how much they will cost and what their long-range domestic or international effects will be.

The "jobs" issue, it turns out, amounts merely to expanding the existing program of making the Government the employer of last resort.

And the "bring the troops home" issue, Muskie says, means he'd stop bombing North Vietnam and offer to withdraw all U.S. forces from South Vietnam by a fixed date in exchange for release of American prisoners and guaranteed safety of the withdrawing forces. This seems to be a tactical, rather than strategic difference with an Administration that already has made significant strides toward bringing the troops home.

Likewise Muskie proclaims: "I think what we want once again is a country we can love, a country we can believe in, fight for and die for. If we build that kind of country nobody will have to die for it."

We think even the candidate himself might have axed that ringing line if he had had an opportunity to think about it a bit.

The only way to construe that statement is that Muskie thinks that right now "we" no longer love our country, no longer believe in it and are unwilling to fight and die for it as we once did.

That, in our opinion, is hogwash. The fact that Muskie and a horde of fellow Democrats are scrambling for the nomination is evidence that the great majority of the citizenry loves and believes enough in the American dream to work toward it through the two-party system.

To simply, as Muskie does, say that "we" are unwilling to fight and die is a gross insult to the hundreds of thousands of American military men who as careerists or draftees today serve the nation at home and abroad.

Credibility is a legitimate enough issue. But the candidate who chooses to make it one carries an extra burden of proof of his own credibility. And we suspect Muskie is a more credible man than much of his oratory thus far would indicate.

WBBM RADIO SPEAKS OUT ON THE NEED FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, WBBM radio in Chicago has a reputation as one of the most influential molders of public opinion in my city. That station through its editorial series has spoken out forcefully and responsibly on most of the major issues faced by Chicagoans.

Therefore, it was with great pleasure that I heard WBBM add its influential voice to the call for a more realistic attitude toward vocational education in our society. I have been advocating the same idea for years and it is therefore with a great measure of pride that I bring to the House's attention the editorial endorsing this position.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial follows:

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

WBBM feels it's time for a more realistic attitude toward vocational education. What's wrong with working with your hands? A major newspaper reports that by 1980 some eighty per cent of all jobs will require less than a college degree. But these jobs will require skills. This demand is going to have to be met and it seems unlikely that a person who has spent years studying the Romance Languages would have these skills.

Certainly there will always be a need for a student who has mastered the Romance Languages. But what we're talking about is what we might call the average student. Bright . . . but not brilliant. Brilliant . . . but in a different way. Goaded by his parents he might go to college to become an accountant when he really wanted to be a barber.

Everyone doesn't have to go to college to be successful. Perhaps we were all shaken in the 50's when the Russians launched the sputnik. America, the world leader, was being outstripped. In more recent years young people have attended colleges and graduate schools to avoid being drafted.

Polls indicate that Americans are most concerned about the economy. The economists talk about a thing called "proper allocation of resources." Youth is probably our most vital resource. We aren't going to achieve this favorable balance with a society of tradesmen . . . nor will we achieve it with a society of eggheads.

THE SOVIET NAVY

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in this year of the administration's escalating requests for military appropriations we shall be hearing much about the threat of the expanding Soviet Navy and the need for a massive buildup of the U.S. Navy in response. The public and Members of Congress will be bombarded with the latest exciting details of Soviet submarine construction, antiship missiles, merchant marine tonnage, deployments to the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean, and ominous hints that the Soviets are finally, at last, building a genuine aircraft carrier. We will certainly be made aware of the threat in all its infinite detail.

What we will not be given is a coherent framework for understanding what the growth of the Soviet Navy really means for the national security of the United States. We will not know what reasonable and necessary steps should be taken on our part. There is a clear danger of an aimless, tit-for-tat reaction that is based on nothing more than a primitive intuition that we must constantly have more and better, matching the Soviets ship for ship, sub for sub. The astonishingly gigantic increase in funding for the ULMS submarine program in the fiscal 1973 defense budget, responding to the alleged threat from an almost totally ineffective Soviet antisubmarine warfare effort, is a first indication of the trend toward overreaction to the Soviet Navy. We may confidently expect that there is more to come, unless we stop and think.

There are very few Western experts on Soviet naval developments to whom one can turn with some confidence that one will receive an informed and balanced appraisal. The former British naval commander Michael McCwire is a fortunate exception to the rule. Mr. McCwire served in the Royal Navy for some 25 years and was assistant naval attaché in Moscow. He is currently visiting professor of military and strategic studies at Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Michael McCwire's writings provide an insight into Soviet naval activities that can be found almost nowhere else in unclassified discussions. In the July 1, 1971, RECORD, I previously brought to my colleagues' attention two papers by Mr. McCwire published by the Royal United Service Institution, "Soviet Naval Capabilities and Intentions" and "Soviet Naval Procurement." Today I would like to insert in the RECORD an article by Mr. McCwire that appeared in the October-November 1971 issue of NATO's Fifteen Nations, "Russian Maritime Requirements." I am also inserting a paper by Robert Weinland of the Center for Naval Analyses, "The Changing Mission Structure of the Soviet Navy," that provides an interesting critique of some of Michael McCwire's work. The material follows:

[From NATO's Fifteen Nations, October-November 1971]

RUSSIAN MARITIME REQUIREMENTS

(By Michael McGwire)

(NOTE.—Michael McGwire is visiting Professor of Military and Strategic Studies at Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia.)

(As a Commander in the Royal Navy he served in the function of Assistant Naval Attache in Moscow. He is a Russian Interpreter. Latterly he has been "lecturer on Russian Affairs" in the Department of International Politics at the University of Wales.)

In the past, Russia's maritime policy has been dictated by her extended coastline and the fact that four quite separate seas wash her shores, requiring four self-sufficient fleets to defend them. This has meant that although Russia is predominantly a land power, for the last 200 years her navy has generally been the third or fourth largest in the world. The Revolution did not alter the essential basis of Russian naval requirements; what did change was her position in the international system and the new dogma that all capitalist states were adversaries. Changed, too, was the style of government; this enabled ruthless decisions on relative national priorities and an un-Russian persistence in their application.

But continuity, if not persistence, has been a basic feature of Russian naval policy. Until the late 1950's, their operational concepts were substantially those established in the 1937 "Fighting Instructions" (BUMS-37, pronounced "booms", not "bums"); and it is symptomatic that the post-World War II reconstruction of the navy was the fourth such Twenty-Year Programme to have been started in 65 years.

The question which concerns us here, is whether this continuity was broken in the early sixties, and whether we are now faced with a radically new style of Soviet naval policy, seeking to pursue what we, in the West, see as the traditional policies of a maritime power.

The short answer is no, but. The evidence for this assertion lies in Soviet warship building programmes, the composition of their navy and the pattern of operational deployments. The fundamental change has not been in the aims of Russian naval policy, but in the nature of maritime warfare; most particularly the range from which devastating military force can be launched against strategic targets on land. But; the question does not lend itself to short unqualified answers, and must be viewed in perspective.

PERSPECTIVE

If we bear in mind such factors as the Russian Navy's flair for technical innovation and the sorry record of poor administrative support, it will be sufficient to start with the rebuilding of the Red Fleet. During the 1930's work was put in hand to more than double Soviet naval building capacity, and for the first time a sustained and successful effort was made to establish four largely self-sufficient fleets. The Twenty Year Programme (1928-47) provided for about 9 capital ships, 30 cruisers, 200 destroyers, 400 submarines and large numbers of torpedo boats and naval aircraft. The scale of construction was not excessive, either by comparison with pre-revolutionary programmes (e.g. 1970) or the threat which faced the Soviet Union. What was unusual by contemporary standards was the composition of the Red Fleet, with its seemingly disproportionate number of submarines, torpedo-boats and aircraft, backed by coastal surveillance systems.

This reflected the operational concepts derived from the so-called "young school" of naval strategy; these had been incorporated in BUMS-37, and emphasised the navy's role as one component of combined military

operations. They encouraged withholding engagement, and co-ordinated attacks, relatively close to shore. Of longer-term importance was the "young school's" pragmatic approach, which challenged the "western" doctrine of command of the sea, questioned the relevance of fleet actions such as Jutland, denied the existence of some universal maritime strategy applicable to all nations, and argued that it was not necessarily best to match like against like. The post-war evolution of the Soviet Navy suggests that this iconoclastic approach was thoroughly assimilated by the present high command, who were then in their formative years as naval officers.

1945

Although the "young school's" concept of maritime defence was by-passed by the German land offensive, it was directly relevant to the threat which faced the Soviet Union after the war. Her likely opponents were now the "traditional maritime powers", who had just demonstrated their capacity to project and sustain continental-scale armies by sea. Operational concepts and, to a lesser extent, building programmes were carried over wholesale from before the war, and the Soviet Navy's two main tasks continued as before, but with the recent wartime priorities inverted. The likelihood of invasion by the West was seen as a substantial threat and the task of defending the fleet areas determined the size and shape of the twenty-year building programme; no shipyard capacity was allocated to the task of supporting military operations ashore.

Strategic delivery was added as a third, new task. Being the only weapon available, the submarine-torpedo was the original delivery vehicle, but a submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM) had been developed by 1955. The task of strategic delivery was given priority in the allocation of nuclear propulsion within the fleet.

1954

The first major adjustment to Soviet maritime policy came after Stalin's death in early '53. This engendered a review of national defence, which concluded that the primary threat was from surprise nuclear attack, and belittled the likelihood of major maritime invasion. At this period, the post-war naval building programme had just reached full production; besides her submarine force (planned to be 1200 strong by 1965) the Soviet Union was building a large and reasonably well-balanced surface fleet. Horizon-range cruise missiles were ready to enter service aboard surface ships, and the Soviet Navy had reason to believe that they were ahead of the US Navy in submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBM), and running level on nuclear propulsion.

If the Soviet Union had chosen to continue the existing allocation of resources to naval new-construction, this would have yielded a surplus of capability over her reassessed defensive requirements. It is therefore significant that her political leaders chose instead to shift resources into the domestic economy and into building up the merchant and fishing fleets. The allocations of resources to strategic delivery was not diminished and it was maritime defence which bore the brunt; this involved re-assigning the remaining 7 cruiser-ways and really savage cuts in current and projected naval building programmes, including halting the construction of medium-type submarines. This cut-back in warship production was made possible by the Soviet leaders' willingness to gamble on the successful development of long-range cruise missiles for ship-board application, which replaced the need for large numbers of individual units. It was the present C-in-C of the Navy, Admiral Gorshkov (then only 45), who was promoted

by Khrushchev to force through these controversial decisions.

1957-58

The Soviet Navy came to realise that it had been geographically and technologically out-flanked; the maritime threat once more became a national, rather than a single-service, problem. The US Navy's A3D carrier-borne nuclear strike aircraft could reach Russia's industrial areas from the South Norwegian Sea and the Eastern Mediterranean; the US Navy's submarines had a much higher performance than the Soviet classes about to begin delivery; and the US Navy was establishing an anti-submarine area-defence system off its seaboard which would largely counter Soviet strategic delivery units. The repercussions of the consequential short-term decisions were considerable; they included curtailment or outright cancellation of programmes which had been newly projected in 1954 (*Kynda*, J-Class and *Longbin*), the cancellation of the second generation SSBN and the re-allocation of nuclear hull/propulsion units to what was now the top priority task of countering the carrier.

The quantum jump in the range of carrier-borne aircraft had fundamental policy implications. The maritime defence of Russia had until then been synonymous with the task of defending the separate fleet-areas. Soviet operational concepts and naval force requirements had therefore been predicated on the assumption that the main engagement zone with Western units (including carriers) would always lie within range of shore-based air cover; this was no longer valid. A nuclear submarine was the only naval unit capable of meeting the new requirement that carriers must be countered in distant sea areas; hence the decision to build-up a force of nuclear submarines as the main offensive arm of the fleet. As a corollary, cruise-missile armed units would have to rely on their own sensors for target location, which meant that horizon-range systems must be developed.

The inadequacies of the original classes of strategic delivery units meant an increase rather than a cut-back in the construction of SSBN (nuclear-powered ballistic-missile submarines). With this additional requirement it necessitated a threefold increase in nuclear submarine building capacity; this was scheduled to begin deliveries to the fleet in 1968.

A very different type of consequential development was the establishment in 1958 of a forward submarine base in the Mediterranean, whereby a tender and (ultimately) 8 W-Class were deployed to Valona in Albania.

1961

The third, and most far-reaching shift in naval policy took place in 1961¹ and was prompted by three developments; (the international climate at this period is typified by the U-2 incident and the Berlin wall). Before *Polaris* was deployed, there were widely held doubts about its usefulness, and the Soviet navy was not alone in assuming that it was primarily intended to close the northern arc of threat against Russia; hence the reconfiguration of the cancelled *Stalingrad*s to produce the *Moskva* class of "anti-submarine cruiser" (the Soviet designation) which was intended to extend helicopter coverage and the anti-submarine defense zone in the Barents Sea. However, by 1961 it was clear that the threat from *Polaris* would cover 270° of arc, of which the northern sector was probably the least significant.

Second, the Soviet naval leadership also perceived the particular nature of "nuclear-missile war" at sea. The essential distinction

¹I.e. before September 1962; the Cuban crisis only served to confirm that in American waters a diesel submarine is a dead submarine.

between sea-borne strategic delivery systems is that it is practical to withhold the former from the initial exchange with a fair assurance that the weapons will remain available for a deferred strike. Nuclear war is a possibility inherent in mutual deterrence, and although the Soviet Union wishes to avoid such a war, should it happen she intends to prevail; one might assume that her plans allow for the occupation of a largely undamaged Western Europe. This intention could be thwarted if the USA retained a monopoly of sea-borne nuclear weapons, with which she could dictate the final outcome.

The Soviet Union was not able to rely on matching this monopoly with an equivalent force of her own; her recent experience had shown that she could not be certain that her new-design submarines would have the margin of performance which would guarantee their evasion of US counter-measures. In consequence, if the Soviet Navy was to foreclose the US option of withholding naval systems from the initial exchange, it had to provide for at least the possibility of the destruction of such units at the outbreak of war, irrespective of whether or not the effective reaction time was likely to prevent the actual launch of these strategic weapons.

The third imperative to action was the Soviet Navy's eviction from its Albanian base in mid-1961.

FORWARD DEPLOYMENT

The most far-reaching policy implication was the shift to forward deployment. Faced by the maritime preponderance of the West, this was no simple decision, and Gorshkov has mentioned the need to "meet the qualitatively new requirement" which involved the "organic restructuring of traditional naval policy." The Soviet Navy appears to have evolved a new operational concept which depends on the fact that where nuclear missiles are concerned, the shift from peace to war is instantaneous. Hence, if Soviet naval units are within weapon-range of their Western opponents at the outbreak of war, they only have to survive long enough to discharge their weapons. This concept could be described as posing a permanent counter using the protection of peace. The central (and radical) decision, to by-pass the basic naval requirement to be able to survive in a hostile environment, is fundamental; it has allowed the Soviet Navy to base its future plans on the forward support of unprotected units on distant deployment. Militarily, it is only tenable in the context of mutual deterrence.

An important adjunct to this concept of marking Western strategic delivery units, was the physical extension of the existing Soviet zones of maritime defence (their separate "fleet areas") to cover the more vital sea-areas of threat, such as the Norwegian Sea and the Eastern Mediterranean. This would deny Western units the advantage of unimpeded access, simplify the problem of countering carriers in the area and enable the Soviet Navy to apply certain of its tactical procedures for area defence. These extensions and the requirement to provide forward support to units on distant deployment necessitated the partial rehabilitation of the surface ship as a vital component of the fleet; this was evidenced by various high-ranking statements in early 1962, and the decision to convert *Kotlin* and *Krupnyj* to SAM-armed ASW ships. But this did not diminish the exposed nature of the forward deployments, or the danger that the West would see them as convenient hostages to Soviet good behaviour. It was considered imprudent to rely too heavily on the protection of peace, and future new-construction surface units were to be adequately armed, in order to discourage a pre-emptive strike or seizure.

1967

The Arab/Israeli war in June 1967 provides a final insight into Soviet naval policy. There

are good indications that between 1961-67, increasing but unavailing pressure was brought on Egypt to provide sheltered berths and limited support facilities ashore. After Egypt's defeat, both port and maritime air facilities became available and the quantum jump in the scale, quality and effectiveness of the Soviet naval presence in the Mediterranean was notable. This was a significant development, not least in the unprecedented commitment of the Soviet flag. It raises far-reaching questions as to whether similar base facilities will be essential in other areas, and the extent to which Soviet foreign policy will be influenced by these requirements.

CONTEXT

So much for perspective. Now a few facts to set Soviet policy in context.

STRATEGIC FACTORS

1. To quote Admiral Gorshkov's assessment, in 1967 one third of the United States strategic strike capability was seaborne, and by 1970 the proportion would rise to one half.

2. For the last 14 years Western aircraft carriers have simulated launching nuclear strikes against Russian territory, in the course of major NATO exercises in the South Norwegian Sea.

3. With the increased range of strategic delivery systems, the eastern basin of the Mediterranean is now in many ways of greater defensive concern to the Soviet Union than her Arctic Seas. Moscow is equidistant between the two, but whereas the population and industry thin out to the north, to the south and east of the capital lies the greater part of Russia's industrial strength. A3D strike aircraft were operating from carriers in the Mediterranean by 1958; *Polaris* deployed on patrol in the Mediterranean in March 1963.

4. The Arabian Sea is the optimum area from which to target both Russia and China with the 3000 nm *Poseidon* missile; it also provides good *Polaris* coverage of industrialized central Russia, reaching to just west of Moscow. Well publicised US/Australian discussions began in 1961, resulting in the 1963 agreement that the US Navy should build a VLF station (i.e. to communicate with submerged submarines) at N.W. Cape in Australia.

5. If "Soviet" submarines deployed to mark U.S. naval strike units, had a *point d'appui* in the Caribbean, this would permit a substantial reduction in transit time to the attachment area off the U.S. Navy's East Coast bases. This would enable an increase in time-on task of 20-40% (depending on the standard length of deployment) allowing either a corresponding reduction in the number of units required or an increase in the density of cover.

MATÉRIÉL FACTORS

1. As a measure of the allocation of resources to Naval power, in the 13 years 1958-70, Western nations (i.e. NATO plus Australia, New Zealand and Japan; excluding Sweden and Spain) built 2-3 times as many surface ships of 1000 tons or more, as did the Warsaw Pact countries. If account is taken of the considerable disparities in size and capability at every level of comparison, Western resource allocation has been 3-4 times as great.

2. Until 1968, the USA was building more nuclear submarines per annum than the Soviet Union; thereafter the Soviet rate has been rising to about 16-18 a year (a three-fold increase) while U.S. construction dropped to about five. During the last 13 years the West built more nuclear submarines, but the Soviet Union built more diesel units.

3. As a measure of the problems which have hampered Soviet post-war naval construction, at least 13 surface and eight submarine building programmes have been cancelled or curtailed, comprising over half of those projected. In Russian eyes at least, the performance of these classes was inadequate to

meet the changed requirements since they were first designed. Many of what might seem to be the Soviet Navy's proudest ships, fall within this category.

ECONOMIC FACTORS

1. In 1953, the Soviet Union's merchant tonnage was barely adequate for intra-Russian coastal trade, and if she was not to remain completely in hostage to the West for the carriage of aid as well as trade, she had to build up her own merchant fleet. By 1959 the Soviet Union was managing to carry over half her own trade, but this had fallen back to 37% in 1961, by which time the annual currency drain was running at about \$100 Mn. The proportion rose again to 50% in 1965, but despite the volume of new shipping tonnage, was back to 47% in 1967. It is planned to carry 75% of Soviet trade in Soviet ships by 1980, but this will still leave some 70 million tons of Soviet exports to be shipped in foreign bottoms.

2. Fish provides about 20% of the protein consumed in Russia; fish products now earn foreign currency and are a welcome form of aid.

MARITIME POLICY

It will help us determine whether, or in what way Soviet naval policy has changed if we consider it in terms of their maritime strategy.

Maritime strategy is concerned with the use of the sea; both for a nation's own purposes and the way in which others may use it to harm the nation's interests. A nation's maritime policy reflects the relative importance it attaches to both these strategic aspects (which I will call "purposive" and "preventive" respectively), and its material capacity to pursue effective policies in support.

Western theory has tended to equate maritime strategy with maritime control, but this reflects our particular experience and circumstances. Use of the sea is not synonymous with the use of force at sea, nor is control of the sea always essential to its use. Sea power is only one element of maritime strategy, and its influence is variable.

By tradition, and through force of circumstances, Russian maritime policy has been less concerned to pursue a purposive strategy than to prevent others from using the sea to her disadvantage; but Tsarist policy was frequently ineffective because of lack of political will and inadequate material support.

During the inter-war years the Soviet Union pursued a traditional Russian maritime policy but with a difference; her leaders were convinced of the policy's vital importance and made strenuous efforts to ensure the necessary material capacity to implement an effective preventive strategy. This process was carried through to the post-war years, when the great bulk of the navy's resources were allocated to maritime defence.

By the middle fifties, Soviet maritime policy had developed two purposive elements, and needed to use the world's oceans:

a. For the deployment of strategic delivery submarines.

b. For fishing, trade and aid.

Between 1957-61, there was a five-fold increase in the range from which maritime attack could be launched against targets on land. Shifting the engagement zone to far distant waters changed the substance of preventive strategy, and the advent of nuclear missiles meant that what were essentially wartime tasks, had to be discharged continuously in peacetime. But, it did not change the type of strategy.

This is not just semantics. The *why* of an action is quite as important as the *what*, since it determines the degree of political commitment. In terms of Soviet maritime strategy, this has two major implications.

1. National security takes priority over all other Soviet interests, and defence of the homeland is the irreducible core of any na-

tional strategy. Political commitment to the preventive strategy of a forward naval deployment is therefore likely to be high. The requirements of this strategy are likely, therefore, to influence Soviet foreign policy, and justify action which in other circumstances might be seen as running counter to Russia's long term interests; (eg the deep embroilment in Egypt.)

2. The Soviet Union will naturally extract the maximum political advantage from the enforced presence of Russian naval units in distant sea areas. But options which might lead to a need for positive action will be cautiously pursued and she will be particularly chary of any initiative which might prejudice her primary maritime interests. To a considerable extent, these rely on continuing maritime stability and the freedom of the seas, both of which lie within the gift of the West.

There are both dangers and opportunities to NATO in this situation. On the one hand, Soviet naval action in support of their main preventive strategy will be backed by a far greater degree of political commitment than were it a case of traditional maritime expansionism or an urge to gunboat diplomacy. On the other hand, lesser categories of Soviet naval initiative will be subject to considerable constraints, and the degree of political commitment will be even lower than could otherwise be expected. In this respect the Soviet Union will be more responsive to clear-cut statements of Western interest, and sensitive to prompt and positive Western reactions to a probing initiative.

There remains the question of whether the Soviet Union, now that her fleet has been drawn forward, will be tempted by the political opportunities to develop a traditional world-wide maritime capability in support of an expansionist policy. On balance, for several reasons, this does not seem likely. The sheer scale of Western maritime preponderance; the cost in men and resources of a large all-purpose modern navy; the present structure of her fleet with its emphasis on submarines; the questionable utility of traditional naval power by comparison with the cheaper and more effective instruments of political persuasion which are available to her. But the most convincing reasons still lie in the pattern of her warship building programmes. There are as yet no indications of the considerable diversion of resources which would be required to implement such a shift in policy, and it appears as if the priorities which were so clearly demonstrated in 1954, still persist through today. Certainly, she will use the ships she has, to our maximum discomfiture, encouraging political turbulence and Western maritime hyperchondria. But except where the security of the homeland is threatened, Soviet maritime policy is more concerned with the political advantages which can be gained from the use of the sea, than from the use of force at sea.

It would seem, therefore, that there has been no break in the Soviet Union's traditional maritime policy, in terms of its underlying aims and intentions. What has changed is the substance of the consequential strategies, and with it, the potential range of maritime options which are now open to her.

A final note of caution. Soviet naval requirements are determined in terms of the Western maritime threat to Russia. Any cut-back in Western strike units must automatically release an unscheduled surplus of capability over requirements, which the Soviet Union may be tempted to exploit. Meanwhile, we should reflect that if present trends continue, in 15 years time the Soviet Union will have a force of 300 nuclear submarines; whatever the underlying strategy, this is a capability to be concerned about.

[INS Professional Paper No. 80, Institute of Naval Studies, Center for Naval Analyses, Oct. 7, 1971]

THE CHANGING MISSION STRUCTURE OF THE SOVIET NAVY

(By Robert G. Weinland)

Robert G. Weinland is a member of the professional staff of the Center for Naval Analyses, Arlington, Virginia. The ideas expressed in this paper are those of the author. The paper does not necessarily represent the views of either the Center for Naval Analyses, the United States Navy, or any other sponsoring agency.

This discussion makes two basic points:

1. the character of Soviet naval operations has changed significantly over the last few years, and these changes reflect a modification of the navy's mission structure.

2. we in the West should be more aware of this change, and its implications, than we are at present.

The essence of the argument to be presented is that, while the defense of the homeland against attack from the sea has been, is now, and will undoubtedly continue to be its primary mission, the Soviet navy has recently acquired an additional responsibility—a responsibility for the "protection of the state interests of the USSR on the seas and oceans"—and it has begun to carry out that mission. As a result, it can no longer be regarded as simply one component of the more or less reactive Soviet defense establishment, it must also be considered an active instrument of Soviet foreign policy—and hence the proper subject of greater concern to the West than has heretofore been the case.

There are two questions that must be addressed before this argument can be taken up, however. The first concerns the relationship of this to other explanations of recent Soviet behavior. The second concerns the likely adequacy of any explanation of Soviet behavior.

For far too long, the Soviet navy received much less attention from the analytical community in the West than it deserved. Today it may be receiving more attention from everyone than it deserves—whether or not that is the case remains to be seen.

It is nevertheless clear that our failure to closely monitor the several stages of its development has proved very costly. Had we been watching more carefully along the way, we would undoubtedly know more fully today why it evolved the way it did, and hence what the Soviets intended that it become. This was not done, however, and we are now faced with considerable uncertainty and large gaps in our knowledge of Soviet capabilities and intentions.¹

To talk about uncertainty and gaps in knowledge is not to say that we are operating "in the dark." Quite the contrary; reconstruction and analysis of the history of Soviet naval development has already provided much useful information, and we are currently keeping a very close eye on their activities, which provides more information. We do not, however, have an integrated corpus of clearly articulated, and demonstrably valid and reliable knowledge in this area—especially in the public domain. We need precisely that.

It would therefore be a mistake to undertake a discussion such as this without specific reference to one of the few systematic analyses of this subject published in the open literature to date. Traditionalists should note that I said "systematic," not "quantitative." I am referring here to the recent work of Commander Michael McGwire, RN (ret.).² However controversial his theses may be, he has nevertheless made a significant contri-

bution to our understanding of Soviet naval developments—and it is now clearly incumbent upon those who would speak to this subject to at the very least specify the nature and degree of divergence between their arguments and his.

In addition to his timely and telling comments on the origins and generally counter-productive consequences of alarmism, a charge which I hope cannot be leveled against my remarks here today, McGwire makes a set of observations concerning Soviet naval policy and practice that upon close examination appear to be generally consistent with the available evidence, and well worth repeating. At the risk of telling you something you already know, let me briefly list what one might take to be his principal points.

1. Post World War II Soviet naval development has taken place in response to, and has therefore been shaped by, the threat perceived posed to the USSR by Western naval capabilities.

2. The primary mission of the Soviet fleet is the defense of the homeland against attack from the sea; their attention is consequently focused on at least blunting, if not negating, the principal threat of such attack—Western seabased strategic strike capabilities—and their force is designed to perform this task in the period when that threat is most imminent—the transition to, and initial period of, a general war; the dominant element in this strategy is essentially that of damage-limitation, and involves, to use McGwire's wording, "posing a permanent counter under the protection of peace"; and it is in order to be able to pose this "permanent counter" that they have adopted a posture of forward deployment.

3. Their ability to exploit this forward deployment for purposes other than strategic defense is limited by:

- a. the very requirements of strategic defense that originally brought them forward,
- b. the lack of balance in their force structure, which precludes maintenance of forward deployments in a hostile environment, and
- c. the overall balance of naval forces, which continues to weigh in favor of the West

4. Their predominant interest in the avoidance of general war, and actions that might lead to general war, enforces their adoption of low-risk policies.

5. The combination of these limitations on their ability to exploit forward deployment, and their predominant interest in avoiding war, makes them susceptible to Western counterpressure—i.e., the expansionist content of their behavior can be influenced.

6. Their forward deployment posture nevertheless does cause both military and political problems for the West—some of which have been exacerbated by the Western response.

McGwire actually states a number of these points far more strongly than have I.

This is the principal defect in his argument. Most of what he says is right. Some of what he says, on the other hand, is so right that it is wrong.

Soviet naval policy and practice are in fact predominantly reactive in character and defensive in orientation. In McGwire's argument, however, they are only that—the imperatives of strategic defense are depicted as all-powerful and totally pervasive, and the Soviets are clearly denied freedom of initiative. Strategic defense is the reason for, and explanation of, all that they do.

This is determinism par excellence; and single-factor explanations of this nature—especially explanations of the behavior of organizations as large and multifaceted as

Footnotes at end of article.

the Soviet navy—require a considerable amount of direct empirical evidence in their support before they can be accepted. That kind of evidence simply does not exist in this case.

As indicated, the evidence does support the interpretation of Soviet naval policy and practice as predominantly reactive in character, and defensive in orientation. Some of their actions, however, require other explanations, since they clearly represent initiatives rather than responses, and are directed at the expansion of Soviet influence in the world rather than the defense of the homeland. Other actions require a different explanation, since, while they are reactive in nature, they are reactive to stimuli other than those presented by Western seabased strategic strike capabilities.

This leads us to the reason my McGwire's argument cannot be accepted *in toto*: it does not pay adequate attention to the context in which the Soviet navy was developed and now operates. The Western naval threat certainly represents the most significant aspect of that context, but other aspects of the context—Soviet domestic politics, other Soviet external behaviors, and events in the international political environment—are by no means insignificant, and must be taken into consideration if valid and reliable explanations of Soviet behavior are to be produced.

