EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ILLINOIS VOLUNTEER TUTORS HELP CHILDREN LEARN TO READ

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that the citizens of Illinois are taking imaginative and important action to meet the reading crisis in this Nation.

They have begun a statewide volunteer tutor effort to assist our boys and girls to learn to read.

This Nation's reading problem is serious.

Teachers estimate that 43 percent of the children in America's primary schools need special help with reading problems.

Educators tell us that 8 million schoolchildren need reading help, and that 1 out of 20 is held back a grade each year, usually because of reading problems.

Mr. Speaker, America's teachers and schools cannot alone supply the time, talent, and funds to meet this problem.

But citizen volunteer tutors dedicated and well trained, working under supervision of the classroom teacher, can provide our children with the individual assistance needed.

This approach is now underway in my State of Illinois, sponsored by Dr. Michael Bakalis and his State department of education, with the cooperation of the National Reading Center, of Washington, D.C.

Two tutor-training workshops recently were held in Chicago and Springfield, involving 255 volunteer reading tutor-trainers and coordinators from throughout our State.

More than 70 Illinois public and parochial school districts were represented in these workshops. The National Reading Center provides the tutor training program at no cost to the volunteers.

Thus far, the workshops have been held in 20 States and 5 metropolitan areas. They are available to all States in the Nation.

The trained volunteers from these workshops have now returned to their home communities. They are teaching other volunteers how to tutor primary-grade children in reading when school begins this fall.

The future of American democracy depends upon the American people's capacity for mature and rational decision. The ability to read is essential to a strong and progressive nation.

Every man, woman, and child in the United States has a right to read. We must work to assure the reality of that right, and we must begin our work with our children.

As a member of the National Reading Council, the body dedicated to the elimination of illiteracy in this Nation during this decade of the 1970's, I am particularly proud of the lead that Illinois citizens are taking in this national volunteer effort.

I invite my colleagues to join me in commending the thousands of volunteers in Illinois and in the many other States participating in the National Reading Center tutor training program.

I express my thanks and appreciation to the volunteers at work in the 70 public and parochial school systems of my State. The following organizations are among the many supporting this endeavor to give reading help to the children of Illinois:

ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING TUTOR-TRAINING IN READING FOR ILLINOIS CHILDREN

Council of Community Services of Metropolitan Chicago, Chicago Housing Authority, Englewood Urban Progress Center, Lutheran Welfare Services of Illinois, Northwest Cook County Volunteer Services Bureau, Operation Word Power, Voluntary Action Center, Woodlawn Urban Progress Center, University of Illinois, Menard Branch of the AAUW, Moline Association for Children with Learning Disabilities, Governors' Commission on Voluntary Action, Illinois State Library, East St. Louis Project Outreach Libraries, Prairie City Parent Teacher Organization, Retired Teachers Association and Shamel Manor No. 2 Shelter Care Home.

SKYROCKETING METHADONE ADDICTION

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the tragic offshoots of our unsuccessful attempt to rehabilitate the estimated 560,000 heroin addicts in the United States is that we are presently relying on a drug as dangerous and addictive as heroin itself—methadone—to treat 85,000 of our addicts.

I am deeply troubled by methadone maintenance and by the thought that we are depending on one drug whose long-range effects on the human body are still unknown to treat those addicted to another drug. Unfortunately, until research efforts to develop nonaddictive heroin antagonists are completed and as long as certain panicking politicians call for heroin maintenance programs, we have little choice but to accept methadone as one modality for treating addiction.

Out of the growing use of methadone under medical supervision has sprung an increasing diversion of methadone into illegal channels. Certain unethical physicians and pharmacists are also growing rich from dispensing methadone with the knowledge that it is destined for the black market. As a result, methadone overdose deaths are skyrocketing and may soon overtake the heroin overdose death rate.

Jim Markham, a journalist who specializes in covering the problems of the drug epidemic, has written an excellent article on the methadone addict which I am pleased to share with my colleagues at this time.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 14, 1972]

A NEW PROBLEM: THE METHADONE ADDICT

(By James M. Markham)

In New York and other large metropolitan areas, methadone-maintenance programs are rapidly expanding and reaching out to help thousands of heroin addicts. But at the same time controversy hounds methadone because more people—frequently nonaddicts—are dying from overdoses of the drug, while an uncertain number of others are becoming primary methadone addicts, bypassing heroin.

As a result, a debate is building over the controls that should govern the dispensation of methadone. While physicians involved in methadone maintenance argue they are being hobbled by Federal regulations, those who would regulate them insist that the Jekyll-Hyde properties of the synthetic opiate dictate extreme caution.

"Pilot studies of the data indicate a steady rise in the number of primary methadone addicts over the past three years," observed Dr. Jerome H. Jaffe, head of the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention in Washington.

"The problem is small in terms of the heroin problem," he added, "but, in terms of trends, it indicates that substantial efforts are going to be needed to bring it under control."

Like others in the tangled field of addiction treatment, Dr. Jaffe notes that methadone, which is now dispensed to an estimated total of 85,000 addicts in some 450 programs across the country, has been an important rehabilitative tool, enabling many addicts to resume normal lives. But, as methadone programs continue to expand at a galloping pace, he sees a need for a balanced approach.

"We are aware of both the necessity for expanding and the need for further controls to prevent diversion," Dr. Jaffe said.

At the heart of the methadone debate is the issue of "diversion" of methadone from legitimate programs to the street, where addict-patients retail it to a varied clientele of genuine heroin addicts, poly-drug abusers and simple experimenters.

The following handful of recent developments highlights the nature of the diversion controversy:

Dr. Robert T. Dale, who operated one of the largest private methadone programs in New York, has, along with his wife, been declared a fugitive from justice. A warrant for his arrest was issued after agents of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs said they had discovered that Dr. Dale was unable to account for 55,000 40-milligram methadone wafers. One or two wafers could maintain an addict for a day. The legitimate price of a wafer is 4 cents; on the street one costs from $5 to $10.

Dr. Elio Maggio, a psychiatrist who ran a private methadone program in the Bronx, was indicted for selling sizable quantities of the drug to six undercover agents who reportedly told him they were not even heroin addicts. The psychiatrist, who allegedly passed methadone to his customers through a slit in the door of his office, grossed $3,000 during a monitored two-day period, according to the Bronx District Attorney's office.

In Hudson County, N.J., Dr. Sidney A. Nelson, a Union City physician, and Joseph Klausner, a pharmacist, were indicted for selling and filling prescriptions for methadone for more than 1,000 "patients."

In the first seven months of 1972, there have been at least 57 methadone overdose deaths in New York City, according to the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner. In all of 1971, there were about 20.

In Washington, methadone has been almost as lethal as heroin this year. In the first six months, 19 people have died from heroin overdoses, 17 from methadone overdoses and 13 from a combination of the two drugs, according to Dr. James Luke, the capital's Chief Medical Examiner. In 1971, eight persons died from methadone overdoses.

Confirming what appears to be a pattern in many methadone overdose deaths around the country, notably in New York, Dr. Luke said: "These are younger people, most of them are teen-agers. Many of them take the methadone orally, although some of them inject it."

"It's hard to say whether they're addicts or not," Dr. Luke continued. "What is an addict? But there's a paucity of track marks—they are not New York City addicts."

FOUND IN AUTOPSIES

Around the country, in addition to recording a growing number of methadone fatalities, medical examiners and coroners are finding methadone in the bodies of addicts and drug abusers—along with heroin, barbiturates and alcohol—indicating that the synthetic opiate has joined the pharmacopoeia of the street.

If a nonaddict takes methadone orally or by injection, it produces a heroin-like euphoria, lending methadone a high potential for abuse by kicks-seeking drug users. Only when methadone is administered in regular, oral doses to a stabilized, tolerant individual does it produce little or no euphoria.

In a study of 95 heroin addicts in Brooklyn's Bedford-Stuyvesant section, Dr. Carl D. Chambers reports that 87 said they had been offered an opportunity to buy illicit methadone in the previous six months and that 53 said they had in fact purchased street methadone, with the majority of them stating that the drug was always available in their neighborhoods.

The primary suppliers of street methadone, according to the interviewed addicts, were other addicts who had "take home" privileges from ambulatory maintenance programs. The addicts gave several reasons for buying methadone: to insure against withdrawal (41 per cent), to "boost" other drugs and enhance their euphoric effects (40 per cent), to "clean up" or detoxify themselves (17 per cent) and to resell to others (2 per cent).

PROBLEM OF BLACK MARKET

The methadone black market has become sufficiently widespread to cushion the effects of heroin shortages on the street, according to some narcotics law-enforcement officials. While the East Coast is currently facing a heroin shortage, addicts, particularly in New York, have not been flooding rehabilitation programs as they have in past "panic" periods.

And when the heroin market is tight, the value of methadone rises. Last month two men in stocking masks held up the methadone program at Francis Delafield Hospital in Washington Heights, getting away with 17,000 milligrams of the drug—worth more than $2,000 on the street.

In San Francisco, researchers associated with the Haight-Ashbury Free Medical Clinic reported that transplanted "New York junkies, with habits bred in a methadone boom town, are found to be more methadone oriented" than their West Coast counterparts.

The researchers also found that the flourishing black market for the synthetic opiate had spawned a new, pathetic species of addict—"the phony-heroin consumer"—who is sold methadone by street-wise California junkie-pushers who maintain they are retailing the real thing.

"The connection's motive is obvious—he can sell the inexpensive methadone, obtained usually more or less directly from local methadone clinics, in place of heroin which he would have to obtain from abroad through many price-multiplying middlemen," the Haight-Ashbury study found.

The methadone black market, it is argued, is a fairly benign phenomenon as long as its clientele is restricted to established heroin addicts. But, in addition to the methadone overdose deaths, there is other disquieting evidence of primary methadone addiction.

SITUATION IN DETROIT

Dr. George Wilson, special assistant to the Michigan Director of Mental Health, said that this spring methadone-maintenance programs in Detroit began seeing a new type of "addict"—with no track marks, no established history of addiction, no morphine in the body.

"What we found was that a huge proportion—more than two-thirds—did not have a clear history of heroin addiction," Dr. Wilson said. "Some of them appear to be methadone addicts, people who were buying street methadone."

Detroit, which is thought to have perhaps the highest addiction rate per capita in the nation, has a long, unhappy and continuing history of badly run methadone programs that have fueled a bulging black market for the drug.

"What's bothering me," said Dr. Wilson, "is that we may be on the verge of creating a new generation of methadone addicts."

NEW FEDERAL REGULATIONS

Equally bothered by that possibility, the Food and Drug Administration is honing a new set of regulations that will probably restrict the number of private methadone programs—by insisting on higher, more expensive standards—which some officials feel have been responsible for some of the most blatant instances of diversion.

The new regulations are also expected to restrict take-home privileges for new patients who have not established their "trustworthiness"—a proposal that irritates some methadone administrators, particularly in New York.

"The regulatory agencies are losing themselves in a morass of unenforceable rules," commented Dr. Vincent Dole of the Rockefeller University, who pioneered the use of methadone in addict rehabilitation. "The key thing is to control the ratio of patients and doctors—to make sure programs don't get too large."

NONFOOD ITEMS IN SUPERMARKET BASKET

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, we hear constant references from consumers about the increasing cost of their groceries and immediately someone has the idea that our food producers are making too much profit.

I have previously called attention to the fact that in general the food producer is still getting paid at the level of 20 years ago, while all the costs between the producers' gates and the supermarket cash register have been escalating.

I recently read an article by Dr. Don Parlberg of the U.S. Department of Agriculture that further pointed out that 28 cents of every grocery dollar is spent on nonfood items.

With your permission, and for the information of all of those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to insert this article on Dr. Parlberg's findings:

NONFOOD ITEMS IN SUPER MARKET BASKET

Have you ever sat down and figured what percent of your supermarket dollar is spent for nonfood items? Dr. Don Parlberg, director of economics for the USDA, has; and he determined that 28 cents out of every dollar is spent for nonfood items. The breakdown is as follows:

	Percent
Food items	72.3
Alcoholic beverages	5.0
Pet food	1.2
Tobacco	4.0
Health and beauty aids	3.6
Soap and laundry supplies	2.4
Paper products and foil	1.7
Housewares, etc	2.1
Magazines and books	.3
Miscellaneous	7.4

Let's not point our finger at food prices and ignore the rest of the items in the shopping basket.

FACT SHEET ON MENTAL ILLNESS IN CHILDREN

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, today, in my weekly insert on mental illness, I am including a fact sheet on mental illness in children. The mental health issue has been one that has been much discussed throughout the country. However, many people are not aware of what mental illness really is. Also, the events of recent weeks have shown that Americans continue to discriminate against their fellowman who has received some form of mental health treatment. A main element of this discrimination, like any discrimination, is ignorance. It is my intent today to help clear the air on some of the facts of mental illness in children.

Mentally ill children are those children whose progressive personality development is interfered with or arrested by a variety of factors so that they show an impairment in the capacity expected of them for their age. These impairments include a lack of a reasonably accurate perception of the world around the child, a lack of impulse control, unsatisfying and unsatisfactory relations with others, an incapacity for learning, or any combination of these.

Most Americans view mental illness as untreatable. Some do not even consider it a valid illness. In 1970 alone, over 150,000 children sought treatment at the community mental health centers, but only 10 percent received treatment. Estimates are as high as 10 million young Americans under the age of 25 who need some psychotherapeutic help. One out of every 10 young people or one out of every 10 Americans for that matter are afflicted with mental health problems that require specialized services.

Other factors involved in mental illness in children include:

First, boys outnumber girls 2 to 1 in

admissions to psychiatric hospitals and once they are hospitalized, they remain longer.

Second, most of the children in State and county mental hospitals are over 10 with more than half between the ages of 15 and 17.

These statistics do not say much, Mr. Speaker, until we realize that we are dealing with human lives. We are concerned with people, not pure numbers or percentages. I have introduced H.R. 16154, the Mental Health Act of 1972 and intend to reintroduce it tomorrow with more than 40 cosponsors. The services covered under that bill will help to relieve the mental health problems that plague young and old Americans regardless of cost. It is time, Mr. Speaker, that these people receive the proper treatment and without any stigma attached to their seeking help.

TEXAN POOLE TOPS BALLET

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Dallas is proud to see her sons achieve leadership in all fields. The most recent triumph was Dennis Poole. Dallas is a center of culture. This young Texan, Poole, won recognition as the best in ballet. He and his partner, Michelle Lees, danced their way to fame and first prize at the Sixth International Ballet Competition at Varna, Bulgaria, July 11 through 25. This competition, long viewed abroad as the "olympics" of the dance world, attracted competitors from 21 countries.

Mr. Poole and Miss Lees along with other members of Washington's National Ballet Company are to be commended not only for their marvelous performances on the dance floor, but for their noteworthy diplomatic gestures throughout the entire competition. With respect to this dual triumph for America, Miss Mary Day, director of the Academy of the Washington Ballet, commented:

> We were frankly surprised over the outcome . . . and terribly pleased. We went over there simply to show what we had to offer and are delighted that what we offered was so well received.

She added that the hosts, jurors, and dancers were marvelous to the Americans.

> We made a lot of new international friends, which was one of our objectives in the first place.

Texas-born, Mr. Poole started ballet lessons at age 8, going to New York at age 15 on a Ford Foundation scholarship to study at the American School of Ballet. He became a trainee with the Harkness Ballet, subsequently joining the Youth Dancers and the Harkness Ballet. He became a member of the National Ballet in the 1971–72 season and has danced leading roles in "Cinderella," "Sleeping Beauty," "Giselle," "Nutcracker," and "Swan Lake." Nationwide he has received high praise for his dancing at the barre in the prize-winning "Three Preludes." He is a principal dancer with the National Ballet for the 1972–73 season.

It is no wonder that at the age of 20 Dennis Poole has gained recognition by the national critics. Mr. Poole has become a "part of the young American promise." Texas and especially our Dallas community is proud to have our local son achieve rank as No. 1 in the world ballet.

THE TUNDRA TIMES—A TRIBUTE

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, there are many things about Alaska of which I am extremely proud, but few of which I am so proud as the Tundra Times. This small newspaper, devoted to the Natives of Alaska, is simply one of the best things about the State.

I have recently received an excellent history of the Tundra Times which I would like to share with my colleagues. I am fully aware that many items are put in the RECORD for such attention, but never really receive it. Let me just say that I think you will all find this one of the most interesting stories you have read.

The history follows:

A SURVIVAL STORY

(By Lael Morgan)

One of the most astonishing survival stories of the Far North is that of the *Tundra Times*. This fall the little Eskimo-Indian newspaper celebrates its 10th year of publication, flourishing in the financial wasteland of the Arctic on an erratic circulation that wavers between 1,500 and 5,000.