This obviously complicates the problem. Unfortunately, there is no way around it. We are dealing with complex questions; and there is no reason to believe that they will have other than complex answers.

Any attempt to describe and explain recent Soviet naval activities must explicitly come to grips with two major problems that lie at the heart of this complexity. The first is our imperfect knowledge of the subject. The second is the fact that, while for purposes of analytical convenience we tend to treat the Soviet navy as a more or less homogenous and distinct, even autonomous, entity, in reality it is not that at all.

For a variety of reasons, our knowledge of Soviet naval policy and practice is at best imperfect. In the first place, our information base consists primarily of observations of those things that are more or less readily observable—the statements and actions which are the end products of the policy process. The farther back up that policy chain we attempt to go in analyzing their behavior, the less we are able to rely on empirical evidence, and the more dependent we become on inference. The most directly observable phenomena—operations conducted outside Soviet waters—turn out to be those furthest removed from their policy origins, and thus most susceptible to intervening factors. We can see how deployed forces are used, and learn quite a bit from such observation, but we can't see the antecedent decisions being made and policies being articulated—and these are, of course, the very things we need to know most about in order to understand why the Soviets act as they do.

Secondly, this imperfection in our knowledge is unevenly distributed throughout the analytical community. For obvious reasons, most of what is known does not appear in the public record. Furthermore, most people have no way to assess the quality of that information which is in the public domain. Even if it is assumed that most of this information is accurate, there is no way for them to tell how representative it is of Soviet behavior as a whole.

These two factors acting in combination have severely constrained systematic analysis of Soviet naval policy and practice. Not only has the circle of those directly engaged in such research generally been restricted to the relative few who have access in one way or another to official data sources, the unequal distribution of information has also inhibited the development of a working dialog with those outside this circle—a dia-

log which could facilitate development of the kind of rigorous conceptual thinking we urgently need to both link together the islands of knowledge we do possess, and fill in the gaps between them. That is one reason why, right or wrong, McGwire's work is so important—it makes dialog possible.

Even if our knowledge of Soviet naval policy and practice were perfect, however, we would still be faced with a difficult problem in gaining an understanding of why they act as they do in any one instance. Were the Soviet navy a unitary system, our task would be much simpler, but it isn't. It is a large, complex organization—a congeries of more or less interrelated components, each of which has its own outlook, objectives, and operating procedures—and it therefore enjoys the same institutional irrationalities and inefficiencies as any other large, complex organization. Were the Soviet navy a closed system, our task would also be much simpler, but it isn't. Like any organ of the state, it is not an independent actor. It is told what to do; and the way in which it eventually does what it is told is influenced not only by its internal constitution but also by a whole host of external factors, both domestic and international.

Consequently, in order to insure that our explanations of their naval actions are meaningful, we have to consciously disaggregate our subject of study into its various component factors and actions, and clearly recognize:

First, that some portion of their behavior is the result of explicit decisions of the Soviet government, some the result of general naval policies, and some the result of the initiative of local commanders—and we often can't tell which is which; and

Second, we have to recognize that much of their behavior cannot be explained as the result of some one or another rationally articulated and implemented policy, since it is the product of physical and organizational constraints—some of which we can identify, and some of which we cannot.

The antecedents of most of the external behavior of complex organizations such as this are woefully difficult to recognize. This is especially so when our access to the internal goings-on of these organizations is limited, and we are forced to infer antecedents from their observable consequences—remembering all the while that any action can, and most actions probably do, have more than one antecedent.

In some instances, both the action and the context in which it occurs will be sufficiently unambiguous to permit identification of the relevant antecedents. In other instances, however, that will simply not be the case.

This is because—as indicated several times already—most of these actions will be in fact reactions, responses to changes in the international environment. Again, as already indicated, most of these environmental changes will be changes in the military postures of the West—in particular, seabased strategic strike capabilities. Perhaps as little as five years ago—certainly ten years ago—one could have stated with very high confidence that, not most, but *all* of the changes that elicited such Soviet reactions would have been changes in Western seabased strategic strike capability. That cannot be said today.

Today the Soviets are responding not only to Western strategic forces, they are also responding to events in the international political arena that have no bearing whatsoever on the strategic balance—and their actions are not only responsive, but initiatory as well. At the onset of this discussion it was stated that “the character of Soviet naval operations has changed significantly over the last few years, and these changes reflect a modification of the navy's mission structure.” This increase in the political content of their naval operations in the change to which that statement referred; and the indicated modification to the Soviet naval

mission structure is the addition of the responsibility for “protecting the state interests of the USSR on the seas and oceans.”³

Exactly what this mission entails is not yet clear. The Soviets have not explicitly defined it for us, and we have all been so absorbed with the very real military problems posed by their acquisition of new weapon systems, and the adoption of a forward deployment posture, that this aspect of their activities has not received the attention it deserves.

Not only have they not defined this mission for us, they may not have completely defined it for themselves either; nevertheless, they have begun to carry it out, and an examination of some of their recent operations permits us to see its major outlines. We will of necessity be dealing exclusively with observables here; hence the unknowns will be many, and the residual uncertainty large—but not so large as to prevent our making some inferences, and gaining a reasonably clear understanding of what they probably mean by “protection of the State interests,” as well as a hint of what this might imply for the West.

A “reasonably clear understanding” should not, of course, be portrayed as certainty. As the preceding discussion has attempted to establish, however, a “reasonably clear understanding” is probably all that we can expect to acquire at this juncture.

There are two ways to examine this change in the character of their operations, and illuminate the extent to which their forward deployments serve not only strategic defensive but other ends as well. One way is to examine the Soviet forward deployment posture as a whole, and see where and how closely it parallels the disposition of Western strategic strike forces—colocation presumably being the *sine qua non* of a capability to counter these forces. The other way involves the identification and examination of specific cases in which the Soviet navy has clearly acted, not in defense of the homeland, but to protect state interests. Let us go as far as we can down each of these paths, and see how close we can come to a plausible explanation of their behavior to date, and a forecast of what they appear likely to do in the future.

With the exception of an abortive attempt to circumvent the restrictive provisions of the Montreux Convention by stationing submarines in Albania in the late 1950's, the Soviets did not establish a significant combatant presence outside their home waters until 1964, when they began to deploy surface forces into the Mediterranean on a regular basis. Although they had been making occasional cruises to foreign ports since the mid 1950's, had been conducting annual exercises in the North and Norwegian Seas since the late 1950's, and had caused quite some consternation around Cuba in 1962, 1964 must nevertheless be regarded as the starting point for what we see today.

Since 1964, they have effected a better than ten-fold increase in their out-of-area deployments—with the major portion of this increase occurring during and after 1967, and concentrated in the Mediterranean. Steady-state deployment in the Indian Ocean began in 1968, and periodic cruises to the Caribbean were initiated in 1969. Operational days in the Atlantic and Pacific are accounted for primarily by periodic deployments for their own exercises and monitoring of Western exercises, as well as by inter-fleet transfers—the principal steady-state deployments here are those of intelligence collectors and their own strategic strike forces.

The question at issue—whether these forward deployments are related to the presence of Western strategic strike forces or are undertaken for other purposes—must be approached region by region. With the exception of operations in the Gulf of Tonkin,⁴

Footnotes at end of article.

the general deployment patterns of U.S. forces capable of launching strategic strikes against the Soviet Union—in effect the attack aircraft carriers and ballistic missile launching submarines—have not appreciably varied since before the Soviets began moving forward.

The CVA's have been operating in the Mediterranean and Western Pacific for more than two decades. The first SSBN went on patrol in the Atlantic in 1960, the Mediterranean patrol area was established in 1963, and patrols from Guam were initiated in 1964.

There is no point in attempting to contest the attribution of a strategic defensive motive to Soviet Mediterranean deployments. The West maintains significant strategic strike capabilities there, and the Soviets have good reason to be concerned about them. If we were in their shoes we would be concerned as well.

Having just granted a strategic defensive mission for the Soviet forces in the Mediterranean, if only on the basis of colocation, the following points should nevertheless be made:

CVA's had been there for at least 15 years before the Soviets responded with a permanent counter, and the Soviets cannot have thought them any less dangerous to themselves when first deployed there than they think them to be today;

SSBN's had been deployed there for over a year before the Soviets undertook anything that could conceivably be regarded as a counter-deployment, and for five years before the anti-submarine cruiser Moskva came out;

The initial Soviet combatant deployment coincided with the 1964 Cyprus crisis, and the major escalation in their deployment coincided with the 1967 Arab-Israeli war—but neither coincided with a major change in CVA or SSBN operations, because there was no such change; and finally

While some of the Soviet forces in the Mediterranean may be performing a strategic defensive function *all* of the time (e.g., shadowing carriers), and most if not all of their forces may act in that capacity *some* of the time (e.g., as they did during the invasion of Czechoslovakia), some of these forces indisputably perform other missions (e.g., deterring Israeli strikes on Port Said and Alexandria) in no way connected with the defense of the Soviet homeland, but clearly in defense of Soviet interests in the region.

Furthermore the Soviets have not been reluctant to discuss their Mediterranean deployments in public. While admitting a strategic defensive mission for these forces, they put equal or greater stress on another, essentially political mission: neutralizing Western interventionary capabilities, particularly as represented by the U.S. Sixth Fleet, and directed against their Arab clients.

As stated earlier, a deployment such as the Soviets have effected in the Mediterranean can have more than one antecedent, and therefore be intended to perform more than one mission. Consequently, given the complexity of the context, and the ambiguous nature of many Soviet actions there, while we clearly must grant the Mediterranean Squadron a strategic defensive mission, we must also grant it other functions—in this case political in character.

In most of the other regions where they have assumed a forward deployment posture, the situation is more clear cut, and the context and content of their operations makes identification of their motives comparatively easy. As already indicated, Soviet operations in the North Atlantic and Pacific are clearly governed by strategic offensive and defensive considerations. The establishment of a permanent presence in the Indian Ocean, on the other hand, cannot be regarded as motivated by the same considerations—unless we regard the Soviets as grossly uninformed, or more

paranoid than is usually thought the case, or both. I would hesitate to do either.

Western strategic strike forces are not now, and never have been, stationed in the Indian Ocean; and, given the exigencies of geography and the current and foreseeable strategic balance, there is little incentive for the West to place its offensive capabilities there. We could do it, of course, but it would cost more than it would buy, and the Soviets can calculate this as well as we can.

Since they cannot be operating in defense of the homeland, there being no strategic threat against which to defend, the Soviets must be doing something else in the Indian Ocean. As their actions to date have shown, this "something else" is essentially political in character.

Their periodic deployments to Cuba remain somewhat enigmatic. Had they been allowed to run their course, the purpose of these operations might have become clearer—but U.S. actions have obviously distorted the situation.

Soviet operations off the west coast of Africa, on the other hand, leave little to the imagination; and provide ample evidence of the changing character of their activities. There are two aspects to this change: a significant increase in the scope and intensity of their operations in the region, and an equally if not more significant increase in the political content of these operations.

Prior to the changes, Soviet naval activity off the West African coast was both infrequent and unrelated to events on the littoral. Their naval presence in the area was accounted for primarily by various R&D activities, and the passage of units in transit elsewhere. Within the last two years, however, this situation has come to be the exact opposite. Soviet naval activity off the West African coast has become more or less continuous, and directly related to events on the littoral. Their naval presence in these waters is now accounted for primarily by operations undertaken in defense of established Soviet state interests in the region, and the navy has been employed in active support of Soviet foreign policy undertakings aimed at the establishment of *new* state interests there.

Before identifying and examining a set of cases in which naval operations in this area have been conducted in defense, not of the Soviet homeland, but its overseas interests—one in tempted to say its imperial, if not imperialist, interests—the parallel between Soviet activities off West Africa and their operations in the Indian Ocean should be made clear. Just as there are no Western strategic strike forces deployed in the Indian Ocean, and hence no need to defend against such a threat from that quarter, there are no Western strategic strike forces deployed along the West African littoral, and no reason to suspect that there ever would be. Once again, the costs of operating there outweigh the likely gains, and the Soviets are just as capable as are we of calculating those costs and gains.

It is conceivable that the Soviets might ultimately want to establish some sort of basing structure of their own in the area, perhaps to support forward deployments elsewhere in the Atlantic. Doing so would have much to recommend it; but the chances of their acquiring the necessary rights appear slim indeed, and they would probably be reluctant to pay the costs involved. In any event, this is not what they appear to be doing at the moment—and it is not likely that they will attempt it in the near future.

Their recent naval activities in this region can be classified in at least three categories—each of which apparently represents a different aspect of the overall mission of protection of their state interests. These activities are:

1. protection of their own resources—personnel and equipment—operating in the area,

2. protection of their clients against threats both foreign and domestic, and

3. assistance in the establishment or enhancement of political influence with non-clients.

Some operations apparently have more than one such objective.

As indicated, what is said here about these operations is based on reported observables—overt Soviet activities and public statements—and on inferences linking these Soviet activities with the contexts in which they occurred. Reporting on these operations in the press has been rather minimal, but enough has been revealed to permit the following three undertakings to be pieced together.⁵

The first—a case in which the Soviets apparently acted to protect their own resources—occurred in February-March 1969, and involved the attempted application of "pressure" to Ghana to expedite the release of two Soviet fishing vessels impounded the preceding October. The evidence is purely circumstantial, but two facts lead one to suspect a resort to classic gunboat diplomacy here: (1) the unprecedented deployment of three combatants to this area was undertaken after a series of less radical moves—including strongly-worded protests and the imposition of significant economic sanctions—had not effected release of these trawlers, (2) the release of the trawlers coincided with the obvious presence of the Soviet units in the Gulf of Guinea, most likely directly off the Ghanaian coast (they took 13 days to go from an unusually well-publicized visit to Conakry, to a hastily-arranged visit to Lagos, a trip that normally takes about 4 days). This is, of course, only an inference. There is no direct evidence. It is, however, a plausible explanation for an otherwise amazing set of coincidences.

The second operation—a case in which the Soviets have apparently been acting to protect a client—is equally if not more significant than the first. Until the *Daily Telegraph* lifted the lid somewhat, there was next to no information available on this operation.⁶ What information there is suggests that, in the aftermath of the Portuguese-supported attack on Conakry last November 22nd, the Soviets established and have since maintained a regular combatant patrol off the coast of Guinea, to deter or prevent a recurrence of such events—perhaps something roughly analogous to our MARKET TIME operation off the coast of Vietnam. If this is the case, it represents a significant departure from their previous caution—since in acting for Guinea, they are of course acting against Portugal, one of the least powerful members of NATO, but nevertheless a member. I will return to this point in a moment.

The third operation, in which the Soviets acted to establish their influence with a non-client, is well documented in the public media. It occurred this May, and involved an ostensible "business call" to Freetown, Sierra Leone, by a Kashin-class DLG (possibly detached from the Guinea Patrol for this purpose). There is nothing especially remarkable about most Soviet "business calls"—they require fuel, water, provisions, and an opportunity for crew R & R just as does everyone else. This "business call," on the other hand, is remarkable on two grounds—the activities undertaken by the Soviets while in Freetown (which were not at all those typical of "business calls") and the local political situation in which the visit took place (which was extraordinarily receptive to outside influence).

Siaka Stevens, who had just declared Sierra Leone a republic and engineered his own elevation to the Presidency, was at that moment in deep trouble—seriously in need of

Footnotes at end of article.

some means of establishing the legitimacy of his regime in the eyes of his constituents and heading off what was widely believed to be an impending coup. The Soviets provided at least the requisite legitimization, and possibly also a visible deterrent to the coup. What was announced to the outside world to be a routine "business call" by the Kashin was pointedly portrayed to the people of Sierra Leone as what is normally referred to as an "official visit"—involving all of the customary formalities and protocol exchanges, with their implied recognition of Stevens' legitimate status and visible demonstration of Soviet solidarity with him. It seems to have worked.

Now it is admittedly tempting upon hearing about these three relatively obscure undertakings to say "so what?". With the exception of the purported Guinea patrol, these actions are in and of themselves insignificant. Their importance, of course, lies in the fact that they are not just isolated instances of the use of naval forces for political purposes. In the first place, they continue a trend initiated in 1967, when the Soviets established a permanent naval presence in the Port Said and Alexandria areas—openly committing themselves to the defense of Egypt, and attempting thereby to deter further Israeli strikes. The process by which they have subsequently become ever more closely identified with the defense of Egypt, particularly in the first two years, is too well known to require exposition here.

Secondly, these are not the only instances, and West Africa is not the only arena, in which they have undertaken such operations over the last two years. They have, for example, done essentially the same thing in the Indian Ocean—the principal target there apparently being the Somali Republic. That, however, is the proper subject of discussion at another time and place.

For a variety of reasons, politically oriented operations such as these have not received the attention they deserve. Five reasons why this might be so come readily to mind:

1. most such activities, far from being insidious attempts to export Communism, are rather straightforward exercises in the application of seapower for influence purposes, long a common feature of international intercourse;

2. the principal areas in which these operations are currently being conducted—the East and West African littorals—are not considered of vital import to the West today;

3. these operations have very low military content, present little if any immediate threat to vital Western interests, and do not directly affect the strategic balance;

4. and this is the principal point of this discussion—this change in Soviet behavior is sufficiently recent, and sufficiently at variance with their previous *modus operandi*, so that, coupled with the relative paucity of information on Soviet operations in general, few observers would recognize these activities for what they are unless looking specifically for such behavior; and

5. thus far, the Soviets have been lucky—none of these operations has backfired.

To a certain extent, by being exceedingly cautious in selecting their course of action in each case, and by being very discrete in discussing such activities in public, they have manufactured this luck. They have, nevertheless, been lucky.

One of these days, their luck might run out. This being a non-zero-sum world—in which Soviet loss does not necessarily signify Western gain—it is quite possible, and if the West does not take the appropriate steps beforehand it is quite likely, that whatever losses are incurred will be mutual.

It is no accident that the three-fold classi-

fication of their activities in defense of state interests presented earlier in given in order of what might be termed ascending adventurousness—from reaction to initiative, from self-protection to at least internationalism if not rank imperialism. This is the direction in which they appear to be going, and it appears to be the result of conscious choice on their part.

The most recent step in that direction—the proclamation of a "policy of active counteraction to Imperialist aggression" in the wake of the 24th CPSU Congress—has not yet been put to the acid test. If they mean what they say, however, and their behavior in Egypt demonstrates beyond doubt that they are willing, under certain circumstances, to commit their own forces to combat in defense of a client, it would appear that sooner or later a situation might arise—perhaps off the coast of Guinea, perhaps off the horn of Africa—in which both East and West, acting in defense of their own interests, or in support of Third World clients, meet on at sea—perhaps inadvertently, certainly well away from the accustomed arenas and established patterns of confrontation in the Northern Hemisphere, and probably in a situation over which each has at best only partial control.

Both the Soviets and NATO have demonstrated some ability to control the course of events on the center stage in Europe and in the Mediterranean, where the stakes and risks are clearly very high. One wonders if both will be able to exercise the same restraint out on the periphery, where the stakes and risks appear to be much lower.

Some may not find this scenario particularly appealing. There are, of course, many factors which make it unlikely of realization—not least of which is the growing inclination on the part of both the United States and the other major NATO powers to studiously avoid becoming involved in local conflicts in the Third World.

It is not, however, an incredible scenario—especially if the Soviets are, as just depicted, becoming increasingly adventurous.

Much more likely—and I would submit only slightly less dangerous in the long run—is a situation in which a NATO member with clearly defined and strenuously defended interests south of the Tropic of Cancer—Portugal for instance—winds up facing the Soviets down there alone. Portugal's policies and practices in Africa are not universally popular, and the Tropic of Cancer is clearly defined as the Southern boundary of NATO responsibility—both factors which would make it easy for the other NATO members to opt out of whatever might ensue.

Could the Alliance—or what is left of the Alliance—take the strain that such a situation would engender? I don't propose to answer that question; I simply propose that we take now whatever steps appear to be appropriate to insure that such a situation does not arise in the future.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Let me note here that the "we" refers in very cavalier fashion to that amorphous collective of organizations and individuals, both private and official, which provides information and advice to policymakers.

² In particular, his paper on "Soviet Naval Capabilities and Intentions," presented at a joint RUSI-Southampton University seminar, Milford-on-Sea, 23-25 March 1970, and subsequently published by the RUSI in: *The Soviet Union in Europe and the Near East: Her Capabilities and Intentions*, London, 1971. (Reprinted in: Congressional Record, vol. 117, pt. 18, pp. 23362-23370.)

³ That this change has occurred should come as no surprise. James Cable has recently

discussed this type of activity at some length, in particular in his very recent book: *Gunboat Diplomacy: Political Applications of Limited Naval Force*, London: Chatto and Windus, 1971. This paper is an attempt to reinforce much of what he has said, and carry the argument somewhat further.

⁴ Which, it should be noted, have elicited no Soviet countering actions.

⁵ These descriptions are based on the information presented in: James M. McConnell, *The Soviet Navy in the Indian Ocean*, CNA Professional Paper No. 77, August 1971 (Unclassified).

⁶ Cf. *The Daily Telegraph* (London), 27 September 1971; 4 October 1971; 11 October 1971.

APOLOGY TO DR. KISSINGER

HON. K. GUNN MCKAY

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. MCKAY. Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion recently about the uses which have been made of the Extensions of Remarks section in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. While I frequently find myself in disagreement with some of what is printed in this section, I generally have felt that it serves a useful purpose in disseminating information to both Members of Congress and the general public. A recent insert, however, does neither. It serves no useful purpose. In fact, it adds only to increasing distrust and suspicion about Government. Such an attitude eventually discredits all of us and does nothing to uplift our already sagging spirits.

The article to which I refer was entitled in the RECORD, "Herr Kissinger Swings Secretly in Harlem." While I have not always agreed with the President's foreign policy nor with the role of Dr. Kissinger in the formulation of foreign policy, surely Dr. Kissinger deserves more than to reprint a scandalous notation from a newspaper of dubious repute. The article has overtones of attitudes which Congress should work to discourage, not encourage through reprinting.

There is always room in Government for legitimate criticism. It is even in the best interests of good Government. But it is not necessary to bring imputations against another man's character, integrity, or honor. I have always felt that persons who occupy positions of public trust and responsibility, of whatever party, are entitled to some measure of sympathy and understanding in the discharge of their duties. It is difficult to please everyone and the best of policies adversely affect someone. However, there is no justification for personal attack either against someone's character or loyalty. I for one wish to apologize to Dr. Kissinger for the unnecessary and uncalled for slur.

CONGRESSMAN OTIS G. PIKE REPORTS TO HIS CONSTITUENTS ON FIRST SESSION, 92D CONGRESS

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, the first session of the 92d Congress convened on January 21, 1971, and did not finally adjourn until the week before Christmas. Accordingly, my 11th annual report to my constituents could not be placed in the RECORD until the second session began. This, however, is it, and although it is not as attractive as a Christmas card, people should have a bit more time to peruse it now.

The first session of the 92d Congress was not the longest on record, because of summer and election recesses, but it did result in more record votes than any other session in history by a wide margin. During the year-long session, 320 record votes were held on almost every vital issue concerning America and Americans. This compares with only 177 record votes 2 years ago and with only 116 in 1961, the year I entered Congress. Most Americans would agree that the three issues most concerning Americans are the continuing war in Vietnam, an economy combining recession and inflation, and the preservation of our environment, and these were indeed the issues on which the greatest controversy, the most debate, and the largest number of votes took place. Other very serious issues on which the Congress took at least some action included crime control, drug abuse, health, civil rights generally and women's rights in particular, consumer protection, education, including the peripheral issues of school prayer and schoolbusing, election reform, welfare reform, and all the myriad problems which confront our Nation, seemingly in ever-increasing numbers.

The Congress started slowly, as committees were assigned new members and began hearings on new bills, but by the end of the session votes were coming at such a frantic pace on the floor of the House that all Members of Congress were finding it difficult getting their other work done. While legislation is a major job of the Congressman, no less important is the job of acting as a liaison man between his constituents and the Federal Government. While after the 1960 census our district had approximately 415,000 persons in it, the 1970 census shows that it has today approximately 850,000 people, making it the second largest in the Nation and more than twice as large as some. Our offices in Washington and Riverhead received over 200 letters, telegrams, postcards, and phone communications each day, much of it pertaining to legislation, but more of it pertaining to other problems people were having with the Federal Government. Young people were concerned with their chances of being drafted, older people were concerned about a lost social security check. Grade school students wrote concerning the

preservation of the wild mustangs, high school students wrote about the possibility of getting college loans, college students wrote about the 18-year-old vote. Defense workers wrote about unemployment, Federal workers and teachers wrote about pay and pay freezes, retirees wrote about inflation and the cost of living. Despite the huge volume of mail, we answered it, and we tried to help where we could.

Many issues which were of national concern were of immediate concern to eastern Long Island, too. The national concern over the preservation of our environment was made more specific at home by the threat of drilling for oil off our south shore and by oil spills in the sound. Suffolk County's unemployment rate ran well above the national average because of the stronger slump in the aerospace industry. The F-14 program was under attack in some quarters in Congress, and remains in difficulty today, not because of the performance of the aircraft, but simply because of its cost.

The immediacy and importance of these problems caused a flood of meetings, correspondence, and legislation which had to be attended, written, and sponsored. I have done and shall continue to do all that I can responsibly and usefully do to prevent any drilling for oil off our shores at this time for I believe that there is no way in which present technology can conduct such drilling without serious danger of great damage to our waters, our beaches, and our marine life.

As to the problems of the F-14, I have been in constant communication with both the heads of the Grumman Corp. and the Navy officials responsible for the program. For the best interests of both our national security and our local economy it is essential that Grumman continue to produce an aircraft with all of the capabilities which the F-14 contains in the most efficient and least expensive manner possible. Any further curtailment of the program would have very serious effects on our whole Long Island economy and on our aerospace industry.

One issue which involves both national legislation, conservation, and eastern Long Island in particular is the bill I have introduced to create a Gardiner's Island National Monument from Gardiner's Island, some small outlying islands, and over 1,000 acres of land at Napeague on the south shore of Long Island. My hope is to carefully preserve the wildlife and trees and buildings of the island by restricting access to it, while providing additional swimming, camping, and recreational facilities for our exploding population on the Napeague property. As with any major issue, some voices were heard in opposition, but the general concept has now been endorsed by the Audubon Society, the Wilderness Society, the Open Space Institute, the Suffolk County Planning Commission, the Nassau-Suffolk Planning Board, the East Hampton Conservation Advisory Council, and other conservation groups. It has been opposed by the Daughters of the American Revolution, but supported by such

diverse groups as the American Legion and the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. Just for the record, Gardiner's Island is owned by the estate of Sarah Diodati Gardiner and the United States Trust Co. of New York is the executor of the estate. Under the bill the two people who now have the life use of the property could continue to hold it for life or for 25 years. The proposal is a long-term one but in view of our population pressure I believe we must plan for the future and preserve some open spaces for our children.

As we look forward to 1972, we can expect many of the same issues to be before Congress this year. It will probably be another busy year as far as votes are concerned and it will surely be a controversial one. Election years, particularly presidential election years, are frequently so rife with maneuvering for partisan advantage that very little gets done. As you know, I am a Democrat, but I supported the President more than half of the time in the first session. I will continue to do so when I believe his proposals are sound, but I will not support them all. For example, during the current fiscal year we anticipate a huge deficit of approximately \$40 billion in our Federal budget. The budget just presented to Congress already anticipates another \$25 billion deficit for the fiscal year which begins on July 1, and January predictions are notoriously optimistic. This is no time for an insolvent government to be talking about sharing revenue it does not have or of guaranteeing an annual income to others when it cannot guarantee its own. We must cut down on waste in our Federal spending, from the defense budget to the welfare budget. We can, and we can make more money available for our elderly, our deprived, and our handicapped, our unemployed, and our environment, without bankrupting the Nation. By the same token, I felt obliged to vote against tax cuts which would only increase the deficit.

Congress has all too often avoided issues rather than meeting them. On votes as vital as the Mansfield amendment and the contempt citation of CBS, all our votes were procedural rather than "yes" or "no" votes on the merits of the issue. For example, I voted against sending the CBS contempt citation back to the committee, not because I thought that CBS should have been cited for contempt of Congress, but because we should have faced the issue.

With these general philosophies in mind, I hope you will look at the voting record appended hereto. This does not include all of the votes we had—with 320 votes it would take a book—but it does include the most important, the most controversial, and the toughest ones. One other explanation is necessary. On every law which requires the spending of your money, we have four separate votes. First, we authorize a certain amount of money. The Senate usually authorizes a somewhat different figure and then the House and Senate get together in a conference and work out a compromise. We then have a second vote

on the compromise on the authorization. The compromises are called "conference reports." When the authorizing process is through we have a third vote on an appropriation bill which actually provides the money and a fourth and last vote on the conference report on the appropriation. It is a cumbersome procedure, but that is the way Congress operates. In reporting my votes I am not reporting them all four times if I voted the same way all four times. If we had a record vote on the conference report on the appropriation, that vote is used, as it was the final and most accurate figure. If the fourth vote was a nonrecord vote, the third one is used, and so forth. I apologize for this lengthy explanation, but during my last election campaign a lurid document proclaimed in screaming red ink that Congressman PIKE did not tell you about almost \$43 billion of spending he voted either for or against. Congressman PIKE did tell you, and does tell you in this report; he just does not repeat it four times.

In addition to legislation and taking care of constituents' requests, work in the Armed Services Committee kept me very busy last year. Work on the draft legislation, military pay legislation, the annual military procurement and research and development legislation, caused lengthy hearings by the full committee throughout the year. In addition to those, I was made the chairman of a subcommittee which drafted a bill to aid the widows and children of career military personnel. This bill passed both the committee and the House and is currently pending in the Senate. As soon as that job was done, another interesting assignment came as chairman of a committee investigating the question of whether the military utilizes its manpower—and womanpower—effectively or not. In addition to the two subcommittees of which I was chairman, there were also two other subcommittees on which I served, the Research and Development Committee and the Special Investigating Committee, so committee work took up a great deal of our time.