More remarkable is the influence exerted by this hardy weekly and its Eskimo editor, Howard Rock. Working with one reporter, or often just a part-time staffer, Rock has shaken high offices in Washington, D.C., with the force of seismic seizure and helped change the face of Alaska.

"Perhaps more than anyone else, he helped weld together the frontier state's 55,000 natives for their successful, years-long fight to win the largest aboriginal land-claims settlement in American history," notes Stanton H. Patty, veteran Alaskan observer for the *Seattle Times*.

"He was their voice, at times about the only calm voice when crescendos of invective threatened to tear Alaska apart."

If credit is given where credit is due, however, Rock would not be the original hero of this tale. That honor belongs to the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) to which Alaskans often assign the role of villain.

PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC POWER

In 1958 the AEC developed a plan to excavate a harbor with nuclear explosives in Alaska's northwest Arctic. The need for a deep water refuge on this storm-strafed coast had long been felt by the handful of seamen who ventured there and proponents of the blast believed it a good chance to test the peaceful uses of atomic power.

They failed, however, to take into account the 800 Eskimos who lived in the area of Cape Thompson, the chosen blast site. The isolated natives knew little about the work of the AEC, but they had heard of the Atomic Bomb and they began to worry that their game and perhaps their very existence might be threatened.

"There were attempts to lull us, the people of Noatak, Kivalina and Point Hope," recounts editor Rock who was born in Point Hope. "We were wheedled with rewards of acclaim from science and the peoples of the world if we would agree to go along with 'Project Chariot.'

"We, the people of the three villages, did not go for the enticements. We chose to remain in our home villages come what may. The love for our homes, however humble, and the deep sense heritage prevailed . . ."

To defend this heritage an unprecedented meeting of Eskimo leaders from 20 villages was held in the fall of 1961. It was called "Inupiat Paitot"—The People's Heritage.

Until this time there had been little communication between native communities and even less between natives and whites. Major Alaskan newspapers seldom carried news of Indians and Eskimos and showed little concern for the problems of native people.

As a result of Inupiat Paitot, it was decided the native people must have a voice of their own—a newspaper. To found it, Eskimo leaders chose Rock, then a well-known artist who was fluent in English but had no writing experience, and Tom Snapp, the only white journalist in the state who had been interested enough to cover the meeting.

Funding for the enterprise was to be investigated by the late LaVerne Madigan, then director of the Association on American Indian Affairs, who helped organize Inupiat Paitot.

At the outset the project seemed impossible. Either it failed to fit foundation specifications or philanthropists required elaborate proposals that would have cost several thousand dollars to prepare.

Finally, in desperation, Miss Madigan volunteered the names of her five richest board members and turned up a winner. Dr. Henry S. Forbes of Milton, Mass., headed the list. He was a retired physician, a descendant of Ralph Waldo Emerson and well ahead of time in concern for aboriginal rights.

Rock wrote him a formal, rather stilted letter and the answer—long in coming—was a question:

"What do you need a newspaper for and what are the issues?"

Rock left the reply to Snapp who had a ready answer. The reporter had been trying to cover native news for the *Fairbanks News Miner* but they'd limited him mainly to editing quaint little local-interest columns from the villages.

"It was frustrating. Personal columns! I wanted to cover the issues—education, hunting and fishing rights.

"I did a series on Project Chariot and they (the AEC) tried to stop it. I'd gone through all the Associated Press copy and found the AEC reports didn't match with what the scientists said. The scientists were upset. They'd found radiation in the food chain and the AEC had tried to cover this up. They were talking in terms of moving mountains and doing mining and they said it was no more dangerous than the luminous dial on a watch!"

After reading Snapp's 85 page reply, Forbes pledged to back the paper with $35,000 in its first year. His only requirement was that it start at once with Rock as editor and Snapp assisting.

AN UNLIKELY TEAM

It seemed an unlikely team and Snapp was a reluctant member. He'd come to Fairbanks in 1959 on vacation from the University of Missouri where he was about to start his second year's work on a Master's in journalism. He'd already been talked into postponing his schooling once, when the *News Miner* couldn't find a replacement for him, and he wasn't anxious to postpone again.

"His bags were packed and he was even

mailing boxes back to Missouri," Rock still recalls with a shudder. "I was just desperate and I begged him to stay."

Howard Rock had absolutely no grounding in journalism and he'd been long absent from his native state. Although raised in the traditional Eskimo fashion, he'd left Alaska at an early age to pursue a career in art. He studied under Max Siemes, a Belgian artist, worked his way through three years at the University of Washington and had become a successful painter and designer of jewelry in Seattle.

In 1961 he returned to Point Hope for a vacation and family reunion.

"After the excitement of the whaling season that was climaxed by the whaling celebration, I began to hear some of the problems and fears my folks were having," he recalls. "One subject that came up most often was the impending nuclear blast. They talked about radioactive fallout, contamination of food animals and probable genetic effects it might have. These subjects were altogether foreign to me. And my ignorance appalled me when the folks said more than once, 'You came at a most opportune time. It must be the answer to our prayers.' "

Rock set out to educate himself and found Tom Snapp a major source of information. The artist had suggested a native newspaper to his village council but it was Snapp (who turned out to be his roommate at Inupiat Paitot) who really made the idea jell.

Rock didn't know how or what to write and he didn't have the vaguest idea how to go about setting up a newspaper. In the end he got Snapp to unpack his suitcases and stay another year.

PARAKEET IN THE DISHWATER

"To start a paper is a tremendous job," observes Snapp who now publishes *All Alaska Weekly*, the liveliest general issue paper in the state. "Mine took five or six months but the Tundra Times had just two weeks."

Fortunately Snapp's sister had gone on vacation leaving him in charge of her trailer. The two men set up shop there, working round-the-clock three days straight, catching a night's sleep, then working three more straight days and nights.

"One problem was the parakeet," Snapp recalls with a smile. "I was supposed to take care of it and Howard just couldn't stand to see it caged up. He used to let it out and it was always flying headfirst into our dishwater.

"Of course we had to eat our meals right there . . . and the backshop kept complaining because we had peanut butter and jelly on our copy."

It was the midst of the political season and Snapp and Rock ran themselves thin collecting political ads.

"We stuck together just like that," Snapp brandishes crossed fingers. "That's what we did that whole year almost. That was the deal. He got a journalism education in that year he'd have had to go (to school) two or three years to get.

"We talked about what he knew. He was very proud of his Eskimo culture and he started telling me all these fantastic things like you go to the supermarket now and they have all these plastic bags they wrap everything in. Well, he said, 'We've had that for centuries.' What it was, was oogruk (giant seal) gut. They cleaned them out and made pokes out of them. And all that frozen food . . . They've been having frozen food like that for centuries.

"I started encouraging him and he started writing about all these things. He wrote for months about Arctic survival and his traditions and it ought to be reprinted. Some fantastic stuff.

"He had a natural bent for writing. It wouldn't have worked with just an ordinary person. He had an art background and an appreciation for humanity. He also had a rich heritage. He could appreciate both cultures and he believed you could mesh the two."

"INUPIAT OQAQTUT" WON'T GO OVER THE PHONE

One of the biggest hassles was finding a name for the publication. At first they picked "Inupiat Oqaqtut", Eskimo for "The People Speak."

"But what if we got a non-Eskimo for a secretary?" someone asked. "She would have the darndest time trying to put that over the phone."

Finally they settled on *Tundra Times* and flanked it with explanations in Alaska's four major native languages:

Unanguq Tunuktauq—The Aleuts Speak

Den Nena Henash—Our Land Speaks (Athabascan)

Ut kah neek—Informing and Reporting (Tlingit)

Inupiat Paitot—People's Heritage

The first issue hit the street Oct. 1, 1962, with the banner: Interior Secretary Udall Visits Alaska—Historic Rights and Claims Settlement is Number One Problem, Declares Official.

There was also an editorial explanation of *Tundra Times* intent.

"Long before today there has been a great need for a newspaper for the northern natives of Alaska. Since civilization has swept into their lives in tide-like earnestness, it has left the Eskimos, Indians and Aleuts in a bewildering state of indecision and insecurity between the seeming need for assimilation and, especially in Eskimo areas, the desire to retain some of the cultural and traditional way of life."

It promised unbiased presentation of native issues and added the paper would support no political party.

"With this humble beginning we hope, not for any distinction, but to serve with dedication the truthful presentations of native problems, issues and interests."

Snapp's former associates at the *News Miner* took one look and sent word they'd give the paper six weeks.

FILES IN THE ICE BOX

The Association on American Indian Affairs wasn't much more encouraged. When their representative arrived in Fairbanks to inspect the new Tundra Times headquarters, he found its staff struggling to settle a small office on the main street.

"We couldn't afford file cabinets or anything like that but the place came with an ice box and stove that didn't work," Snapp recalls. "We kept our papers in there and when the AAIA man wanted a tour of the plant that's about all we had to show him."

They also had more than the usual share of problems to report.

"Starting a native paper at this time was very rough because there was distrust against us," Rock explains. "It took a lot of nerve, really. We had things thrown through the door at night and I was threatened with beatings and things like that, but somehow we just kept right on going."

"We got all kinds of trouble along the way," Snapp adds. "One thing, the utility company asked for a much larger deposit because none of the incorporators had a credit reference. Once when I placed a long distance call that cost more than $100 the operator called back and told us we had to come down and pay the bill at once . . . in the middle of the night!

"Then there was the cost of printing. Outside I'd paid $3,000 for printing 32 times a year. Here, for 24 issues, they wanted $28,000.

"We were stepping on some awfully big toes."

The Atomic Energy Commission had called off plans for a major blast at Cape Thompson before the *Tundra Times* began publication but in April of 1963 it filed a new application for land withdrawal. The *Tundra Times* bannered the news and the project subsequently died.

The paper also reported findings of scientists on Russian atomic testing. Fallout had settled on the Alaskan tundra and been absorbed by caribou that grazed there. Eskimos who lived exclusively on this game were found to have a higher radiation count than any people in the United States. AEC began to monitor their exposure and the *Tundra Times* monitored the AEC.

Rock and Snapp also began actively pushing for settlement of native land claims.

"You see the federal Bureau of Land Management had never plotted native claims on their records so people would check and find no claims," Snapp explains. "All those claims the natives had been filing for years were with the Bureau of Indian Affairs down in Juneau or in the archives in Washington, D.C."

In 1962 five oil companies filed leases between the native villages of Nenana and Minto and private businessmen followed suit. The state got word of oil activity and started making tentative selection under the federal Statehood Act and no one paid any attention to native claims which had accumulated over the years.

"We didn't know who you could trust to get an attorney," Snapp shakes his head. "You couldn't tell who was your friend. We finally got Ted Stevens (now a U.S. Senator) who said we should file a protest. It would probably be dismissed locally but we could appeal."

The problem was that the natives had filed a number of conflicting claims on maps too crude for legal use, so Snapp and Rock bought huge, detailed maps and traveled to the villages to straighten out the contradictions.

"As soon as our first native suit was filed, there were two more, even bigger. That's when the first freeze came against the state," Snapp reports.

"Then Udall came to the *Tundra Times* banquet and announced the deep freeze," Rock adds with pride. "The natives had filed suits all over the state."

The paper also campaigned for abolition of "semi-servitude" for the people of the Pribilof Islands.

"In those days the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries controlled the Pribilofs. It was kind of a company store arrangement, where hunters were paid in kind for their seal skins. They had to barter with the government," Rock says.

"The *Tundra Times* did so well on that series the Bureau of Fisheries threatened to expose us as Communists," Snapp recalls.

Tundra Times reporting was so lively other newspapers in the state became interested in covering native news. Soon a number of white reporters were plugging away on the issues of subsistence hunting rights, education, equal opportunity and a decent standard of living for natives.

PRECARIOUS EXISTENCE

Tundra Times existence has remained precarious, however. Despite generous financing by Dr. Forbes (until his death in 1968) the overhead has remained high and circulation low.

Reading comes hard to many Alaskan natives and so does the $10 *Tundra Times* subscription fee, so often one copy of the paper services an entire village. The bulk of the subscribers are native leaders, government agencies, other newspapers and interested whites.

In 1966 the paper incorporated as the Eskimo, Indian, Aleut Publishing Co., Inc. (with a native controlled board) and many well-wishers began to purchase stock at $25 a share to keep the paper going. Rock has taken on additional fund raising ventures like the *Tundra Times* annual banquet and management of the Eskimo Olympics, and whenever the wolf is really at the door, something unusual turns up.

The current angel is Rural Alaska Community Action Program which purchases a page to publish its own news twice monthly. The Alaska Federation of Natives sometimes buys subscriptions for native villagers. So does the National Guard. And other organizations, both native and white, have provided loans or grants.

When Snapp resigned to go back to school, the little paper could not offer the kind of salary needed to attract a reporter of similar caliber but a good man turned up anyway. When he quit, another materialized out of the blue, and it's still happening.

During one bare budget siege, an east coast heiress volunteered to work for Rock free and turned out to be a remarkably good writer. She was followed by a top flight magazine editor from New York who worked for expenses one summer.

Currently the job is being held by a former interior decorator who writes like Faulkner, has a good feeling for the issues and lives on bread and water.

In addition, there is Tom Richards, Jr., a young Eskimo who was drafted following an outstanding apprenticeship with the paper. Rock, now 61, hopes Richards will eventually work into editorship and the young reporter is enthusiastic about the idea.

SETTLEMENT IS JUST THE BEGINNING

For Howard Rock, settlement of the land claims does not mean the end of a fight but a new charge. After meeting with other native leaders for announcement of the bill's passage, he wrote, "The (Congressional) vote was overwhelming, to be sure, for President Nixon to sign the measure. There was a 40 million acres of land award in the offing, and there was $962 million—a payment for lands lost. These are almost astronomical figures, but at the end of the voting, they were met with almost dead silence by the 600 native delegates . . .

"One would think that some measure of elation would be apparent. Instead something else happened. We do not know exactly what.

"The Alaskan native people have a profound sense of belonging to their lands, or a profound sense of ownership. The delegates must have sensed that as they voted, they were also voting to relinquish some 300 million acres of land forever—lands they and their ancestors were accustomed to using for their subsistence. Indeed this was what was happening and there were mixed feelings.

"We believe that the measure will be the closest to a substitute to the former way of living. It will not do away with subsistence living altogether. It can be a good basis for perpetuating charming cultures and traditions. It will provide food for the table. In order to make it do these good things, the provisions in it must be handled carefully, always with feelings that it is being done for the good of the present generation and for the the good of the native people in the future."

And that will take some watch-dogging. The 13 regional corporations set up to administer the bill will undoubtedly produce newspapers of their own but Alaska still needs—now more than ever—a strong, statewide native paper.

There should be more money to support one, too. In fact, under the management of Frank Murphy, the *Tundra Times* advertising revenues have increased considerably even though the claims settlement payment is still two years off. The paper has grown from eight to 12 and 16 pages since last summer.

Eventually Rock hopes to increase village coverage and circulation; add an easy-to-read supplement for those who speak English as a second language; develop a wire service for native news; build his own printing plant and go daily.

THE BIGGEST WHALE

Occasionally Editor Rock gets nostalgic, unearths his old sketch books and moodily thumbs through their yellowing pages. He has not picked up a paint brush since 1961, although the canvases he did at that time are now selling for $1,500 and $2,000.

He has no time for art now except for serving as a member of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board for the Department of Interior.

"I just think that expansion of the paper is more important than my painting," he says quietly. Then he smiles, recalling his beginnings and his family who have been famous Point Hope whaling captains for generations.

"My brother, Allan, used to tease me. He used to say 'You know Howard you're the only man in our family who never got a whale!'"

But perhaps Howard Rock has caught the biggest whale of all.

H.R. 13915—EQUAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY ACT

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a short statement on H.R. 13915, the so-called busing bill. I very much regret that I will not be in Washington tomorrow when the House considers and votes on this bill, due to a longstanding commitment I made to my family over a year ago.

Therefore, I would like to go on record today as opposing this bill. If I could be present and voting, I would vote "nay" on final passage and "nay" on the amendment which proposes to reopen court orders and school desegregation plans already in effect under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. I voted for and strongly supported this civil rights legislation, and indeed introduced the very first Voting Rights Act in the House of Representatives. This is not the time to turn our back on fundamental rights of all Americans.

Although I do not support long-distance busing which would cause harm to the education or health of young children, this so-called antibusing bill is a bill which in fact handcuffs the courts of our Nation—supposedly a coequal branch of our Government—and, indeed, does violence to the very Constitution of our land. I supported the Higher Education Act which passed earlier this year, and I worked hard on it in conference, including supporting the Scott-Mansfield amendment limiting busing to achieve racial balance. However, as the New York Times noted in comparing that legislation with the bill which is now before us, the higher education bill "specifically put the brake on busing to achieve racial balance, which is a dubious goal, as against busing to further integration, which is an essential one." To return to separate but equal now, in 1972, would be to turn back the American dream in which every child has a stake.

What is truly needed if we are to equalize and expand educational opportunities for all children is a much higher priority for education: an increase in Federal funds for local school districts is vital, along with quality day care programs, early childhood education programs, smaller classrooms, qualified guidance counselors, and other special services. This bill provides no new money to upgrade our educational system, even while we as a nation still continue to spend more of our resources on the building of highways than on elementary and secondary education.

This bill, in summary, does not address itself to the basic question of the quality of education in this country. Dealing with unconstitutional segregation is a task of the courts, but dealing with the quality of education is a task of the Congress. We must attack that task realistically and promptly, but we must not prohibit the courts from doing their duty.

COMMON CAUSE: PART II

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 15, 1972, on page 28348. I called to my colleagues attention the first of three parts of an article on Common Cause. I would like to bring to their attention part II of that article for their further consideration:

COMMON CAUSE: PART II

Until Gardner joined the Johnson Administration in 1965, he had led an almost cloistered life, broken only by a hitch behind a Marine Corps OSS desk during World War II. For several years before the war he had worked quite happily in what he later described as "fine girl colleges in sylvan glens"—Connecticut College for Women and Mount Holyoke College. Books were his favored entry to life. During his undergraduate days at Stanford University he dropped out with plans to become a fiction writer, but at the end of a year he decided he needed to understand people better in order to write about them. Others might think the best way to do this would be to travel or get the right kind of job or in some other way arrange to mix with people. Not Gardner; his solution was to return to Stanford's books and switch his major to psychology.

In 1946 he became an official and in 1955 the president of the Carnegie Corporation and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. This was the life of a theoretician devoted to guessing what esoteric teaching projects deserved how much moola. For backing such ventures as the new math and the Russian Research Center at Harvard, Gardner was hailed by *The New York Times* as "the most powerful behind-the-scenes figure in American education."

If the reputation was deserved, it was obtained at a bargain price. As with most foundations, the benevolence of the Carnegie Corporation was marked by stinginess; it was worth more than $330,000,000, but under Gardner it was giving away only $12,000,000 of its taxfree dollars, or less than four per-cent, a year.

A foundation officer's ideas of the immediate problems of education are not necessarily related to the outside world. There is no indication that Gardner was much interested in using the Carnegie power and prestige during the period when it was his to command—which spanned the era between the Supreme Court's *Brown* decision in 1954 and the first major civil rights legislation of the Johnson regime—to promote desegregated education.

In 1963, when 97.5 percent of the black children in the South still attended wholly segregated schools, Gardner spoke at the University of Georgia. Only two years before, two blacks had needed police protection to register there, and feelings were still inflammatory. Gardner urged the Georgia students to "keep your horizons wide," to develop your potentialities," to "risk failure"—all admirable advice, no doubt, but nowhere in the speech (as preserved in *Reader's Digest*) does one find him alluding even vaguely to the most critical problem then confronting the students: racism. "If you want to get back to the source of your own vitality," Gardner counseled the Georgians, "to be refreshed and renewed, cut through the false fronts of life and try to understand which are the things that you really believe in and can put your heart into." Like white supremacy?

One must sympathize with his terrible isolation during this period. Even as late as 1965 he could write as though he were making a great discovery that "young people find that the moral precepts their parents have to offer are no longer relevant in a rapidly changing world." Gosh.

For 19 years Gardner was in the foundation icebox and then one day he was miraculously rescued by President Johnson, who pulled him out and made him his Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. It was a time of enormous growth in the department, with L. B. J. grinding another social-welfare or education program through Congress every other day and depositing it on Gardner's doorstep for implementation, and at least Gardner carried out his duties with dignity under great stress.

But once again it was a period in his life unmarked by exceptional leadership in the delicate area of race relations, although, of course, his education agency was expected to exert a pivotal influence. As his stay at HEW neared its end, he admitted, "If we had taken literally the language of the Civil Rights Act, which instructs us not to give Federal money to anyone who discriminates, we would have cut off a far greater number of school districts than we actually did." At the time he made that declaration of obvious lawlessness, HEW was withholding Federal funds from only 34 districts of the literally thousands that were refusing to comply with the civil rights law.

Gardner was in his early 50s (he'll be 60 next October) before he even went into the street, which is pretty late to get started and may partly account for his subsequent erratic course.

Today, like so many of the men who happily served L.B.J., Gardner denounces the war as the worst blight on our existence. As a result of it, he says, "the erosion of the spirit that we have experienced is beyond calculation." No such remarks were heard from him during the great escalation. He knew the kind of Administration he was coming into; the build-up had already started in Southeast Asia when he joined HEW.

Johnson used Gardner as a show horse in his Vietnam snow job, trotting him out to indicate that the Administration didn't really want to destroy Vietnam but to bring it health, education and welfare—as Gardner's presence was supposed to symbolize when, in February 1966, L. B. J. hauled him out of a sickbed and took him along for the meeting in Honolulu with South Vietnam's leaders. Apparently Gardner enjoyed being used in this fashion. His response to the trip was a breathless "God, it was exciting!"

When he left HEW in March 1968, there were speculations among his many journalist fans that he did so out of opposition to the L. B. J. war. But Gardner publicly denied it and he did not condemn the war until Johnson had left Washington.

Today one of Gardner's favorite themes is the disastrous callousness and unresponsiveness of the Federal Government. He pounds away at this in every speech. But when he was an important part of that same Government, he never made any such complaint. Early in 1971 he told *The New Yorker*, "What was borne in on me during my years in Washington is that we aren't going to solve any of our problems with the existing machinery." Later the same year he told me that his time at HEW had persuaded him how decayed some of our political institutions are.

One finds no trace in the printed record of his having felt this way at that time. As recently as 1969 he wrote condescendingly of dissenters who believe in the "old and naive doctrine" that "corrupt and wicked institutions" have oppressed mankind.

The reason he has got by with this *ad hoc* hopping around without being caught is that he sticks to generalities—the vaguest sort of generalities—and avoids specific like poison.

Assuming that he is now really convinced the machinery of Government is decadent, surely he should be able to supply an example of the decadence from his two years and eight months at HEW—which, next to the Department of Defense, has the biggest budget and the biggest waste factor and the biggest employee mess in the Federal Government. I asked him for just one example, one specific example. His response was, "The unholy trinity among a bureau chief and a lobbyist and a member of the Appropriations Committee. There are hundreds of them all over town. Little threesomes. Fellows who have gone fishing together for years. Their wives have played bridge together. They are part of a permanent invisible Washington. Their names are not known. They rarely make the headlines. But they've seen Presidents come and go, they've seen Secretaries come and go, and they determine a great deal of what actually goes through Congress with respect to their field. This is roughly the kind of relationship you might have among, say, the head of vocational education in the Office of Education, the American Vocational Association and a member of the Senate or House Appropriations Committee."

That's a colorful and totally believable premise—sneaky little threesomes—but how about one concrete example of their destructiveness while he was at HEW?

"Gee," he said with an apologetic seizure in his throat, "I could have given you a lot of examples [once upon a time], but it's faded now."

Incredible? Not really. To Gardner, life has been an unanchored, unballasted, gaseous romanticism. Sometimes there has not been a single sandbag hanging from his balloon, and things down below in the solid world of specifics are just too small to make out. Excelsior. A Higher Calling. On his way up he admonishes us to have faith in "justice, liberty, equality of opportunity, the worth and dignity of the individual, brotherhood, individual responsibility," and then, as if sensing that maybe we had heard of those things somewhere before, he hurries on to concede that these have little meaning unless translated into "down-to-earth" programs. But when he is asked to point out exactly what he has in mind, he squints at the receding earth below and, waving vaguely, equates all those airy concepts with "a decent job for everyone who wants one."

Such is the typical view from a Gardner balloon: that the ultimate of the faith he had been preaching, the purest expression of human existence, the highest aim of all his exhortations against "sterile self-preoccupation," comes down finally to something that the Employment Act of 1946, if enforced, could provide.

But a man with that outlook is highly valued in some quarters. So in 1968, with Detroit and Newark still smoking and with the powers that be afraid that this time the blacks might really be out for theirs, the Urban Coalition was established and Gardner was put in charge of it. Concocted by big-city mayors, the standard labor leaders, the standard civil rights organizations and a representative covey of big businessmen, the Urban Coalition was supposed to have a tranquilizing effect. It was supposed to "establish a dialog," as they say.

Gardner's concept of how to proceed was captured in a speech he made in 1969 that went like this: "Our problems today—poverty, racial conflict, urban decay, archaic Government institutions, inadequate education, inflation, crime, air and water pollution, snarled transportation, and so on—are more complex and deep-seated than most Americans wish to recognize. But I want to talk about them not as problems *but as opportunities.*"

The italics are mine, but the rest is pure Gardner. Fortunately the ghetto blacks weren't paying any attention or they would probably have switched from gasoline to napalm. He was full of that sort of thing. The confrontation of the races, he said, "will be resolved only by patient, determined efforts on the part of the great, politically moderate majority of whites and blacks through programs of education, job training, health care and social services." God. After nearly three years in HEW did he still think a few rinky-dink programs could fix up a place like Bedford Stuyvesant? Did he really think that health care could offset a city full of the kind of apartment buildings in which the upstairs toilet leaks into the downstairs kitchen sink?

Today, when he's peddling a lobby to the middle class, his objective is to cut through apathy, and so he talks occasionally in a semi-quasi-revolutionary way about how the ballot will never get the job done, as the system now stands. "If you could increase by ten percent or even 15 percent the number of first-rate people in Congress, it would be spectacular," he says. But if you did, so what? For "there would still be the oil lobby, the Congressional-military-industrial complex." Good people, he suggests, are swallowed by the system; they disappear into its reeky conflict-of-interest bowels and are never seen again.

That's his line now, and it may be an accurate one. But if it's accurate for the middle-class whites, who aren't expected to react with more vigor than to reach into their wallets and produce $15 for a C.C. membership, why wasn't it also accurate for the rioting blacks of the late Sixties? Gardner didn't see it that way. In those days his line was that first among the "long-tested, well-established procedures of a free society," the chief means by which "citizens make their influence felt" was—the ballot. Put down that brick, darky.

The Urban Coalition of that era was a flop, but not necessarily because of any failure on Gardner's part. Perhaps the failure could be traced to the fact that by the time he left it, most whites were fed up with blackish organizations and blackish needs. Whether or not Gardner diagnosed his problem that way, it is clear that Common Cause was set up to appeal to another class, the white middle- and upper-middle and even wealthy class—the people whose daughters he had got along with so well as a professor, the people he had spent Carnegie Corporation money on, the people for whom he had held HEW to a program of gradualism. They were back in business together.

It was a brilliant step to take, a perfect marriage of talent and interests. The middle class was in despair. Yet it is also the center of whatever clout the people might have. No serious effort had ever before been made to organize it. And Gardner was just the man to launch the organization with respect.

No effort is made to disguise the predominant color. At Common Cause headquarters I was repeatedly told that if I really wanted to get a feel for the interplay between Gardner and his followers I should attend one of the "town-hall-type" meetings he has been holding around the country. A few weeks later there was a meeting in the Daughters of the American Revolution auditorium in Washington. On several notable occasions in the past the D. A. R. has refused to let Negro and antiwar artists perform in their hall. The ladies would have been pleased with the people who used their hall that evening. At first swing I could not see a single black face in the 2000 or so on hand; in a city whose population is 72 percent black, an all-white crowd of that size is rather unusual. Then I saw two black men in the first balcony, just at the edge of the stage. Obviously they wanted to hear everything. But as it turned out, their interest was not personal: They were reporters for *The Washington Post* and the Washington *Star*, ordered to listen.

The color and class on display that night constitute the strength of the citizen lobby, some of its leaders feel. C. C. president Conway says, "The thing about our members is they are where labor people aren't. The peculiar thing about our members is they are right smack in the middle of where the power in this country now resides—that's the suburbs, the areas surrounding the cities, in the small towns. Middle America." He said he had no idea how many blacks were among the membership, but conceded the obvious, that "until we're on issues that have a direct appeal to the blacks and browns and Indians and poor folks where they can see it, they're not going to join."

Unfortunately, Gardner's brilliant conception has not yet brilliantly achieved. Considering the lobby's immaturity, however, it has done OK. Perhaps its biggest problem was that during the first year and a half, it usually joined an issue too late to really make much difference (although Common Cause newsletters convey an entirely different estimate of its impact).

A TRIBUTE TO THE BALTIMORE AFRO-AMERICAN

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, the Baltimore Afro-American is a leading information and communication source for the black community of Baltimore, as are its counterparts in other national cities. At a time when many black citizens are realizing the need for more black involvement in media, both in terms of employment and programatical content, the Afro-American can take great pride in its outstanding service and inspiration to the community.

The paper was founded by John Murphy, Sr., on the philosophy of "faith in the common people" and the preservation of their liberties. For eight decades they have demonstrated their commitment to this goal, and in so doing, have gained widespread recognition and respect as a spokesman for the thoughts and aspirations of many black people.

On August 13, the Baltimore Afro-American celebrated its 80th birthday. I extend to the staff of that publication my most sincere congratulations and best wishes for the future.

VERMONT GOV. DEANE C. DAVIS

HON. RICHARD W. MALLARY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. MALLARY. Mr. Speaker, not too long ago many of the citizens of the State of Vermont of both political parties were saddened to hear that our Governor, Deane C. Davis, would not seek reelection. It was my privilege to know him well before his active political career and to be closely associated with him during his two terms as Governor.

I have known no person to excel him in his dedication or service to his fellow man in either his public or his private capacity.

To mention that Deane Davis, at age 30, served as Vermont's youngest superior judge in history, and that he currently serves, at 71, as the Nation's oldest Governor, is only to establish benchmarks in a long and distinguished career. To speak of his working his way through law school in a shoeshine parlor, of his overcoming physical handicap to become a great horseman, and of his personal efforts in rehabilitating the criminals he prosecuted, defended or passed judgment upon, is only to highlight the determination and compassion with which he lives.

As a member of the first Boy Scout troop in America, as a 33d degree Mason, as chairman of Vermont's Little Hoover Commission, and as an active lay Christian, Deane Davis personifies the highest qualities of civic and religious involvement. As a business executive, he envisioned the transformation of a local mutual life insurance firm into a progressive and profitable firm of national prominence and he carried his plans to fruition. As a man without a college education he set out in his youth to read for 1 hour every day on a variety of subjects in order to broaden his knowledge, and he pursued this form of self-education for 30 years. These events speak to the quality of the man.

Deane C. Davis has always lived in Vermont and has remained a faithful servant to its citizens. His continuous service, combined with his abilities and strength of character were sufficient to gain him the governorship of Vermont in 1968. It never occurred to him to sit back as a senior public servant to reap the rewards of political prominence. Instead, he set out to achieve an ambitious program of government reorganization, fiscal accountability, and environmental conservation. He pressed for and passed a reorganization program to transform an outmoded unmanageable administration into an efficient responsive system. He won a landslide victory in seeking a second term of office after introducing a sales tax by demonstrating that it is possible to provide quality services while remaining fiscally accountable. His comprehensive environmental legislation, which is facilitating environmental conservation without jeopardizing economic vitality or private rights, has become a model to the Nation.

In refusing to seek a third term as Governor of Vermont, Deane C. Davis has again opened the way for a new dialog with his fellow Vermonters as servant and friend. Whatever may be the form of that dialog, it will be to the benefit of his State and country, for, in the words of an honorary citation to Deane Davis from Middlebury College:

He blends tireless diligence with persuasive logic, warm humanity with professional skill, translating the liberal ideal of the whole man into the field of public action.

THE RATIONALE FOR EARLY INTERVENTION

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Bettye M. Caldwell, director of the Center for Early Development and Education in Little Rock, Ark., is one of the most articulate, enthusiastic, and energetic spokesmen for young children whom I have met during my years of work on child-development legislation.

Dr. Caldwell recently shared her vast knowledge, talents, and experiences with Idahoans at the Early Childhood Conference I sponsored in Boise, and it is with great pleasure that I insert portions of her remarks in the RECORD:

THE RATIONALE FOR EARLY INTERVENTION

(Dr. Bettye M. Caldwell)

Congressman Hansen, Dr. Zigler, and dedicated guests, I am really very delighted to be here with you today. I sat there and smiled when Congressman Hansen introduced me as, I don't remember what all the words were, but I heard the one "enthusiasm". I have decided that is a kind of euphemism that people use for me. Now they never say that Bettye Caldwell is right or that she is this or that, they always say that she is enthusiastic and that is the truth. I am very enthusiastic about what I do; very grateful for the opportunities that I have had to play some small role in helping to develop programs for young children.