All the work was rewarding. On three separate occasions last year we were able to help eastern Long Island concerns get Federal contracts for which they were qualified, but as to which they were having difficulty with the Government. The contracts involved millions of dollars and meant hundreds of jobs. Equally rewarding was appointing qualified young men to service academies, or simply helping an elderly person with a problem on social security. Our office and my most efficient staff continues to stand ready to help you when we can.

Of the 320 record votes held in the House last year, your Congressman was present and voting 98 percent of the time. No other Congressman in the State of New York can make that statement. I try to vote in a manner which is responsible and responsive to the greatest problems confronting our Nation and our area. I would appreciate hearing your views both as to these issues and these votes. My address is room 2428, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

My voting record follows:

PIKE VOTING RECORD

DATE, ISSUE, AND PIKE VOTE

January 21: Election of Speaker (Albert 250; Ford 176), Albert.

March 3: Increase permanent debt ceiling from \$395 billion to \$430 billion (yea 228; nay 162), Yea.

March 10: Extend Presidential authority to impose a freeze on wages and prices and ceiling on interest rates (yea 382; nay 19), Yea.

March 16: Adopt conference report providing 10 per cent across-the-board increase in Social Security benefits, a \$70.40 minimum benefit and increase in special payments to persons 72 years old and over (yea 360; nay 3), Yea.

Appropriate \$50,675,000 for unemployment compensation for federal workers and former servicemen (yea 355; nay 0), Yea.

March 18: Delete \$134 million for development of the supersonic transport from Transportation appropriations (yea 217; nay 204), Yea.

March 23: Amend Constitution to give 18-year-old citizens right to vote (yea 401; nay 19), Yea.

March 31: Repeal President's authority to induct men into the armed forces effective July 1, 1971 (yea 62; nay 331), Nay.

Extend the draft for one year instead of two (yea 198; nay 200), Yea.

April 1: Prohibit involuntary assignment of draftees to Indochina after Dec. 31, 1971, and involuntary extension of duty of those serving in Indochina after that date (yea 122; nay 260), Yea.

Prohibit use of draftees in any war unless declared by Congress (yea 96; nay 278), Nay.

Extend draft two years, increase military pay (yea 293; nay 99), Yea.

April 7: Add \$728.6 million for education programs (yea 187; nay 191), Yea.

Delete from education appropriations section forbidding school districts from assigning pupils to schools over the protests of parents (yea 149; nay 206), Yea.

April 19: Amend Immigration Act to permit aliens over 50 who have lived in the U.S. for 20 years to become U.S. citizens regardless of English literacy (yea 192; nay 84), Yea.

April 20: Authorize \$507,650,000 for maritime programs, including subsidies for construction of 22 merchant ships (yea 360; nay 11), Yea.

April 22: Extend Public Works Acceleration and Appalachian Regional Development Act (yea 320; nay 67), Yea.

April 28: Amend Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 10 per cent increase in annuities (yea 379; nay 0), Yea.

April 29: Increase investigative funds for the House Internal Security Committee (yea 257; nay 129), Nay.

Provide \$570,000 for House Internal Security Committee (yea 298; nay 75), Yea.

May 3: Extend for two years President's authority to submit plans for reorganizing executive branch agencies (yea 301; nay 20), Yea.

May 5: Raise ceiling on Small Business Administration loans by \$900 million and continue five SBA programs through fiscal 1972 (yea 383; nay 0), Yea.

May 6: Authorize additional foreign travel authority for four subcommittees of the Education and Labor Committee (yea 156; nay 172), Nay.

May 10: Extend penalties for assaults on D.C. police officers to assaults on firemen, and provide criminal penalties for interfering with firemen in performance of their duties (yea 312; nay 0), Yea.

May 12: Provide that \$85.3 million in supplemental appropriations bill for termination of supersonic transport be used for continued construction of two prototypes (yea 201; nay 195), Nay.

May 17: Authorize \$4 million in appropriations for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (yea 262; nay 67), Yea.

Authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide additional \$150 million for free school lunch programs for needy children (yea 332; nay 0), Yea.

Establish an environmental data system (yea 304; nay 18), Yea.

Provide criminal penalties for shooting at certain types of wildlife from aircraft (yea 307; nay 8), Yea.

Establish National Advisory Committee on the Oceans and Atmosphere (yea 293; nay 10), Yea.

May 18: Provide a 13.5 percent pay increase for signalmen and extend period of negotiations in railroad strike (yea 264; nay 93), Yea.

May 20: Provide \$155.8 million for termination of the supersonic transport (yea 118; nay 156), Nay.

Adopt conference report on Second Supplementary Appropriations bill totaling \$6,889,152,545 (yea 264; nay 28), Yea.

May 24: Authorize House Post Office and Civil Service Committee travel to Europe and Far East (yea 201; nay 88), Nay.

May 25: Resolution to disapprove President's proposal to merge Peace Corps, VISTA and other volunteer organizations (yea 131; nay 224), Nay.

Set up Select Committee on Energy Resources (yea 128; nay 218), Yea.

June 2: Authorize \$4.9 billion through fiscal 1975 to provide approximately 150,000 public service jobs for the unemployed at State and local level (yea 245; nay 141), Yea.

June 3: Authorize \$3,433,080,000 for NASA in fiscal year 1972, including \$125,000,000 for space shuttle (yea 303; nay 64), Yea.

June 4: Appropriate \$449,899,605 for legislative branch operations (yea 259; nay 26), Yea.

June 7: Extend authority for government procurement of articles produced by the blind to articles produced by other handicapped persons (yea 309; nay 0), Yea.

Authorize \$622 million for National Science Foundation (yea 319; nay 8), Yea.

June 10: Extend Sugar Act for three years and modify quotas for foreign and domestic sugar producers (yea 229; nay 128), Nay.

June 14: Provide payment of costs of medical care for D.C. police and firemen and members of the U.S. Secret Service totally disabled in course of duty (yea 311; nay 1), Yea.

June 16: Limit ABM funding to completion of present sites (yea 129; nay 267), Yea.

Delete \$370.2 million for the B-1 bomber from defense procurement bill (yea 97; nay 307), Yea.

Amend defense procurement bill by limiting total procurement and R & D authorization to fiscal 1971 appropriated level (yea 118; nay 278), Yea.

June 17: Amend defense procurement bill by barring funds provided for military in and over Indochina after December 31, 1971, giving the President right to change the cutoff date if he could gain support of Congress (yea 158; nay 255), Nay.

Amend defense procurement bill by cutting off funds for military in and over Indochina for materials after June 1, 1972, provided that all POW's had been released 60 days prior to that date (yea 147; nay 237), Nay.

Authorize \$21 billion for defense procurement and research (yea 331; nay 58), Nay.

June 18: Authorize additional foreign travel for members of four subcommittees of the House Education and Labor Committee and attendance by two members of each party at ILO conference (yea 183; nay 119), Nay.

Extend for one year student loan and scholarship provisions of Public Health Service Act (yea 299; nay 0), Yea.

June 21: Motion to prohibit amendments to Welfare-Social Security Act (yea 200; nay 172), Nay.

June 22: Delete the guaranteed annual in-

come provisions from Social Security bill (yea 187; nay 234), Yea.

Increase Social Security benefits and assistance programs for the needy aged, blind and disabled and establish a family assistance program (yea 288; nay 132), Yea.

June 23: Set \$20,000 limitation on subsidy payments for farm products except for sugar and wool (yea 214; nay 198), Yea.

Bar food stamps to households which need assistance solely because some member is taking part in a labor strike (yea 173; nay 225), Nay.

June 28: Table motion instructing House conferees on draft bill to accept Mansfield amendment (yea 219; nay 175), Yea.

Appropriate \$4,487,676,190 for Treasury Department, the Postal Service, the Executive Office and certain independent agencies for fiscal 1972 (yea 380; nay 6), Yea.

June 29: Appropriate \$2,350,145,035 for Interior Department for fiscal 1972 (yea 400; nay 5), Yea.

June 30: Table resolution requesting President Nixon to furnish text of Defense Department's secret Vietnam study for years 1945-67 to the House (yea 273; nay 112), Nay.

Adopt conference report on Office of Education appropriations of \$5,146,311,000 (yea 376; nay 15), Yea.

July 1: Adopt conference report on Emergency Public Service Employment Act authorizing \$2.25 billion to provide public service jobs for unemployed at state and local level (yea 343; nay 14), Yea.

Provide increased manpower for the health professions (yea 343; nay 3), Yea.

Continue for three years programs to train nurses (yea 324; nay 0), Yea.

July 7: Table motion directing Secretary of State to give Congress documents on policy decisions on military operations in Laos (yea 261; nay 118), Nay.

July 7: Establish definitions of obscene material to prohibit delivery of such material to minors and others through the mail (yea 356; nay 25), Yea.

July 8: Delete language in Export Expansion Finance Act permitting Export-Import Bank with the President's approval to finance exports to countries supplying or aiding countries in armed conflict with U.S. forces (yea 207; nay 153), Yea.

July 13: Recommit resolution citing Dr. Stanton and CBS for contempt of Congress for refusing to provide certain film edited from "The Selling of the Pentagon" to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (yea 226; nay 181), Nay.

July 19: Authorize drug treatment and rehabilitation program in Veterans Administration (yea 379; nay 0), Yea.

Authorize Veterans Affairs Administrator to provide assistance in establishment of new state medical schools and improvement of existing VA-affiliated medical schools, and develop cooperative agreements between VA and other institutions to train health-care personnel (yea 371; nay 2), Yea.

July 20: Consider bill establishing Joint Committee on the Environment (yea 372; nay 18), Yea.

July 21: Motion to recommit bill increasing bus-width limit on interstate highways (yea 178; nay 213), Yea.

July 27: Adopt conference report on Agriculture appropriations totaling \$13,276,900,050 (yea 230; nay 162), Nay.

Add \$200 million to Labor-HEW appropriations for various programs (yea 169; nay 215), Nay.

Add \$82.4 million to Labor-HEW appropriations for vocational rehabilitation programs (yea 236; nay 153), Yea.

Add \$64 million to Labor-HEW appropriations for child welfare services (yea 185; nay 201), Yea.

July 28: Authorize \$3,992,500,000 through fiscal 1978 for Public Works and Economic

Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act (yea 376; nay 27), Nay.

July 29: Adopt conference report on Department of Housing and Urban Development, NASA, VA and Independent Office appropriations bill totaling \$18,339,738,000 (yea 363; nay 30), Yea.

Adopt conference report on Department of Transportation appropriations totaling \$8,156,105,000 (yea 393; nay 15), Yea.

Bar funds for Project Cannikin nuclear test at Amchitka Island, Alaska (yea 108; nay 275), Yea.

Delete \$100,000 for restudy of proposed Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric power project in eastern Maine (yea 199; nay 181), Nay.

July 30: Authorize federal guarantee of bank loans for Lockheed (yea 192; nay 189), Nay.

August 2: Adopt conference report on State, Justice, Commerce Departments appropriations totaling \$4,067,116,000 (yea 337; nay 35), Yea.

Require Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to furnish House with documents relating to school desegregation and busing (yea 351; nay 36), Yea.

Require equal treatment for married women employed by the Federal government (yea 377; nay 11), Yea.

Continue in force existing appropriations for activities for which appropriations bills had not yet been passed (yea 350; nay 6), Yea.

August 3: Authorize \$3,444,350,000 for foreign aid in fiscal 1972 (yea 202; nay 192), Yea.

August 4: Adopt conference report extending draft and expressing sense of Congress that U.S. troops be withdrawn from Indochina (yea 298; nay 108), Yea.

Appropriate \$1 billion for Emergency Supplemental Labor bill to provide public service jobs at the state and local level (yea 321; nay 76), Yea.

August 5: Adopt Export Expansion Finance Act conference report (yea 219; nay 140), Yea.

August 5: Adopt Labor-HEW appropriations conference report totaling \$20,804,662,000 for fiscal 1972 (yea 280; nay 56), Yea.

September 9: Establish controls over dumping of waste materials in the oceans and setting up a marine sanctuaries program in the Commerce Department (yea 304; nay 3), Yea.

September 14: Repeal Title II of Internal Security Act of 1950 and provide that no citizen shall be imprisoned or detained by the U.S. except pursuant to an act of Congress (yea 356; nay 49), Yea.

September 16: Authorize the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to bring suit against recalcitrant discriminatory employers in federal court (yea 285; nay 106), Yea.

September 22: Adopt conference report on Public Works-AEC Appropriations totaling \$4,706,625,000 for fiscal 1972 (yea 377; nay 9), Yea.

September 23: Amend Peace Corps bill by cutting over-all authorization by \$27 million (yea 113; nay 232), Nay.

September 30: Delete provision in Economic Opportunity Act creating a nonprofit Independent National Legal Services Corporation to take over OEO's Legal Services program (yea 152; nay 210), Nay.

Establish a comprehensive child-care program to provide educational, nutritional and health services free of charge for disadvantaged children from families with an annual income of \$6,960 or less and setting fees on a graduated scale for children from families with a higher annual income (yea 186; nay 183), Yea.

Recommit Economic Opportunity Act to

Education and Labor Committee with instructions to report it back with an amendment coordinating fees levied in the child-care section of the bill with fees charged in other federal government day-care programs, and making annual family income \$4,320 as a maximum level entitling disadvantaged children to free services (yea 191; nay 180), Yea.

September 30: Extend Office of Economic Opportunity for two years and authorize \$5 billion for its programs, creating a comprehensive child-care program and establishing a National Legal Services Corporation to replace OEO Legal Services program (yea 251; nay 115), Nay.

October 4: Veto President Nixon's alternative federal pay plan ordering scheduled salary increases for federal employees delayed until July 1, 1972 (yea 174; nay 207), Yea.

Adopt resolution calling for humane treatment of Americans held prisoner of war by North Vietnam and endorsing efforts to win their release (yea 370; nay 0), Yea.

Provide for new career training programs and early retirement benefits for air traffic controllers (yea 294; nay 0), Yea.

October 6: Appropriate \$270,500,000 in supplemental Department of Labor funds and federal unemployment benefits in fiscal 1972 (yea 394; nay 9), Yea.

Continue through Nov. 15, 1971, appropriations for government departments whose fiscal 1972 appropriations had not yet been enacted into law (yea 387; nay 12), Yea.

October 12: Approve Equal Rights amendment guaranteeing equal rights for men and women (yea 354; nay 24), Yea.

October 14: Broaden Consumer Protection Agency's authority to intervene on behalf of consumers in proceedings of other federal agencies and providing the agency additional authority to act when other federal agencies refused to investigate consumer complaints (yea 160; nay 218), Yea.

Establish Independent Consumer Protection Agency and a White House Office of Consumer Affairs (yea 345; nay 44), Yea.

October 19: Instruct conferees not to accept any nongermane Senate-passed amendments on Defense Procurement bill (yea 192; nay 216), Nay.

October 20: Amend Alaskan Natives Land Claims bill to set aside 125 million acres for possible inclusion in national park systems and establishing a federal-state planning commission to review land selection by the state and natives (yea 177; nay 217), Yea.

October 21: Create a Survivor Benefit Plan to allow career military personnel opportunity to leave a portion of their retired pay to their survivors (Pike bill) (yea 372; nay 0), Yea.

October 27: Appropriate \$2,012,446,000 for military construction (yea 354; nay 32), Yea.

November 1: Authorize \$1.5 billion for desegregating school districts (yea 135; nay 222), Nay.

Provide Law Enforcement Assistance Administration funds for treatment of drug addicts confined to or on parole from state or local correctional facilities (yea 350; nay 2), Yea.

Amend the definition of treatment in the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 to allow use of methadone in federal narcotics treatment programs (yea 354; nay 0), Yea.

November 3: Establish a Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences to overcome shortage of career-oriented military personnel in health professions (yea 351; nay 31), Yea.

Strike out Title VIII of Higher Education Act of 1971 authorizing general federal aid for institutions of higher education (yea 84; nay 310), Nay.

Delete language in Higher Education Act establishing an Interns for Political Leadership program (yea 229; nay 149), Yea.

November 4: Exempt undergraduate admissions policies of all institutions from the sex discrimination ban on education programs receiving federal funds (yea 194; nay 189), Nay.

Postpone effectiveness of any federal court order requiring busing for racial, sex, religious or socioeconomic balance until all appeals—or the time for all appeals—had been exhausted (yea 235; nay 125), Yea.

November 4: Bar use of federal funds for busing students or teachers to overcome racial imbalance or to buy buses for such purpose (yea 233; nay 124), Yea.

Exempt from the ban on sex discrimination undergraduate admissions policies of all institutions of higher education (yea 186; nay 181), Nay.

Extend Higher Education Act of 1971, providing for program of general aid, creating a National Institute of Education and authorizing \$1.5 billion in aid to desegregating school districts (yea 332; nay 38), Yea.

November 8: Discharge House Judiciary Committee from further consideration of School Prayer Amendment (yea 242; nay 156), Yea.

Adopt School Prayer Amendment providing it was constitutionally permissible for persons in public buildings to participate in voluntary prayer (yea 240; nay 162) (2/3 majority vote required), Yea.

Approve Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act of 1971 (yea 288; nay 91), Yea.

November 10: Extend disability benefits to orphans of families in which the father had died of black lung disease and the mother is deceased (yea 312; nay 78), Yea.

Amend continuing appropriations bill by prohibiting Department of Defense from further expenditure of funds for fiscal 1972 (yea 10; nay 356), Nay.

November 15: Expand National Cancer Institute to permit intensified cancer research program (yea 350; nay 5), Yea.

Increase limit on U.S. dues for membership in the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) (yea 346; nay 0), Yea.

Liberalize provisions of existing law covering payment of military disability and death pensions (yea 351; nay 0), Yea.

November 16: Delete \$801,600,000 for purchase of F-14 aircraft during fiscal 1972 (yea 76; nay 311), Nay.

November 17: Set July 1, 1972, cutoff date for funds supporting our military in Southeast Asia and call for withdrawal of all U.S. military by a specified date subject to the release of POW's (yea 163; nay 238), Nay.

Limit net defense expenditures to 95 per cent of the funds budgeted for fiscal 1972 (yea 74; nay 307), Nay.

Reduce total defense appropriations to fiscal 1971 level (yea 114; nay 278), Nay.

November 19: Authorize \$36 million in fiscal 1972 and \$38,520,000 in fiscal 1973 for interim financing of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty (yea 271; nay 12), Yea.

November 29: Repeal for all candidates for federal office the "equal time" provision of the Communications Act of 1934 (yea 95; nay 277), Nay.

November 30: Define more clearly role unions and corporations might take in political campaigns (yea 233; nay 147), Yea.

Approve Federal Election Campaign Practices Act limiting campaign expenditures by or on behalf of candidates for Congress and the Presidency (yea 372; nay 23), Yea.

December 2: Add \$72.5 million to D.C. appropriations bill for D.C.'s share of construction costs of a rapid transit system (yea 196; nay 183), Yea.

Halt above funding until the transit authority complied with provision of National Environmental Policy Act requiring submission of an environmental impact statement (yea 163; nay 205), Yea.

Provide supplemental appropriations of

\$786,282,654 for various federal departments for fiscal 1972 (yea 271; nay 20), Yea.

December 6: Authorize loan of certain submarines and destroyers to Spain, Turkey, Greece, Korea and Italy (yea 260; nay 116), Nay.

December 6: Authorize \$5 million in additional funds to conduct Transpo 72, an international transportation exposition at Dulles Airport May 27, 1972 (yea 202; nay 173), Yea.

Extend authority of Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to set maximum interest rates on Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance programs and modify provisions of the National Flood Insurance Act (yea 357; nay 4), Yea.

Set up a weak program to regulate the killing of marine mammals (yea 199; nay 150), Nay.

December 7: Adopt conference report extending Office of Economic Opportunity for two years, authorizing \$6.3 billion for OEO (yea 211; nay 187), Nay.

December 8: Increase to \$91 million foreign aid appropriations for contributions to international organizations, and provide \$50 million of that amount for the U.S. contribution to the United Nations Development Fund (yea 119; nay 268), Nay.

Appropriate \$3,003,461,000 for foreign economic and military assistance (yea 214; nay 179), Nay.

Kill amendment to Strategic Grain Reserve bill limiting individual farm subsidy payments to \$20,000 (yea 204; nay 164), Nay.

Establish a national grain reserve of 300 million bushels of wheat and 25 million tons of feed grains (yea 182; nay 170), Nay.

December 9: Adopt conference report reducing federal individual and business taxes and establish a federal presidential election campaign fund effective in 1973 (yea 321; nay 75), Nay.

Adopt conference report providing supplemental appropriations of \$3,406,385,371 for various federal departments (yea 301; nay 73), Yea.

December 10: Limit mandatory payment of pay raises scheduled under pre-freeze contracts to those for which prices or taxes had already been raised (yea 209; nay 151), Yea.

Adopt conference report setting federal payment to the District of Columbia at \$173 million for fiscal 1972 and \$178 million for fiscal 1973 (yea 242; nay 93), Yea.

Extend Economic Stabilization Act (yea 326; nay 33), Yea.

December 15: Adopt conference report appropriating \$70,518,463,000 for Defense Department (yea 293; nay 39), Yea.

Adopt conference report appropriating \$932,512,700 for District of Columbia (yea 260; nay 79), Yea.

Adopt conference report on Unemployment Compensation providing one-half unemployment compensation payments for an additional 13 weeks to persons who had exhausted their regular benefits in states with unemployment rates at least 6.5 percent for a 13-week period (yea 194; nay 149), Nay.

Provide continuing appropriations to February 22, 1972, for foreign aid and other federal departments and agencies whose appropriations had not yet been approved by Congress (yea 235; nay 86), Nay.

December 16: Table motion instructing House conferees to accept Mansfield amendment (yea 130; nay 101), Nay.

FROM THE MAN WHO GAVE YOU CENTRAL PARK

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to place in the

RECORD an article by Wolf Von Eckardt, which appeared on Saturday, January 29, 1972, in the Washington Post. The article commemorates the 150th anniversary of the death of landscape artist Frederick Law Olmsted. Olmsted was the original designer of New York City's Central Park and San Francisco's Golden Gate Park, but, more important, he was one of the original practitioners of the art of esthetic urban planning. As Mr. Von Eckhardt aptly states:

Today we see that Olmsted's approach to (city) planning . . . might have saved us much of the misery of slums, ghettos, traffic jams, urban disorders, physical and mental health problems and other urban disasters.

It is fitting that we honor a man whose foresight was unfortunately ignored for a century and a half. The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 19, 1972]

FROM THE MAN WHO GAVE YOU CENTRAL PARK

(By Wolf Von Eckhardt)

A new national hero is emerging. Frederick Law Olmsted, whose sesquicentennial will be celebrated this spring, has so far occupied only a relatively minor place in the American pantheon.

People interested in the history of our cities know him as "the father of landscape architecture" and the designer of New York's Central Park, the first park to bring generous open space, sunshine and fresh air into a modern industrial city.

What promises to make Olmsted a hero whom school children will be taught to admire along with Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Alva Edison, is that the nation's new concern for the quality of urban life is finally catching up with him.

We are now beginning to realize that protecting the natural environment, the traditional kind of conservation, is not enough. The principles of conservation, of "sympathetic cooperation with nature," as Olmsted called it, must also be applied to the man-made environment—the city and metropolitan area—if both man and nature are to survive. Man is part of the much-talked about natural ecology.

And this, in essence, is what Olmsted preached and practiced in the course of a long (1822 to 1903), varied and productive lifetime that has left its mark all around us. People still enjoy not only Central and Prospect Parks in New York and the Golden Gate Park in San Francisco, but also the great parks that act as the "lungs" of Chicago, St. Louis and a dozen or so other American cities.

More importantly, perhaps, are Olmsted's theories on city planning. They herald those of the English "garden city movement," Lewis Mumford and Jane Jacobs, and are just now beginning to make their influence felt. Olmsted saw the need to create new communities, and designed one at Riverside, Ill. He recognized the need to make whole urban regions wholesome, showing how this can be done with his proposal for an "emerald necklace" of urban parks and parkways in Boston.

Olmsted, in fact, stands at the beginning of a new urban vision, a new concept of how we must guide rapid urbanization and, in the face of mechanization and pollution, make our place to live human and livable. He was a pioneer in civilizing American cities.

Truly great men make a new contribution to every new age that succeeds their own. Every generation discovers some new aspect of the great man's wisdom. In his own time, Olmsted was mainly looked upon as a successful landscape architect who rode a fashionable wave of romantic love for nature and the picturesque. The fashion was partly a reaction to "the shame of the cities." It

was exemplified by the paintings of Monet and the architecture of H. H. Richardson.

The last generation saw him primarily as an artist, who, in contrast to the rigid formality of baroque park design, created Monet landscapes complete with random rocks, meandering roads and brooks, dreaming meadows and utterly natural-looking artificial lakes, in the center of the city.

Today we see not only the esthetic, but the social implications and intentions of his work. Olmsted foresaw that Central Park, which was out in the sticks when he and his partner, Calvert Baux, laid it out in 1858, would be hemmed in by a wall of skyscrapers. He foresaw the crush of traffic and was the first to separate people and vehicles by way of under- and overpasses in his park designs.

Today we see that Olmsted's approach to urban planning, had it been more fully accepted, might have saved us much of the misery of slums, ghettos, traffic jams, urban disorders, physical and mental health problems and other urban disasters. Olmsted warned, a hundred years ago, against building cities "little by little and chiefly to suit the views of landowners, acting only individually and thinking only of how what they do is to affect the value in the next week or the next year of the few lots that each may hold at the time."

But that, of course, is exactly what we did and are still doing.

The answer to the resulting chaos is comprehensive community planning that is focused, much as Olmsted prescribed, around parks and open spaces. This prescription is now being returned to us from England where it was developed and refined by the "garden city" movement and its "new towns" which Ebenezer Howard launched at the turn of the century.

But it seems that Howard, who visited America as a young man, was inspired by Olmsted's new community at Riverside. Howard is very likely to have visited this first modern, American "new town" according to Walter L. Creese, an eminent urban historian.

Olmsted, at any rate, was surely concerned with far more than beauty and commodious urban design. He stood as Lewis Mumford quotes Charles Eliot Norton as saying of him, "first in the production of great works which answer the needs and give expression to the life of our immense and miscellaneous democracy."

He knew that life as an inveterate traveler and early in his career, as a reporter, writer and editor who worked for a number of newspapers and publications, including *The New York Daily Times*, *Putnam's* and *The Nation*. His reports on the state of the South before the Civil War are among the most valuable historic sources we have.

Olmsted's "very temperate picture of the beating of a young Negroess," writes Mumford, "calmly, coolly, by a matter of fact overseer, was far more damning than the violent melodramatics of Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe. Olmsted's account of the antebellum South has well been compared with Young's picture of France before the Revolution."

A number of determined environmentalists, historians and other admirers of Frederick Law Olmsted's led by architecture historian Frederick Guthelm, are busy planning an "Olmsted Sesquicentennial" celebration in honor of this remarkable man.

Plans include the issue of a commemorative postage stamp, forums and symposia in various cities where Olmsted works are found and a comprehensive exhibition, designed by William Alex, to be held at New York's Whitney Museum next summer.

The exhibition is to be shown in a number of cities, including Washington. The Architect of the Capitol, George M. White, has expressed interest in showing it on the Capitol's West Front Terrace, which Olmsted designed. An extension of the West Front would inevitably destroy this design.

Guthelm sees the sesquicentennial as one of his committee's most important tasks, however, to raise funds for the preservation of the Olmsted office, house and grounds in Brookline, Mass., and to microfilm its fund of letters and drawings. The Library of Congress has recently acquired 400 boxes of these papers. But far more are still inadequately stored and in danger of deterioration and fire.

Another central idea of the Olmsted celebration is to call public attention to the plight of our troubled urban parks, said Guthelm. "In a way they are the victims of their success. They mirror such national problems as crime, delinquency, overcrowding, drugs, traffic and environmental pollution."

"The result is an extensive invasion of chain-link fences, blacktopped play areas, bright illumination, highways and parking. These piecemeal responses by hard-driven park administrators can eventually destroy the original creations of a century ago."

But the main focus is on the man. The 150th anniversary of Olmsted's birth, says William Alex, "marks nothing less than a rededication to the idea of human survival. It is against this American that we must measure the captains who must now guide spaceship Earth."

MOTOROLA SHIFTING WORK BACK TO THE UNITED STATES

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a most significant and important news article which appeared in the January 31, issue of the *Pittsburgh Press*.

Written by Milt Freudenheim and datelined Wolfsburg, Germany, home of the Volkswagen auto, the article reports one of America's best known names in radio manufacturing—Motorola—is going to transfer its production facilities in Japan back to the United States. The reason given for the shift is the higher exchange rate for the Japanese yen combined with the devalued U.S. dollar.

The report is significant because Volkswagen buys nearly 500,000 car radios a year from Motorola. It is important because those radios now will be stamped "Made in U.S.A." and that spells jobs in our electronic industry.

Mr. Speaker, I say in all sincerity to Motorola: "Welcome Home!"

The news article follows:

MOTOROLA SHIFTING WORK BACK TO UNITED STATES

(By Milt Freudenheim)

WOLFSBURG, GERMANY.—Major radio manufacturing facilities are being transferred from Japan back to the United States by Motorola, it is reported here.

Reliable sources in this world headquarters of Volkswagen automobiles said Motorola is switching production of its car radios supplied to VW.

Volkswagen buys in the neighborhood of 500,000 car radios a year from Motorola, they said.

While no figures were available here, the order obviously runs to millions of dollars.

One likely factor behind Motorola's decision to move out of Japan is the new higher exchange rates for Japanese yen plus the devalued dollar agreed to in Washington Dec. 18.

The yen went up nearly 8 per cent and the dollar dropped about the same amount. This adds a nearly 16 per cent price advantage to buying in the United States compared to Japan.

The rise in the yen comes on top of steadily increasing costs in Japan. Some electronics and textile manufacturers have been leaving Japan for Taiwan, Hong Kong and other lower-cost areas. Among those moving or building new foreign plants have been Japanese firms.

Sources here said Volkswagen is actively considering other American built parts and accessories for their cars. Under study is a big order for car electric generators, they said.

The West German Deutsche mark also went up in comparison with the devalued dollar a total of over 12 per cent.

In addition, wages at Wolfsburg actually are higher than those paid by some Volkswagen suppliers in the United States (although certainly not in Detroit), the sources said.