Now, my assignment today puts me on the side of the endeavored and it is a little bit different from the assignment I usually get, which is mainly to tell about what we are doing or really what I have done in the past or what I am doing now in Little Rock, Arkansas. Rather I have been asked to talk about some of the background factors that have gone into the current ferment about early childhood.

There certainly can be no doubt that the importance of early development is an idea whose time has come. It seems to me that it came to us right smack in the middle of the 20th century and when it arrived it seemed so obvious and so apparent to everyone, at first so void of opponents, that we must wonder how and then why it took us so long to recognize or appreciate the fact.

We have had many reminders and exhortations from specialists in many fields—people in poetry, philosophy, medicine, psychology, education. But until fairly recently, no one really paid too much serious attention to the importance of the first five or six years of life. Perhaps this is not too surprising when we reflect on Aries' suggestion that the idea of childhood per se—childhood, not just being little adults—is of relatively recent origin and that it certainly did not go back beyond the 18th century. Thus, the idea of early childhood, not childhood but very early childhood, as being an important developmental period does not go beyond about the middle of the 19th century.

Now in this country, in the 1920's and 30's, early childhood had a brief fling in America. But after rather vitriolic attacks from the heavily scientific wing of the social sciences, the advocates licked their wounds and slipped away to dream up apologies for what they had been suggesting should be done. Programs continued, but those in the universities operated mainly to provide subjects for research studies for professors and students and to train teachers so that they could provide subjects for professors and students for the next generation.

Then suddenly in the mid-60's (and I think we can date it officially as February, 1965, the month when Head Start was officially born—that doesn't include its pre-natal period)—early childhood education was rediscovered and it certainly was not a chance discovery. Rather I feel it was not that it was so much re-discovered, it was simply that we could not ignore it or overlook it any longer. Reasons for the discovery appeared every time we picked up an idea or turned it over or examined its implications. What were the reasons, why did we become so heavily concentrated, so focused on the importance of early childhood?

The first class of reasons that I would identify I have called inferential, and the second I have called emperical and I am going to review these briefly with you now. First of all, let us look at some of the inferential rationale for our current interest in early childhood.

Maybe I should define my term just a little bit. I am referring to ideas that were generated in another context sometimes bearing no direct relation to early intervention with humans, but from which one can infer the importance of early experience. And the importance of early experience is basically what early childhood intervention is all about. All of the programs are predicated on the assumption that this is indeed an important period. Not a critical period, not a magic period as Dr. Zigler said, but one which we cannot afford to ignore.

The first category of inferential reasons that I would sight is one that many of you might object to. I know sometimes people do not like to think that we build programs for humans on studies that have been done with animals, but I dare say that none of us would feel very comfortable having been vaccinated against measles or against polio and other things if we had not previously tried out the vaccine with animals. Much of the same kind of background work has been done with animals in relation to the importance of early experience.

If you think back to general psychology text books, you will find a lot of these studies under chapters that are concerned with perhaps maturation vs. learning, an old dichotomy that we don't slip into anymore, or heredity vs. environment. A whole host of different kinds of behaviors were looked at and a whole host of different kinds of variations of early experience were tried, but the main principle to emerge from these studies is that the timing as well as the type of experience may well have profound effects on development.

I certainly won't try to offer a comprehensive review of such experiments (a number of these are available), but I do wish to recognize the contribution of this line of endeavor to our current concern with early intervention and enrichment.

The studies have measured a variety of behaviors; sensory, perceptual and motor functions; learning and problem solving; and conflict forms of social behavior. Different types of early intervention were tried, sometimes depriving, sometimes enriching, and so on. One of the chief generalizations that emerges out of this vast body of literature is that the timing of experience was indeed critical and from the standpoint of many of the infrahuman animals that were used in these studies, manipulation of experiences during the early infancy of the animals seemed to have the greatest effect. Now with non-human animals this may be due to the fact that most complex forms of behavior are mediated by intrinsic processes which when fully developed are relatively less sensitive to variations in experience. The data, however, also points to the importance of experience during the time that neutral patterns which form the substrata for all complex forms of behavior are being established. So, whether or not we like the idea, we must recognize our indebtedness to the animal studies that pointed to the importance of early experience.

Now for a second kind of inferential data about the importance of early experience. Here I would turn to inferential studies; I am using Anastasi's term there, comparative studies, if you will, of children reared in different environments. Most of our information that we have here relates to cognitive development. I wish I could cite with as much authority studies that relate to the effects of different kinds of environments upon social and emotional variables. I think that we simply have to apologize at the outset of this and then go right on and look at what information we have. It seems to me that one of the reasons that we concentrate so much on cognitive development is a very poor one. Namely, we do think that we can measure it more accurately than we can measure other variables and, therefore we go right on, say giving these tests, even though we may be less concerned with change in this area than in some other areas. I say that as a way of apologizing for the fact that when we look at human studies again, much of the evidence relates to the effects of variations of experience on some kind of cognitive measure.

How do we measure different kinds of environments? One of the greatest inadequacies in our vast armamentarium of psychological and educational measuring devices, is a sensitive technique for measuring the environment—very much like what Dr. Zigler said that in a way Head Start is insulting to the poor because it assumes that everybody who lives in an environment identified by some financial cut-off point is in an environment that is of itself depriving.

We simply know that is not true. We have relied on this kind of cut-off point simply because it gives us a reasonably accurate, actuarial statement about what might transpire within those families. I say reasonably accurate is the best we can come up with. Usually the designation that is employed is something called a measure of socio-economic status that hopefully combines social as well as economic variables and a sociologist who introduced these terms years ago made the bad mistake of using a vertical-sounding hierarchy when really it ought to be horizontal. They speak of upper class, middle class, lower class, and so on.

Now when you take information about a child being reared in an environment that on a host of educational, economic variables is considered middle class and then look at this development and let us multiply that by a thousand and then take a thousand children who are in different social class as measured by the same index, you can come up with a pretty accurate statement that by and large on almost all psycho-educational variables you might choose to measure you will find differences associated with socioeconomic status.

It doesn't matter whether it is an achievement test, an intelligence test, or certain kinds of personality measurement and so on. You will clearly find it if you are working with fourth graders or high school students or first graders. We have found it with Head Start children, you will find it to some extent with three-year-olds. But below that point in the age spectrum do you stop finding it, or do you ever stop finding it; that is, when, in the developmental cycle, do the differences that are associated with social class appear? This is actually an extremely important scientific and practical question for us.

Until Head Start came along one of the real tragedies in the whole psycho-educational world was that we knew so little not, let us say, children of professors or about the development of children who were doctors in town who attended university nursery school where they could be adequately studied. We never really had access to a population of children younger than six, because we only get in contact with large numbers of children when they get into public education.

So, we did learn from Head Start children the performance of the children on various measures of some kind of cognitive or intellectual functioning showed that they were below national norm, which is perhaps but another way of saying that if they would have had a control group from the middle class they would have been different. So, now dropping on down, first grade—yes, Head Start which was really five-year-olds at first. What about much younger children? What about babies, for example, because this is an extremely important question to ask yourself. What do we know about infant development as a function of social class?

The answer dealt with 30, 40, 50 children. But in 1965, Nancy Bailey—who worked with infants for 40 or 50 years—standardized a new version of an infant scale that she had developed on about 1,500 children. She looked at the performance of children on her scale as a function of race, sex, and social class. At every assessment point, up to 15 months of age, there were no significant differences of performance on the Bailey scale as a function of sex, birth order, parental education, geographic residence, or race. In other words, the infants from all of these different sub-groups performed in a varied and highly similar fashion as a function of their overall maturity. Black babies tended to score higher than whites on the motor scales up to about a year, but the differences were not statistically significant beyond that point.

Now Dr. Bailey has not given us any data from this standardization beyond that point although such data are currently being prepared. They are going to be extremely important because we know that by age five we've got differences; here at age 15 months, no differences. Somewhere in that in-between developmental period the development of children from the less privileged environments begins to diverge from that of children who are growing up in more privileged environments and we very much need to pinpoint exactly when it occurs.

A recent study by two people named Golden and Burns suggests that if one looks only at test scores this difference still has not declared itself by the age of two. However, if you regard the full constellation of test behaviors you can see possible marginal differences by age two. These people used the Katelle Infinite Intelligence Scale and also an experimental procedure designed to assess a child's development within the Piaget framework. They examined three separate groups of children who were 12, 18, and 24 months of age. On neither test were statistically significant differences observed at any of the three age periods. However, the authors reported that children from the lower socioeconomic groups were far more difficult to test and that they frequently required more than one session to complete the procedures. Had the examiners not made efforts to get a valid score for each child, significant differences in mean scores might have appeared. You might want to reflect here back on what Dr. Zigler said earlier about motivational and attitudinal differences which may appear that are perhaps more basic than some of the cognitive ones that we can so easily measure.

This says in effect that if one does want to develop preventive programs and if the environment really is one of the main explanations for what is happening here, it says that it is extremely important to begin some kind of intervention during this early period, regardless as to whether those effects are going to last forever. It is important because if you don't, by even age three you are going to have to be dealing with a remedial program.

It is my deeply-held conviction that the only opportunity to develop truly preventive programs lies in beginning such programs in this period of 18 months to three years. Certainly during that time seems to be the period when the environment really begins to show itself. The comparative studies of children in different environments—that is my second inferential rationale for early intervention.

The third one is what I have called major conceptual analysis of the role of experience in development. If you have been around for the last ten years and been interested in young children, you have probably heard about Piaget, and about Joseph McVicker Hunt, about Ben Bloom and also I would add Jerome Bruner to that list. These are people I feel have made an important contribution to our rationale for early development, not by virtue of emperical studies that they have done proving the importance of early experience, but rather because of an exhaustive and scholarly analysis of what other people have done, but often not integrated with things that other people in perhaps similar areas might have done.

A decade ago, Joe Hunt published his magnificent book called *Intelligence and Experience*. In this book he attempted to survey all that was known at that point in time about the influence of experience on intelligence. Hunt felt that for too many years the thinking in psychology had been dominated by a belief in fixed inheritance of intelligence even though data from a variety of sources should have challenged this belief. As he put it, "Evidence from various sources has been forcing a recognition of central processes in intelligence and of the crucial role of life experience in the development of these central processes".

In his book, Hunt presented evidence that would challenge the belief in fixed intelligence and pre-determined development, and offered instead a model of information processing, which stresses the importance of experience for the development for the central organization of information necessary to solve problems. He also reviewed for American audiences the work of Piaget.

Piaget had been around on the American scene—he is another one who has been rediscovered many times. He was discovered and outlawed by some earlier people who said his work was not very worthwhile and he does publish mainly in French—and most of us are language illiterate. But Hunt tried to review for the American reader the basic tenets of Piaget and highlighted particularly Piaget's emphasis on the way that experiences help program the development of cognitive functioning in the human infant. For Joe Hunt the implications were very clear. Society must pay ever greater attention to what takes place in the lives of very young children and must stop leaving things to chance during this period.

The second of these conceptual analyses that I mentioned was made by Benjamin Bloom and it started from a different frame of reference. No matter what point you start from, you cannot escape the inference that the early years are very important. Bloom surveyed all of the longitudinal studies that had been published at that time. This was done eight years ago, and in it he looked to see what the authors had come up with about the measurement of change and a variety of characteristics within the same individual. He was interested in only longitudinal studies in which the subject had matured, that is, had reached early adulthood or beyond.

Bloom's chief interest in this analysis lay in identifying periods during which the characteristics under study were going through relatively stable growth—physical growth, intelligence, achievement motivation and so on—and those periods in which they were unstable and showed rapid change. In considering all the data that he could find relating to repeated measures of physical and personality characteristics, intelligence and achievement test data, Bloom concluded that the introduction of the environment as a variable makes a major difference in our ability to predict the mature status of a human characteristic.

Surprisingly little attention has been given to measuring environmental characteristics. We have been content to take something like socio-economic status and say that because it is accurate in some cases we will assume that it is accurate in all. Yet we know—absolutely—that is is not the case. In any data that I have ever collected, and I have happened to have worked primarily with the low-income background families, the variability that we find in all of the characteristics that we have measured tends to be greater than the variability from the same characteristics from a middle class sample.

I happen to think that is extremely important point. It says that if you are making this judgment about what a child might be experiencing in a middle class home there is a slight chance that you will be a little more accurate if you guess that is going to be right at the mean or median than you will be if you are making that assumption on the basis of a less privileged home. The variability tends to be greater in the latter situation.

We desperately need sensitive measures in this field that deal with the specific environmental characteristic likely to influence the particular growth characteristic in which we are interested. In calling attention to the impact of the environment, Ben Bloom suggested further that it will have more impact on a characteristic at a time when that characteristic is undergoing relatively rapid change than it will at a point in time when relatively little change is likely.

A final step in this logic is the realization that since most characteristics are perhaps changing most rapidly during infancy and early childhood, one might expect the environment to have its greatest impact during the first years of life. This realization led Bloom to suggest in his famous term that has now become an avarism with us that in regard to intelligence measured at age 17, about 50 percent of the development takes place between conception and age 4. He feels that the statement has often been misinterpreted but again the implications of the analysis are very clear. If the environment can be assumed to have its greatest impact during roughly the first four years of life, then very careful attention to the development of growth-fostering environments during this period is absolutely essential.

Furthermore, his analysis suggests that as far as education is concerned, we may well have had emphasis placed at the wrong points in time. Whereas we have had elaborate mechanisms for providing education for older children in our society, guidance for the growth and development of the very young has been a casual venture indeed.

We have fallen back on statements but we really don't know all of the answers. Therefore we must be very careful. We don't know all of the answers about how to educate 16-year-olds, as countless 16-year-olds will be happy to attest, but we go right ahead and design educational procedures nonetheless. It is fair to summarize this section on inferential rationale by saying in the middle of the decade of the 60's, no thinking person could ignore the first few years of life. We were but one step away from a social mandate to give careful attention to the development of programs that would foster learning cognitive development.

THE ARMY CAREER OF STAN SMITH

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a rough chronology of the past year in which Specialist Stan Smith, allegedly of the U.S. Army, has received acclaim as an international tennis celebrity.

An official letter from the Office of the Secretary of the Army dated July 7 to me recounts Stan's year in a somewhat loftier tone. In part, the letter states:

From June 1971 to 30 October 1971, Specialist Smith was directed to participate in national and international tennis competition under the auspices of the U.S. Davis Cup Committee in preparation for Davis Cup play. Following this, he was attached along with several other soldier athletes to the U.S. Army Recruiting Command to serve as a sports clinician in a nationwide sports clinic program. His duties required him to travel throughout the United States addressing high school and community groups. On 15 March, 1972, he was once again ordered to the U.S. Davis Cup Team to represent the United States in international competition, now in progress.

I urge you to compare this official statement of July 7 with a recapitulation gathered from the daily sports pages of the New York Times that follows:

RECAPITULATION

DATE AND TOURNAMENT

June 1–4, 1971, in Paris for French Open Tennis Tournament.

June 8–12, in Beckenham, England, for Kent Grass Tennis Tournament.

June 16–19, in London for the London Grass Tennis Tournament. Wins singles prize of $690.

June 21–July 3, at 1971 Wimbledon takes second prize purse of $5,400.

July 6–9, in Baastad, Sweden for Swedish Open Tennis Tournament.

July 13–17, at Washington (D.C.) *Star* International Tennis Tournament.

August 4–8, in Cincinnati for the Western Tennis Tournament. Wins Singles. Share of $30,000 purse not disclosed in AP dispatch.

August 16, upset in first match of the Pennsylvania Lawn Tennis Championship at Haverford, Pa.

September 1–16, at Forest Hills, N.Y. for U.S. Open Championship. Wins singles prize of $15,000 and $5,000 expenses. Prize money goes to Davis Cup Fund in return for Army's permission to let him compete.

September 16, drops out of California Tennis Championship in Sacramento.

September 22–25, in Los Angeles for Pacific Southwest Open Tennis Tournament.

October 8–10, in Charlotte, N.C. for Davis Cup challenge round.

October 25, in Wembley, England for $48,000 Wembley Open Tennis Tournament. Loses opening match.

November 1–7, in Stockholm, Sweden for $45,000 Stockholm Open Tennis Tournament. Wins doubles, purse undetermined.

November 23–27, in Buenos Aires, Argentina for South American Open Tennis Tournament.

December 1, Reuter's dispatch from London says Smith won Pepsi Grand Prix of Tennis first prize of $25,000 based on point standing in 31 international tennis tournaments.

December 4–12, in Paris for $50,000 Pepsi Masters Grand Prix. Wins $9,000 second place prize.

February 11, in San Diego, Calif., for $40,000 International Open Tennis Tournament.

February 14–20, in Salisbury, Md. for National Indoor Open Tennis Championship. Wins singles prize of $9,000.

February 22–27, in New York City for Clean Air Tournament. Wins single prize of $4,500 and also takes doubles share of $500.

February 24, named co-winner of Martini & Rossi Gold Racquet Award for 1971. Donates one-half share of $7,500 award to California charity.

February 29–March 5, in Hampton, Va. for U.S. National Indoor Tennis Tournament. Wins $9,050 single's prize.

March 8–12, in Washington, D.C. for $25,000 International Tennis Tourney. Wins undisclosed singles prize.

March 19, in Kingston, Jamaica for Davis Cup Regional Match.

March 27–31, in San Juan, Puerto Rico for Caribe Hilton Tennis Tournament. Wins $3.500 prize.

April 11–16, in Spain for Madrid International Tennis Tournament.

April 18–22, in France for $30,000 Nice International Tennis Tournament.

April 25–26, in Rome for Italian Tennis Championship.

May 8–12, in Bournemouth, England for $39,000 British Hardcourt Tennis Championship.

June 6–18, in Mexico City with Davis Cup Team for North American zone final against Mexico.

June 20, in England for London Grass Court Championship.

July 9, 1972, wins singles prize for $13,000 at 1972 Wimbledon.

Really, Mr. Speaker, is this the Army?

U.S.S. "THORN" REUNION

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the clock will be turned back a quarter century next week as the former crewmembers of the U.S.S. *Thorn* reunite at the Philadelphia Naval Station aboard their mothballed destroyer. What is unique about the event is that it is the first time that a ship and its crew will be reunited. Furthermore, I am particularly proud that one of my constituents, Mr Kaj "Swede" Swenson, is chairman of the reunion committee and as his fellow crewmembers have assured me, it has been his initiative, drive, and persistence that has sparked the reunion.

The U.S.S. *Thorn*, or the "Mighty T" as it is fondly remembered was commissioned April 1, 1943, and served with distinction during World War II. After the war it was retired to the Philadelphia Reserve Basin. Because time and the elements have taken their toll, the *Thorn* is currently slated to be towed to sea and sunk during target practice. Thus, although many crewmembers have expressed a strong interest in preserving the ship, the annual cost of berthing and maintaining the retired destroyer would be about $10,000.

Thus, the event takes on added significance since there may never be another chance for crewmembers to go aboard. Consequently, Mr. Swenson and his committee have conducted an extensive search for the members of the *Thorn* family, and it is expected that 250 people will be present for the August 25–26 festivities. To increase interest in the upcoming event, the committee has been publishing the *Thorn* Flashback, which prints letters from crewman fondly recounting incidents from their life aboard the "Mighty T."

The Navy, too, has been cooperating with the reunion planners by providing facilities for the dinner dance by unsealing and sprucing up the *Thorn*, itself, and by making it possible for returning veterans to take small souvenirs from the ship.

As the time for the reunion draws near, I want to recognize the outstanding work that Mr. Swenson has done in organizing the affair and send my best wishes to him and the rest of the crew, while at the same time realizing that the greatest rewards are yet to be reaped when the returning sailors will be able to renew friendships and rekindle the memories of the time they spent aboard a proud vessel that served and fought with distinction in World War II.

TRIBUTE TO THE ORDER OF AHEPA ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. PAUL S. SARBANES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a great honor and a matter of deep personal pleasure for me to salute on the occasion of its 50th anniversary the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, known with respect throughout our Nation as the Order of Ahepa.

It is a matter of great pride because, as a Greek-American and as an Ahepan, I am deeply aware of the significant contributions which the Order of Ahepa has made to the progress and growth of America. The Order of Ahepa was founded 50 years ago in Atlanta, Ga., by eight farsighted, patriotic, and civic-minded Greek-Americans who realized that the time had arrived for the establishment of an organization which would reflect the finest in the Greek and American ideals of freedom, democracy, good citizenship, and devotion to family and church. Since that historic moment in Atlanta on July 26, 1922, AHEPA's progress and achievements have surpassed even the boldest dreams of its visionary founders.

AHEPA's programs and activities have spanned two continents helping to strengthen the historically close ties which have marked the relationship between the United States and Greece. In truth, Ahepans have succeeded in combining the best traditions of these two great nations whose histories have been marked by a dedication to human justice and freedom.

As proud sons and daughters of Hellas, Ahepans have generously and often at great sacrifice aided a troubled Greece, in time of natural disaster, national peril, or philanthropic need. At the same time the Order of Ahepa has been a leader in preparing Greek-Americans for full and constructive participation in virtually every sphere of American life, be it in business, politics, education, labor, or the arts. In addition, Ahepans have played a major role nationally and locally in the establishment and support of such important Greek-American institutions as the Greek Orthodox Church, various educational and philanthropic facilities and a host of other important community projects.

Most importantly, however, the AHEPA family, which includes the auxiliary organizations of the Daughters of Penelope, Maids of Athens, and Sons of Pericles, has inculcated in their members, their families and friends a keen sense of civic responsibility and patriotism, a love of family and church and a devotion to democratic practices and ideals, all reflected in a devotion to their fellow man and a dedication to a just society. AHEPA has indeed reflected the finest precepts of Hellenism, formulated by the brilliant philosophers and law-givers of ancient Greece, and carried forward by the democratic ideals and institutions of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that in my own State of Maryland there are nine active chapters of AHEPAN's and that in my own city of Baltimore, there are two active chapters, Worthington chapter No. 30 and the Lord Baltimore chapter No. 364. I should like to pay tribute to the members of these chapters by listing their officers and home cities. I know that my colleagues join me in wishing them and all other AHEPAN's continued good fortune in their efforts to carry on the finest traditions of our shared heritage.

MARYLAND AHEPA LEADERS

WORTHINGTON CHAPTER NO. 30, BALTIMORE

August A. Krometis, President.
Paul Cocoros, Vice President.
Michael N. Psaris, Secretary.
Nicholas Pistolas, Treasurer.

LORD BALTIMORE CHAPTER 364, BALTIMORE

Basilios A. Trintis, President.
Nick Gianakakis, Vice President.
John A. Demetriades, Secretary.
Basil Lambros, Treasurer.

OTHER LOCAL CHAPTER OFFICERS

Constantine J. Leanos, President, Annapolis.

Dimitrios G. Mandris, Secretary and Treasurer, Annapolis.

Richard Diamond, President, Cumberland.

Christ G. Charuhas, Secretary and Treasurer, Cumberland.

Constantine Nicholas, President, Silver Spring.

Alexander S. Lazarou, Vice President, Silver Spring.

Nicholas Stamos, Secretary, Silver Spring.

Mario Vouzikas, Treasurer, Silver Spring.

Stratis Skenderis, President, Rockville.

George D. Sirinakis, President, Hagerstown.

John Callas, Vice President, Hagerstown.

Peter Papandreu, Secretary, Hagerstown.

John T. Doukas, Treasurer, Hagerstown.

Charles J. Papuchis, President, Silver Spring.

Chris Fotos, Vice President, Silver Spring.

Stanley S. Xenakis, President, Silver Spring.

Andrew Manos, Vice President, Bethesda.

George D. Lampros, Secretary, Chevy Chase.

George Mellonas, Treasurer, Silver Spring.

CURRENT NATIONAL OFFICERS

Dr. G. Dimitrious Kousoulias, Ahepa Educational Foundation, Bethesda.

George J. Leber, National Executive Secretary, Silver Spring.

CURRENT DISTRICT LODGE OFFICERS

Socrates P. Koutsoutis, Treasurer, Laurel.

PAST NATIONAL OFFICERS

Andrew A. Papaminas, Past Supreme Lodge, Baltimore.

Louis P. Maniatis, Past Supreme Lodge, Bethesda.

J. William Holmes, Past Supreme Lodge, Silver Spring.

AID AND TRADE WITH THE ENEMY

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the most despicable practice I have encountered in my lifetime is that of successive Republican and Democrat administrations in carrying on aid and trade with the Communist nations which supply the weapons to kill our men in Vietnam. How any Member of this body, who supports such action, can go home and sleep with a clear conscience, is beyond my understanding. Many of them have sons, like mine, who some day will serve in our Armed Forces if they are not already doing so, and may well be a target for those weapons whose manufacture we make possible.

In Arlington Cemetery we keep a 24-hour watch over our honored dead, who made the supreme sacrifice to defend our country and freedom against its foes. Their loved ones mourn them still, and will never forget them. Many of these dead would be alive today if we had not done so much to build up and sustain the economy of the Soviet and satellite nations for the last half-century. But as long as the dollars roll in to fill the coffers of the "big money" men who in turn make many of the largest contributions to both Republican and Democrat presidential candidates, those who profit from aid and trade with the enemy could not care less about the cost in blood paid in places like Korea and Vietnam. Business and hypocrisy of the highest order must be carried on—as usual.

For 10 years, Antony C. Sutton, research fellow with the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, has been researching Soviet technology. He has so far written two volumes on "Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development." Today he is presenting a summary of his findings to the platform committee of the Republican National Convention in Miami, Fla. This is his shattering conclusion:

There is no such thing as Soviet technology. Almost all—perhaps 90 to 95 percent—came directly or indirectly from the United States and its allies. In effect the United States and the NATO countries have built the Soviet Union—its industrial and its military capabilities. This massive construction job has taken 50 years, since the Revolution in 1917. It has been carried out through trade and the sale of plants, equipment and technical assistance.

The evidence he presents in support of this conclusion is of the greatest importance to every American and especially to all who make policy here in Washington. It is imperative that every Member of this body read what he has to say—and act accordingly.

Mr. Sutton says that "this information has been blacked out by successive administrations." I intend to see that it is blacked out no longer. Simultaneously with placing it in the CONGRESSIONL RECORD today, I have released it to the Associated Press and United Press International and to major newspapers throughout the country. For once, let us submerge our differences and unite on an issue on which every man of conscience and honor in this country ought to be able to agree. These facts must not be suppressed or ignored because of concern about face-saving or a desire to pretend that unpleasant truths do not exist. Those who fail to print and publicize Mr. Sutton's evidence do so at the peril of the lifeblood of America.

Nor can it be hidden much longer in any case. This story will become too big to kill. You remember the old saying "murder will out." What Mr. Sutton reports is a very sophisticated kind of murder; the bodies involved are those of our own young men, crying out from their graves for justice. The truth about this murder through trade with the enemy is coming out, and it will be heard.

The article follows:

The information that I am going to present to you tonight is known to the Administration. The information is probably *not* known to the Senator from South Dakota or his advisers. And in this instance ignorance may be a blessing in disguise. I am not a politician. I am not going to tell you what you want to hear. My job is to give you facts. Whether you like or dislike what I say doesn't concern me. I am here because I believe—and Congressman Ashbrook believes—that the American public should have these facts.

I have spent ten years in research on Soviet technology. What it is—what it can do—and particularly where it came from. I have published 3 books and several articles summarizing the work. It was privately financed. But the results have been available to the Government. On the other hand, I have had major difficulties with United States Government censorship. I have 15 minutes to tell you about this work. In a few words: there is no such thing as Soviet technology.

Almost all—perhaps 90-95 percent—came directly or indirectly from the United States and its allies. In effect, the United States and the NATO countries have built the Soviet Union. Its industrial *and* its military capabilities. This massive construction job has taken 50 years. Since the Revolution in 1917. It has been carried out through trade and the sale of plants, equipment, and technical assistance. Listening to Administration spokesmen—or some newspaper pundits—you get the impression that trade with the Soviet Union is some new miracle cure for the world's problems. That's not quite accurate. The idea that trade with the Soviets might bring peace goes back to 1917. The earliest proposal is dated December 1917—just a few weeks after the start of the Bolshevik Revolution. It was implemented in 1920 while the Bolsheviks were still trying to consolidate their hold on Russia. The result was to guarantee that the Bolsheviks held power: they needed foreign supplies to survive. The history of our construction of the Soviet Union has been blacked out—much of the key information is still classified—along with the other mistakes of the Washington Bureaucracy. Why has the history been blacked out?

Because 50 years of dealings with the Soviets has been an economic success for the USSR and a political failure for the United States. It has not stopped war, it has not given us peace. The United States is spending $80 billion a year on defense against an enemy built by the United States and Western Europe. Even stronger, the United States apparently wants to make sure this enemy remains in the business of being an enemy. Now at this point I've probably lost some of you. What I have said is contrary to everything you've heard from the intellectual elite, the Administration, and the business world, and numerous well regarded Senators—just about everyone. Let me bring you back to earth.

First an authentic statement. Its authentic because it was part of a conversation between Stalin and W. Averell Harriman. Ambassador Harriman has been prominent in Soviet trade since the 1930's and is an outspoken supporter of yet more trade. This is what Ambassador Harriman reported back to the State Department at the end of World War II: "Stalin paid tribute to the assistance rendered by the United States to Soviet industry before and during the War. Stalin said about two-thirds of all the large industrial enterprises in the Soviet Union has been built with the United States help or technical assistance." (he in original*). I repeat: "two-thirds of all the large industrial enterprises in the Soviet Union had been built with the United States help or technical assistance." Two-thirds. Two out of three. Stalin could have said that the other one-third of large industrial enterprises were built by firms from Germany, France, Britain, Italy, and so on. Stalin could have said also that the tank plants, the aircraft plants, the explosive and ammunition plants originated in the United States. That was June 1944. The massive technical assistance continues right down to the present day.

Now the ability of the Soviet Union to create any kind of military machine, to ship missiles to Cuba, to supply arms to North Vietnam, to supply arms for use against Israel—all this depends on its domestic industry. In the Soviet Union about three-quarters of the military budget goes on purchases from Soviet factories. This expenditure in Soviet industry makes sense. No army has a machine that churns out tanks. Tanks are made from alloy steel, plastics, rubber, and so forth. The alloy steel, plastics, and rubber are made in Soviet factories to military specifications. Just like in the United States. Missiles are not produced on missile-making machines. Missiles are fabricated from aluminum alloys, stainless steel, electrical wiring, pumps, and so forth. The aluminum, steel, copper wire, and pumps are also made in Soviet factories. In other words, the Soviet military gets its parts and materials from Soviet industry. There is a Soviet military-industrial complex just as there is an American military industrial complex. This kind of reasoning makes sense to the man in the street. The farmer in Kansas knows what I mean. The salesman in California knows what I mean. The taxi driver in New York knows what I mean. But the policy makers in Washington do not accept this kind of common sense reasoning, and never have.

So let's take a look at the Soviet industry that provides the parts and the materials for Soviet armaments: the guns, tanks, aircraft. The Soviets have the largest iron and steel plant in the world. It was built by McKee Corporation. It is a copy of the United States steel plant in Gary, Indiana. All Soviet iron and steel technology comes from the United States and its allies. The Soviets use open hearths, American electric furnaces, American wide strip mills, Sendzimir mills, and so on—all developed in the West and shipped in a peaceful trade. The Soviets have the largest tube and pipe mill in Europe—1 million tons a year. The equipment is Fretz-Moon, Salem, Aetna Standard, Mannesman, etc. Those are not Russian names. All Soviet tube and pipe-making technology comes from the United States and its allies. If you know anyone in the space business, ask them how many miles of tubes and pipes go into a missile. The Soviets have the largest merchant marine in the world—about 6,000 ships. I have the specifications for each ship. About two-thirds were built outside the Soviet Union. About four-fifths of the engines for these ships were also built outside the Soviet Union.

There are no ship engines of Soviet design. Those built *inside* the USSR are built with foreign technical assistance. The Bryansk plant makes the largest marine diesels. In 1959 the Bryansk plant made a technical assistance agreement with Burmeister & Wain of Copenhagen, Denmark (a NATO ally), approved as peaceful trade by the State Department. The ships that carried Soviet missiles to Cuba ten years ago used these same Burmeister and Wain engines. The ships were in the POLTAVA class. Some have Danish engines made in Denmark and some have Danish engines made at Bryansk in the Soviet Union. About 100 Soviet ships are used on the Haiphong run to carry Soviet weapons and supplies for Hanoi's annual aggression. I was able to identify 84 of these ships. None of the main engines in these ships was designed and manufactured inside the USSR. All the larger and faster vessels on the Haiphong run were built outside the USSR. All shipbuilding technology in the USSR comes directly or indirectly from the United States or its NATO allies.