FBI HITS THE SKY

HON. FRANK E. DENHOLM

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, Director J. Edgar Hoover and the special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—FBI—recorded in a quiet manner the successful apprehension of another hijacker over the weekend. Those apprehensive moments are events that often go by without notice when they end without damage to property or injury to innocent people. So it is with many, many acts of law enforcement and grave issues of security in the public interest. Millions of events are occurring each day and thousands of men in law enforcement stand ready for action—action that requires the courage and commitment of life to duty, honor, and country.

The success stories of the "man on the beat" or the "riders in the sky" seldom receive the notoriety equal to one error of less importance.

In recent years the new game of "hijacking" invaded the sky—and the Congress and the people of this country again turned to the FBI. Thousands of ships in the air, on land, and over the seas leave almost as many ports at home and abroad—and the cargoes are innocent, farepaying passengers as riders in the sky. It is a sense of satisfaction to know that along the route—there is the FBI.

I commend J. Edgar Hoover and his associates in the effective control of security in the sky. The task is most difficult—the risk is high but never do the men of the FBI shrink from the challenge to do or die. That commitment—that courage—that leadership is the hallmark of almost 50 years of the FBI. The crackpots, criminals, kooks, and Castro-Commies should take notice that the FBI has hit the sky.

Mr. Speaker, I am but one small voice among the humdrum silence of millions but I know that I am not alone when I say here "God's speed to the gentlemen of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—for the good of us all—and the security of our country at all times."

AMENDMENTS ARE NOT EASILY MADE

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent article in one of my local newspapers on the subject of the current petition to discharge the Judiciary Committee from consideration of House Joint Resolution 620, one of many proposed antibusing constitutional amendments now pending before the House.

The article was written in the form of a column by Jim Carravallah, in the Daily Eagle, published in Wayne, Mich., on January 20. He wrote the column after local NAG—Neighborhood Action Group—members picketed my district office to protest my refusal to sign the discharge petition.

Mr. Carravallah, suggesting that the picketers should take a lesson in civics, analyzed the entire situation with cool logic and understanding. It was indeed refreshing to read such an analysis in light of the hysteria, confusion, and misunderstanding which has surrounded the busing issue.

I am including the article at this point in the RECORD:

AMENDMENTS AREN'T EASILY MADE

(By Jim Carravallah)

After a prolonged absence, probably dictated by holidays which breed understanding and good will among men, NAG has reared its head.

Sixty people recently showed up at Congressmen William Ford's office in Wayne to protest his reluctance to sign a House petition to by pass normal procedure and force a constitutional amendment through Congress. The amendment would ban busing as a means of achieving racial balance in the United States.

The citizens should take a lesson in civics.

There have been only 26 constitutional amendments since the paper, which lays the foundation of American government was adopted in 1787, and none have been passed in short order.

Cong. Ford has said that his reluctance to sign the petition was based partially on this precedent. Any time a proposal to change the 185-year-old document appears, it can't be taken lightly, was his contention.

In fact, it can't be taken so lightly that certain legislative procedures, such as public hearings and committee reports, should be bypassed.

Despite busing being possibly the most important issue of race relations in the 70s, it isn't of sufficient weight that time honored procedures, which won such treasures as the Bill of Rights, women's suffrage and lowering the age of majority, should be bypassed for expediency.

In fact, there is an indication that special amendments, drawn to prevent social evils have a shorter life expectancy than amendments drawn to refine the government processes. The 18th amendment to the Constitution, which banned liquor in the United States, had to be repealed after only 14 years because the public could not, or would not, abide by its measures.

This is the only amendment to the Constitution repealed during the document's existence.

In addition, a proposed amendment to the

Constitution which would protect a child's rights when employed has been lying dormant since the turn of the century.

I can understand NAG's concern with busing, as most suburban parents would not like to see their children carted to the ghettos under the banner of equal education, but then, NAG ought to try and understand a bit of civics and history.

A case in point may help.

It has taken six years, and 50,000 deaths for Congress to consider action against the war in Vietnam.

During that time, public pressure has reached a much higher degree than any group such as NAG could hope to mount at this time.

Considering the results of 50,000 deaths, and marches of hundreds of American citizens against the war, I can't believe that NAG's effort to change the constitution will carry much force to change the demeanor of Congress.

And I can't say I would hope it would happen.

Congress will move in due time, and hopefully, it will move to the benefit of the entire country, not the 60 vocal residents who marched on Cong. Ford.

Opinions expressed are those of the columnist and not necessarily those of this newspaper.

IS WOMEN'S LIB A ONE-WAY STREET?

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Dick Barrett, a respected reporter for the San Jose Evening News, recently raised a point which I believe provides food for thought on the women's rights issue.

In my opinion, Mr. Barrett's article, which follows, makes a cogent point for retention of the provision in the House-passed version of H.R. 1 which would equalize treatment of men and women with respect to the "age-62 computation point" for determining social security benefits.

I commend Mr. Barrett's article to the attention of readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN IN SOCIAL SECURITY?

(By Dick Barrett)

Well, fellow members of Men's Lib, let us build fires in the street, raise a glass of cheer and celebrate. The United States Supreme Court has rendered an opinion that the 14th Amendment grants everyone equal rights. In doing so, it gave us men the chance to pull an option play, the like of which has never been seen on the gridiron.

You may recall that some years ago Congress amended the Social Security law to permit women to collect full benefits at age 62, but still requiring the male to labor until he is 65, or falls over into his grave, whichever is first. This is plainly discriminatory and in defiance of the 14th amendment. Or are women to remain more equal than men in this special situation?

But as I say, if we want to make a test case out of it and throw the Social Security financing for a loop, we have our options:

1. We can file suit demanding that the federal government allow us to retire at age 62 with full benefits, the same as the women.

2. We can sue to have women required to work until age 65, too, before they collect their social security. Along with this we can

allege that all monies paid so far to women under the 62-year ruling were illegally expended and should be recovered with interest.

I would suggest that the latter alternative is the better one, because it gives us a chance to compromise our case and settle in return for a lowering of the male retirement age to 62 and the sequestering of the recovered fund solely for the purchase of chaise lounges for men who will rush to lay down their burdens and bodies.

I am mindful of the fact that the Supreme Court decision in the Idaho case said that women can be treated differently when "the purpose is reasonable." Is their lower retirement age reasonable when the figures show that women are longer-lived than men? If you don't believe the statistics—just go traveling and see how many more widows than widowers you encounter.

Who wants to have the honor of being the first to sue the government for equal rights for men under the Social Security law? Or will Congress hasten (does it ever?) to recognize the situation without being hauled into court?

CONTINUING EDUCATION

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems facing rural America is the out-migration of its young people, it was pointed out at a 10-county conference held at Wothington, Minn., on January 18.

One of the papers presented at that conference by A. F. Gertjensen, Interstate Power Co., of Fulda, dealt with the matter of education for the young people of the area.

With your permission, and for the benefit of my colleagues and those people who read it, I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mr. Gertjensen's paper:

CONTINUING EDUCATION

(By A. F. Gertjensen)

The Storden Times recently carried an editorial with the caption, "A Ghost Town is Still a Ghost Town, even with sewers and running water." It goes about farms getting larger, run by less people and about less and less business places in our small towns.

The booklet you received at the entrance tells a sad story of what is happening in this area of Southwest Minnesota and Northwest Iowa. And, it forecasts a very grim future for our economy and well being, unless we can do something to change it.

We came together today to discuss our mutual problems and to try to find answers if we can, to these two questions:

1. How can we provide the opportunities necessary to keep people from leaving the area?

2. How do we go about improving the quality of life so that one out of every four families need not live in poverty?

At the turn of the century this was a booming area. The land was opening up, the towns were flourishing. We grew even through the great depression. Up to about 1960 we were pretty well holding our own. Today it's a different story.

In its heyday my home town boasted three hardware, five blacksmith shops, three restaurants, a millinery store, theatre, banks, and mind you, five saloons.

Today it's down to a handful of businesses. Main street has more than its share of

vacant buildings, and about half of its homes house retired people. The young people have gone and vacant farms dot the countryside. With the exception of a few of our larger towns, this is true of the whole area.

How in the world could we go from boom to almost bust in 70 short years?

From my own experience I can tell you about one contributing factor.

My grandfather brought his family from Germany to this area of "Cornbelt" in 1895. He came because he wanted a better opportunity for his family than he had in Germany. My father who only managed a 4th grade education told me, "I'm going to see that you get a better education so you can have a better life." And he did. I went to school and learned a trade and went into the electrical business.

I told my children—"Go to college—get a good education so you can get a good job." And they did. And—they no longer live in the Cornbelt. This is the story of most families.

From our grandfathers down to us we wanted more and better things for our children. In this we were highly successful. They work shorter hours for more money and have more of the comforts of life than we ever thought possible.

We have encouraged higher education to the point where they want to leave the land and the small towns to seek their fortunes where they can work for someone else, in a ready made job.

We have not instilled in them a desire to stay and start their own businesses from scratch. They have not gone through some of the hardships we did, so they really don't know the good feeling of carving out a slice of the economy for themselves. We wanted them to start at or near the top. Now they are gone. And those that did not seek higher education are gone also. The high salaries of factory production lines in the Metro areas hold more glamor for them than the good life in the rural area.

Two things have happened—

1. We have over-emphasized college education to the point where we now have a surplus of degree bearing people. For the last 20 years we taught the youngsters that if you didn't have a college education you may as well resign yourself to being a nobody.

2. We have under-emphasized vocational and special education—especially for those who could not afford—or refused to go to college. In the meantime the cornbelt area goes begging for trained and skilled craftsmen and technicians, both male and female.

Let me give you a few examples. One high school I checked sheds some light on where most of our young people go. In the last five years 44% of their graduating classes headed for college. After graduation from college very few will find opportunities in our area. In this same school, of the 1966 and 1967 graduates, another 20% went to vocational or business schools. In the last three years of the five year period—35% went to business and vocational schools. This is an improvement and there are other area schools where the percentage to vocational schools is higher and the percentage to college lower. As I see it, this trend is favorable and I'll dwell more on it a little later on.

If you decide to build a house or any other good sized building, you have fairly good success in getting carpenters, brick layers, plumbers, and electricians. But, try to make some small extensions to your house wiring, plumbing, or a small remodeling job and you are apt to get on that waiting list sometimes for quite a period. There are job opportunities in the area for skilled mechanics, body men, carpenters, electricians, plumbers, and right on down the line. Some opportunities lie in jobs that are unfilled. Other towns could support a new small business. In our own business of supplying electric power, we have in the past taken high school graduates or men returning from the service and made

linemen, plant operators and technicians out of them by on the job training. The office clerks and stenographers were recruited the same way with only basic training in high school. Until the last few years very few came from vocational and business schools.

Technicians are driving out here from the Twin Cities and Omaha to service our hydraulic equipment. What a field this would be to start a business in.

In our own ten county area we have one of the best tools available to help reduce out-migration and to improve the areas living standards. That tool is the training available at our vocational schools and Junior College. In less than an hours drive from any corner of the area you can be at the door of one of the vocational schools or the Junior College.

In the 1930's vocational technical training was available mainly from a few private schools in both states. In 1945 the Minnesota Legislature passed the vocational school law. Today there are 32 area vocational-technical schools in Minnesota with two of them located in our area at Pipestone and Jackson.

The Iowa law was passed in 1966. Today there are fifteen area schools in Iowa that offer vocational technical education with one of them located in our area at Sheldon.

This may come as a surprise to some of you but the Worthington Junior College was established in 1936. It is now a State Junior College and part of an 18 school Junior College System.

Tuition is low in these schools, and the state line is no barrier. Out of state tuition is slightly higher, of course. For most vocational courses high school diplomas are not required. In fact, training is available to give you a high school equivalency certificate.

The vocational schools offer a wide variety of courses in trades and occupations for both men and women of all ages. The junior college has been mainly geared to preparation for further college work, however, many occupational programs are now available. For instance, their catalog lists programs in production agriculture, agribusiness-management or sales and service, and business management, as well as tuition-free programs in clerical, secretarial, and practical nursing.

Here is an interesting example of what the vocational-technical schools are doing.

In the last four years in the fields of auto mechanics, fashion designing, business, agricultural banking, carpentry, food merchandising and supermarket management, and meat cutting, the Pipestone vocational school graduated 703 full-time students. Of these 403 or 57% took jobs in rural rather than metro areas. And, of this number, 20 went into business for themselves.

Education is not just for the young. Adults can secure further training in their present field. They can retrain at night for a job or trade they are more interested in without loss of time from their present work.

Last year Jackson had over 2,000 adults enrolled in various courses, mostly at night. Sheldon had about 3,000. Pipestone trained over 600 last year in their Adult Program.

The schools are run by very dedicated people and they are willing to teach most anything the people of the area are interested in. On visiting the schools I was amazed at the number of courses being offered.

The schools are attempting to keep abreast of the times, reshaping their programs as needed.

One way or the other, our education continues from the cradle to the grave.

Formal education is really the knowledge and experience of many people over many years, compiled into text books and passed on to us through instruction. By using our area schools we can take advantage of this vast store of knowledge and increase our earning power at a much faster rate than we can through the school of experience and hard knocks.

For purposes of this afternoons workshops

and discussions I would ask these questions of all the segments of the economy represented here:

Can you secondary school board members do more to update and expand your basic vocational offerings, so that you expose your students to the benefits of staying in the rural area. How about having your counselors talk about rural life, at least to some extent, rather than counseling all students possible toward bachelors, masters, and doctor degrees in some far off specialized position? True, we need well educated people in all fields but shouldn't we try for more of a balance especially when our rural area is at stake?

Are you people in business and industry getting acquainted with your area school? Can you give them more cooperation in the way of furnishing competent members of your firm to help with instruction in special classes? Are you encouraging your employees to take additional training to improve both their lot and yours?

Can you help your area school in getting them acquainted with new equipment and new techniques? Remember, their best source of information is you.

What can you mayors and councilmen and you folks in the civic and church organizations do to furnish the best possible municipal, recreational, educational, and social services to make your town attractive to small businessmen, professional people, and tradesmen? The news media has always had a deep concern for the areas economy and problems. Certainly they should never relax in promoting what is good and speaking out sharply against whatever appears to be detrimental.

Can the farm organizations do more to encourage people to train for and start agri-related business and services in our area?

Development corporations are continually on the lookout for new industry in their towns. I would ask you men to consider back up financing for the individual that has had the training and ability but little or no money to start in business.

Our State and Federal officials, both elected and appointed, have a tremendous responsibility, and their decisions are not easily made. It is important, however, that an equitable tax balance be maintained between rural and metro areas to keep from draining away too many dollars that could be used by individuals and industry to pour back into the economy of the area.

I ask these questions, not in criticism, but in the interest of the welfare of the Cornbelt and of making the afternoons workshops more productive and meaningful.

The continuing education group discussion will be held in Room 215. Staff members and administrators from the area schools will be there. Your questions are welcome and your ideas and suggestions will be most helpful. We invite you to attend to help us help you make continuing education a real benefit to the area.

A KANSAS DAY TOAST

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Kansas observed its 111th anniversary of statehood on Saturday, January 29, Traditional Kansas Day festivities were held in our State capital of Topeka. Mr. Robert Gadberry of Wichita served as chairman of the Kansas Day committee. Dr. Dolf M. Droge, a member of the staff of the National Security Council, was featured speaker at the annual banquet.

It is customary at this yearly event to have the toast delivered by a young Kansan. We believe that our young people constitute one of our greatest assets and resources in Kansas. Mr. Mike Murray, of Junction City, presented the toast to Kansas on Saturday night. He eloquently described the wonders of our great State and set forth a challenge for all Kansans.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in *THE RECORD*, I include the Toast to Kansas by Mike Murray:

Fellow Kansans: This evening we are here to toast the Great State of Kansas.

The time has long passed to praise sunflowers, buffalo, cottonwood trees, and meadowlarks.

Now, the time has come to praise the spirit and enthusiasm that has made Kansas great.

We must go forward from this hall tonight united in the purpose of not just keeping this driving spirit alive, but to once again move ahead to better Kansas government, economy and way of life.

This spirit and enthusiasm is embodied in a state of mind. Years in age have nothing to do with it.

This state of mind is one of action, and getting the job done.

The oil, aircraft and agricultural industries of Kansas did not just happen.

They were built by men and women of action.

In the same spirit, winning political parties in Kansas are not born, they are built by hard work and determination.

As we reach this gala conclusion of the Kansas Day festivities, we toast this spirit of action, and resolve that tonight the buck stops with us.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1972, marked the 54th anniversary of the Ukraine, a nation within the U.S.S.R. from which a proud and spirited people came to the United States in search of the better life. Like the Italians, the Irish, the Jews, the Swedes, the Poles, and the Germans, the people of the Ukraine melded with American society while maintaining an individuality and a momentum of purpose that has brightened and enriched the towns and cities where they have settled. Today, the sons and daughters of our original Ukrainians are among America's finest citizens.

On January 22, in my district, the Third Congressional District of the State of Connecticut, I had the privilege of attending a celebration honoring Ukrainian day and the Ukraine's 54th anniversary. At this function, I observed in the Ukrainian people not only an earthy and proud love of heritage but also a firm commitment to the American promise and to those ideals that cause us to be a cohesive nation of many peoples. Should our country ever falter, I am certain that the Ukrainians will be among the first to become a pillar of support.

Coming to these shores before the terrible depression, serving overseas to defend the land and its principles, struggling along with the rest of us to build a viable society, the Ukrainians are Americans of the best grain. As they are capable of relating to their past by wearing the rich costumes of their earlier land and performing those unique Ukrainian dances, I noted that America's Ukrainians also sing the "Star-Spangled Banner" with moistened eyes.

In my district, many Ukrainians serve in responsible positions and as skilled workers of a high order. I am pleased and grateful that they have chosen to live and work in Connecticut, and I take pride in their accomplishments.

WATER FACTORY 21

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, I had the privilege of participating along with Interior Secretary Rogers Morton in the ground-breaking ceremonies for the Water Factory 21 desalting plant in Fountain Valley, Calif., which is located in my new congressional district.

Water Factory 21—for 21st century—is an exciting concept. It will demonstrate the technology necessary to desalt large quantities of seawater and mix it with reclaimed water.

It is being funded as a joint project by the Office of Saline Water and the Orange County Water District. I was particularly pleased that the project also has the strong support of the Sierra Club as an effort to improve the quality of our environment.

What this project means to Orange County, the State of California, and the Nation was appropriately described in the January 27 issue of *Water Desalination Report*, by William E. Warne, former director of the California Department of Water Resources. I include Mr. Warne's fine article in the *RECORD* at this point:

ORANGE COUNTY DESALTING PLANT DEDICATED AS WATER TECHNOLOGY OF 21ST CENTURY

(By William E. Warne)

Water Factory 21 of the Orange County Water District will show the way in which California water industry will be ushered into the 21st Century. While the project will demonstrate the test module vertical tube evaporator, multi-stage flash at a capacity of 3 MGD, it is much more than a sea water desalter.

IMPORTANT IMPACTS

The project is more intricately impacted by and will have more numerous impacts upon rapidly changing environment of the Southern California Coastal Plain than any other water project presently under consideration. The latest technological advances in other fields are combined with desalting in the plan worked out by Langdon W. Owen, Secretary-Manager, and the District's staff and approved by the District's farsighted Board.

Financing of the \$31,000,000 cost of the project has been assembled from Federal,

State and local sources, almost as intricately as the engineering plan was put together.

The project sponsors have picked a way through the gamut of environmental review during a period when standards, requirements and procedures are only partially firm. Many less well-prepared proposals have simply failed to survive these scrutinies.

RESISTANCE OVERCOME

Resistances in the legal, institutional and cultural environments have been overcome. Some of these were encountered and mitigated by the District earlier in pursuit of programs that are now being climaxed by Water Factory 21.

Technically, Water Factory 21 at the outset will combine the 3 MGD production of the desalter test module with 15 MGD of water reclaimed from the trickling filter secondary effluent of Treatment Plant No. 1 of the Orange County Sanitation District. These combined sources will be supplemented as needed by pumping from a fresh water aquifer 800 ft. below sea level, and a total of 30,000 acre-ft. of water a yr. of acceptable drinking water quality will be injected into an underground fresh water barrier. The barrier will prevent intrusion of salt water from the sea into the groundwater basin upon which the population of the District depends. It will also augment total supply of the groundwater reservoir as it percolates to the depressed water table. In 1976, the desalter will be increased in capacity to 15 MGD.

AQUIFERS AT STAKE

The barrier to sea water intrusion in the Talbert and Santa Ana Gaps was begun in 1967. The injection, extraction and observation wells, together with the water lines, have cost \$600,000. At stake is the continued viability of an underground reservoir with a usable capacity of at least 500,000 acre-ft., provided it is properly recharged and managed. When the aquifers were over-pumped in the past, saline waters moved inland to a distance of as much as three and one half miles from the Pacific Ocean.

The District already has several unique achievements to its credit in meeting the threat that over-use of the groundwaters posed to the whole community. Among them has been the purchase of large quantities of water imported from the Colorado River by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern Calif. and the percolation of this Colorado River water through gravels of the Santa Ana River bed into the groundwater basin that is the principal source of supply for the District's customers.

PUBLIC CONFIDENCE

The use of aquifers as the channels for water distribution was unique when begun. Methods of taxing pumps using the groundwaters in order to finance the recharging operations and as a part of the program to manage the underground basin were also new. The success of these operations has provided public confidence required to enable the District to take the next logical step, Water Factory 21.

Even beyond these problems the District encountered resistances in legal, institutional and cultural environments that were equally formidable. Among these were (1) public distaste for the deliberate mixing of effluent from sewage treatment plants, no matter how carefully reclaimed, into domestic water sources, (2) conjunctive use of surface and groundwaters and management of underground water storage, (3) taxing of rumpage from the common groundwater source which previously had been used freely by many individuals whose lands overlie the basin, (4) use for popular recreational purposes of lands and waters employed in the unique system of recharge of groundwaters and (5) relatively loose content of the delivery of domestic supplies underground to the households and other water users in the

District. An additional measure of the success of the District in its pioneering work in these fields is fact that to date it is the only one among more than 1100 such public agencies in the State to have worked out practicable answers to all of these problems.

POPULOUS ORANGE

Necessity, again, has been the mother of the inventions of the Orange County Water District. Orange County is 48th in size among Calif.'s 58 counties, but its 1.4 million people make it the second most populous county in the State. Between 1960 and 1970, Orange County grew faster than any other county in Calif., having a rate of growth of 101 per cent.

Orange County is semi-arid. It's at the end of the water supply systems that serve it, the Colorado River through the Colorado River Aqueduct; the Santa Ana River, over developed primary source of supply for Orange County; and the State Water Project's Calif. Aqueduct, which in any event, is not expected to bring Feather River water to the areas of the Orange County Water District until 1980. Waters of the Santa Ana River, used and reused in the basin above the Orange County line, presently average about 750 ppm TDS on arrival in Orange County. The Colorado water also contains 750 ppm at the point above Parker Dam at which diversions are made into the Colorado River Aqueduct. Each reuse of water in Orange County adds up to 250 ppm.

Hence, the most severe assault on the environment of Orange County is not made by pollution of the waters, but by the progressive almost imperceptible degradation of the water quality through increasing the burden of dissolved solids that the water carries. And those who would protect the environment by urging recycling of the waters, as by reclaiming the sewage waters that are discharged into the sea, are engaged in a self-defeating contest unless a source of high quality water can be provided to improve the average quality of the supply. About one more use and the reclaimed sewage, though free of all contaminants, nevertheless would become unhealthful.

WF-21 GENIUS

This is the genius of Water Factory 21. It makes feasible recapture and reuse through as many as two or three additional cycles of as much reclaimed sewage as the desalting water that it provides.

DUPLICATE PLANTS

The significance here is not found in the 3 MGD of desalted water that the VTE/MSF test module will provide, but rather in the fact that WF-21 will open the door to ways to restore and enhance the environment of many areas much larger than Orange County. WF-21 could be usefully duplicated anywhere in the Southern Calif. coastal plain, where 11 million people live. Almost no one living in the coastal plain enjoys drinking water of recommended quality, unless he can afford to have it brought to him in a 5-gal. glass jar and fed to him through a private fountain. The water factories wouldn't all be identical. But they would be similar and they would enhance environments to which they were adapted, just as WF-21 will enhance environment of the Orange County Water District.

The whole of the lower Colorado River Basin, including most of Arizona, Southern Nevada, northern Baja California, as well as Southern California, suffers water quality problems as severe as those afflicting Orange County. Deficiencies of as much as 4,000,000 acre-ft. of water a yr., as well as lowered water quality are foreseen for Central Arizona unless the waters of the Colorado River are augmented by massive desalting projects or diversions from other river basins within 50 yrs. Type I Framework Water and Related Land Use studies just completed paint gloomy pictures of the future Southwest unless massive demonstrations of desalting are made in

order to preserve environment of the vast region.

Frequently, Federal and State reviewers look at such projects as WF-21 as potential contributors to degradation of the existing environment. But in this case, a careful impact study of WF-21 was made and the project was found satisfactory up through the highest level of review (WDR, 4 Nov. '71, 1). No problem of thermal pollution of the ocean, noxious odors, air pollution, or noise abatement was foreseen that could not practically be resolved, and for which solutions were not incorporated into the plan. The time has arrived in the maturity of America when such environmental precautions should be taken with respect to the construction of every project, especially one like WF-21 which will be a key element in the environmental enhancement of the region that it will serve.

CONTINUITY DEMANDED

In an arid and semiarid land, such as the Southwest, in which Orange County is but an impacted spot on the map of the whole, population growth and economic development inexorably demand development of the water and related land resources. Once started, the processes of development must be continuous because early solutions become later problems in resources use and management in a never ending progression as growth proceeds.

It's far too early to foresee what Water Factory 22 may be, when it is proposed 100 yrs. from now. But those interested in the maintenance of a satisfactory quality of life in the Southwest Region may clearly recognize WF-21 as the next answer required of the present generation.

The threshold of urgency has been reached first in the Southwest because of the aridity of the region and because of the intense impact of population growth. But other regions will not lag far behind.

WF-21 may find sites where it will be duplicated on the Merrimack, the Androscooggin, and Lake Erie as well as in the Southwest in the waning yrs. of this century.

DELAY ON POLLUTION CONTROL

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Federal water pollution control program is in the awkward position of having funds available, but no authorization to spend them.

Twice, the Congress has enacted continuing resolutions to keep the programs operating under supervision of the Environmental Protection Agency, the second one expiring last October 31. The House approved another 3-month extension, but the Senate cut it back to a month and then the measure became moot as it got lost in the end-of-the-session maze of legislation.

Today, I have joined my colleague from New York (Mr. KEMP) in introducing a new continuing resolution which would extend the water pollution control program authorization to June 30, 1972.

Of course, what we really need is final Congressional action on the main legislation to continue the program. The continuing resolution is only stop-gap.

But we must have the stop-gap in the meanwhile in order to keep the program going. We cannot afford to let the momentum slide back.

Already the result of the Federal de-

lay on authorization has become apparent as programs have been deferred right and left. New York State has invested heavily on the assurance of Federal reimbursement, but now the hard-pressed State has clamped the lid on any further prefinancing and programs all over the State have been shelved indefinitely.

The Public Works Committee has ordered a basic bill reported and has indicated it expects to be ready for floor action within a month. Then, the measure goes to the Senate. Final action thus is at least 2, maybe 3, months away.

It is essential that there be new interim action through another continuing resolution. The pollution problem is great; the need is clear.

THE MEDICAL SITUATION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I recently received from a group of medical personnel—doctors, nurses, and paramedics—who have worked in South Vietnam two most upsetting letters. It would appear that in "Vietnamizing" that war-torn country, Mr. Nixon is withdrawing medical personnel and humanitarian programs at a faster rate than combat troops and materials.

The letters also point out that the reduced American casualty rate does not mean that the war itself is being reduced. All that it means is that more of the killing in Indochina is of and by people with yellow skin, and that nonwhites are being victimized to protect American interests and the nonelected Thieu government.

The United States, having laid waste much of Indochina, cannot just pack its bags and go home. We bear a serious responsibility with regard to restoring the health and vitality of the peninsula and its people. The attached letters point this out, and I include them at the conclusion of my remarks:

JANUARY 24, 1972.

Congresswoman BELLA ABZUG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN ABZUG: The enclosed open letter documents the tragic medical situation in south Viet-Nam today. It was written by doctors, nurses, and paramedical personnel from seven countries whose cumulative experience in south Viet-Nam goes back as far as 1967. Several of the doctors are working for AMA and USAID sponsored programs, and the majority of these twenty-five persons speak and understand the Vietnamese language—more, probably, than in the entire AMA/USAID medical apparatus.

The letter is based on available USAID/RVN statistics and our feelings of horror at the vastly increased suffering of the Vietnamese people that is occurring because of Mr. Nixon's "Vietnamization" of the war and his arrangement of withdrawal priorities, as well as the following premises:

(1) Recent attempts at power politics, without regard for the collective will of the object peoples, have proven to be poor poli-

tics; witness the alienating effect (probably the only effect) of the display of U.S. Naval power in the Bay of Bengal, not to mention the disastrous efforts to maintain a string of unpopular Saigon governments by military and police power. Even in its own selfish interests, the U.S. government would be far more successful in the international arena if it displayed a sincere and concrete concern for the needs and desires of foreign peoples—as interpreted by those people themselves. Need anyone be reminded that if Americans had responded to pleas for aid from a certain bearded Asian representing his people in 1945-46, the U.S. might well have been spared a long and ignominious involvement in wars that have cost the lives of millions?

(2) Almost every aggressive act performed in Indochina by the Nixon administration, even the continuation of war itself, has been justified by Nixon as "necessary to protect our remaining American troops." In the eyes of millions of Asians, this means that the United States government considers Indochinese people to be expendable—to be sacrificed in "rear guard" actions to protect the "more valuable" American lives. If our government does not regard the Indochinese as precious human beings of equal value to ourselves, then who shall we Americans turn to in Asia when we need friends in the future?

We ask not only your support in this effort to change these Nixon "doctrines," but also for new initiatives in this direction from your office.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

JOHN G. CHAMPLIN, M.D.

OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT NIXON AND
THE AMA

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned members of the international medical community working in South Vietnam, vigorously protest the already bad and now rapidly deteriorating medical situation in South Vietnam.

We address this letter to the leaders of the U.S. government and the American Medical Association (AMA) because we feel they bear a major responsibility for the intolerable health conditions now prevalent in Cambodia, Laos, and South Vietnam: first, the U.S. government because of its devastating political and military policies, and secondly, the AMA because it has consistently supported U.S. policy in Indochina, and because though intimately involved with the Vietnamese health care system and familiar with its deficiencies, the AMA has failed to make more than token efforts to help resolve the real problems. The U.S. government and the AMA are also ultimately responsible for the incredibly inadequate health care program of the Republic of Vietnam (RVN).

Although we urge a rapid and complete withdrawal of the American military, we beseech the American government and people to remember the Indochinese victims still suffering from the U.S. government's tragic mistakes. We believe that medical humanitarian programs should be among the last to be withdrawn.

In addition to the undersigned, many other foreign medical personnel in Vietnam have concurred with all or most of this letter, but are under obligation not to engage in actions in Vietnam which might be construed as "political" in nature. They are primarily concerned with continuing their work, and previous protests from concerned foreign civilians in Vietnam have often resulted in threats or harassment, and in some cases expulsion from the country.

In a society where a citizen can be "legally" imprisoned and sentenced to death for "spreading rumors" or "weakening the will of the army to fight," it should be obvious why we have not invited our Vietnamese friends and counterparts to sign this letter.

WE ARE OPPOSED TO THE FOLLOWING POLICIES
AND POLICY RESULTS

U.S. government support of medical aid programs, including voluntary agencies, and Province Hospital Assistance Program teams is being withdrawn before American pilots, warplanes, and bombs. This policy has already caused serious shortages in many province hospitals that were inadequately manned even before withdrawal began. Many patients who might have been saved in these hospitals a few months ago are now dying.

The South Vietnamese government (RVN) health care system is not effectively filling these significant new gaps left by departing foreign medical teams.

The remaining U.S. military hospital facilities are being too rapidly closed to Vietnamese civilians, even when the capability to help still exists in many of these hospitals. The number of civilian war casualties admitted to U.S. military hospitals in the latter part of 1971 is only 1/8 to 1/6 the number admitted during the first months of '71. Compared to 1½ years ago the civilian war casualties admitted to U.S. military hospitals have decreased by about 95% while the casualty rate itself has only decreased by about 20%.

All the above has occurred at a time when the Nixon doctrine forces Asians to kill and injure more and more Asians. Despite the decreased U.S. involvement in ground combat, and the general lull in South Viet-Nam, the number of civilian war casualties admitted to RVN Ministry of Health hospitals during 1971 continued at approximately the 1967 (just prior to the large scale Tet Offensive) rate of 3,000-4,000 per month.

The Army of the Republic of Viet-Nam (ARVN) continues its policy of hoarding physicians despite attempts at joint utilization, while far too few doctors are left for the civilian population.

The RVN Ministry of Health doctors are paid so little that the system encourages them to neglect indigent patients in province hospitals in order to spend more time in private practice.

Even during war years, a time of greatest need, the Saigon government spends only about 2½% of its national expenditures on health, while most developing countries spend close to 5%. WHO recommends that developing countries spend at least 10% on health care. (According to official WHO records, the Colombian and Nigerian governments spent 11% and 12% respectively in 1963-1964. All health expenses in the U.S. amounted to 4.7% of national expenditures in those years.)

The percentage of U.S. financial aid to so-called "public safety" (which includes political assassination programs like Phoenix) is increasing while the percentage of aid to medical teams is decreasing.

The U.S. financing of prison construction (including new tiger cages) continues while money is withdrawn from medical programs.

Despite any U.S./RVN statistical claims regarding money spent for health care in South Viet-Nam, the South Vietnamese people are not receiving anything close to adequate medical care.

These policies reveal a savage disregard for the Indochinese people whose lives are being damaged and destroyed by the prolongation of this war. Together with the continued hostilities they result in the following additional facts which characterize the present health care situation in southern Viet-Nam:

(1) The crowded, filthy conditions in poorly staffed RVN province hospitals have often been a source of comment, but these conditions have not changed appreciably in the past five years—until recent policies have imposed new hardships.

(2) Preventive medicine programs should be given the highest priority, but they are

presently haphazard and ineffective. Large numbers of Vietnamese children still contract poliomyelitis and other preventable diseases in an era when polio and other vaccines are effective, inexpensive, and readily available.

(3) Illness and death among thousands of refugees still occurs because of forced migration.

(4) Inadequate numbers of Vietnamese doctors, nurses, and medical technicians are being trained.

(5) There is a severe shortage of specialists and specialist facilities in all medical fields (e.g. only one mental hospital for eighteen million people).

(6) Showcase hospitals are built in cities while many province hospital buildings have no electricity, no potable water, and no sanitary toilet facilities, not to mention the lack of sufficient beds, hospital supplies, equipment, and funds for maintenance.

We are also concerned for the health of Political prisoners (e.g. *Huynh Tan Man*—a medical student recently arrested without warrant and now held incommunicado) and POW's of both sides who must continue to endure more months or years of confinement because the war is being prolonged.

In keeping with the humanitarian goals implied above, we urge Americans to respond to invitations from whatever governments emerge after the cessation of hostilities in Indochina, to continue medical aid programs as long as they are welcome by the recipients. There will be people injured or dying from unexploded bombs, land mines, and artillery shells for a long time to come. Rehabilitation of all war victims will require generations.

Respectfully,

John Champlin, M.D.; Heinz Palla, M.D.; Norman P. Blair, M.D.; Allen J. Stuckey, M.D.; Gert Junker, M.D.; Hermann Ober, M.D.; and Margaret Fast, M.D.

Yoshihiko Ureshino, M.D.; Sakae Watanabe, M.D.; Keith Arnold, M.D.; Susan Forlenza, M.D.; Torao Fujii, M.D.; Ann O'Neill, M.D.; and Ernst Tenamergen, M.D.

Edward Allen; Robert Redig; Jane Barton; David Paul Barton; and Caroline Elliot.

David Bailey; Michael R. Jones; Roger D. Marshall, L.B.I.S.T.; Ernest Brunner, R.N.; Mistuhiko Hasegawa; and Brigitte Wilmer, R.N.

SALUTE AGRICULTURE PROFESSOR

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union in our effort to establish an improved relationship has been aided by actual and potential agricultural trade. The sale of feed grains in 1971 and the potential sales of U.S. soybean products are good indications of discussions which can lead to improved relationships between our two nations.

Another excellent method of improving the understanding and relationships between our two countries is through an exchange of information.

Prof. D. E. Alexander, geneticist at the University of Illinois, has been honored for his contribution in this effort through his work with Russian graduate

students attending our university. Professor Alexander has been named to the Russian All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences for his contribution in developing corn with higher oil and protein content. He visited Russia in 1962 upon the invitation of the Minister of Agriculture and spent 10 days as a maize consultant.

Election to the academy is the highest honor Russians give agricultural scientists. Professor Alexander is the first American to be so honored.

A spokesman for the Soviet Embassy, in making the presentation, called Alexander's election to the academy "an omen of a very bright future for the improvement of relations between our two countries." I agree and salute Professor Alexander for his contribution to improved relations between the people of the United States and the Soviet Union.

MAJOR INDUSTRIES NOT LIKELY TO CURB THE UNEMPLOYMENT RATE IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of January 30 carried a front-page story indicating that our major industries are not likely to curb the high unemployment rate in the United States.

While we have gone through three budget deficits in a row and a variety of economic game plans before the President's new economic policy was announced last August 15, I submit these plans merely attempt to treat the symptoms of inflation rather than the causes.

Other news accounts report that foreign automobile manufacturers have absorbed the added costs of their cars because of the dollar devaluation, and they will be selling their cars at about the same price as before in the United States, thus negating any advantage we may have in this area. It is expected that other foreign manufacturers will do likewise since the United States is still the biggest export market for Europe and Japan.

Mr. Speaker, the excellent New York Times article follows:

BIG INDUSTRIES NOT LIKELY TO CUT DOWN JOBLESS RATE

(By Jerry M. Flint)

DETROIT, January 29.—Some of the nation's largest industries, even those especially favored by the Nixon Administration's new economic policies, will do little to bring down the nation's unemployment rate this year.

These industries, including steel, automobiles, electronics and textiles, have been big job producers in the past and expect major gains this year in the things they make and sell. But they are not expecting to add substantially to employment in the months to come.

Indeed, some may not have as many workers in mid-1972 as in mid-1971, and some may have fewer workers than only two or three years ago.

There are a variety of reasons for the dim job prospects. In some cases productivity is

going up, meaning that more jobs will not come with added business; in others imports are expected to pluck the fruit of an economic pickup, and in still others the present production rate can handle increased consumer buying without new hiring.

This does not mean there is no hope for reducing unemployment in the new year. The entire manufacturing segment of the economy accounts for only a fifth of the nation's work force. The number of jobs in services, wholesale and retail trades, and local governments continues to grow even in the recession.

And, the failure of big industries to add significantly to the employment rolls does not mean that President Nixon's new economic program is a failure. Some of the actions of the last five months may have saved the industries from major production cutbacks and more layoffs.

But it does help explain why high unemployment has persisted as the economy swings up and why the jobless rate remains burdensome in the old manufacturing centers that depend on such industries even as the nation prospers.

The nation's unemployment rate averaged 5.9 per cent in all of 1971 and 6.1 per cent in the month of December. Economists are predicting some decline this year, generally to a rate close to 5.5 per cent, higher at the beginning of the new year, lower at the end.

In the steel industry, according to an analyst of the United Steel Workers at the union's Pittsburgh headquarters, "Even under the added levels [of steel making expected in 1972] you're not going to get above depression levels of employment."

Last fall the steel industry's job number fell to 430,000 hourly and salaried workers from 536,000 in the summer—the lowest employment level since the Depression days before World War II.

There were special troubles: A strike threat meant steel users built up inventory last year but there was no strike. The users then worked down their hoard rather than buy new metal while imports from abroad soared far beyond voluntary quota agreements.

MORE TONS, FEWER WORKERS

Last year the nation's steel makers produced 120 million tons of the metal. This year, an industry analyst in Washington predicts, tonnage is expected to climb to 131 million tons, perhaps more.

But in 1965 the steel makers used 584,000 employees to produce 131 million tons; in 1968 they used 522,000 for that tonnage; in 1970 they used 531,000 for the same total, and this year, the industry analyst predicts, 131 million tons could be produced with 520,000 employees—not even as many as were at work last spring.

"As volume goes up, output per man hour will go up," he predicts, with the steel makers finally cashing in on billions of dollars in capital spending over the last decade.

Even the currency changes, which halved the price advantage of imported steel, and expected steel imports restrictions, which are being negotiated now, will still leave imports at high levels, better than 10 per cent of the market.

In December the Administration said the currency revaluations could alone add between 500,000 and 750,000 to the nation's job total. But the figures came from no industry-by-industry survey but rather from general theories that for every billion-dollar improvement in the balance of trade—and the currency changes would bring that turnaround—60,000 to 80,000 are added to the employment total. Steel, clothing and furniture were among the industries mentioned that could gain.

However, the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, says it sees no evidence that the devaluation will create the jobs and Peter G. Petersen,

the President's assistant for international affairs, said it might take two years for the changes to show up.

Another disappointment for those hoping to whittle down unemployment will be the automobile industry. An extra million vehicle sales would mean a quarter-million jobs, the Administration announced last fall as it moved to help the industry.

The 7 per cent auto excise tax was removed. And the '72 new car price increase was rolled back to 3 per cent instead of 4 to 5 percent, meaning that the 1972 new cars are priced under the 1971's.

Currency changes completely wiped out the price advantage of small foreign imports over the American made small cars. And it is possible that a half-million or even a million more American-type cars could be sold in the nation this year over 1971. But the return in new jobs will be low through much of the year.

"We built 400,000 vehicles over retail demand in 1971," said a high-ranking executive of the General Motors Corporation. That added production was to make up for strike losses in 1970. But it means that G.M. requires a big sales increase in 1972 just to keep production and employment at last year's levels.

CALLBACKS AND LAYOFFS

The company is calling back or hiring 3,900 workers in the first three months of this year—and will add 1,400 more by fall to increase production—but laying off 1,000 others because it does less new model styling.

But the G.M. executive said the year's employment would probably be around the level of 1968 for the big automaker, or 425,000 hourly workers, not much above the 421,000 at the end of 1971.

Other carmakers promise no more in the job field. Stocks of new cars are high and if modest production increases are needed they can come from overtime.

Just as important, the high and steady production rate expected this spring is counted on, as in steel, to make for productivity gains. New plants and equipment, too, add to those giants in high production periods. Ford's new foundry at Flat River, Mich., is an example; it replaces a 50-year-old plant a few miles north and will produce as many engine blocks and other castings with 15-to-20 per cent fewer workers.

ROLE OF FOREIGN CARS

In the consumer electronics field, analysts predict 3.5-million more television sets, home radios and tape recorders and players will be sold this year over 1971, but 4-million more will be imported from abroad, meaning fewer manufacturing jobs.

Major electronics companies do not expect employment gains. The Westinghouse Electric Corporation in Pittsburgh said it started 1971 with 145,000 employees and ended this year with 5,000 fewer and is not predicting any job gain in 1972.

The General Electric Corporation, with nearly 300,000 United States workers at the start of last year, was down 2.5 to 3 per cent at the year's end, and early this month closed plants in Buffalo and Cleveland.

SEES A STABLE JOB LEVEL

Motorola, which raised its United States employment by 7,000 in 1971, said it expected the job level to be stable this year. An industry committee has complained that 121,000 jobs have been lost in the industry to foreign competition in five years.

The textile industry, too, is looking for more sales in 1972. Analysts predict clothing sales will go up 8 per cent or so and while employment gains may come they will not be that large.

The job force in apparel making dropped to 1.3 million last year from 1.4 million in 1968.

Stanley Nehmer, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Commerce, said the textile industry

employment had declined by 100,000 workers in less than three years, and without recent quotas set for imports "this figure could have been expected to rise to as high as a quarter of a million jobs lost by the end of this year."

The quotas, however, will not stop the import growth, but slow it down. Man-made fiber, textile and clothing imports to the United States permitted under the agreement with Asian nations are still allowed to grow by 5 per cent to 7.5 per cent a year, which is larger than the recent growth in the United States market.

SHIRT MARKET CAPTURED

But that is "only one-tenth of the abnormally high growth rates which these countries had experienced in our market last year," Mr. Nehmer, said.

The low labor-cost nations of Asia captured the market for low cost men's and boy's shirts and girl's sportswear.

But a bright spot is that industry analysts figure new agreements with Japan and other nations aimed at slowing the growth of textile and clothing imports will at least give American companies a bigger share of the expected gain in sales this year.

That is true in the other industries, too, which means that the employment prospects are better than they would be without an economic revival or without the devaluations that raised the price of foreign products or without agreements limiting imports.

And the men in these industries also note that selling more things—cars or TV sets or slabs of steel—creates jobs outside of the basic manufacturing industry in the department store floors for example, or at the repair shops.

But the thrust of these industries appears to be to increase productivity, which can mean fewer workers per unit of inflation.

"The real message is to worry about productivity," said a General Motors executive. "If we can get that kind of job accomplished we'll create opportunities, and the employment will take care of itself."

CURRENT HOUSING BOOM SEEN LIKELY TO FADE SOON

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, in this political world of Washington, one finds two types of people—either those who view with alarm or those who point out with pride—and also two types of subject matter—again that which is viewed with alarm or that which is pointed to with pride.

What one rarely finds is an individual and a subject matter to which both of these activities can be ascribed—yet this is precisely which I propose to do today. My actions and fears are prompted immediately by a recent article in the Wall Street Journal, which I am also inserting in the RECORD, and, more generally, by my long involvement and sincere concern for the needs of the people of this country for adequate and economical housing.

Those of us who have been following the subject are aware that the year of 1971 was a record year in the number of housing units constructed—well in excess of 2 million, an often elusive goal set by this Congress many years ago. We are

also aware that predictions of an equally productive 1972 have been quite freely offered. I am, however, endeavoring to look beyond this year and, in my considered opinion, I cannot at this time share in the general optimism currently in vogue.

There is no doubt in my mind—and I will shortly be addressing this body further on the more general aspects of this weakness—that the money market in the United States is facing a severe and abrupt disruption. The information which I am presently compiling indicates we will soon see a drastic upswing in the demand for money in the open market, a demand which cannot but drive up the bellwether of the construction industry, the interest rate.

Many observers of the housing industry cite the coming of age of the war babies as an indication of the health and continued well-being of the home industry. I feel compelled to point out, however, that without financing, homes are not built, regardless of demand. Also, when interest rates climb as the supply of money declines, those who control the money automatically look to investments with higher and more immediate returns than can be realized from long-term home mortgages.

It is thus that I point with pride to the accomplishments of the housing industry yet simultaneously view with alarm the apparent and severe problems that industry is facing in a future all but upon us. And it is thus that I call on this Congress and this Government to reevaluate its policies and role in meeting this need of our people and to consider possible alternatives to these policies, policies conceived in the past with now outdated inputs. If we are to respond to the demands for housing in a responsible fashion, we must explore new vehicles, vehicles which recognize today's realities.

In the area of low income housing, at once both the most demanding yet most neglected market, entirely new institutions and relationships may be necessary. As Chairman PATMAN of the House Banking and Currency Committee and I have both noted, revisions of the existing financing apparatus may be in order if we are to preserve the commitment of the industry to this vital need. It has been suggested, for example, that the Government ought to insert itself into the financing aspect of housing construction in an effort to guarantee a continued supply free from market-imposed depressions. We also should consider the development of a more structured and formal partnership between the Government and the suppliers of this market as another alternative.

If we respond to this need, if we take appropriate and timely action after open discussion of the problems and alternative solutions, then we may again point with pride to our accomplishments. The aforementioned article from the Wall Street Journal follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 27, 1972]

CURRENT HOUSING BOOM IS SEEN LIKELY TO FADE BEFORE END OF THE YEAR

(By Danforth Austin and James Tanner)

HOUSTON.—The current home-building boom is being freshly fueled by the housing demands of the post-World War II babies

who have come of age. But the hot pace of housing construction, a key to reviving the economy in this election year, is beginning to show signs of overheating and could turn sluggish by next fall.

These conclusions, which aren't really as contradictory as they appear, emerge from interviews and discussions with a broad sampling of the 50,000 builders, materials suppliers and housing analysts attending the meeting here of the National Association of Home Builders.

"Sales of housing continues to climb, and much of this is in response to young first-home buyers—the postwar baby crop," says Michael Sumichrast, chief economist of the NAHB. But Mr. Sumichrast adds that the current rate of housing starts is about as high as it will go and that a leveling-off could come as early as the second half of this year.

Echoing Mr. Sumichrast, many housing experts here agree that a plentiful supply of mortgage money combined with housing needs as yet unfulfilled are providing the momentum to carry the home-building industry in 1972 to its second straight year of two million new dwellings. But despite this heady possibility, many of the builders say their bullishness extends only until November.

POSTELECTION POSSIBILITIES

November, of course, is election month; and after the elections, the builders say, there is the possibility that home building may be ignored by the administration in power or may become a victim of further efforts to curb inflation. "The building industry is always the casualty when the government needs a tool to manage the economy," asserts G. E. Harrington, a San Antonio builder.

Housing, indeed, has historically moved in cycles counter to the economy. The industry has often helped pull the country out of a recession. Then, however, as the economy has gained steam, people have spent more and saved less. A tight-money situation has then ensued, and housing has suffered as its financing was siphoned off by corporate and government borrowing.

Despite government assurance to the contrary, some housing analysts here are saying current federal budget deficits will lead to increased government borrowing at rates sufficiently competitive to attract funds away from residential-construction lending agencies. The NAHB's Mr. Sumichrast anticipates that, as the nation's economic activity increases, pressure on mortgage funds will be evident by the second half of this year. "Housing will be subject to the same old pressures of monetary and fiscal policies as in the past," he says.

FLUSH WITH CASH

For the moment, however, the thrift institutions that make mortgage loans are flush with cash, and interest rates have dropped as low as 7%. Purchases of new houses have therefore become possible for families who couldn't afford to buy at the previously higher rates. For example, studies by the Larwin Group, a home-building subsidiary of CNA Financial Corp., show that in 1970, when mortgage interest rates were near 9%, less than 22% of the families in metropolitan Los Angeles could afford the payments on a house that cost \$32,000; but in 1971, after interest rates had declined, nearly 32% of the families could afford to buy the house—even though its price had climbed to \$33,300.

While it's expected that mortgage lenders will lower their interest rates still further in the near future, many lenders nevertheless say rates will probably start rising again by next fall. For example, Lloyd Bissell, assistant vice president in charge of real estate loans for First National Bank of Oregon in Portland, says, "We look for another quarter-point drop in our prime lending rate for

mortgage loans soon, but we don't anticipate that the resulting 7 1/4% rate will last any longer than October."

Adding to builder worries is a threat from key administration officials to trim the government subsidies that help low-income families to buy and rent homes. While the Department of Housing and Urban Development could approve as many as 550,000 dwellings for subsidies this year, HUD Secretary George Romney nevertheless earlier this week told the home builders here that his department will hold authorized subsidized units to as low as 350,000 unless weaknesses in the programs, such as graft, corruption and kickbacks, are corrected.

Depending on HUD's decision, Mr. Romney went on, housing starts this year could range between 2.1 million and 2.3 million. (It was Secretary Romney who, despite skepticism on the part of many builders, accurately predicted a year ago that 1971 housing starts would reach the level of two million, about one-quarter of which were subsidized.)

OMINOUS SIGN

Beyond the possible subsidy cutoff, the industry has become increasingly concerned with signs of overbuilding—primarily in rental apartments—in several regions. "There are perceptible changes in the multifamily sector (of housing) that one should read very carefully," says Michael Tenzer, senior vice president of the Larwin Group. Mr. Tenzer and other housing producers say areas overbuilt with rental apartments currently include Dallas, Houston, Cleveland, St. Louis, Chicago and parts of California and Florida.

"Evidence of market weakness has become quite apparent in the recent rising level of vacancies," says Saul B. Klamman, vice president and chief economist of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks. "There could well be a downturn in multifamily construction after midyear, which could carry total starts below the two-million level."

Richard W. O'Neill, a New York housing consultant, says he foresees a decline this year of 20% from last year's starts in rental apartments. "I'm inclined to be bearish," Mr. O'Neill says. "By my estimates, we've got 200,000 new 'empties' as a consequence of two million starts this year."

Other housing analysts say any decline in apartment starts will be more than offset by the expected rising sales of houses. However, the surge in housing construction that began more than a year ago has had an important adverse side effect for the industry by creating severe shortages of construction craftsmen in some areas (despite published reports of an 11% unemployment rate in the industry as a whole).

"We are paying bricklayers \$6 to \$6.50 an hour, up \$1 within the past year—when we can get them," says L. A. Westenskow, an Ogden, Utah, builder. "Because we can't get skilled help, we are behind six months on the construction of the condominiums we have already sold."

While all these difficulties may ultimately take their toll, most of the builders interviewed here still say they expect to construct more homes this year than in 1971. Los Angeles-based Kaufman & Broad Inc., one of the biggest national housing producers, says it anticipates its starts this year will be 30% above last year's 8,200 units. As a result, says Eugene S. Rosenfeld, president, Kaufman & Broad's revenues this year should rise by 25% or more from last year's \$226 million.

"The atmosphere is right for our business this year," says Mr. Rosenfeld. The "atmosphere" has also encouraged new entrants in the field of home building. For example, Charles R. Brown, who sold office buildings in Atlanta last year, has now turned to building houses. With his partner, a former aerospace engineer, Mr. Brown plans to con-

struct up to 100 houses before the end of this year.

While the future of the industry is uncertain, this very uncertainty has encouraged some home builders new to the field. One such builder is Milio Brunetti, who until two years ago was a cotton farmer but is now building houses on his farm. "Since money got loose, people are doing without other things so that they can get a house—they're scared interest rates are going back up," Mr. Brunetti says.

PLEADS FOR SENSIBLE REGIONAL BOUNDARIES

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to bring to the attention of my colleagues a perceptive and challenging article written by Mr. Joseph A. Califano, Jr., of the Washington law firm of Williams, Connolly & Califano. Mr. Califano, who was President Johnson's Special Assistant for Domestic Affairs, published this article in the Washington Post of January 30, 1972.

Mr. Califano's very cogent presentation of the irrelevance of municipal and county boundaries and his eloquent plea for the establishment of sensible regional boundaries should be read by everyone who is involved in seeking a resolution of our urgent national problems.

The article follows:

HOW SHOULD WE CHANGE CENTRAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS?

(By Joseph A. Califano, Jr.)

The Founding Fathers designed our federal system as a deliberate balance between the original 13 states and the federal government. They wisely recognized the need to counterpoint local power against the central government to help preserve the individual liberty essential for human development and provide the foundation for an enduring democratic political system. The states were left to work out their own relationships with the local communities within their boundaries.

The notions of decentralization and the distribution of government power remain practical imperatives to limit the power of the central government and thus provide a political structure that will permit the enhancement of our democratic values. But our experience over the past decade makes it increasingly doubtful whether we need 50 states with their existing boundaries to achieve this balance; and the empirical evidence of domestic programs frustrated by fragmentation establishes beyond reasonable doubt that our nation and its people would be far better off with more rational local jurisdictions than the haphazard menagerie of some 25,000 cities and counties that stifle social and environmental progress.

In the formative years of our republic, states and cities were regarded somewhat like shells to embryonic chicks; they provided essential protection for early development. Today, the natural, technological and social forces at loose in our troubled society have left those shells shattered on the ground. Too much of the work of our national, state and local political leaders today resemble quixotic efforts to piece the shells together.

Congested populations now make many cities larger than many states. Some cor-

porations have greater capital investments and spend more than most state and city governments. The federal government collects and spends about two-thirds of the funds devoted to the public sector of the economy and is the major source of financial support in local communities across this country for programs ranging from birth control to flood control.

Our problems with nature have been complicated enormously by technological advances and human congestion. They can no longer be controlled within the confines of political boundaries drawn by Pilgrims and frontiersmen and gerrymandered by local political battles of succeeding generations without regard to the clashes between nature and modern technology.

A century ago, it made no difference that rivers ran through the politically inspired boundaries of several states. Today we know that we cannot clean pollution from part of a river any more than we can purge leukemia from part of a bloodstream.

Air moves in airsheds, a fact not known or considered over most of the past 200 years of political and bureaucratic maneuvering by mayors and governors to establish state and local jurisdictional lines. Today, we recognize that it is no more possible to clean the air in Chicago without cleaning the airsheds and currents in the surrounding suburbs and Gary, Indiana, than it is possible to clear cigarette smoke only from the driver's seat of an automobile.

The boundary lines of the 50 states and the 25,000 cities and counties are simply not drawn to accommodate present day environmental problems. To the extent they inspire and encourage parochial loyalty, more often than not they complicate and impede the solution of these problems.

Modern technology, with its corporate corollary of capital concentration, is a significant element of the case against the present federal structure in America. The automobile, the bus and the airplane have added a dimension in mobility and human congestion never conceived by the Founding Fathers.

Mass transportation problems cannot be effectively eased by the center city alone, for most of the traffic comes from suburban areas. If that city center is Manhattan, then solution of the mass transit problem and traffic congestion involves lower Connecticut and portions of New Jersey and Pennsylvania. As the congestion spreads into suburban areas, metropolitan transit authorities have begun to form across our nation and erode, at least for this limited purpose, the relevance of state and local jurisdictional lines.

Communication, production and computer technology has precipitated unprecedented concentrations of capital in a relatively small number of national corporations. Not only consumer advocates, but most thoughtful academicians and commentators on corporate America recognize that few states, if any, are equipped to protect the public interest vis a vis such large concentrations of corporate power. It is more than the fact that General Motors has a gross product and gross income that far exceeds the gross product and tax income of individual states. Today, virtually all companies on the Fortune 500 list have far more resources, power and single-mindedness of profit-oriented constituency than the State of Delaware, where most of them are incorporated. The formal recognition of this fact through a federal incorporation law displacing our current system of state incorporation is long overdue.

The profusion of consumer protection activity by the federal government constitutes recognition of the irrelevance of state and local boundaries in the manufacture, distribution and consumption of most American products, which today are produced and dis-

tributed nationally, and advertised on network television. Indeed, to corporate managers themselves state and local lines have become unnecessary irritants except to the extent that they provide the safe harbor of tax benefits when new plants are located within their boundaries. To network television, such boundary lines have never been—and are likely never to be—of any relevance.

Our economic and social planners are increasingly aware of the inhibitions state and local boundaries impose on economic development and social progress. The trend is for the federal government to set up regional bodies, like the Appalachia and New England Commissions, which recognize the environmental and population changes that have taken place during the past 50 years and attempt to accommodate those changes to the natural characteristics of different regions. Thus, the development program for Appalachia involves all of some states and portions of others.

The increasing lack of financial resources in the public sector has already begun to put pressure on states and cities to regionalize some of the public services and programs once considered sacredly local. The Safe Streets Act of 1968, as originally conceived and proposed, contemplated the establishment of regional training centers for state and local police forces. The fire safety legislation proposed in 1967 was designed in part to make uniform, on a regional or national basis, fire-fighting training and equipment.

As the courts have placed state property taxes in constitutional jeopardy, a Republican President has indicated that he will propose a national system of taxation to finance local public school systems. Interestingly, the most discussed technique is a value added tax, to be placed on each element of incremental value in the production and distribution of goods, a tax which renders irrelevant the states and localities in which goods are produced and distributed.

Similarly to Revenue Sharing, the federal government will collect the money and disburse it through the states, cities, counties and school districts. As with Revenue Sharing, a key question in my mind is whether these funds should be allocated through the jigsaw puzzle of state and local jurisdictions that now exist or through some independently drawn regional apparatus that disregards state and local boundaries in the interest of giving the taxpayer something that approaches a dollar of value for a dollar of tax paid.