Let's take one industry in more detail: motor vehicles. All Soviet automobile, truck, and engine technology comes from the West: chiefly the United States. In my books I have listed each Soviet plant, its equipment, and who supplied the equipment. The Soviet military has over 300,000 trucks—all from these United States built plants. Up to 1960 the largest motor vehicle plant in the USSR was at Gorki. Gorki produces many of the trucks American pilots see on the Ho Chi Minh trail. Gorki produces the chassis for the GAZ–69 rocket launcher used against Israel. Gorki produces the Soviet jeep and half a dozen other military vehicles. And Gorki was built by the Ford Motor Company—as peaceful trade. In 1968 while Gorki was building vehicles to be used in Vietnam and Israel, further equipment for Gorki was ordered and shipped from the United States. Also in 1968 we had the so-called "FIAT deal"—to build a plant at Vologograd three times bigger than Gorki. Dean Rusk and Walt Rostow told Congress and the American public this was peaceful trade—the FIAT plant could not produce military vehicles. Don't let's kid ourselves. Any automobile manufacturing plant can produce military vehicles. I can show anyone who is interested the technical specification of a proven military vehicle (with cross-country capability), using the same capacity engine as the Russian FIAT plant produces. The term "FIAT deal" is misleading. FIAT in Italy doesn't make automobile manufacturing equipment—FIAT plants in Italy have United States equipment. FIAT *did* send 1,000 men to Russia for erection of the plant—but over half, perhaps well over half, of the equipment came from the United States. From Gleason, TRW of Cleveland, and New Britain Machine Co.

So in the middle of a war that has killed 46,000 Americans (so far) and countless Vietnamese with Soviet weapons and supplies, the Johnson Administration doubles Soviet auto output. And supplied false information to Congress and the American public. Finally, we get to 1972 under President Nixon.

The Soviets are receiving now—today, equipment and technology for the largest heavy truck plant in the world: known as the Kama plant. It will produce 100,000 heavy ten-ton trucks per year—that's more than ALL United States manufacturers put together. This will also be the largest plant in the world, *period*. It will occupy 36 square miles. Will the Kama truck plant have military potential? The Soviets themselves have answered this one. The Kama truck will be 50 percent more productive than the ZIL–130 truck. Well, that's nice, because the ZIL–130 truck is a standard Soviet army truck. It's used in Vietnam and the Middle East. Who built the ZIL plant? It was built by the Arthur J. Brandt Company of Detroit, Michigan. Who's building the Kama truck plant? That's classified "secret" by the Washington policy makers. I don't have to tell you why.

The Soviet T–54 tank is in Vietnam. It was in operation at Kontum, AnLoc, and Hue a few weeks ago. It is in use today in Vietnam. It has been used against Israel. According to the tank handbooks, the T–54 has a Christie type suspension. Christie was an American inventor. Where did the Soviets get a Christie suspension? Did they steal it? No, sir! They bought it. They bought it from the United States Wheel Track Laver Corporation. However, this Administration is apparently slightly more honest than the previous Administration. Last December I asked Assistant Secretary Kenneth Davis of Commerce Department (who is a mechanical engineer by training) whether the Kama trucks would have military capability. In fact, I quoted one of the Government's own interagency reports. Mr. Davis didn't bother to answer it but I did get a letter from the Department and it was right to the point. Yes! We know the Kama truck plant has military capability, we take this into account when we issue export licenses. I passed these letters onto the press and Congress. They were published. Unfortunately for my research project, I also had pending with Department of Defense an application for declassification of certain files about our military assistance to the Soviets. This application was then abruptly denied by DOD. Obviously, the Administration can't take too much heat in *this* kitchen. It will supply military technology to the Soviets but gets a little uptight about the public finding out. I can understand that.

Of course, it takes a great deal of self-confidence to admit you are sending factories to produce weapons and supplies to a country providing weapons and supplies to kill Americans, Israelis, and Vietnamese—in writing. In an election year, yet. Many people—as individuals—have protested our suicidal policies. What happens? Well, if you are in Congress—you probably get the strong arm put on you. The Congressman who inserted my research findings into the Congressional Record suddenly found himself with primary opposition. He won't be in Congress next year.

If you are in the academic world—you soon find it's OK to protest United States assistance to the South Vietnamese but never, never protest United States assistance to the Soviets. Forget about the Russian academics being persecuted—we mustn't say unkind things about the Soviets. If you press for an explanation, what do they tell you? First, you get the Fulbright line. This is peaceful trade. The Soviets are powerful. They have their own technology. It's a way to build friendship. It's a way to a new world order. This is demonstrably false. The Soviet tanks in AnLoc are not refugees from the Pasadena Rose Bowl Parade. The "Soviet" ships that carry arms to Haiphong are not peaceful. They have weapons on board, not flower children or Russian tourists. Second, if you don't buy that line you are told, "The Soviets are mellowing." This is equally false. The killing in Israel and Vietnam with Soviet weapons doesn't suggest mellowing, it suggests premeditated genocide. Today—now—the Soviets are readying more arms to go to Syria. For what purpose? To put in a museum? No one has ever presented evidence hard evidence, that trade leads to peace. Why not? Because there *is* no such evidence. It's an illusion. It is true that peace leads to trade. But that's not the same thing. You first need peace, then you trade. That does not mean if you trade you will get peace. But that's too logical for the Washington policy makers and it's not what the politicians and their backers want anyway. Trade with Germany doubled before World War II. Did it stop World War II? Trade with Japan increased before World War II. Did it stop World War II? What was in this German and Japanese trade? The same means for war that we are now supplying the Soviets. The Japanese Air Force after 1934 depended on United States technology. And much of the pushing for Soviet trade today comes from the same groups that were pushing for trade with Hitler and Tojo 35 years ago.

The Russian Communist Party is not mellowing. Concentration camps are still there. The mental hospitals take the overload. Persecution of the Baptists continues. Harassment of Jews continues, as it did under the Tsars. The only mellowing is when a Harriman and a Rockfeller get together with the bosses in the Kremlin. That's good for business but it's not much help if you are a G.I. at the other end of a Soviet rocket in Vietnam. I've learned something about our military assistance to the Soviets. It's just not enough to have the facts—these are ignored by the policy makers. It's just not enough to make a common sense case—the answers you get defy reason.

Only one institution has been clearsighted on this question. From the early 1920's to the present day only one institution has spoken out. That is the AFL–CIO. From Samuel Gompers in 1920 down to George Meany today, the major unions have consistently protested the trade policies that built the Soviet Union. Because union members in Russia lost their freedom and union members in the United States have died in Korea and Vietnam. The unions know—and apparently care. No one else cares. Not Washington. Not big business. Not the Republican Party. And 100,000 Americans have been killed in Korea and Vietnam—by our own technology.

The only response from Washington and the Nixon Administration is the effort to hush up the scandal. These are things not to be talked about. And the professional smokescreen about peaceful trade continues. The plain fact—if you want it—is that irresponsible policies have built us an enemy and maintain that enemy in the business of totalitarian rule and world conquest. And the tragedy is that intelligent people have bought the political double-talk about world peace, a new world order and mellowing Soviets. I suggest that the man in the street, the average taxpayer-voter thinks more or less as I do. You do not subsidize an enemy. And when this story gets out and about in the United States, it's going to translate into a shift of votes. I haven't met one man in the street so far (from New York to California) who goes along with a policy of subsidizing the killing of his fellow Americans. People are usually stunned and disgusted. It requires a peculiar kind of intellectual myopia to ship supplies and technology to the Soviets when they are instrumental in killing fellow citizens.

What about the argument that trade will lead to peace? Well, we've had United States-Soviet trade for 52 years. The 1st and 2nd Five-Year Plans were built by American companies. To continue a policy that is a total failure is to gamble with the lives of several million Americans and countless allies. You can't stoke up the Soviet military machine at one end and then complain that the other end came back and bit you. Unfortunately, the human price for our immoral policies is not paid by the policy makers in Washington. The human price is paid by the farmers, the students, and working and middle classes of America. The citizen who pays the piper is not calling the tune—he doesn't even know the name of the tune.

Let me summarize my conclusions: *One:* trade with the USSR was started over 50 years ago under President Woodrow Wilson with the declared intention of mellowing the Bolsheviks. The policy has been a total and costly failure. It has proven to be impractical—this is what I would expect from an immoral policy. *Two:* we have built ourselves an enemy. We keep that self-declared enemy in business. This information has been blacked out by successive Administrations. Misleading and untruthful statements have been made by the Executive Branch to Congress and the American people. *Three:* our policy of subsidizing self-declared enemies is neither rational nor moral. I have drawn attention to the intellectual myopia of the group that influences and draws up foreign policy. *Four:* the annual attacks in Vietnam and the war in the Middle East were made possible only by Russian armaments and our past assistance to the Soviets. *Five:* this world-wide Soviet activity is consistent with Communist theory. Mikhail Suslov, the party theoretician, recently stated that the current detente with the United States is temporary. The purpose of the detente, according to Suslov, is to give the Soviets sufficient strength for a renewed assault on the West. In other words, when you've finished building the Kama plant and the trucks come rolling off—watch out for another Vietnam. *Six:* internal Soviet repression continues: against Baptists, against Jews, against national groups, and against dissident academics (like myself). *Seven:* Soviet technical dependence is a powerful instrument for world peace if we want to use it.

So far, it's been used as an aid-to-dependent Soviets welfare program. With about as much success as the domestic welfare program. Why should they stop supplying Hanoi? The more they stoke up the war the more they get from the United States. One final thought.

Why has the war in Vietnam continued for four long years under this Administration? With 15,000 killed under the Nixon Administration? We can stop the Soviets and their friends in Hanoi any time we want to. Without using a single gun or anything more dangerous than a piece of paper or a telephone call. We have Soviet technical dependence as an instrument of world peace. The most humane weapon that can be conceived. We have always had that option. We have never used it.

VERY ACCURATE PREDICTION

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I periodically make it a point to go back and reread editorial commentaries to check if the comments or predictions carried in any specific editorial turn out to be reasonably accurate and appropriate. This morning, I rechecked an August 7, 1972, editorial in the San Diego Union which predicted that Mr. Ramsey Clark would be subject to a carefully staged tour of North Vietnam and, upon his return to the United States, he would claim expertise and trumpet his own views in every possible media outlet.

In inserting this editorial into the RECORD, I call the attention of the Members to the very accurate prediction of Mr. Clark's behavior pattern that it carried:

CERTAIN TRUMPET

The planned visit to North Vietnam by former Attorney General Ramsey Clark will follow a pattern as ingrained and predictable as the program of a computer.

Like Jane Fonda before him, Mr. Clark will be taken to carefully selected and staged damage areas at dikes that could have been accidentally damaged by bombing, and perhaps to a few civilian buildings also damaged by aerial warfare.

In due time he will return to the United States of America and take to the stump as the final expert on bombing damage in North Vietnam, and the futility of the war, reporting the exception as the fact. In doing so he will deliberately volunteer to be a public address system for the Communist North Vietnamese.

The objectives of the Communists are plain. They seek to bring the greatest possible political pressure to bear on the presidential election in the United States.

They also are preparing to convince the world that the flooding that will occur in the impeding monsoon season in North Vietnam—which also happens annually with intact dikes—is the fault of the United States. Finally, they are whipping up anti-American frenzy among their own people, who even now are tightening their belts because of the blockade of Haiphong, by blaming the rice shortage on destruction of rice fields.

At least one has to have a grudging admiration for the Communists for their tenacity.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE FRANK A. PLESCIA

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, Frank A. Plescia, the founder of the Lodi, N.J., Boys' Club and one of the great humanitarian figures of our area, passed away recently. Frank Plescia's life exemplified the biblical command to love thy neighbor and many formerly underprivileged youngsters are better off today as a result of his guidance and his concern. I join with the citizens of Lodi in mourning the death of this great man, and include at this point in the RECORD a tribute to Frank Plescia recently published in the Lodi Messenger.

The tribute follows:

THE UNFORGETTABLE FRANK A. PLESCIA

(By Lawrence C. Toscano)

In my humble opinion, I sincerely feel that upon the death of the late beloved, Frank A. Plescia, founder and father of our Boys' Club, no greater man has ever graced our proud community. This devoted, faithful and truly dedicated man has well earned the everlasting gratitude and remembrance of the entire Boys' Club family and the people of Lodi. In his passing, Mr. Plescia's many sacrifices, unselfishness and unfailing loyalty for the welfare of a boy has left innumerable reflections upon the hearts and minds of the youth and people in all walks of life.

In my long association with this distinguished and lovable man, I feel duly qualified to re-affirm Plescia's great patience, faith, zeal and enthusiasm in the great cause of our young boys! Perhaps unknown to many people, it was long before his interest in our Boys' Club, when he befriended 'Yours Truly' and my young friends in all of our sports activities in early 1900. I remember well his gifts of baseballs and gloves for our baseball team. After each game Plescia woud always lecture us on good sportsmanship and good behavior.

It was during these early years when Plescia organized the popular Royal A.C. baseball team. I was one of the mascots who chased all over Westervelt Place recovering foul balls. I recall some of the players, Steve Nebesni, Charles Cutitto, Anthony Greco, Martin Bua, Johnny Goulen, Frank J. Terranella, Tony (Raymond) Sproviero, John Micklas, John Lascari and Louis De Rosa. How well I remember the bitter rivalry between the Royals and the Eagles A.C. in their playoff series. I don't think they ever finished a nine inning game. Those were the days when baseball dominated all local sports.

HARDSHIPS IN THE GHETTOS

Frank Plescai didn't develop his interest in boys—he was born with kindness and compassion for all underprivileged youngsters. He was blessed with a warm nature and just consideration for all humanity. His special interests for the well-being of the young boys was utmost in his mind after he acquired great experience when he resided in a tough Ghetto district in New York City.

As a young man, Plescia lived in New York City's tough Tompkins Square district. He had witnessed the daily rival gang wars that brought havoc and fear in the neighborhood, the hate and prejudices among ethnic groups and the endless crimes committed in the streets. In order to escape the everpresence of violence and danger, he and his two young brothers found a peaceful sanctuary in the Tompkins Square Boys' Club. It was here where Plescia learned the need to assume leadership for a youth organization when he came to our borough.

I am taking the privilege to repeat some early accounts of Mr. Plescia written several years ago. It was in the winter of 1943 during a local Civil Defense Council meeting when he accepted to assume the responsibility to help organize a Youth Activity Council (YAC). This request was made by letter from the U.S. Civil Defense. With a genuine fatherly interest and great patience, Plescia set out to recruit members for his newly found organization. Without any available funds, he turned his home basement into a clubhouse to give aid and shelter to his many new young members.

With the loyal assistance of his lovely wife Frances, Frank embarked upon a one man crusade to help find a permanent home for our long neglected young boys. After each meeting the youngsters enjoyed hot dogs and ice cream served by Mrs. Plescia. It was several months later in May 1943, when Frank A. Plescia changed the name of the organization from the Youth Activity Council and planted the seed of our present Boys' Club of Lodi! At this point I wish to remind the Boys' Club family that lest they forget; Mrs. Frances Plescia is truly the Mother of the Boys' Club of Lodi!

How can we ever forget this lovable man as he rode down our main streets in his familiar station wagon, packed with smiling and happy youngsters! Within the years, it has become well-known that to the young boy, Frank's face always radiated with kindness and understanding and he was blessed with warm tenderness. There always existed a strong bond of affection and friendship between them. Yes, many of us well remember too that despite his many bitter disappointments, idle promises, financial setbacks and roadblocks, his unshakeable spirit, inexhaustible virtues, faith and strong determination to help a boy, won for him great acclaim and the admiration and gratitude of the people of Lodi.

BOYS' CLUB BUILDING

It was about fifteen years after Plescia founded the Boys' Club organization that his long dream had come to pass with the building of the first part of the Boys' Club building in 1957. Upon completion of the building, an elaborate dedication program was held with John J. Lattanzio, acting as master of ceremonies. On this happy occasion, Plescia was joined by many dignitaries, club directors, happy youngsters and the general public. A borowide parade preceded the ceremonies.

Governor Robert Meyner was the principal speaker and he lauded Mr. Plescia for his many years of self-sacrifices, epic labors and unselfish devotion to help realize a boys club building for the youth of the borough. Yes, on this memorable day, this obedient, illustrious, modest and humble, Frank A. Plescia was the recipient of deserved praise and glory from a grateful people in Lodi!

In 1961, in recognition for his outstanding contribution and services rendered to our Boys' Club, Plescia received national honors when he was presented the Silver Keystone Award from the Boys' Clubs of America at a dinner in his honor at the Boys' Club. Several years later, he received several outstanding awards from local organizations and was named Boys' Club Director Emeritus by the Board of Directors. A little boy had no greater friend than Frank A. Plescia.

Frank's work on earth is done . . . but we will always cherish his loving memory. His name will always grace the pages of our borough's history. His greatest credentials on earth was his love, friendship and deep concern for the "little boy." May the good Lord always rest his soul in peace and invoke his divine grace and blessings upon his wonderful wife and family.

AN INTERVIEW WITH CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN E. BURGER

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of U.S. News & World Report, August 21, 1972, contains an excellent interview with Chief Justice Warren E. Burger, wherein he sets forth his views on many of the problems which now beset the Federal judiciary. The Chief Justice also explores many of the remedies which have been proposed to correct these problems, including what may be done to insure a more prompt disposition of criminal cases.