The federal judiciary has not limited its involvement in the relevance of state and local boundaries to the property tax area. Judge Merhige's recent Richmond school decision reflects a constitutionally mandated recognition of the irrelevance of municipal and county boundaries to the achievement of school desegregation in Virginia. That decision is a symbolically significant piece of evidence in the increasingly convincing case that the forces and events of the 1960s and the 1970s have presented to establish the artificiality of state and local boundaries in America.

At least one federal district court will ignore city and county jurisdictional lines within a state where they impede social and constitutional equality. But the imperatives of racial integration and the recognition of equal opportunity imbedded in our Constitution cannot be contained within the boundaries of a single state. To achieve equality of educational opportunity and school desegregation in the metropolitan areas of Washington, D.C., or New York City requires that school systems be recast in parts in neighboring Virginia and Maryland, or Connecticut, New Jersey and perhaps even Pennsylvania.

Moreover, school desegregation is only one battlefield in the fight for social justice that presses all three branches of the federal government to pierce the state and local veil.

The plight of thousands of blacks and poor whites in Harlem, Detroit and Chicago did not begin in those cities, any more than it is likely to end there. It began in large measure in the rural poverty of Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana, and in the hills and mountains of Appalachia. Social justice for these disadvantaged Americans requires commitment and action on a scale that has nothing to do with the lines on maps that define the geographic limits of Northern cities and Southern states.

During the past ten years, legislators and political leaders have acted in gingerly, piecemeal fashion to circumvent state and local boundaries: in establishing regional commissions for economic development; in the clean river and clean air legislation of the Johnson administration; in the educational parks to provide specialty secondary education for metropolitan areas regardless of state and city lines; and in the forthcoming Nixon program to finance public school education.

It may now be time for our scholars and foundations—to say nothing of our national Congress and Executive—to confront systematically and head on the issue of how the country should be organized to preserve the balance between central and local government, and at the same time encourage the establishment of sensible regional and local boundaries that will facilitate, rather than impede, the resolution of urgent national problems and the achievement of worthy political and social goals.

In Thomas More's Utopia there are 54 perfect, identical and permanent city-states, "all spacious and magnificent, identical in language, traditions, customs and laws." The city-states in More's Utopia have passed beyond progress and beyond change, because they have achieved perfection. There the city of man has very nearly become the city of God.

Our cities and states will never achieve perfection. For them, significant improvement remains an elusive goal and each change that brings them closer to improvement carries problems ever more difficult and challenging. The least we can ask of our political leaders is to recognize that this nation is not made up of 25,000 and 50 perfect and static Utopian city-states and to begin to look at the question of when and how to change them.

A KENTUCKY TAXPAYER DEMANDS INFORMATION ABOUT WELFARE

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, the issue of welfare reform remains one of the major subjects of legislation still pending before the 92d Congress. Although the House has taken action and sent a bill to the Senate, our deliberations in this important area are far from complete.

Accordingly, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following research report compiled by the Human Resources Committee of the League of Women Voters of Kentucky.

These interested citizens and taxpayers, many of them residents of my district, took it upon themselves to look behind the standard rhetorical questions we hear asked so often about welfare recipients. They decided to try to seek out some factual answers rather than

accept the answers implied by the questioners.

For much of their information, they turned to the Kentucky Department of Economic Security and Mr. Merrit S. Deitz, who was then the department's commissioner.

The answers they received are quite revealing. Since many of the questions are ones that frequently are asked here in Congress, I include the following report in the RECORD:

A KENTUCKY TAXPAYER DEMANDS INFORMATION ABOUT WELFARE

"... the people who are forced to pay for these handouts have some questions we want answered. We want an accounting of how many of these children are legitimate, how many illegitimate, how many were born so the parents could get a welfare bonus of more tax money.

"How many of these parents spend most of their time and money in some beer joint; how many are disabled and receive little or no help because of the criminals, deadbeats and social misfits who are on welfare."

HOW MANY OF THESE CHILDREN ARE LEGITIMATE?

Accurate statistics on the sexual behavior of any group of people are difficult to obtain, but recent studies indicate that the percentage of children conceived out of wedlock is much the same in the population at large as it is among recipients of Aid to Families of Dependent Children. The national figures on AFDC children show that about one third are illegitimate. Kentucky estimates that 25,500² of the 100,919³ AFDC children in the state are illegitimate, or about one in four.

But a year ago the *Boston Sunday Globe* reported that "one third of all first-born American children, born between 1964 and 1966, were conceived out of wedlock."⁴ At higher social levels such situations are more frequently concealed by shotgun marriages, abortions, and adoptions, leaving us with the impression that the poor have many more illegitimate children than those who are well-off.

In any case children born out of wedlock cannot in justice be held responsible for the behavior of their parents. If as a society we wish to penalize such parents for illegitimate behavior we must find some means that does not starve or degrade their children.

HOW MANY OF THESE CHILDREN WERE BORN SO THE PARENT COULD GET A WELFARE BONUS OF MORE TAX MONEY?

Families on welfare in Kentucky have an average of 2.5 children.⁵ The average payment to an AFDC family is \$30.36 per person monthly⁶ (the maximum amount for a four-person family is \$187⁷), or seventy-three percent of the amount our state calculates is needed for minimum health standards. No one can feed, clothe, and house a growing child on less than seven dollars per week and get a "bonus" out of it. Welfare recipients know this.

Kentucky denies aid to families with two able-bodied parents in residence unless the father is in a work training program. If he is unable to find work after his training is finished he can get support for his children only by deserting them. It is not likely that deserted mothers plan to have more children, especially since the amount of money allotted per person generally decreases as the size of the family increases.

Persons on welfare, including the blind, aged, and disabled, comprise four percent of the total population of Kentucky,⁸ and receive about seven percent of the state's General Fund.⁹ Surely this is not a disproportionate amount for the government to spend on Kentuckians who need the basic necessities of life, especially when the great majority of them are over sixty-five or under

eighteen. (In the state of Massachusetts, twenty-five percent of the budget goes into public assistance; in contrast, less than two percent of the Federal budget is accounted for by welfare payments.)

Children who are not adequately fed or cared for often are impaired mentally, physically, or emotionally. If we do not see to their well-being at an early age it is likely that we will be maintaining them at great expense in one of our state institutions.

HOW MANY OF THESE WELFARE PARENTS SPEND MOST OF THEIR TIME AND MONEY IN SOME BEER JOINT?

In May 1971, 40,996 adults in Kentucky were members of AFDC families. The Department of Economic Security considers about eighty percent of these persons unable to work, usually because they are ill, disabled, or parents of small children.¹⁰ Research on Kentucky's AFDC parents in 1967 showed that of the persons studied only 2.3 percent of the mothers and 3 percent of the fathers were known to "use alcoholic beverages excessively."¹¹

Seven and a half percent of AFDC parents are already doing some kind of work. Anywhere from three to five thousand more might be hired if jobs they can handle were available.¹²

But jobs are not available. In February 1971, 6.4% of Kentucky's work force (75,300) was unemployed. The number of high school dropouts looking for work comes to about twice the number of AFDC recipients who could be employed. In addition we have 114,000 workers who are below the poverty line although they have full-time jobs.¹³ Under these circumstances the six thousand "potentially employable" adults receiving assistance face stiff competition.

HOW MANY ARE DISABLED AND RECEIVE LITTLE OR NO HELP BECAUSE OF THE CRIMINALS, DEADBEATS, AND SOCIAL MISFITS WHO ARE ON WELFARE?

Kentucky spends nine million dollars more on the aged, blind and disabled than on AFDC. The totally and permanently disabled receive 100% of their estimated need; the average monthly payment is \$78.82.¹⁴ However, a man who loses his leg in a mining accident is not eligible because he can be trained to do some other job with his hands if he can find an employer willing to train and hire a handicapped man. If he is a veteran, he can get a pension even though his disability has no connection whatsoever with his military service. Otherwise he must depend on relatives or charitable organizations.

A criminal racket of almost any description pays better than a welfare check. HEW studies on the subject suggest that welfare recipients seldom give false information about their circumstances to the government:

In 1969, about .3% (3 cases in 1000) of all individuals and families in Aid to Aged, Blind, Disabled and Dependent Children programs were considered by state agencies to be suspected of fraud.

This extremely low incidence of suspected fraud may be contrasted with Internal Revenue frauds which have been estimated to run between three and thirty-four percent.¹⁵

It is possible to consider that all welfare recipients are misfits but the obvious fact that they have not been successful in our economic structure may often be as much a failure of our society as of their ability to cope with it. The most optimistic thinkers do not seriously expect that the human race will ever be without members who are seriously flawed by low intelligence, criminal tendencies, inadequate training, or other disabilities. No doubt Hitler would solve the problem by liquidating them. Kentuckians would be horrified if social workers decided that a small number of welfare recipients were simply deadbeats or social misfits and

should be executed. Is it better to insist that they beg, steal, or die of exposure and hunger?

REFERENCES

- ¹ "Letters to the Editor," *Courier-Journal*, May 1971.
- ² Merritt S. Deitz, Jr., Commissioner, in a letter to Miss Julia Allen on June 30, 1971.
- ³ Roy Butler, Public Assistance Research and Statistics, in a letter to Mrs. Richard Martin on July 30, 1971.
- ⁴ National Welfare Rights Organization, *Six Myths About Welfare*, 1971, p. 7.
- ⁵ Based on Deitz-Allen letter and Butler-Martin letter listed above.
- ⁶ Fact sheet developed by the Kentucky Alliance for Social Progress for their conference on May 15, 1971.
- ⁷ U.S. Department of HEW, Social and Rehabilitation Service, NCSS Report D-2 (July 1970), table 4.
- ⁸ KASP, fact sheet.
- ⁹ Deitz-Allen letter.
- ¹⁰ Deitz-Allen letter.
- ¹¹ Sample Data from the 1967 AFDC Study (FS-2019.1), Dec. 1967, pp. 10, 14.
- ¹² Deitz-Allen letter.
- ¹³ KASP, fact sheet.
- ¹⁴ KASP, fact sheet.
- ¹⁵ Interfaith Task Force, "Public Assistance Myths and Facts," drawn from Philip M. Stern, *Great Treasury Raid*, New York, 1962, and U.S. Department of HEW, "New Methods of Dealing with Questions of Recipient Fraud in Public Assistance," 1970.

ZERO DISCHARGE: NATIONAL GOAL OR NATIONAL CALAMITY?

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable John T. Connor, U.S. Secretary of Commerce in 1965 to 1967, delivered a dynamic and challenging address on January 6 to the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association luncheon.

Secretary Connor very ably and forcefully pointed out the danger in the Muskie water pollution bill which passed the Senate by a vote of 86 to 0. Governor Nelson Rockefeller of New York, testified before the House Public Works Committee that the Muskie bill could well cost the American people two to three trillion dollars. The House will soon consider a water pollution bill reported from my Committee on Public Works where we have worked long and hard to write legislation the American people can live with. Before the Congress again considers this legislation, I commend to my colleagues a careful and serious study of the following outstanding address of Secretary Connor:

ZERO DISCHARGE: NATIONAL GOAL OR NATIONAL CALAMITY?

(By Secretary John T. Connor)

I'm happy to be here to take part in your first meeting of the New Year. In view of the season, I wish I had an optimistic, upbeat message for you, but I don't. My mixed feelings about the water pollution control legislation now entering the final stages of Congressional consideration are well expressed in the title of my talk—"Zero Discharge: National Goal or National Calamity?"

My concern is not just for my own com-

pany or even just for the chemical industry. I am concerned that, if the legislation emerges in the form of the Muskie Bill which passed the Senate by a vote of 86 to zero, considerable damage will be done to American industry, to our entire economy, to Federal, State and local government credibility, and to all taxpayers. In my view that damage will far outweigh the beneficial effects on our waterways.

Let me start by saying again what most industrial leaders have been trying to make clear. Most of us in industry, and particularly those of us in the chemical industry, not only accept but actively support the goal of a clean, healthy environment. The chemical industry alone has spent well over a billion dollars on pollution controls and is currently spending at a rate of more than a quarter of a billion dollars a year to improve the environment. In support of a constructive program for the whole environment, I wholeheartedly agree with the general objective of upgrading U.S. waters to a quality which will sustain a well-rounded aquatic life and allow full use for recreational purposes, as well as the efficient utilization of our water resources in a country with a growing population and an ever-increasing gross national product.

And I fully support a national program that has a goal of attaining those objectives by a reasonable date—say 1980—and to help reach that goal I support the establishment of necessary effluent limitations by the Federal Government and the States. I am willing to give this support even though the attempt to attain that objective will be extremely costly. It could very well have far-reaching consequences on our economic, social and political lives in terms of job dislocations, the cost of financing large capital expenditures, operating and maintenance expenses, community dislocations, foreign trade imbalances and a reordering of national priorities.

But I strongly oppose "flying blind" in such a serious undertaking by setting up a goal of zero discharge of all pollutants into all our waterways by 1981 or 1985. And that's exactly what the Muskie Bill (S. 2770) would have us do. That bill requires us to set our course in 1972 towards that zero discharge goal and requires the Federal and state administrators to continue to drive all of us forward towards that goal as quickly as possible. True—the bill does provide for the development of an inventory of information and data that conceivably could lead to a "mid-course correction" if the Congress decides to pass an amendatory law in 1976, or later, but as the bill now stands, all of us, and particularly the governmental administrators, have to proceed towards the zero discharge goal. The fatal error in that approach is that none of us, and particularly not the members of the American public who must pay the cost, have the foggiest notion of what that cost will be in terms of human and financial resources.

Somewhat more preferable is the approach which seems to have been taken by the House Committee on Public Works in the legislation that it approved before Christmas and will report to the full House early this year. The House bill (H.R. 11896) will require the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering, acting through the National Research Council, to submit to the Congress, not later than two years after enactment of the law, a full and complete investigation and study of all aspects of the total social, technical and economic effects of achieving, or not achieving, the effluent limitations and goals. Also, the Secretary of Commerce (poor man!) is ordered to investigate and report back within six months on the cost impact as related to the competitive position of U.S. manufacturers vis-a-vis foreign producers. Of the greatest possible significance is the fact that no actions are required beyond the 1976 deadline unless and until the Congress takes further action. Even the House formula imposes

great uncertainties on corporate and governmental planning, and may require the incurring of significant costs for projects that have to be redone later as requirements and objectives are changed. But at least it would require the Congress to act after—not before—it had assembled the facts and realistic projections and estimates of total costs required to fix ultimate goals. The Senate Committee itself, in its reports on the Muskie Bill, recognizes that "no one is under any illusion that the \$12 billion investment (authorized for) municipal waste treatment plants will implement existing water quality standards in many areas of the Nation, much less meet the goals of this Act."

One thing should be understood by everyone who joins in this environmental debate. Whatever the costs of our pollution control programs, and they will be in the hundreds of billions of dollars, they will be borne eventually by the general public, the consumers and taxpayers of America. This applies specifically to programs that will be mandated under the Muskie Bill. Quite clearly in view of other demands for funds and their weakened financial conditions, the Federal, State and local governments will have to impose drastically higher taxes, and float bond issues, to pay their shares of the costs. There is no way that the huge sums can be absorbed by industry; if industry is to survive at all, and of course it must if our system of competitive economic enterprise is to endure, these expenditures will have to be passed on indirectly to the consumer in the prices industry gets for its products. Also, additional taxes will be necessary because of important reductions in tax revenues paid to the governments from industry profits, since undoubtedly industry profits will be affected adversely by added non-productive costs that cannot be absorbed in price increases. As we realize all too well, about one half of all corporate profits go to the federal government in taxes, and taxes on business make up a very substantial percentage of the revenues of all governments.

The people, then, must be given the chance to know and understand what kind of environmental program is being legislated into existence by the Muskie Bill. They should know its ultimate cost to them, and its other economic consequences and benefits, so they, acting through their legislative representatives, can make a sensible cost-benefit judgment. Unfortunately, the truth is that right now neither the public nor the Congress is well informed on these consequences of the Muskie Bill. The Senate Public Works Committee, it is true, debated the proposals over a period of months, but the most critical decisions were made at the last minute and without public hearings. In particular, the change in the enforcement mechanism of the Federal program from water quality standards to effluent limits was adopted at the last minute without public hearings. The same thing is true of these important goals and objectives:

(1) In Phase I, to be implemented by 1976, all industrial pollution sources must apply the "best practicable technology," and communities will be required to have secondary sewage treatment construction programs by June 30, 1974.

(2) In Phase II, to be implemented by 1981, communities and industries will be required to apply, where the goal of no-discharge cannot be attained, the "best available technology."

And (3) the policy is stated that the discharge of all "pollutants" should be eliminated by 1985 and that the natural chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation's waters be restored.

How can we refuse to sympathize with the business people and the governors of our states and mayors of our municipalities who have nightmares about being required to build or alter a plant in 1974 using the "best practicable" technology and then being re-

quired in 1979 to alter it, or build a new plant at a different location, using the then "best available" technology, as defined by the government administrative people?

After the Muskie Bill emerged from Committee, its 190 pages of complex material were approved by the Senate by a vote of 86 to zero only five days after the Committee reported it on October 28, 1971. It's fair to say that the Senate acted hurriedly and there was no real consideration and debate. The bill then was sent to the House and apparently would have shot right through Committee action and final House vote had it not been for efforts of the Administration and some slowly awakening industry representatives who cried out in outrage for at least some kind of hearing. And that's exactly what was given—some kind of hearing. It lasted just four days. Exactly one day was allocated to industry witnesses.

I urge all of you here today—with all the force and persuasive power at my command—to study the Senate bill, and the House bill when it becomes available. For those who don't have the time to read the full bill and the Senate report, a summary of the main provisions affecting industry is available to you here today. I urge you to estimate the effects of this legislation on your business, the businesses of your customers and your suppliers, on your communities, on the employment situation, and on costs and necessary tax increases, and to give this the concentrated attention that you rarely give to any legislative proposal. And then, if you are as concerned about its probable consequences on your businesses as I am on the business of Allied Chemical, and on the chemical industry generally, get in touch with your Congressmen and your Senators and tell them so—in plain, unvarnished English.

I think we in industry must also do all we can—through our plant executives and their contracts with community leaders—to carry this story directly to the people, so that they will discover that this kind of environmental measure is not in their interest, either.

The Muskie Bill simply promises too much. It raises hopes on which it can't possibly deliver. The bill sets forth the goal of no discharges of any pollutants into any body of water in this country by 1985, and for technological reasons, this just can't be done. The Muskie Committee report quotes an Administration estimate that a 95 to 99 percent reduction in pollutants would require a capital expenditure of more than \$35 billion in the next 10 years and operating and maintenance costs of more than \$83 billion over a 20 to 25-year period. The Committee acknowledges that these figures may be conservative, and it notes that the Administration estimates the capital cost of achieving 100 percent pollution control at more than \$94 billion, which undoubtedly also is too low an estimate. The chemical industry has provided the House Committee with a responsible estimate of costs for chemical companies alone. The estimate is \$25 billion in capital expenditures by 1985, plus an additional \$10 billion a year to operate these non-productive facilities. Just multiply those figures by the costs that will be incurred by the metals industries, the pulp and paper industries, the utilities, the oil, coal and other energy businesses, and by all the other industries that now contribute to the nation's pollution problem. Then add the enormous price of trying to achieve zero discharge in all our municipal sewage treatment plants and other public facilities. Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller, testifying last month before the House Committee on Public Works, estimated the cost of zero discharge in New York State alone at \$230 billion and between two and three trillion dollars for the entire country.

Of course, no one can state now with any precision what the total costs will amount to, but undoubtedly they will be high, very high. And because they will, it is vitally

important that we set a different kind of goal for ourselves—not zero discharge. It is important also that we ask other questions. What is the quality of the water that is essential for recreational uses and to support aquatic life? What kind of limits must be set on the discharge of pollutants to achieve this quality level? Should it be 90 percent? 95? Or, more likely, a whole range of percentages, depending on the nature of the particular pollutant, the stream into which it's being discharged and a number of other factors.

If the American people understand what is involved, they will say that they are not willing to pay in increased local, state and federal taxes, and in higher product costs, the astronomical cost of trying to achieve the zero discharge goal, on top of the rising government expenditures for so many other worthy public objectives. I make those predictions flatly because I have been around to see the credibility gaps, bitterness and disillusionments that have set in among the people when other goals were announced by earlier Administrations and Congresses and which proved to be unattainable or undesirable. Some examples of earlier goals that were not attained as advertised are: the Alliance for Progress, the "crash" cancer research program after World War II, the Urban Development program, the Housing program, the Model Cities program, the higher education and research program, the health programs, the economic development programs for underdeveloped parts of the United States, and many others that were passed or announced with great flourishes and then killed or mortally wounded later because of inadequate appropriations or lack of public support. Why add to the list now and build up false hopes that cannot be realized, when a more realistic program could have unreserved support and be successful in a reasonable time?

A classic case of the "promise too much" credibility gap happened recently right here in New York City and involves the water pollution field. The New York Times on December 31, 1971, carried a long tale of woe about the belated announcement by Mayor John Lindsay—fresh from Florida—concerning the award of a \$228 million contract for the legendary North River Pollution Plant, first proposed in 1967 at an estimated cost of \$70 million. The plant is now estimated to cost at least \$750 million and is expected to be completed in 1979—mark that date! When it is completed, the plant will treat for the first time the 220 million gallons of sewage that pours raw each day into the Hudson River from most of Manhattan's West Side.

Everyone should be overjoyed at the news, particularly the people who use the beaches around New York Harbor or like to go boating or fishing in the waters. But there were some critical voices, according to the Times article. Two-thirds of the money for the contract is due from Federal and New York State sources, and the Mayor was critical that "only a token contribution by the Federal government" of \$7 million has so far been made. Mr. Henry L. Diamond, the State's Environmental Conservation Commissioner, also criticized the Federal effort and said that New York State not only is putting up \$231 million of State grant money, but also is committing an additional \$224 million of State funds until "our Federal friends can add to the \$7 million they are now contributing."

The unkindest cuts of all came from Mr. Jerome Kretschmer, New York City's Environmental Protection Administrator. He first pointed out that New York State assistance was available for sewage plant construction through the \$1 billion Pure Waters bond issue of 1965 that was to have cleaned up all water pollution by 1972. On that point the Times writer's understated conclusion was that the 1972 goal will not be met. But Mr. Kretschmer went on to question whether the

money should be spent on the plant at all, in view of other priorities. He said that, as an example, mass transit should have a higher claim on construction funds. He did not say how the Hudson would be cleansed of the City's raw sewage if the plant were not built. Nor did he explain what he would say to the people who want to use the beaches and the waters for recreational purposes, or to the business people who, at their own expense, have been doing their part in trying to clean up the Hudson by improving or closing down factory operations to meet the new water discharge standards.

As I have indicated, I question the principal concept in the Muskie bill, switching the enforcement mechanism of the federal water pollution control program from water quality standards to a simplistic zero discharge goal—with no showing that this costly goal is necessary to achieve the water quality we all want.

The so-called "mid-course correction" that might or might not be made by the Congress is not a sufficient answer to these serious questions. Henry Ford II, chairman of the Ford Motor Company, commenting last month on the Muskie bill, said:

"There are some who say that industry should not complain about legal requirements that cannot be met—that such standards are needed to frighten industry into doing its utmost—and that standards that really turn out to be impossible will be modified when the time comes." Mr. Ford continues: "I say that it is wrong in principle to establish legal requirements that cannot be obeyed and are bound to cause conflict and controversy. To leave management uncertain of what it must do to obey the law until the last moment before the law becomes effective is to create waste and chaos and to trifle with the jobs and income of American workers."

William D. Ruckelshaus, Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, pointed to another defect in the philosophy behind the Muskie bill in a speech to the National Press Club on December 16, 1971. Mr. Ruckelshaus said it is unwise to aim at zero discharges into our waterways without considering what happens to those pollutants that are kept out of the water. The EPA Administrator suggests they will go into the air and the land, and he asks: "Is this the best place to put them? The bill assumes yes. Such an assumption is unwise and unsupportable."

I certainly agree with Mr. Ruckelshaus that "we cannot deal with water pollution alone and set a national goal without consideration for the whole state of the environment."

Perhaps even more fundamental is the conviction that we cannot act wisely on matters so complex if we treat them within the framework of ordinary political issues, worrying about whether President Nixon or Senator Muskie or Senator Kennedy or someone else will get the most credit. Matters of such magnitude, affecting the lives of all of us, deserve objective, nonpartisan, informed solutions which cannot possibly develop in an environment of political opportunism.

I think the Congress can and must do much better by all of its constituents on this issue. The Congress and the people need many more facts and far more expert opinions before they can move constructively to set down attainable goals and a course of action to meet them. Frankly, I see no good reason why this issue shouldn't be taken out of the inevitable politics of a national election year. That can be done if the Congress defers final action on the legislation for a time, and instead asks the National Research Council to develop a comprehensive, nonpartisan, technical investigation of the nation's need for water resource use, control and preservation, as well as related environmental problems. The Council should consider the important questions of environ-

mental goals and costs; it could examine the assumptions behind pending legislation; it should retain and consult all the experts it thinks desirable, and it could then make specific recommendations to the Administration and the Congress on the form our water control legislation should take, fully considering the effects on air and land. In the meantime we can continue to make progress toward cleaner and cleaner waterways under the existing laws and regulations.

We do need further legislation to insure a real environmental cleanup. But we don't need and can't support narrowly conceived legislation forcing us into a futile attempt to attain the perfection of zero discharge into our waterways. And there is no real evidence that such perfection is necessary to make our lakes and rivers swimmable for people, livable for fish and other aquatic life and enjoyable for esthetic purposes. We do need the most careful consideration of the environmental aspects of our water resources, but it should be provided within the framework of an adequate long range development of our water supply and its better utilization in a growing America.

PRIVATE CITIZEN STORMS FROM POSTAL HEARING WHEN OFFICIALS REFUSE ANSWERS

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Wall Street Journal appears the story of how a Virginia housewife appeared on January 17, 1972, at a Postal Service "public forum" in Washington, sought to obtain information on the operation of the Postal Service, and stormed from the meeting room when officials refused to answer her questions.

This clearly indicates that the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee needs to exercise its oversight function and ascertain whether the new postal corporation is serving as efficiently and well as it was supposed to do when it was so enthusiastically created by Congress.

The newspaper story follows:

LONE PRIVATE CITIZEN QUESTIONS, STORMS FROM POSTAL HEARING—OFFICIALS REFUSE TO ANSWER HOUSEWIFE AT PUBLIC FORUM ON RECLASSIFICATION OF MAIL.

WASHINGTON.—Only one member of the public showed up to speak at the Postal Service's public forum on mail classification yesterday, and she stormed out of the session when assembled postal officials refused to answer her questions.

Mrs. Doris Behre, a housewife and mother of five who heads the Virginia Citizens Consumer Council, was the only person who addressed the panel of seven top postal officials, meeting to allow private citizens a chance to offer suggestions on changes in the familiar first, second, third and fourth classes of mail. Reclassification of postal services, required under law by next January, is one of the toughest problems facing the Postal Service.

Although about 50 persons attended the forum, almost all were postal employees or representatives of large mailer groups who attended merely to hear the citizen comments.

"HURRIEDLY CALLED MEETING"?

The soft-spoken, articulate Mrs. Behre said she wasn't surprised at the poor turnout be-

cause the meeting wasn't announced until last Thursday. "Certainly one hurriedly called meeting here in Washington provides little opportunity to determine how consumers across the country feel about proposed or pending changes," she asserted. And, she added, few private citizens have the means or time to make a trip to Washington for such a meeting.

Then, conceding she knew little about the question of mail classification, she asked a series of questions: Would consumers be given information "as to just what the department is thinking about" on mail classification? What will be the program's scope? Has an outline already been formulated that will be a pattern for mail classification?

Postal officials were silent.

"How much time will we have to prepare the material and suggestions as to the new mail classification program?" Mrs. Behre wondered. Ron Lee, Assistant Postmaster General, customer development, who chaired the meeting, didn't respond.

Mrs. Behre continued her questions: How many other meetings have been held and how many are planned? Are all the meetings for the public to be held in Washington?

Mr. Lee quietly stood behind the podium in the huge Postal Service auditorium and didn't reply. The audience, including Mrs. Behre, fidgeted.

"DISILLUSION" CITED

She told the postal officials that consumers are "already disillusioned with things that have happened" since the Postal Reorganization Act, creating the semi-independent Postal Service, was approved in August 1970. She cited the substantial postal rate increases that went into effect on a temporary basis last year and she asserted that mail service continues to deteriorate. "There doesn't seem to be anybody in authority who can review unsubstantiated and unnecessary costs incurred in the new Postal Service," she said.

When no postal official responded after several minutes, Mrs. Behre marched from the auditorium.

Mr. Lee said the meeting wasn't to be a "give-and-take session, a discussion, between Postal Service and private citizens." Rather, he said, the Postal Service only wanted to gather suggestions.

After the 15-minute meeting, Mr. Lee said he would respond to Mrs. Behre's questions by mail. He indicated, however, that he didn't think further public meetings would be necessary. "We've received many calls and letters from the public on this classification issue," he said. He also defended the four-day notice of the meeting, saying it was adequate.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the programs under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act have been carried out under the authority of two temporary resolutions since June 30, 1971. The latest extension expired on October 31, 1971. Since that time, the Environmental Protection Agency has been without authorization for important areas of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

The distinguished chairman of the House Public Works Committee (Mr. BLATNIK) and his committee have been working hard on the Federal Water Pollution Control Act amendments. How-

ever, it will be some time until this vital bill is reported, considered by the House, and differences reconciled with the Senate version. Therefore, I have introduced today a continuing resolution which is cosponsored by my able and distinguished colleague from Buffalo (Mr. DULSKI) who is also deeply interested in the restoration of the Great Lakes. It is imperative that this continuing resolution be passed so that important environmental programs which are now being held up because of lack of authorization can get going again.

This resolution can also be the vehicle for a major crash program to restore Lake Erie and the other Great Lakes.

Dr. Robert A. Sweeney, the very able and dedicated director of the Great Lakes Laboratory of the State University College at Buffalo, has been working very closely with me on this project. Recently Dr. Sweeney stated:

The costs of not instituting a program to abate pollution in the Great Lakes, particularly with respect to up-grading the effectiveness of municipal sewage collection and treatment systems, would incur damages which far exceed the expenses of such a program.

My distinguished colleague (Mr. BLATNIK) also serves as chairman of the conference of Great Lakes Congressmen which has been a bipartisan effort since 1966 to initiate a comprehensive program to restore the Great Lakes. I know he shares my concern.

Section 1 of the bill extends section 5(n) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and provides an additional authorization of \$45 million for the period ending June 30, 1972, for research, investigations, training, and information programs.

Section 2 authorizes \$7 million in addition to funds previously appropriated for financing research and development grant programs under section 6(e).

Section 3 provides an additional \$6 million for section 7(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act—a total of \$15 million for the 12-month period ending June 30, 1972. This will permit the States to continue the planning of their programs in an orderly fashion.

Section 4 increases the authorization for the basic grant program for waste treatment facilities under section 8(d) to \$2 billion.

In addition, section 4 provides for extending section 8(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Under this section certain States are eligible to be reimbursed for the Federal share on such projects as have been prefinanced under section 8(c). This section provides in part that:

In the case of any project on which construction was initiated in such State after June 30, 1966, which was approved by the appropriate State water pollution control agency and which the Secretary finds meets the requirements of this section, but was constructed without such assistance, such allotments for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1971, shall also be available for payments in reimbursement of State or local funds used for such project prior to July 1, 1971, to the extent that assistance could have been provided under this section if such

project has been approved pursuant to this section and adequate funds had been available. In the case of any project on which construction was initiated in such State after June 30, 1966, and which was constructed with assistance pursuant to this section but the amount of such assistance was a lesser per centum of the cost of construction than was allowable pursuant to this section, such allotments shall also be available for payments in reimbursement of State or local funds used for such project prior to July 1, 1971, to the extent that assistance could have been provided under this section if adequate funds had been available.

The two temporary resolutions extending this act beyond June 30, 1971, did not include provision for continuing the reimbursement policy. Therefore, no new projects could be initiated with the contemplation of subsequent reimbursement. The House Public Works Committee fully recognizes the need to deal with this problem and has considered this need carefully in the legislative hearings. It is expected that this question will be handled in connection with the permanent legislation. Until permanent legislation is passed I believe that the policy established by the Congress in section 8(c) should be continued since it will materially assist the States in their financial planning. Therefore, section 4 will extend the existing reimbursement provision until July 1, 1972.

The waste treatment program has been accelerating for the past 2 years and this precious momentum must not be lost.

This authorization is urgently needed to enable the Federal water pollution control program to continue until permanent legislation is passed by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it has also been brought to my attention that salaries are being paid under section 5(n) for which no authorization exists.

I strongly urge immediate consideration and passage of this critical measure.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a letter from Dr. Robert A. Sweeney, director of the Great Lakes Laboratory of the State University College at Buffalo. I believe this letter is illustrative of the very deep concern which many dedicated individuals and environmental organizations in my district share for the future of not only Lake Erie, but for the Great Lakes and our total environment as well.

STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE
AT BUFFALO,
GREAT LAKES LABORATORY,
Buffalo, N.Y., January 24, 1972.

Congressman JACK KEMP,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JACK: I share your disappointment regarding the President's decision concerning the Great Lakes clean-up program. As a result, I have compiled the following information, which I hope will be of value to you in preparing your address in the House. Since we neither had a copy of EPA's proposal or the reason why it was turned down by the administration, my remarks are not as specific as I would have liked them to be.

The costs of not instituting a program to abate pollution on the Great Lakes, particularly with respect to up-grading the effectiveness of municipal sewage collection and

treatment systems, would incur damages which far exceed the expenses of such a program. Before we postpone the clean-up of these lakes, which contain more than a third of the available freshwater in the world, we must examine the price of postponement of these abatement plans.

The pollution of the Great Lakes, and particularly Lake Erie, has been an environmental focal point for more than a decade. No other body of water has been given more attention by the media. As early as 1960 the then Secretary of the Interior declared that Lake Erie had the highest priority with respect to cleanup over any other river or lake in the nation. Numerous elected and appointed officials, as well as most of the leading aquatic scientists in the world, have stated that the rejuvenation of Lake Erie will be the model and incentive for the saving of our nation's water resources. To curtail this effort would be a serious blow to the morale of our country as well as a serious blow to Canadian-United States relations. The Canadian federal, provincial and local governments have kept their pledges made at meetings of the International Joint Commission and other conferences. The percentage of their economy which has been and will continue to be expended on water pollution is more than triple even the most costly of the proposed United States plans. Most of the Canadian efforts, as well as the nearly one-half billion dollars of previous abatement efforts by the public and private sector of our economy will be for naught if we do not implement the proposed clean-up program.

It is imperative that we keep in mind two essential facts. First, we have the technology and manpower to abate the pollution. The only factor blocking our path is the lack of funding. . . . Secondly, the actual cost of not abating the pollution or postponing our efforts far exceeds the cost of clean-up. I would like to give some examples of the latter.

The cost of municipal sewage plant construction has more than doubled during the past five (5) years. Even with inflation under restraint, it will cost considerably more two (2) years from now if we put off construction. At least one of the lakes—Lake Erie—is on the brink of an ecological cliff. A joint 1970 study by the governments of Canada and the United States—Project Hypo—has shown that unless the wastes being added to the lake, particularly from cities and towns, is substantially reduced in the next five (5) years, Lake Erie may go beyond the point where it can be changed from a liability to an asset. These scientists found that a larger section of the lake bottom was becoming devoid of oxygen for a longer period of time each summer. This was due to the death and decay of algae, whose overpopulation had been caused by municipal wastes. When the oxygen level at bottom reached zero, the nutrients that had accumulated on the bottom for more than a hundred years were released. Swept up into the water, these nutrients induced the growth of more algae. This perpetuated the vicious cycle. Conditions are now being approached that the amount of nutrients released may be sufficient to perpetuate a year-round algae bloom. If this occurs, even if we cease all pollution of the lake, it will remain a festering pot of foul smelling slime.

Under oxygen-less conditions, other undesirable processes occur. Mercury and other heavy metals are released in the water. The mercury that was added to Lake Erie and the Niagara and Detroit Rivers probably would have caused little problem if it were not for the low dissolved oxygen in the bottom of these waters.

The mercury pollution damage to the Lake Erie fishing industry, which was the most profitable of all the Great Lakes for both the United States and Canada, will exceed \$60

million. The costs on the sports fishing industry probably will exceed \$100 million.

The impact of pollution on recreation should not be ignored, particularly from an economic point of view. Despite the fact that more boats are owned by people residing in the Great Lakes basin than any other area in the country, the percentage of those people who sail on the Great Lakes is less than 25 percent. Instead, they trailer their boats to other areas, particularly Canada. One survey, conducted by the Great Lakes Laboratory of the State University College at Buffalo, demonstrated that the money spent by Americans who crossed into Canada via three bridges on the Niagara Frontier for summer boating vacations in Canada, far exceeded the amount spent by Americans in Europe during a comparable number of months. When asked why they had not taken a similar vacation on the Great Lakes, the overwhelming reply was that they did not like the pollution.

The closing of beaches along Lakes Michigan, Erie and Ontario has not only resulted in the loss of revenue for local governments but it has induced further spending for the construction and maintenance of municipal and private pools. Likewise, the closing of motels and other tourist oriented businesses along the Great Lakes in Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania and New York has dealt serious economic blows to these areas. If the problem is not checked, even more losses can be expected.

It is clearly evident that when all the costs are examined, it is far less expensive to abate pollution of the Great Lakes now, rather than postpone our efforts.

Hope the above is some aid to you. Please do not hesitate to contact me for clarification and/or additional material.

Respectfully,

ROBERT A. SWEENEY, Director.

STATE DEPARTMENT COMMENTS ON AID TO BANGLADESH AND INDIA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I have just corresponded with the State Department regarding U.S. policy toward Bangladesh and India. The letters, of January 10 and 28, 1972, should be of interest to my colleagues.

The State Department did not respond to points three and five in my letter, but the response is informative nonetheless.

The letters follow:

JANUARY 10, 1972.

HON. WILLIAM PIERCE ROGERS,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY ROGERS: I would like to know what the policy of the United States is going to be toward Bangla Desh.

More specifically:

1. Will the U.S. recognize Bangla Desh?
2. Will we offer it aid? If so, how—through West Pakistan, a third country, international agencies, or directly?
3. Can aid funds earmarked for West Pakistan be used for Bangla Desh? If not, what kind of enabling legislation is needed?
4. What use will be made of multilateral channels to aid Bangla Desh?
5. What assistance efforts will be made by other countries, e.g., Western Europe and Japan?
6. What is our policy regarding aid to India?

Thank you for your consideration of these questions.

Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., January 28, 1972.

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HAMILTON: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of January 10 requesting information on our policies regarding Bangladesh and India.

The United States has taken no position on the question of recognition of Bangladesh. We have, however, kept a small group of consular personnel at our Consulate General in Dacca. We believe there is a good basis under international law to expect them to continue consular functions on a limited basis, without prejudging the issue of recognition. We will continue to watch and assess developments in the Subcontinent in the months ahead, with careful consideration of their effect on U.S. interests in the area.

It would be premature to consider extending regular developmental assistance to Bangladesh since such aid requires formal government-to-government agreements. However, there is still some United States assistance (mainly PL 480 food) in the pipeline for East Bengal, and the USG is prepared to consider new requests for humanitarian assistance channeled through the United Nations. The U.N. is presently in the process of assessing the relief and rehabilitation needs of the area and resuming its relief activities which were interrupted by the fighting in December. We expect that the Secretary General will soon be making an appeal for international contributions, to which the USG can respond.

Regarding our policy toward India, on December 6, 1971 general economic assistance in the pipeline for India was suspended to the extent it was not firmly committed to suppliers or banks. This type of assistance, not tied to particular projects, is normally provided to support the general economy of an aid recipient and thus support a development effort. The suspension was undertaken on the basis of a determination that, in the existing circumstances in India, the objective of supporting a development effort could not be secured. The amount of aid affected by the temporary suspension is about \$87.6 million, while about \$135 million, consisting of \$105 million in firmly-committed non-project aid and \$30 million in project aid, remained unaffected. The suspension remains in effect while we keep the entire situation in India and the neighboring areas under close review.

I hope this information has been responsive to your inquiry. Please do not hesitate to call on me again if you believe I may be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID M. ABSHIRE,
Assistant Secretary for
Congressional Relations.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks:

"How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

SURVEYING AND MAPPING IN ALASKA

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, the week of February 1 through 5 has been set aside as Surveying and Mapping Week in Alaska. This occasion, proclaimed by the Governor of Alaska, William Egan, falls simultaneously with the Seventh Annual Alaska Surveying and Mapping Convention, that will be held in Anchorage.

I rise to point out the importance of these men of the surveying and mapping professions, and the contributions they have made to the development of my State and this Nation. I ask my colleagues to join with me in honoring these men for their great work.

The proclamation of the Governor of Alaska follows:

PROCLAMATION: SURVEYING AND MAPPING WEEK IN ALASKA

Alaska can only be assured of obtaining full value and benefits from its subsurface wealth of natural resources if we adequately identify and appraise our land areas with proper surveying and mapping techniques.

The contribution of science and industry toward the development of equipment and methods makes it possible to properly survey and map the expanse of this great State with speed, accuracy, and economy heretofore unattainable.

Surveying and Mapping professions have made major contributions to past and present development in the State of Alaska, and will continue with greater efforts in the future, by employment of the evolving techniques, to improve the comfort, health, and living standards of our people.

The Seventh Annual Alaska Surveying and Mapping Convention will be held in Anchorage, February 1-5, 1972, sponsored by the Alaska Region of the American Society of Photogrammetry, the Alaska Section of the American Congress on Surveying and Mapping, and the Alaska Society of Professional Land Surveyors. This important Convention will direct public attention to the accomplishments of the professional societies involved in surveying and mapping Alaska's vast areas.

As Governor of the State of Alaska, I, William A. Egan, do hereby proclaim the week of February 1 through 5, 1972, as "Surveying and Mapping Week in Alaska" and urge all libraries, schools, and all citizens of Alaska to join in extending recognition and honor to our surveyors and mappers.

Dated this 3rd day of January, 1972.

WILLIAM A. EGAN,
Governor.

DEVOTED YOUNG PATRIOT KATHY CONNELLY BEGLEY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the tragic and untimely death earlier this month of a young American patriot from my district, Kathy Connelly Begley.

Following the first moratorium day in November 1969, Kathy, then a 21-year-old secretary, realized that the morale of our American fighting men was at a low ebb.

With the energy of a little dynamo, Kathy founded a group called Support Our Servicemen and organized a Support Our Servicemen parade in New York on November 15, 1969. As a result, over 1,500 Bronxites including myself, the only public official present, marched down the Grand Concourse to an Honor America Day rally at Poe Park.

At a time in our country's history marked by flag burning, confrontation, and intimidation, Kathy's position was a courageous one. The success of that day, however, and the morale that it provided for our men in uniform was largely attributed to the organizational talents of Kathy Connelly Begley. At the time, she described her reasons for organizing S.O.S.—Support our Servicemen—in the following words: "It's not a political thing." She said:

We exist solely for the purpose of letting our servicemen know that we back their efforts 100 percent.

Her efforts, however, did not fall on deaf ears. As a result of her untiring hard work, Kathy became vice president of the nationwide silent majority, a group dedicated to expressing concern and support for the American prisoners of war. Consequently, servicemen all over the world were comforted.

In addition, she was presented with two citations for patriotism by the William E. Irwin American Legion Post 774 and the Hendrik Hudson Memorial Post 3300, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Her energetic efforts soon won her the admiration of enlisted men and officers alike, including Lt. Comdr. Francis J. Robinson—U.S. Navy (retired)—an aide to the former 7th Fleet commander, the late Adm. J. J. "Jocko" Clark.

So great was their admiration and respect for Kathy that both men, leaders in their branch of the service, were among the onlookers at the St. Simon Stock Church in the Bronx when Kathy was married to Dennis Begley in June 1970.

Dennis, an ex-marine, and his bride of less than a year were blessed with a baby daughter 10 months ago. Donna Jean, many say, looks just like her mom. But the arrival of the baby and returning to work did not alter Kathy's feeling of patriotism or dedication to Americanism. She still attended events in support of our Government and its fighting men and was present for a VFW parade in the Kingsbridge area.

Kathy, once called one of the most patriotic young ladies by Admiral Clark,

fell unconscious while dancing with her husband at a New Year's Eve dinner-dance in New York. She died a short time later at Montefiore Hospital.

Kathy is gone; the world is less for her passing, but her indomitable spirit will prevail—it must—for America will always have servicemen who thirst for the knowledge that the folks back home really care.

I am sure that my colleagues will join with me in extending our deepest condolences to Kathy's husband Dennis, her parents Harry and Elizabeth Connelly, and her brothers Sgt. William Connelly USAF, and Richard Connelly at home.

T-38 TALON SUPERSONIC TRAINER

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, today at Palmdale in my district in southern California, the Air Force is accepting delivery of the final T-38 Talon supersonic trainer built by Northrop Corp., and the T-38 production line closes down. I would like to call attention to the little-known success story of the T-38 because it stands in such sharp contrast to the accounts of defense cost overruns and stretchouts we hear so often these days.

Delivery of the last Talon brings to 1,187 the number produced by Northrop for the Air Force since 1961. Every one of those planes was delivered on schedule, or ahead of it. The plane has surpassed its guaranteed performance on speed, range, maintenance requirements and reliability. And all contract cost commitments were met, or bettered.

The T-38 has returned other cost dividends, while logging more than 3.7 million hours and training some 20,000 pilots. It has the lowest major accident rate of any supersonic aircraft in the Air Force inventory, and attrition has been only a fraction of original estimates. Man-hours needed to maintain the Talon also are less than half those forecast. These savings in attrition and maintenance alone can be translated into cost dividends of more than \$500 million—in effect, a savings to the U.S. taxpayer.

This Air Force-industry team effort stands as a model in military aircraft procurement, a well-run, effective program resulting in a high-performance product at the lowest cost. The taxpayer would stand to gain if all of our Federal programs, nondefense as well as military, met the same standards of efficiency.

At this point I would like to insert the text of a news release about today's delivery ceremony at Palmdale:

NORTHROP DELIVERS THE LAST TALON

One of the most successful U.S. military aircraft procurement programs ever conducted culminated today with delivery to the U.S. Air Force of the last T-38 Talon Supersonic Trainer, built by Northrop Corporation, in a ceremony at Northrop's Palmdale, California facility.

The milestone aircraft was the 1,187th to

be built by Northrop. Each Talon was delivered on or ahead of schedule and production cost commitments were met.

The final Talon was accepted from Thomas V. Jones, Northrop President and Chairman, by Brig. Gen. Donald G. Nunn, Commander of the Air Force Contract Management Division. General Nunn then officially turned over the aircraft to Brig. Gen. Michael C. McCarthy, Chief of Staff of the Air Training Command, prime user of the T-38.

General Nunn, whose command oversees all USAF procurement contracts, said that Northrop's record in building T-38s has been outstanding in terms of "on schedule, on cost, and trouble-free deliveries."

General McCarthy, in accepting the aircraft, noted that the T-38 has "etched its way into Air Force history by consistently achieving one of the best safety records of any supersonic aircraft in the Air Force inventory."

Prior to the action delivery, Col. J. R. Lindsay, Deputy Director for the International Fighter Program, cognizant office for T-38 procurement, Aeronautical Systems Division, said that the success of the T-38 program can be attributed to a long period of cooperation between Northrop and the Air Force.

The delivery ceremony marked the end of an era for Northrop, an era of continuously building T-38 aircraft for the past 14 years. During peak production, in the 1960s, more than 3,800 Northrop employees in Hawthorne, California, and the Antelope Valley were working on the T-38. In addition, the Talon program generated more than 16,000 jobs throughout the state of California.

Civilian, military and company officials at the event were welcomed by Welko E. Gasich, Northrop's Aircraft Division and one of the original designers of the T-38.

Following the ceremony, the final Talon was flown to Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, by General McCarthy and Lt. Col. Vincent Roy.

The T-38's career in the Air Force began with delivery of the first production aircraft in March, 1961. Since that time more than 24,000 student pilots have been graduated in the Talon, and more than 3.7 million flight hours have been logged by the aircraft.

The Talon is symbolic of Northrop's heritage of technology in designing lightweight, simple and easy-to-maintain aircraft. The integrity of the preliminary design has been demonstrated by the fact that no basic configuration changes have ever been required and all airframe subsystems have exceeded the reliability standards originally set by the Air Force.

In 1959, the T-38 became the first supersonic aircraft in the USAF's history to complete its flight testing without incurring a major accident, a record equaled only by Northrop's F-5 Freedom Fighter.

The compact and highly maneuverable Talon has held a number of world time-to-climb speed records. It is powered by two General Electric J85-5 turbojet engines.

The T-38's history of safety, easy maintainability and performance has also made it the choice of the Federal Republic of Germany for its air force pilot training in the United States, the U.S. Navy for test operations, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for astronaut flight proficiency training.

PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Peter Reich, aviation-space editor for Chicago

Today, undertook a humanitarian project during the holiday season by interviewing and writing a story about two families in the Chicago suburbs who have POW's-MIA in Southeast Asia.

Mrs. Mildred Pilkington of Morton Grove, whose son is a Navy pilot, and Mrs. Peggy Lane of Winnetka, whose brother is an Air Force pilot, both wear bracelets inscribed with the names of their loved ones and the date they disappeared in Southeast Asia.

These commemorative bracelets, made available through the National League of Families of Americans Missing in Action or Prisoners of War in Southeast Asia, bear the name of one of the 47 Illinois men known to be a POW or MIA, and the date he was captured or disappeared.

This symbolic gesture of human tragedy serves as testimony that we must do everything possible to bring our POW's/MIA's back home to their loved ones. It is my hope that the first priority on the President's agenda on his upcoming trip to Peking and Moscow is the release of our men held captive by the Communist tyrants.

The heart-rending story by Mr. Reich follows:

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

(By Peter Reich)

The slim, nickel bracelet on Mrs. Mildred Pilkington's wrist is inscribed: "Lt. Thomas Pilkington—9-19-66"

Lt. Pilkington is her son. Sept. 19, 1966, is the day his Phantom II jet disappeared on a night flight over North Viet Nam. For the past five years, he has been one of the 1,199 Americans missing in action in the Viet Nam war.

No word from any of them ever has been received by their families.

Mrs. Pilkington says she intends to wear the bracelet until she receives some official news—good or bad—about her son. She hopes other Americans will join her in a similar gesture.

The National League of Families of Americans Missing in Action or Prisoners of War in Southeast Asia is making the commemorative bracelets available at cost to anyone requesting them. The charge is \$2.50 for a nickel bracelet, \$3 for a copper one. All bear the name of one of the 47 Illinois men known to be M.I.A. or P.O.W. in Southeast Asia, and the date he was captured, or disappeared.

Mrs. Pilkington said anyone desiring a bracelet may write to: National League of Families, Glenview Naval Air Station, Glenview, Ill. 60026.

If he still is alive, Mrs. Pilkington noted, this will be the sixth Christmas that her son has spent in captivity. He was 25 when he failed to return to his carrier, the Coral Sea. He will be 31 soon.

Her son attended Notre Dame High School in Niles and graduated from Loyola University before becoming a navy pilot, she said. Mrs. Pilkington still lives at 9408 Normandy Av., in Morton Grove.

Mrs. Peggy Lane, of 766 Prospect Av., Winnetka, wears a bracelet inscribed with the name of her brother, Lt. John F. Conlon III, an air force jet pilot missing over South Viet Nam since March 4, 1966. Neither his light observation aircraft nor his body ever was found, so he is presumed to have fallen into the hands of the Viet Cong or the North Vietnamese. He, too, was 25 when he disappeared, and will be 31 soon.

Mrs. Lane pointed out that in addition to the 1,199 Americans officially listed as missing, another 460 are known to be prisoners

of war—however the North Vietnamese have acknowledged holding only 339, and the Viet Cong and the Laotian communists have denied all knowledge of the 79 and 3 Americans, respectively, known to be their prisoners.

Both Mrs. Pilkington and Mrs. Lane pleaded with Americans not to forget our missing or captured men, some of whom have had to endure unspeakable conditions for seven long years.

These conditions—amply documented by the handful of Americans who have managed to escape from Communist captivity in Southeast Asia—have taken their toll already.

Mrs. Lane told of one P.O.W.'s wife who noticed that her pilot husband's handwriting on the 6-line notes the North Vietnamese permitted him to send her every few months was becoming progressively less legible.

The last letter she received, just this month, bore a notation from a Defense Department analyst who had examined the writing for authenticity:

"Your husband has given up hope; we regret to inform you that he has become simple-minded."

Mrs. Lane requested that the P.O.W.'s name not be published.

WASHINGTON STATE SENATE COMMENDS PRESIDENT NIXON FOR HIS NEW PEACE EFFORT

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Washington State Senate has passed a resolution commending President Nixon for his eight-point peace plan and urged the Washington State congressional delegation to pledge all possible support for his efforts. This is a nonpartisan request, Mr. Speaker, because the Washington State Senate is controlled by the Democratic Party.

Speaking for myself, I do pledge my support for the President's peace plan, and I am inserting the aforementioned resolution at this point in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, The President's speech of January 25, 1972 revealing secret negotiations covering twelve separate meetings over a period of thirty months, in addition to the previously publicized acts and offers, demonstrates that the President's efforts are responsive to his pledge to the American people, and to their demands for action by their government and his administration, in connection with the disengagement of our armed forces from South Vietnam; and

Whereas, The offers made public provide the North Vietnamese the essential options to consummate a compact for peace in Southeast Asia;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the Senate of the State of Washington commends the President for his efforts, acknowledges its gratitude therefor, and urges the congressional delegation from the State of Washington to pledge all possible support for his efforts; and

Be it further resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate cause copies of this resolution suitably embossed to be transmitted to the President and the members of the congressional delegation from the State of Washington.

CHRISTMAS SHARING

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, each year, during early December, the Christmas spirit descends upon us and the spirit of sharing, which has been hidden all year, again reappears.

I recently read an article by Norma Gray in the Oakland, Calif., Catholic Voice entitled "Christmas Sharing." The article described a very special manifestation of the spirit of giving. Bob Hughes and Dick Martin, well-known nightclub entertainers, have given their time to organize a boys choir which performs each Christmas season. Despite the demands made on them and their successes, Mr. Hughes and Mr. Martin will accept none of the credit for their choir. They give all the credit for the choir's success to the boys who are members.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the time and efforts given by these two men and the boys in the choir deserve to be recognized. In an age when too many people are concerned only with themselves, this group has given of themselves to spread the joy of Christmas. I feel that my colleagues will enjoy and benefit from this story.

The article follows:

CHRISTMAS SHARING

Each year as the holiday approaches we find ourselves, perhaps for the first time all year, thinking more about others than about ourselves. Talents grown rusty with disuse are polished up and shared freely. Almost forgotten friends and relatives, those who have touched our lives, however briefly, are remembered. All of a sudden, even hearts locked up or held back all year long, spill over with love and joy that cries out to be shared—through gifts and cards, through song, through self.

Being human, we grumble about the extra work, the extra expense, the extra time this burst of loving and sharing takes. But would we change it?

Certainly not Dick Martin and Bob Hughes of St. Mark's parish, Richmond. Each Christmas season, these professional entertainers clear their calendars of commitments to return to their Richmond parish where they go about transforming 50 healthy normal boys, ages eight and up—boys of diverse races and backgrounds from 14 public schools in the city—into the very popular St. Mark's Boys Choir.

A crash program of 40 hours of rehearsal readies the boys for singing the joys of Christmas in hospital wards, homes for the sick and aged, cathedrals, parish churches, famous hotels, city streets and squares, radio stations and this year a special appearance at the Oakland Chancery Office. They expect to perform for 150,000 people this season. 14 appearances are scheduled for Dec. 21 alone.

Performances are gratis. The boys earn money for the chartered buses they use for transportation by singing on the street corners near the parish church on the first Sunday of Advent.

One of the highlights of the rehearsal period is a "laundromat party" during which the boys themselves clean and press the surplices, scapulars and big red ties which they wear.

Climax of each season comes on Christmas Eve when the choir sings the Midnight Mass in St. Mark's Church. It is on this evening that many former members return to visit or sing along. Of the original group founded eleven years ago with nine boys, seven have finished college; six have been to Vietnam and back safely.

New boys must serve one year as postulants before being received into full membership in a special church ceremony.

Bob and Dick consider it a privilege to be able to share some of their talents with others.

"To us it's missionary work, and it might be a square idea, but we believe we are all missionaries," says the pair, whose work with the boys has brought Christmas delight to thousands.

CHICAGO TRANSIT AUTHORITY

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, which has jurisdiction over all authorizing legislation for the Department of Transportation, I am delighted to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial, entitled "Free Rides on the CTA?" which appeared in the January 28 edition of Chicago Today.

Mr. Michael Cafferty, who is chairman of the Chicago Transit Authority, formerly served as Assistant Secretary for Environmental and Urban Systems at the Department of Transportation and received in 1970 from Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe a meritorious achievement award for his outstanding service.

Since becoming chairman of the CTA last spring, Mr. Cafferty has offered many new ideas for improving public transportation in the city of Chicago. He is to be commended for his leadership and for the innovations he has suggested. I know in the years ahead the citizens of Chicago will derive great benefit from his excellent planning.

The editorial follows:

FREE RIDES ON THE CTA?

Free rides are about the most delightful prospect the Chicago Transit Authority could offer. And apparently it isn't such a wild idea; CTA chairman Michael Cafferty suggests that it might be tried soon—perhaps when the distributor subway system is completed in 5 or 6 years, maybe even sooner.

It would only apply downtown, within limits not yet described. But financially speaking, it would make getting from one part of the business district to another as painless as riding elevators. "We should have this concept in the Loop," Cafferty said, "with people able to get on and off at any point."

Everyone, including the CTA, benefits from good business. Making it cheap and easy for people to get around downtown is the best business the CTA could get into.

Some cities including New York are weighing the possibility of totally free systems. That could happen eventually, but it would be an immense gamble to start with. The CTA's version, which pins its hopes on increased patronage thru the downtown free-ride bonus, would test the idea at much less risk. But the possibilities are dazzling, and we hope to hear more of this plan soon.

LOST CORD CLUB AIMS AT REHABILITATION

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following article from the Louisville Courier-Journal about a courageous group of people in my home community who have not allowed a serious physical handicap to stop them from being heard.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the members of an organization called the Lost Cord Club of Kentuckiana. These good citizens share the common misfortune of having undergone surgery for the removal of the larynx.

The profound effect of this operation is a total loss of the ability to speak. The club's president, Mrs. John Beha, says it is a shattering experience "when you come out of that operation and you open your mouth and there's nothing there."

The purpose of the Lost Cord Club is to cushion this postoperative shock and to assist patients in regaining the gift of speech through the use of the esophagus.

Among the prime movers in this most worthwhile organization are Mrs. Robert Waldron, Mr. Phil Michels and Mr. George T. Warren. I think their commendable activities are worthy of the notice of my colleagues in the House. I therefore request that the following article entitled "Speaking of People, Lost Cord Club Aims at Rehabilitation," written by reporter Joan Kay, be inserted in the RECORD.

The article follows:

LOST CORD CLUB AIMS AT REHABILITATION

(By Joan Kay)

At most meetings of the Lost Cord Club of Kentuckiana, the business session is brief and then the members just sit around and talk.

Talking is the main purpose of the club for it is made up of people who have lost their larynx (or voice box) through surgery and are learning to talk by using their esophagus.

The chief aim of the group "is to get people together and let them know they are not alone with their problem—to provide emotional support," said Hazel (Mrs. Robert) Waldron, one of the founders of the club and instructor of post-laryngectomy voice at the Rehabilitation Center.

Club get-togethers give laryngectomees (those who have had their larynges removed) "a chance to express their feelings and a chance to try their new voice," she continued. "When they first learn they do not talk well and don't like to talk in front of strangers."

Newly elected club president Mrs. John Beha attended her first meeting two months after surgery in 1965 and she has been going regularly ever since.

It is quite a shattering experience "when you come out of that operation and you open your mouth and there's nothing there," said Mrs. Beha. "If you go to those meetings, you feel like you're not the only one."

"If you take advantage of everything Hazel and the others at the club tell you and practice with it, you've got no problem."