When I introduced the Speedy Trial Act of 1971 last November, I stated my firm conviction that bringing criminal defendants to trial within 60 days of their arrest would represent a giant stride forward in the reduction of crime in the United States. In my judgment, speedier trials would serve as a certain deterrence to the commission of other crimes.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following excerpts from the interview with the Chief Justice in the RECORD:

SWAMPED: "EVERY LEVEL OF JUDICIARY"

Q. Over all, are the courts themselves trying to do too much? Or are they required to do too much?

A. They are certainly being called on to do more than their resources permit. This is true from the bottom of the pyramid, in the minor-offense State and local courts, right straight up to the Supreme Court. With few exceptions, every level of the judiciary has more work than it can properly handle.

Q. How much has the Supreme Court's load grown in recent years?

A. In 10 years the docketed cases have doubled. More than 10 years ago, Chief Justice [Earl] Warren urged the American Law Institute to conduct a study on federal jurisdiction, and I think he would agree that he had less incentive than we have now for seeking relief. One measure of federal-court business generally is the Supreme Court's work. In 1959, the Supreme Court had 2,178 cases docketed, and it disposed of 1,822. In 1969, when I came on board, the load had increased to 4,202 cases docketed, with 3,500 dispositions.

Q. Has the study asked for by the former Chief Justice ever been made?

A. Yes, but it took the American Law Institute more than eight years to complete the study, partly because the institute has no substantial permanent staff and must depend on the volunteer work of lawyers, judges and law professors. The study has been in Congress since 1969.

Q. What would you propose as a solution to this problem?

A. I would do away with these three-judge district courts completely. For any case in which a constitutional issue on a State or a Federal statute requires urgent decision, the Supreme Court may take the case directly and without review by a court of appeals. For example, a reapportionment case involving an impending election, in which time is crucial, can reach the Supreme Court for an immediate decision.

Q. Would constitutional questions, then, be initially decided by a single district judge?

A. Yes. But there is nothing unsual about that. District judges in the federal system frequently decide important federal constitutional questions sitting alone. They're perfectly capable of doing so.

Q. What are the powers of the Congress to change or limit jurisdiction of federal courts?

A. The Constitution enumerates the areas of federal judicial power subject to "such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make."

Q. Can Congress limit jurisdiction on a specific case?

A. It can do so on specific categories under the clause I just mentioned.

Q. Getting back to the glut of federal court cases, whatever happened to the Institute of Court Management that was set up in Denver some years ago?

A. It has prospered. It is functioning today.

Q. What does it do?

A. It has given 87 men and women an intensive, full-time training course for six months. Of these graduates, 94 per cent are now working in fields related to court management. An additional 48 are currently enrolled in the fourth 6-month program. About 150 others, such as clerks of courts, have received shorter-term training.

Q. Are most of its students lawyers?

A. The ratio of lawyers has dropped from almost one half to one third, as more non-lawyer court personnel have enrolled.

Q. Are judges willing to relinquish some of their administrative functions to these aides?

A. When judges become thoroughly familiar with the potential of court executives, they'll not only be willing but anxious to have the assistance that these people can give them.

Q. Do these graduates function more or less as efficiency experts in the courts?

A. No, not at all. They function primarily in a managerial capacity as an assistant or executive officer to the chief judge or the administering judge—State or federal—doing many things that now take him away from his judicial work.

Let me give an illustration of what has happened in the federal system:

At the same time that we proposed the creation of the Institute for Court Management, we proposed that Congress create a position of court executive for each of the 11 circuits and for every district court—that is, the trial court—having six or more judges. That would have been a total of 29 executives. Congress was somewhat skeptical and created the position of court executive only for each of the 11 circuits, excluding the district-court executives.

The bill created a blue-ribbon certification board. This board interviewed 129 people considered to be well-qualified out of some 700 applicants. The board certified 52, of whom 28 were not lawyers but had managerial skills from private industry, military service, or public administration.

Eight court executives have been appointed by U. S. courts of appeals. So here we have made a start. However, the metropolitan district courts also need executives.

Q. Can you tell about some other ideas you've been working on?

A. We now have an intensive two-week seminar for new judges at the Federal Judicial Center. Whenever we get 25 or 30 new federal judges onboard, we bring them into Washington for two weeks.

The assumption has been for several hundred years that every lawyer was automatically qualified to be a judge. If that was ever true, it is not so any longer. He is—one would hope—qualified to become a judge, but not every person appointed is immediately qualified to step right in and perform the function. I think it is now widely recognized that even very experienced lawyers need some special training to adapt prior legal experience and skills to the bench. The State courts have been far ahead of the federal system in this respect, with their voluntary association, the National College of Trial Judges at Reno, Nev., which was established eight or nine years ago.

Another example of the leadership of State courts is found in the matter of using court executives. This conception had already been tested in the States and had been used for years in States, notably New Jersey, New York and California. I might say, too, that most of the graduates of the Institute of Court Management have gone into the State systems. They have been snatched up immediately.

LEARNING FROM "BEST-RUN COURTS"

Q. What else can be done to eliminate or reduce delays that drag out trials interminably?

A. Starting from the premise that the function of the courts is to deliver the best quality of justice at the least cost and in the shortest time, we have been conducting studies to identify what are the significant characteristics of the best-run courts—where they get their cases tried promptly, their appeals reviewed promptly, and where the disposition rate is high. This has been done by federal judges themselves.

The effort is to try to get all the courts in the federal system to begin adopting these characteristics. One, for example, is the "individual calendar" system, so that, instead of having one great pool from which cases are parceled individually to judges as they finish the prior case, a court with 10 judges and 2,000 cases will assign 200 cases by name and number to each judge. These cases then become his responsibility, and everything relating to a case must go to him.

I can illustrate the significance of this by recalling that when I sat on the Court of Appeals [for the District of Columbia], it was a common thing to review a file two inches thick and find that 6 to 14 judges had signed various orders, and reading the transcript you would see that each judge had to familiarize himself with the case before he could act on motions unless they were simply postponements.

The individual calendar requires that all matters on a case be handled by a single judge. It focuses the responsibility on that one man. If he has the misfortune of getting an antitrust case which takes two months to try, sometime before the end of the year there has to be a reshuffling of his assignments, and some untried cases are given to other judges.

Another way to help speed trial and appellate procedures is a pooling of all the court reporters, making them available for courtroom work when they do not have transcripts to prepare for appeals, but relieving them from trials when it is necessary to do so in order not to delay appeals for want of the record. District judges have made great improvements in this respect.

Q. We have read of something called the "omnibus hearing." What is that?

A. That is also called the single-hearing procedure. A number of innovative district judges have evolved a procedure by which the judge, particularly in a criminal case, directs that all pretrial motions must be made by a fixed date, after which the court will entertain no additional motions except for some new, unexpected development.

Q. Such as newly discovered evidence?

A. Yes, that could be one development. Otherwise, however, all motions for disclosure of evidence, for suppression of evidence, are waived. This precludes delaying trial by a series of dilatory motions and hearings.

Q. How much can measures such as these speed up courtroom justice?

A. In one of the State courts in New York City, studies show they have cut the backlog 58 per cent by steps of the kinds I'm talking about here, plus some others.

PAROLE SITUATION: "DESPERATE"

Q. Are you as concerned as you have been in the past by the state of correctional institutions in this country?

A. Yes. As you may know, one of my first steps as Chief Justice was to urge the American Bar Association to create a Commission on Corrections to look at the whole operation of the prison systems of the country.

The association promptly created a Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services which is doing some very important work. For example, one project is developing a system of part-time auxiliary probation officers to assist the State and federal probation system. There is, as you know, a desperate shortage of probation and parole officers.

Q. You use the term "desperate." Can you enlarge on that?

A. We probably have no more than one third of what we need in the federal system, and this is very crucial in the whole spectrum of criminal justice. You have read time and again that men on probation and on parole are committing additional crimes. There have been situations where a man, by the time he came to trial, had three or four other indictments waiting for him—each of the charged crimes allegedly committed while he was on probation or on parole, and before parole was revoked.

Now, there is no guarantee that the presence of a parole officer would stop this, but the grim fact is that probation and parole officers are so overburdened that they aren't able to perform the function of counseling, helping these fellows get jobs, keeping them away from the negative environments that get them back into trouble. A probation officer with 150 parolees and probationers to supervise is really not supervising any of them—or only a few—effectively, and the whole function of parole and probation becomes undermined.

Many federal district judges have told me they are sending convicted offenders to institutions instead of placing them on probation because the judge has before him the figures of how many cases each probation officer in his district is charged with. That figure is so high the judge decides that there will not be any realistic supervision. I have no first-hand information about what goes on in the minds of parole-board members, as I do of what goes on in the minds of some federal judges, but I would not be surprised if parole boards are influenced by knowledge that parole supervision also is totally inadequate. It is entirely possible—even likely—that parole boards deny parole in marginal cases because of the lack of adequate supervision of parolees.

Q. Where it is adequate, do you have confidence in the parole system as a means of rehabilitating released criminals?

A. The truth is that we do not really know, but I do know that without supervision there is no chance of really restoring most of these people. With supervision and careful selection of people for probation and parole, there is some chance. What are the alternatives? Put every offender in jail, and throw the key away? We know this has been a total failure. We are beginning to see that the processes for deciding who is to be confined and who is to be on probation and parole are very faulty and inadequate.

BACK OF THE PRISON RIOTS

Q. We're now having a rash of prison riots and a lot of disorder in the penal system. Why?

A. Well, there are probably many causes, and I'm not professionally qualified to understand what they are, even though I have visited many penal institutions of various kinds in this country and in Europe for the last 17 years on a fairly regular basis, and I've kept in very close touch with experts in correction.

One of the major problems of unrest and disorder within the institutions is the failure to have constructive programs not only to keep the inmates occupied, as people are in normal working life, but to at least give them some hope that they are learning something they can market on the outside when they're released.

Q. Do you mean vocational training?

A. Yes—vocational training and educational training of every kind. That's missing in the vast majority of penal systems.

The second thing that brings on trouble is the environment of the prison itself. I know of one prison that was built in 1829 to house 700 or 800 prisoners, with cells that are approximately 5½ feet wide by 8 feet in depth. When I last visited it, it had 1,600 or 1,700 prisoners, two men in the cell built more than 150 years ago for one man—with one bunk on top of the other. This situation can't have anything but a destructive effect on people. When you bear in mind that most of the inmates are younger men—an enormous number of them are between 18 and 25—not to provide recreational facilities so they can burn off their excess energy is asking for trouble.

A third factor that I'm far less able to evaluate is that with television sets in all of these institutions, it is not surprising that a prison riot in one State or one city triggers a prison riot in another place within the reach of television. I don't suggest that TV sets be removed but that the conditions be changed—and swiftly.

Q. In a lot of these cases, inmates now demand the right to negotiate their grievances with the authorities. Does a felon have civil rights?

A. I would not be willing to say that a felon loses all rights, but I don't think that is the issue. For me, common sense dictates that whether we call it negotiating or "providing avenues for articulating grievances and complaints," that is what must come.

There is a parallel in the history of employer-employee relations. More than a hundred years ago in Europe, beginning largely in Germany, they developed grievance procedures within factories, so that before there was a blowup people had an opportunity to be heard. This is a keystone in all mass human relations. We all want to be heard.

I think correctional institutions should have an established grievance procedure. I wouldn't put that on the level of negotiating. I do not think society negotiates with prisoners in that sense, but society should provide a mechanism where the complaints, real or fancied, of prisoners can be heard. And in the process of being heard, most of the complaints will "wash out." If they don't, they should be closely examined by prison administrations.

Q. How important are prisons as a deterrent to crime?

A. It is possible that the idea of imprisonment as a punishment and significant deterrence to crime has been overrated. At least it has been placed in the wrong order in relation to the deterrent effect of the prospect of being caught in the first place, and being properly tried and convicted in the second stage.

When you look at the figures, it is a dismal statistical fact, widely accepted both by professional experts and in the criminal community, that there is probably only about 1 chance out of 5 that an offender will get caught in the first place. Some of the figures would indicate even less risk. Of those who are caught, there is in turn less than 1 chance in 5 that they will be convicted and punished. Even where that happens, the process is so drawn out that the deterrent impact of the conviction is dissipated or lost.

Q. Have the new and relaxed bail provisions affected this?

A. I think we must concede that releasing virtually all defendants pending trial and providing free counsel for everyone tends to keep trials from occurring promptly. This is why delay in criminal trials is so damaging. If we could see to it that every person arrested would be brought to trial within six weeks or 60 days, you would see a downturn in crime, if for no other reason than you'd have these people off the street that much sooner and the swiftness of society's response would itself have a deterrent impact.

Q. Haven't you recently suggested a federal authority to improve justice?

A. At the American Law Institute this year in the traditional welcoming speech from the Chief Justice, I urged that we take action on an idea long discussed in professional circles. The idea is that we create a National Institute of Justice to parallel in some respects the National Institutes of Health which, as you know, has a budget of 2.5 billion dollars a year. There has never been any comparable federal program for the system of justice in the country, State and federal.

Q. Don't Justice Department grants to States and communities for law enforcement carry out this function?

A. Yes, but in a very limited although an important way. The Justice Department's Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) has made grants to police departments for the training of policemen, for two-way radios and more automobiles, better training, and that sort of thing. It has also made some grants to State courts. But this is a very, very small step in relation to the problem.

The 50 States have no mechanism, except the recently created National Center for State Courts, to function in meeting what is a problem common to all of them. What they need is more resources—money and central facilities. The new center provides something comparable to the Council of State Governments and the Conference of Governors, but they need funds that the States seem unable to provide.

What we genuinely need is some central or national facility to deal with the needs of the judicial systems on a long-range and comprehensive basis, rather than piecemeal and short term.

EXPERIMENTAL EDUCATION AT HOLY CROSS

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past 18 months several outstanding students at Holy Cross College in Worcester, Mass., have spent a semester working as interns in my congressional offices.

My staff and I have benefited much from the conscientious efforts of these young men, and I am very pleased that another Holy Cross student will be with us this fall.

I insert at this point in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Holy Cross Quarterly for spring 1972, by the director of the Center of Experimental Studies at Holy Cross, Dr. Phyllis Keller. I congratulate Dr. Keller and her associates on this excellent program.

The article follows:

EXPERIMENTAL EDUCATION AT HOLY CROSS

(By Phyllis Keller)

The so-called "crisis of higher education in America" is fundamentally demographic. In the aftermath of World War II American colleges and universities were transformed by the ever broadening base of population that they were called upon to serve. In the first round of democratization, the issue was equality of opportunity to secure a college education. New groups in the population were invited to compete—against a rigid and inflexible set of standards—for the social, intellectual, and economic rewards that their talents might earn. From the one extreme of emphasis upon achievement, higher education has moved, in the last decade, to the other extreme of emphasis upon ascription: the issue is now whether a college degree is a constitutional right. In response to powerful pressures, the definitions and standards of academic work have inevitably yielded to the variety of interests and abilities that characterize a vastly expanded population of eligible youth. In 1971 about 45% of the appropriate age group attended institutions of higher learning; projections indicate that the number will reach 70% in 1980.

Two distinguished American scholars (Oscar and Mary Handlin, *Facing Life*, Atlantic-Little Brown, 1971) argue persuasively that American universities have always been the product of a bargain struck between scholars and society: for the scholars, freedom to pursue ideas for their own sake; for society, a set of institutions that will responsibly exercise authority over the intellectual and moral development of the young. Our current crisis is perhaps nothing less or more than an agonizing and uncertain struggle to find the right terms for a new bargain among a fresh and significantly altered set of negotiators.

There can be no mistaking the national problem before us: huge numbers of a heterogeneous population of young people—heterogeneous in values, attitudes and abilities—are going and will continue to go to college and no degree of resolution will make the older academic structures serve them all. The "new movement" in education, like its experimental forebears dating back to the nineteenth century, articulates an urgent social demand that the forms and content of higher education demonstrate utility (i.e., relevance) for the lives of an extraordinarily diverse group of young people.

Catholic schools such as Holy Cross are doubly buffeted by the winds of change, for they must meet the challenge of heterogeneity both in their religious and their academic aspects. In the early 1960's, Holy Cross maintained a relatively inflexible curriculum rooted in the traditions of Jesuit education. Priests presided in dormitory corridors as counsellors and as enforcers of a set of moral standards which the community (however much it may have chafed) endorsed in the deepest recesses of its conscience. In the classroom, men of learning and wisdom taught young American Catholics to appreciate the richness of their cultural heritage. Now, a decade later, the college would be unrecognizable to the men who lived here a short time ago. The youths in the dormitories govern themselves—often badly. In the classrooms students and faculty struggle to find a common language with which to address the task of appreciation and understanding.