In a laryngectomy all of the larynx, which includes the vocal cords, is removed. Though sometimes the larynx is removed because of acid burns or a fracture resulting from an accident, the major cause is a malignant tumor.

To explain in simple terms how a laryngectomee talks, said Mrs. Waldron, "we learn to get air in the upper part of the esophagus and cause the air to vibrate" as a substitute for the vibration of the vocal cords which have been removed.

When Mrs. Waldron had surgery in 1946, "there was nothing in the area in the way of rehabilitation," and she didn't talk for a year and a half. After initial speech therapy at Northwestern University, she had further training from Miss Miriam Robinson, a trained speech therapist, who at that time was teaching public speaking and drama at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. (Miss Robinson now teaches at Belmont College in Nashville.)

Later the two began visiting surgical patients in hospitals and teaching laryngectomees in Miss Robinson's office. In 1951 they formed the Lost Cord Club.

The club, sponsored by the Kentucky division of the American Cancer Society, meet in its offices in the Medical Arts Building on the third Monday of every month.

In the beginning there were six or eight people. Now there are 15 to 20 dues-paying members and the club has a mailing list of about 150. "People come and go," said Mrs. Waldron. "Once they are back at work and feel less need, they drop out." But there are some longtime members.

Other officers in addition to Mrs. Beha are Phil Michels, vice president, and George T. Warren, secretary-treasurer.

The Kentuckiana club is a charter member of the International Association of Laryngectomees, founded in 1952 and sponsored by the American Cancer Society. From 11 chapters, it has grown to 165 clubs.

Mrs. Waldron is secretary of the international group, and Robert F. Watts of Lexington, who formed the Bluegrass Lost Cord Club in 1961, is vice president. He is expected to be elected president at the August meeting in Florida.

Another club is in the process of forming in Owensboro.

ORGANIZE SPRING MEETING

Mrs. Waldron hopes to organize a regional meeting in the spring mainly "to find out if there are people we aren't reaching for therapy or help. We have no idea how many people there are in the state we have never heard of."

Many times doctors will alert Mrs. Waldron or other club members about patients facing laryngectomies, and they will visit them in hospital to offer information and evidence that a person can learn to talk again.

"We want to know early enough," said Mrs. Waldron, "so we can see people while they are in a state of depression. People always say, 'If only I could have talked to you before the operation or right after.' We feel club members can do so much to reassure these people."

Though the club has some social activities, such as a summer picnic, "We think of the club as a service organization rather than a social club."

Mrs. Waldron, who was a volunteer teacher for about eight years with Miss Robinson, attended workshops of the international association on teaching laryngectomees to speak and has read widely in the field. She joined the Rehabilitation Center in 1957 as instructor of post-laryngectomy voice in a program sponsored by the Kentucky Division of the American Cancer Society.

Though people vary widely in their ability to master the new speech technique, with a normal post-operative recovery she estimates that generally it takes three to four months of therapy once or twice a week to have usable speech. "Control and loudness improve over the years with practice."

One important barrier a person must cross is shyness "because the voice has a most unusual quality and many are reluctant to use it." She often encourages a patient at first by taking him around the Rehabilitation

Center and introducing him to other staff members.

In 1967 Mrs. Waldron was honored by the Kentucky Commission on Employment of the Handicapped as "handicapped individual of the year."

"Sometimes I've said that my life has been much richer since I've been laryngectomized because a lot of new doors have opened up to me." Before the operation as a housewife and mother of two sons, she did some community work, but "through the years I've had so many wonderful experiences through the work I've done. I think this is the attitude most laryngectomees have taken." Though some never adjust, "most jump in with both feet to help others."

Mrs. Waldron is particularly pleased about a local industry executive who began therapy last June and now has resumed all his job responsibilities, including conferences with other businessmen. A 6-year-old boy she once trained to talk is now 17, holding a part-time job and involved in many school clubs.

"And I am just one of many people in the field who feel this glow about it. . . . I think this is the philosophy that most laryngectomees have—they want to help others who have been through the same experience."

VIETNAMESE REFUGEE RELOCATION VIOLATES ARTICLE 49 OF THE GENEVA CONVENTION

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, last Friday's New York Times carried on its "Op-Ed" page an article by John Isaacs, a young man who recently resigned from the U.S. Foreign Service. During the year that Mr. Isaacs worked with refugees in South Vietnam, he had ample opportunity to observe the coercion attendant upon their "voluntary" agreements to be relocated.

These people—South Vietnamese citizens—are the individuals whom we are supposedly protecting. With friends such as we, they hardly need any enemies.

Mr. Isaacs' article follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 28, 1972]

A NATION OF WRETCHED WANDERERS

(By John Isaacs)

WASHINGTON.—About 1,400 Vietnamese refugees were recently moved from wretched refugee camps in Quangtri Province of I Corps, the northernmost region of South Vietnam, to another camp 450 miles to the south. Vietnamese refugees have never before been resettled so far from their former homes.

This latest move points up the continuing ground war and again reveals the failure of Vietnamization to guarantee the security of the peasants in their home areas. The relocation may be the first of many totaling hundreds of thousands of refugees as the South Vietnamese try to clear land for military operations.

Large-scale relocations of refugees from I Corps have been planned for many years. I was involved in such planning while in Vietnam, and saw other American preparations dating back to 1966 and 1968 for resettling up to 200,000 people.

Only a year ago, the American head of the War Victims Directorate in Saigon announced plans to move 200,000 to 400,000 refugees from I Corps, although premature publicity and the resulting outcry killed the move.

Forced relocations have long played a key

role in the war in Indochina. Previous schemes have been entitled "agrovilles," "strategic hamlets" and "new life hamlets."

By whatever name, hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese have been uprooted from their traditional lives and forced into barren camps.

Each new relocation indicates a continued lack of South Vietnamese governmental confidence in its political control of the countryside, while directly violating Article 49 of the Geneva Convention which prohibits "individual or mass forcible transfers."

State Department officials claim that this latest movement, labeled "don dien," is different from those of the past. Only those Vietnamese who agree to move will go.

Yet the circumstances of the movement raise serious doubts about how voluntary the moves will turn out to be in the future. The people at one of the two camps involved wrote a letter last July 21 to a Vietnamese Cabinet Minister asking to be moved. The free will of those making the request is called into question by their plea: "You witnessed the miserable life of the inhabitants and told us that the Government has intention to move the people in Hathanh resettlement center."

A survey conducted by the Americans five months before that request stated that "The people are opposed to any move outside of Military Region I [I Corps]."

By July the refugees supposedly had changed their minds. There are sufficient precedents to show that the South Vietnamese Government has means to get the people "willingly" to follow its desires.

The motives of the South Vietnamese officials involved are also suspect. When questioned about the move last Sept. 17, Dr. Phan Quan Dan, Minister of State in Vietnam and director of this movement, told me about improved land and better security as reasons why Saigon favors the relocation.

These reasons make some sense in light of the miserable conditions in the two camps of 8,200 people at Hathanh and 20,000 at Camlo, with refugees living on sandy soil which prevents all but the most elementary farming. Yet while the refugees want most of all to return to their ancestral lands, strategic considerations clearly outweigh human ones.

These further considerations were admitted by Dr. Dan, who said: "When the refugees are moved out of their camps, the Government can turn much of the land into a free-fire zone. Then it will be much easier to fight the Communists."

It is doubtful how limited the move will remain or how much free choice there will be because the same minister expressed a desire to move as many as 330,000 people by the end of 1972.

Moreover, the refugees who are moving constitute a suspect group for their long-held sympathies with the Vietcong. An April, 1970, "Survey of the Attitudes of Refugees in Twelve Selected Camps in I Corps" found: "There are large numbers of Vietcong sympathizers among the refugees in I Corps in general, but the most critical problems pointed up by this survey are in the large camps of Camlo and Hathanh." The move only makes sense if there is a desire to get the people out of the militarily sensitive I Corps region threatened by North Vietnamese troops to the north and west.

HAROLD J. GIBBONS, RECIPIENT OF THE HERITAGE OF LIBERTY AWARD

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently, Mr. Harold J. Gibbons, vice president of

the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, was honored in Chicago by the Anti-Defamation League Appeal.

Mr. Gibbons was presented with the first annual Heritage of Liberty Award sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League.

The award was presented to Mr. Gibbons in recognition of his outstanding labor leadership, his vanguard role in the struggle against bias, his commitment to social justice, his distinguished public service, and in appreciation of his championship and generous support of Israel.

The Heritage of Liberty Award has been established by the Anti-Defamation League in recognition of labor's leading role in the advancement of the Nation's heritage. It was conferred upon Harold Gibbons at a dinner in his honor for his steadfast advocacy of labor's rights, his leadership in the struggle against bigotry, and his untiring support of Israel's cause.

Cochairman for the dinner was the very highly respected Chicago industrialist, Mr. Lester Crown. The honorary chairman was Dore Schary and dinner cochairman was Ray Schoessling, vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and president of the District Council 25. Rabbi Eric Friedland delivered the invocation and the Rev. Robert Reicher delivered the benediction. Remarks were made by Seymour Graubard, national chairman of the Anti-Defamation League. Mr. John W. Gardner was the principal speaker and America's No. 1 satirist, Mr. Alan King, provided a lighter touch to the evening.

Mr. Gibbons richly deserves the honor bestowed upon him at McCormack Place in Chicago, Ill.

THE ECOLOGY OF SOCIETY

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable John Lumpkin, a distinguished attorney, president of the South Carolina State Chamber of Commerce, and chairman of the board of the South Carolina National Bank, delivered a splendid address to the annual chamber of commerce banquet in my hometown of Greenwood, S.C. It was a very special privilege for me to hear Mr. Lumpkin's eloquent and timely address. It is thought provoking and challenging. I commend this great speech to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and to the American people:

THE ECOLOGY OF SOCIETY

I'd like to touch upon a matter that is a bit more serious and current, a matter that affects us all these days. We have now solidly embedded in our working vocabularies, the word "ecology", and while I haven't looked it up since school days, I seem to have it associated with the balance and/or interrelation of things in nature. And, I understand that when any species of ecology's vast network is reduced or eliminated, its loss affects the entire system. Ecologists tell us they are concerned about keeping all plant and animal species alive and intact not so much for the sake of preservation as for

the sake of perpetuating all life. All of us, they say, should be greatly concerned by the excessive tinkering with plant and animal life, lest the entire structure give way.

There is a similar danger in tampering with the ecology of society. This ecology is maintained by two important basics: One, a system of laws protecting the social fabric, and two, a healthy marketplace. Both are constantly undergoing changes, but neither is immune to destruction. *Excessive* change is a thing we must guard against.

Two great interrelated forces work within the system—the individual and society itself. Between the two there is an ever-present interplay of war and love, of rejection and acceptance, of aggression and cooperation.

We are all endowed with a fiercely self-centered nature. It is our weakness that forces us to seek cooperation with each other. But our untamed, unconscious drives, our selfish ways constantly threaten to disrupt our social partnerships.

In primitive society, the struggle between aggression and cooperation is taken care of by the environment; when the specter of starvation looks a community in the face every day—as with the Eskimos or the African hunting tribes—the pure need for self-preservation pushes society to the cooperative completion of its daily tasks. But in an advanced community, this tangible pressure of the environment is lacking. When men no longer work shoulder to shoulder in tasks directly related to survival—indeed when half or more of the population never touches the tilled earth, enters mines, keeps cattle or builds with its hands—the perpetuation of the human animal becomes a remarkable social feat.

The very existence of society is at the mercy of a thousand dangers. It can feel immediately the effects of excessive governmental control. When trade union strikes or consumer boycotts or civil strife come upon the scene, we all are affected. The network of markets is so intricate and interwoven that the whole is affected by a small part . . . just as the tiny sting of a bee can cause pain to a 200-pound man. In the extreme, if our farmers should fail to plant enough crops or if too few men should suddenly offer their services as stevedores, miners or doctors or engineers, or if any of the millions of intertwined tasks of society should fail to get done, industrial life would soon become hopelessly disorganized. We face the possibility of such a cataclysm daily—not from the forces of nature, but from sheer human unpredictability.

In the market system, the lure of gain steers each man to his task. And yet, although he is free to go where his acquisitive nose directs him, the interplay of one man against the other results in the necessary tasks of society getting done.

But through history, industry and profit have been under attack and suspicion. Throughout, there have been attempts to discredit and destroy the process.

Boston—1644. A trial is in progress; Robert Keane, "an ancient professor of the gospel, a man of eminent wealth and having but one child, and having come over to conscience's sake and for the advancement of the gospel," is charged with a heinous crime. He has made over sixpence profit on the shilling, an outrageous gain. Question: Whether to excommunicate him for his sin. However, in view of his spotless past, the court finally relents and dismisses him with a fine of two hundred pounds. But poor Mr. Keane is so upset that before the elders of the Church he does "with tears acknowledge his covetous and corrupt heart." A minister of Boston cannot resist this golden opportunity to profit from the living example of a wayward sinner and he uses the example of Keane's avarice to thunder for in his Sunday sermon on some false principles of trade. Among them are these:

"(1) that a man might sell as dear as he can, and buy as cheap as he can;

"(2) if a man lose by casualty of sea, and so on, in some of his commodities, he may raise the price of the rest, and

"(3) that he may sell as he bought, though he paid too dear . . ."

All false, cries the minister; to seek riches for riches sake is to fall into the sin of avarice.

To this day, the notion is handed down that to seek riches for riches sake is a thing of the devil.

Therefore, one of the great dangers in our social ecology is psychological. Puritan and primitive mores dictate feelings of modern men. He rails excessively against the profit system or the market system. He causes laws to be passed, judgments to be made and utterances voiced to the detriment of the market.

Then, there is the matter of regulations and rules.

France—1666. A regulation has been sent out warning against a dangerous and disruptive tendency of too much initiative being displayed of late. The regulation says that henceforth the fabrics of Dijon and Selangey are to contain 1,408 threads, neither more nor less. In four other manufacturing towns, the threads are to number 1,376; at Chatillon, 1,216. (Any cloth found to be objectionable is to be pilloried. If it is found three times to be objectionable, the merchant is to be pilloried instead.)

There is something common to all these scattered fragments of bygone worlds. It is this: First, the idea of the propriety (not to say the necessity) of a system organized on the basis of personal gain has not yet taken root. Second, a separate, self-contained economic world has not yet lifted itself from its social context. The world of practical affairs is inextricably mixed up with the world of political, social and religious life.

Even in this late 20th century these worlds have not yet fully separated. And, while the physical separation isn't really necessary, it is not important that we differentiate them in our minds and our reactions to their functions.

There is sometimes the notion that the system owes the individual a living, must guarantee him a pension, must protect him from cradle to the grave. Paradoxically, this same notion says that enterprise can be sinful. In the Middle Ages, the Church taught that, "No Christian ought to be a merchant."

In banking—in all industry for that matter—we frequently run across these primitive reactions to the system of marketing.

In recruiting, we sometimes find the young collegian is reluctant to join a corporation. He believes that in so doing he may lose his personal identity. He cannot find himself in a corporate enterprise, and he does not want to be guided by what he considers impersonal policies and procedures. It is, in a sense, a kind of snobbery. It is brought on probably by the diminishing individuality in our modern society. As the world grows smaller by faster transportation and instant communications, and as the population soars, and as mass production continues to turn out all manner of goods and materials, we get the idea that each one of us is too much like all the rest of us. And, we don't especially like that. I'm told that brand names don't have the appeal of a few years ago. Perhaps it's because people now search for the offbeat, something with which to make them different from the masses. People seem to want to maintain an individual sovereignty. This includes a personal interpretation of behavior, of morals and of rules and laws.

There appears to be a strong sentiment for the individual's rights over the rights of society. Laws are passed, judicial decisions are made and writings support the individual's role against society's order. It is more popular today to protect the criminal's rights

after the crime than it is to protect society against the criminal's acts. Even the overt revolutionary today can draw the sympathy because he acts as an individual against an "oppressive" society. If his plight continues, he is often lionized.

The ancient Greek and Roman societies were built on the conception of subordination of the individual to the community, of the citizen to the state; it set the safety of the commonwealth, as the supreme aim of conduct, above the safety of the individual whether in this world or in the world to come. When Oriental religions came along, all this was changed. The center of gravity was shifted from present to future life, and a general disintegration of the body politic set in. The ties of the state and the family were lessened; the structure of society tended to resolve itself into its individual elements and thereby to relapse into barbarism; yet civilization is only possible, says the historian Toynbee, through the active cooperation of the citizens and their willingness to subordinate their private interests to the common good. The obsession with Oriental philosophies lasted for a thousand years. Men refused to defend their country and even to continue their own kind. The revival of Roman law marked the return of Europe to native ideals of life and conduct, to saner, manlier views of the world. The tide of the Oriental invasion had been turned.

Here in the 20th century, we have witnessed a remarkable flirtation with these same philosophies. The Woodstock set finds a new god in "love", a new purpose in burning draft cards, and a new manifestation in drugs. The affectation of flowing robes and long hair and the propensity to occult teachings reminds us of the ancient Oriental influence. It is again a rebellion against society and a gratification of personal likes and desires. The premise seems to be that man is a noble creature corrupted only by the society surrounding him. It is reminiscent of the thesis propounded by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, intellectual godfather of the French Revolution. As you know, that revolution left us along with many lofty sentiments a memory of one of the bloodiest conflicts in history.

The Russian Revolution, built on the same premise, led to the same result. *There are no contrary examples.* Edward Bloomberg, author of *Student Violence*, reminds us that, "No government founded in the 'man is good' principle (as opposed to society is good) has ever ended otherwise than in tyranny and blood."

The healthy balance of our society, as we have said, is dependent upon a system of laws and a healthy marketplace. Each of these is experiencing pressures unequalled in modern civilization. Our laws are challenged by revolutionaries and anarchists. Our police are vilified and our traditional institutions are under bombardment. There is an impatience with the due process of law. The marketplace is impaired by an overzealous protection of the consumer's interest, by excessive taxes, tax bookkeeping and general regulatory procedures.

We say and we believe that this ecology can and will withstand this tampering, but there is a warning in the words of Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, speaking decades ago before a joint session of Congress:

" . . . Forms of government, however well contrived, cannot assure their own permanence. If we owe to the wisdom and restraint of the fathers a system of government which has thus far stood the test, we all recognize that it is only by wisdom and restraint in our own day that we can make that system last. If today we find ground for confidence that our institutions which have made for liberty and strength will be maintained, it will not be due to abundance of physical resources or to productive capacity, but because these are at the command of people who still cherish the principles which underlie our system

and because of the general appreciation of what is essentially sound in our governmental structure."

These are rather alarming words, but they are intended only as another recognition of what might be—not what will be. Just as the reasonable men of science tell us about the balance of nature, we should give heed to those who warn us about the ecology of our society. The society we know today in America, despite its avowed shortcomings, is the best man has ever devised. While changes and refinements are constantly needed, we should always be aware and remind ourselves of Justice Hughes words, "forms of government cannot assure their own permanence."

We the benefactors must have the wisdom for this assurance.

THOSE WHO SERVE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the withdrawal of American forces from South Vietnam has been greeted with enthusiasm and relief by most Americans. But there are some men who realize that this country cannot extract its troops and then assume the problem is over.

Mr. Speaker, the war-ravaged people of Southeast Asia have suffered for centuries. A young man from Concord, Calif., realizes this fact, and is trying to do something about it. Sgt. Edward A. Artis has spent 8 years in the Army—almost 2 of those years in Vietnam where he was a medical corpsman. He requested another extension of his duty in the war zone but the Army denied that request. It is ironic that one of the few men who wanted to stay and use his medical skills to help the people was sent home, while other men who did not want to go in the first place were sent in his place.

Sergeant Artis wanted to stay in Vietnam, Mr. Speaker, not because he likes war, but because he felt he could help the people. He is especially concerned about the Cambodian refugees. In Vietnam, Sergeant Artis used his free time to work as a volunteer in a hospital emergency room and as part of a civic action group working with the civilian population.

Sergeant Artis is now back in the States, Mr. Speaker. In his hometown of Concord, he has started a project to collect clothing and soap for those refugees. He is trying to get civic clubs, church organizations and other groups to donate the clothing and soap to be sent to Vietnam.

The work this young man is performing is already receiving the notice of local Concord citizens, but I feel it needs to be brought to the attention of my colleagues in Congress and everyone who reads the Record.

With that thought in mind, Mr. Speaker, I include the following article by Tom Debley of the Concord Transcript for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

AID FOR CAMBODIANS LOCAL SOLDIER'S GOAL

(By Tom Debley)

Sgt. Edward A. Artis has been home from Vietnam less than a week. And he'll only be in Concord for a little more than 40 days, a brief period of time in which he hopes to launch an ambitious project with the help of area residents.

The sergeant, a medical corpsman who graduated from Clayton Valley High School in 1962, has spent eight years in the Army, the last 23 months in Vietnam.

And now the 26-year-old, thrice wounded soldier would like to go back to war ravaged Southeast Asia, but the Army has said no. Artis' desire to return is not because of any love for war. In fact, if you ask, he has definite views on the politics of war.

But Artis is not interested in the politics. He is concerned about people. Two small infants, for example, whom he found in garbage cans.

Of prime concern to him are Cambodian refugees who are suffering and dying from the effects of decades of war in Southeast Asia. Their plight, Artis says, is just as bad as the Bangladesh, but people have forgotten about the war victims of Cambodia as attention has focused on this new world problem.

"If there's a new thing, people look at it more than the old," he says.

As a medical corpsman, Artis became interested in the poor conditions of the refugees in his spare time by becoming involved in "civic action."

"I hate busy work and I'd rather be doing something that's beneficial," he says, explaining how he began working as a volunteer in the hospital emergency room while stationed in Tay Ninh.

From there, Artis and members of a civic action team that was formed began working in their free time as volunteers with the civilian population in other ways. One of the men he met and who is now part of the group was another Concordite, Bob Rogers, son of retired Concord Police Capt. Sam Rogers.

Although Artis can now tell many stories, and show hundreds of pictures, about what he has seen, it boils down one problem he's hoping to solve: clothing and soap for the refugees.

And that's where he hopes to have the help of the people here at home. Right now, he's looking for the donation of office space and a telephone so he can get his project started.

As for getting the materials to Vietnam, he's not worried. "I'll pay for that myself if I have to," he says.

But to get the donations of materials, he wants to meet with groups of people—civic clubs, fraternal organizations, church groups, anyone who wants to help.

In 10 to 14 days, the notes, slides and films he has shot will arrive and he hopes to get audiences to show them to in order to literally show the need.

In explaining this need, Artis says food is not the major problem of Cambodians nor the Vietnamese. In fact, as far as the Vietnamese are concerned, "free world sources are carrying them" and they don't need the help the Cambodian refugees need.

Artis explains that as the North Vietnamese Army (NAV) moves through Cambodia, imposing taxes and conscripting soldiers, refugees are being evacuated into South Vietnam. At one village, Katum, the population jumped from 700 to 2,500 people in just two weeks.

As a result, people are sleeping anywhere they can, including holes in the ground.

It is at this village that Artis has been working. And clothing and soap are in prime need. Soap, especially, because it is a medical

necessity, since skin disease is one of the worst problems of the people.

The children and the old, as is often the case in war zones, suffer the most, he says in explaining how mammoth the problems are in this way:

"In two days we saw over 1,000 people. We went through all of our medical supplies."

Artis, Rogers and three officers, Capt. Douglas Hagen, MD, Joe Maryluf, Mike Feenye, and Pehn Young, have been working at Katum, supplementing a public health team.

Artis says as long as he can get materials to the others, most easily by mail, they can be distributed and help the people.

And even though he has to leave for a new base back east in just over 40 days, Artis believes that if he can get things rolling, "the people can carry the ball from there."

What he needs now are the people interested in helping.

PROCLAMATION: ALIEN REGISTRATION MONTH IN ALASKA

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, William A. Egan, Governor of Alaska, has proclaimed the month of January 1972, as Alien Registration Month in Alaska.

He has done so in an effort to bring the attention to those visiting the United States from other countries that registration is required by law.

I wish to share with all of my colleagues Governor Egan's proclamation.

The proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION: ALIEN REGISTRATION MONTH IN ALASKA

Under the Immigration and Nationality Act, most aliens in the United States are obliged to report their address to the Immigration and Naturalization Service during the month of January each year.

Aliens living in Alaska may comply with this law by completing an address report card that is obtainable from post offices throughout the State, or from the Immigration and Naturalization Service office.

If sick or disabled, a friend or relative can obtain the address report card, which should be returned to the post office or Immigration and Naturalization Service. Parents should fill out cards for alien children under age 14.

As Governor of the State of Alaska, I, William A. Egan, urge all aliens who reside in this State to remember that the month of January, 1972, is hereby designated to be Alien Registration Month in Alaska and to properly register as required by law.

Dated this 27th day of December, 1972.

A NATION STILL STRUGGLES

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1972

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, last week the people of the Ukraine, who are

not free, celebrated the 54th anniversary of their nation's declaration of independence.

Their courage and hunger for freedom are examples of patriotism that should be noted and remembered by some of America's own critics.

For, here is a nation of peace forced to exist behind the curtain of communism, and its people still love to be free.

The Ukrainian people have never accepted Soviet rule, although it was imposed upon them in an invasion of the

Ukraine, ending in 1920 with Soviet domination.

Last week, the official celebration was held. But all freedom-loving people the world over will join throughout the year in praying for the eventual emergence of independence in the Ukraine.

SENATE—Tuesday, February 1, 1972

The Senate met at 9:15 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, who has promised that wherever two or three or ten thousand are gathered in Thy name Thou art there, be with this Nation and its leaders at prayer. Teach us when to pray, what to pray, and how to pray. Help us each to live the life of prayer, to be a nation at prayer. Give us strength and wisdom for the tasks of this day. Hear the prayers which we utter and the deeper prayers which our lips never frame.

In His name who taught us to pray. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., February 1, 1972.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 31, 1972, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON III, a Senator from the State of Illinois, attended the session of the Senate today.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE DEEP-SEA MINERALS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the January 1972 issue of the Mining Congress Journal, published by the American Mining Congress, included an interview with the distinguished Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), who is the principal sponsor of S. 2801, the deep-sea minerals bill.

I call the attention of my colleagues to Mr. METCALF's remarks about the legislation and importance of encouraging U.S. nationals to take advantage of their present rights to mine the deep-sea bed. I ask unanimous consent that the interview be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SENATOR METCALF DISCUSSES DEEP SEA MINERALS BILL

(On November 2 Senator Lee Metcalf of Montana introduced S. 2801, a bill to provide the Secretary of the Interior with authority to promote the conservation and orderly development of the hard mineral resources of the deep seabed, pending adoption of an international regime. The measure is cosponsored by Senator Henry Jackson of Washington, Senator Gordon Allott of Colorado, Senator Henry Bellmon of Oklahoma and Senator Ted Stevens of Alaska. The bill is strongly supported by the American Mining Congress.)

(In a candid interview with the AMC's J. Allen Overton, Jr., Senator Metcalf discusses S. 2801 and other aspects of undersea mineral development for Mining Congress Journal.)

Senator Metcalf, I suppose it would be correct to say that S. 2801 is, in a very real sense, an outgrowth of a series of hearings you chaired for the Senate Interior Committee.

(1) Why did you introduce S. 2801?

As I indicated in my remarks on the Senate floor upon the introduction of S. 2801 on November 2, it was in response to a suggestion made by Mr. T. S. Ary (chairman, AMC Ad Hoc Committee on Undersea Mineral Resources, and vice president, Union Carbide Exploration Corp.), during his testimony before my subcommittee.

Mr. Ary testified that U.S. industry was close to being capable of exploiting the sizable quantities of hard minerals on the seabeds beyond the continental margins and that domestic legislation was needed. He indicated that such legislation, if adopted in substantially similar form by other nations, could, through the principle of international reciprocity, "become the basis for common rules among nations regarding freedom of development and security of tenure among—ocean—miners."

I then advised Mr. Ary that if his organization, the American Mining Congress, would prepare legislation which dealt with the subject matter, I would introduce it for circulation and discussion.

(2) S. 2801 addresses itself to the deep seabed beyond the limits of the continental shelf. Is this not beyond the limits of national jurisdiction?

What ultimate agreement concerning the limits of exclusive national jurisdiction the international community may reach is not yet entirely clear. Our subcommittee concluded that the entire continental margin should be included within the limits of national jurisdiction. Several nations have supported a 200-mile limit. In any event, S. 2801 is intended to apply to seabed areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.

(3) What are the key provisions of this legislation?

Without going into the technical details of the bill which we intend to review during the hearing process, the bill incorporates and combines several well recognized international law doctrines, including the right of a sovereign state to regulate the activities of its nationals no matter where in the world they may be, the freedom of the high seas; mutuality and reciprocity between sovereign states, among others. Through the combination of these doctrines as included in S. 2801, the U.S. ocean mining industry will be encouraged to undertake serious and far-reaching commercial undertakings on the deep sea bed. This would be a boon to the maintenance of U.S. leadership in deep ocean technology.

(4) In December 1969, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution which declared a moratorium on all exploitation of deep sea bed resources pending establishment of an international deep sea regime. What are your views regarding this?

My views and the views of the Committee were made clear during our hearings in 1970 and made especially clear in the report of our special subcommittee. The so-called moratorium resolution like others of its kind was a mere paper majority motivated by a policy of confrontation on the part of its sponsors and as such was no more than a weak recommendation without binding force of law.

(5) Does the State Department take a similar position?

Yes, basically, and that was made clear to us through correspondence with the State Department.

Responding to my December 23, 1969 letter of inquiry about the moratorium resolution, John R. Stevenson, legal advisor to the Department of State, responded as follows in reference to this point:

"The Department does not anticipate any efforts to discourage U.S. nationals from continuing with their current exploration plans. In the event that U.S. nationals should desire to engage in commercial exploitation prior to the establishment of an internationally agreed regime, we would seek to assure that their activities are conducted in accordance with relevant principles of international law, including the freedom of the seas and that the integrity of their investment receives due protection in any subsequent international agreement."

(6) Senator, the President has urged that exploration and exploitation of the deep seabed go forward and has called on other nations to join the United States in an interim policy. Has the Administration submitted any legislation to implement this policy?