Within the last two or three years Holy Cross has moved dramatically—not to abandon or diverge from its essential values and perspectives—but to modify and adapt its heritage to new conditions. Symbolic of these adaptations is the Office of Special Studies which combines a traditional Honors Program (representing commitment to the older academic models of education for the gifted) with the new Center for Experimental Studies, now in its first year and committed to finding alternative models and flexible procedures that will encourage the intellectual growth of all students. Established in the spring of 1971 and funded in part by a gift from that year's senior class, the Center is Holy Cross' newest program and one that provides a good perspective of the problems and possibilities of the college's present situation.

The Center for Experimental Studies has four dimensions. First, it provides opportunities for students to study for a semester or a year at selected institutions in Canada and the United States where some special educational advantage or cultural enrichment can be gained. Exchange arrangements with a small number of schools may permit a Holy Cross student to study in Montreal, Toronto, Vancouver, Los Angeles, Chicago or New York, while a student from a sister institution in one of those cities may come to Holy Cross to take his place.

Second, the Center is authorized to plan and to implement individually designed programs of study, primarily for students with cross-disciplinary interests. Currently, a dozen students have developed "majors" in urban affairs, American studies, theater arts and dramatic literature, and educational psychology.

The third charge of the Center is the development of innovative or experimental courses. Primarily seminar-discussion groups, these "courses" are open to upperclassmen and limited in enrollment to approximately fifteen students. In the fall of 1971, the Center offered a course, "War and the Christian Conscience," which featured weekly visits by outside lecturers skilled in the history, theology or politics of peace-making from a distinctively Christian perspective. Each speaker addressed an open public meeting and later met privately with students registered in the course. Six faculty members from different departments volunteered to organize a second seminar to examine the ecology crisis from the perspective of various disciplines. A third offering brought a member of the Modern Language Department together with a member of the English department to discuss the novel in eighteenth century France and England. In the spring term, a seminar on legal reasoning taught by a Professor from the Harvard Law School and designed primarily for students planning careers in fields other than the law, attracted a huge number of applicants; a seminar on "The Urban Dilemma," directed by the Dean of Holy Cross, Rev. Joseph Fahey, S.J., invites faculty specialists to work together with advanced students in a problem-centered format.

The fourth, and at the moment the largest, division of the Center for Experimental Studies is that dealing with fieldwork programs. Free of prescribed form or content and providing opportunities for off-campus involvement, the work-study program represents our most broad-gauged innovation. From the outset, it occupied the front stage of the Center because of overwhelming student interest and the great challenge it posed to administrative and faculty resources. Over fifty placements were made during the first term in field agencies dealing with local and regional planning for health, education and economic development; the care of retarded and disturbed children; delinquent youth rehabilitation; national, state and local government; scientific research; civic cultural enrichment.

Work-study projects begin with individual students' interest in field research or work in a particular type of agency. The time allotted to each project varies from the equivalent of one to the equivalent of four courses. Students may initiate their own agency affiliation or select from a substantial list provided by the Center staff. Once the student has chosen his project, he is asked to confer with a faculty sponsor to plan the academic framework of his field experience. The "contract" arrived at by faculty sponsor and student provides for coordinated readings, regular discussion meetings, and the critical evaluation of research papers or other written reports.

Certain obvious benefits of this combination of independent work experience and guided study have clearly emerged from the first semester. The plan is founded upon student interests and in most cases the motivation to succeed at self-chosen tasks has been high. One junior, interested in the problems of community health care, was assigned to work with a Boston physician who was also a Holy Cross alumnus. Under this aegis, the student attended a special seminar for Harvard medical students. His project culminated in an extensive and thoughtful research paper analyzing and evaluating the operations of a health care unit newly placed in a low income community in Boston.

Another student worked as a junior economist for the Boston Economic Development and Industrial Commission. There he undertook a variety of tasks including a study of the feasibility of constructing an urban industrial park on a certain site in Boston, the prospects of generating new jobs for underprivileged workers through granting various tax credits to local enterprises, and other matters pertaining to the industrial development of South Boston. His apprenticeship ended with a full-time job offer—which he turned down in order to go to law school.

A senior planning to make his career in religious education worked with children and parents at Our Lady of the Rosary in Worcester, coordinating the parish's CCD program. Several students, working in congressional offices in Washington or Massachusetts, wrote speeches, articles, position papers; acted as detail men and reporters for their employers; touched and tasted the heady working world of government and politics.

At the end of the term, a number of students reported with satisfaction that "these projects eliminate learning that takes place from the 'neck up' and place much emphasis on involving the whole person." No one who has worked closely with students at the Center will claim that fieldwork always effects a greater acquisition of knowledge than more traditional academic structures. But it *does* for some students, and for all students there are the fringe benefits of an opportunity to explore a greater variety of personal assets, to expand the range of professional role models, to develop special skills and realistic self-images. Still, the great educational rewards of a fieldwork approach come when a student is so captivated by casework or other concrete tasks that academic mastery assumes a new urgency and utility.

The benefits of this program do not accrue to students exclusively. Here, as well as through the interdisciplinary course offerings, faculty members can develop their own interests and direct field research that the demands of full-time teaching does not allow them to do directly. Agency supervisors have been virtually unanimous in applauding the program; many public and private agencies are minimally staffed and wholly caught up in dealing with their everyday concerns. Students bring a valuable outside perspective of the operations of their offices and provide the manpower to follow up on actions and decisions that otherwise might never be evaluated. Public agency personnel, in particular, welcome the opportunity to expose students to the complexities of the working world; to demonstrate the insufficiency of good intentions in dealing with the intractable problems of social organization and the inherent ambiguities of human behavior.

Of course, not all of the students nor all of the projects succeeded. Some students, assigned relatively routine tasks, completed them mechanically and waited to be told what to do next. One or two were charged with solving problems that were over their heads—ironically, these were students who performed very well in the classroom. As with every new program, there were "first try" administrative mistakes in the selection of students and agencies; but these were, fortunately, minimal. There were some serious misconceptions about the significance of the academic component of projects; these have been corrected after a mid-semester period of evaluation, discussion and planning for revisions. Student participation in projects for the second term has increased by 30%, faculty by 17% and agency by 40%.

Where do we go from here? The various programs of the Center have excited considerable interest and enthusiasm on the campus and in the community. Surely more than novelty is responsible, but we cannot tell how much more until we have played out the possibilities of this flexible instrument and evaluated the results over a two year period. What has been demonstrated, at the very least, is that the college can find new ways to stimulate and respond to the interests of a new generation of young people, and to the changing needs of society, by drawing upon its special resources and adapting its unique traditions with care, with caution and with conviction.

In addition to making constant revision of procedures in the light of experience, the staff of the Center for Experimental Studies regularly conducts its own internal planning seminars, in consultation with interested faculty members and students. One new plan is to organize workshop seminars for those students working in seminars for those students working in similar areas. Those employed by various health and education planning agencies may benefit from learning about the operations of offices other than their own. We are beginning to send substantial numbers of students to work in community organizations and want to reinforce this potentially fruitful association by bringing professional agency personnel and community leaders onto the campus.

The possibilities of flexible curriculum planning are almost limitless. There is no reason derived from sacred scripture, for example, why a student must be involved in four separate courses each semester: perhaps he should be involved in two courses, twice as difficult. It is hoped that occasionally an experimental course may prove sufficiently valuable to be subsequently included among the regular departmental offerings. Perhaps some of them may serve as a breeding ground for new programs within departments as participant faculty carry back new interests arising from interdisciplinary exchanges. Some venturesome students (with faculty counsel) have already succeeded in developing model plans of study in fields such as Urban Affairs which might be followed by others. This particular program requires no large injection of new energies or funds, but builds upon existing resources in an imaginative way.

Several of the programs developed by the Center offer opportunities for participation to Holy Cross alumni. Many alumni could provide interesting work opportunities to undergraduates while tapping themselves some of the idealism, energy, intelligence and extraordinary abilities of the younger generation. Sometime in the future we should like to make provision for a few alumni, on leave of absence from their jobs, to come back to Holy Cross and work here with us, studying with our faculty, helping to supervise students in work-study projects, joining in seminars that may benefit from their professional expertise.

It is often a matter of complaint for older men who return to their college that things have changed and they neither understand nor admire the direction of the change. The Center for Experimental Studies is a potential link between the past generations and the present for it offers all parties a special opportunity to take the initiative in joining together in the common and serious enterprises of work and study.

THE LATE SENATOR RALPH TYLER SMITH

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1972

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the recent passing of my longtime friend and former U.S. Senator, Ralph Tyler Smith, recalls to the minds of many of us the distinguished public service rendered by this son of Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve with our former colleague, Senator Smith, in the Illinois House of Representatives during the entire period from 1954 until 1962 when I was first elected to this body.

As majority leader of the Illinois House of Representatives and as speaker of the Illinois House during the 4 years prior to his appointment to the U.S. Senate, Ralph Smith demonstrated his special talents of responsible public leadership. Following the death of Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, our Illinois Governor, Richard Ogilvie, named Ralph Smith to the U.S. Senate where he served from September 1969 until January 1971. Although losing his bid for election, Senator Smith demonstrated that he was a tireless campaigner and an articulate spokesman on the great public issues facing the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Senator Smith, I feel the loss of a longtime friend and colleague—and one who gave a full measure of his time, energy, and uncommon talents in behalf of the State of Illinois and of the Nation.

In noting with a sense of personal sorrow his sudden passing, I wish also to convey to his widow, Mary Elizabeth, and his daughter, Sharon Lynne, my respect and deep sympathy.

NEW PROGRAM ANNOUNCED: THE ASME CONGRESSIONAL FELLOW

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the opening of the Washington, D.C., offices of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers and the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers. This is the beginning of a major communications link between the technical community and the Congress. Mr. Bill Miller of the ASME and Mr. Ralph Clark of the IEEE have assured me that they will cooperate with Congress in obtaining information, reports, and technical witnesses on any subject within their respective fields.

In addition, the ASME is taking what I believe to be an important and encouraging step by advertising in their Journal for applicants for the position of ASME congressional fellow. I cannot think of a better method of encouraging men of science to become involved in the governmental process, while giving the Congress the benefit of their expertise. I would hope that other technical societies will follow their lead.

The advertisement follows:

NEW PROGRAM ANNOUNCED: THE ASME CONGRESSIONAL FELLOW

A program to sponsor ASME Congressional Fellows has recently been authorized by the Executive Committee of the Council. The program calls for ASME to send engineers for a year at the Nation's capitol in Washington and for each to be associated with a congressman or a congressional committee as a resource person. This sponsorship would be shared with the engineer's employer, who would treat the time away from his regular job in the nature of a sabbatical leave. While the prime purpose of the program would be to assist the legislative process by making technical expertise available, both the individual Fellows and their employers would benefit from the experience. In the long run, the program is seen as a step toward better technical input in the setting of public policy.

The program, patterned on the highly successful experience of the American Political Science Association, has developed from a suggestion which came out during a joint meeting of ASME members with congressional leaders last December. It is a direct response to a number of the ASME GOALS, particularly the Overriding Goal: "To move vigorously from what is now a society with essentially technical concerns to a society that, while serving the technical interests of its members ever better, is increasingly professional in its outlook, sensitive to the engineer's responsibility to the public interest, and dedicated to a leadership role in making technology a true servant of man."

The Congressional Fellow would be closely associated with a congressman or committee concerned with legislation on subjects for which an understanding of mechanical engineering is important. He would have available to him the facilities of the office of William P. Miller, ASME's Washington representative, in calling on the resources of the Society.

For the first year ASME will provide up to half of the cost for one man with the understanding that his employer would provide the other half. Facilities of the Congress will make office space and secretarial support available. In taking this action, the Executive Committee of the Council views this one-time cost as seed money, for which reserve funds are available. The action also called for the exploration of other sources for funding in future years.

MEMBERS MAY APPLY

The first step for a member of ASME interested in applying for the followship available in 1973 would be to establish with his employer the basis under which he could be made available. Applications will be held in confidence and should be directed to Dr. Rogers B. Finch, Executive Director and Secretary, ASME, 345 East 47th Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

Each application should include:

1. A résumé covering education, engineering, experience, and pertinent personal factors.

2. A statement describing the terms of the applicant's leave from his employer. This should state his current salary and the total amount of financial support which the employer would provide.

3. A letter describing the way the applicant views this position and how his experience and abilities qualify him for the post.

Applcations will be received up until Nov. 1, 1972, and should cover a period of one year beginning no earlier than Jan. 1, 1973. nor later than Mar. 1, 1973.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

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

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,757 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

VICTOR CLARK OF WICHITA, ELECTED PRESIDENT OF NATIONAL RETAIL HARDWARE ASSOCIATION

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, we in the Kansas Fourth District are especially proud that Victor Clark, of Wichita, has been elected president of the National Retail Hardware Association, the largest retail trade association in the United States. Mr. Clark, a constituent of mine, exemplifies the small businessman in our Nation who has achieved success by providing good service and following a policy of honesty, integrity, and hard work. He has devoted 45 years to his hardware business in Wichita. He will be an effective spokesman for the small businessmen of this Nation and the members of the National Retail Hardware Association. It is a pleasure to congratulate him on this high honor which has been given him.

Bruce Sankey, business writer for the Wichita, Kans., Eagle, recently wrote an interesting feature article concerning Victor Clark which I include under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD:

SMALL WICHITA BUSINESSMAN ELECTED HEAD OF 20,000 HARDWARE RETAILERS

(By Bruce Sankey)

For 35 years Victor Clark has operated the same small hardware store at the same location in west Wichita. By some standards he might be considered just another small businessman in a city that has hundreds of them.

But Vic Clark has set himself apart. Yet, at the same time, he typifies the small retailer who is alert and responsive to change in his own field.

Last week Victor Clark achieved the pinnacle in his field when he was elected president of the National Retail Hardware Association (NRHA), the largest retail trade association in the United States.

"It's quite an honor to represent 20,000 hardware retailers," he said after his return from the 73rd annual NRHA Congress at Atlanta, Ga.

Hardwaremen operating independent stores in more than 10,000 cities in the U.S. and Canada are members of the 26 state, regional and Canadian hardware associations comprising the organization Clark now heads.

The Wichitan's election caps a hardware career that spans 45 of his 55 years.

At the age of 10 he began working in his grandfather's hardware store. Ten years later. in 1937, he purchased a bankrupt hardware store at 1718 W. Douglas, assuming $1,500 in debt on a $500 stock.

Over the years that "one-horse store" of 1937 with an inventory of less than 4,000 items has grown to more than 15,000 different pieces of merchandise today.

Not only has the size of the inventory changed but so has its makeup.

"Fifty per cent of the merchandise in a hardware store today wasn't there in 1946," Clark said.

Latex paints, teflon, transistors, epoxy glues—none of them were around 25 years ago, he said.

"Last week I talked with the president of a company that did $80 million worth of business last year. Everything they make was nonexistent 15 years ago. That's an indication how fast we're living today," Clark added.

Just as the merchandise they sell has changed, so has the hardware business itself, Clark continued.

"Many have gone out of business but the hardware business is a long way from being dead. The hardware business is basically a traditional service-type business. No one yet has been able to duplicate good service. The big home centers and discount stores don't have the personnel, knowledge or know-how. The guy nationwide who wants service still goes to a hardware store," Clark maintained.

"The type of competition has changed remarkably too," he went on.

Clark sees the large merchandisers—K-Mart, David's, Wickes Lumber, Star Lumber & Supply, Sears and Montgomery Ward—as competition.

To meet them he concentrates on service, full inventories, effective advertising and sound business practices.

"Still, while things are changing, honesty, integrity and hard work are the best policies," Clark said. "You've got to stay flexible and move with the times."

He is a firm believer in advertising, even for the small businessman.

"The guy who doesn't advertise is helping his competition out," he said. "We can't compete with Wards and Sears in advertising. But we set a budget and live with it. We keep our name before the public."

He splits his advertising 50-50 between the institutional and pricing. The National Retail Hardware Association also advertises in national publications for its members.

His 4,000-square-foot store is well lighted, displays are attractive and shelves are full.

Although Clark's business is small in comparison to some of the large hardware outlets and home centers in operation today, he is in every sense of the word a successful merchandise retailer.

"The key to merchandising is moving merchandise," Clark said. "The day is gone when you can buy something and let it set out and hope that someone will buy it. We can't move merchandise as fast as K-Mart, but we turn it over."

While Clark has preferred to remain a small dealer, he has actively and enthusiastically supported NRHA programs geared toward large-volume stores such as the formation of the Home Center Institute to support superstores dealing in lumber-building materials as well as hardware.

His dedication to the hardware industry is reflected in his election in 1956 to the board of the Western Retail Implement and Hardware Association and to its presidency in 1962. He also has represented the Western Association as a member of the NRHA's board of governors.

During the next year he will make more than 20 trips around the country representing the NRHA, culminating in June with a trip to Cannes, France.

Clark said he got into the hardware business because he wanted to be in a service-type industry.

"It's been good to me," he said. "I've lived within my means, paid my bills and made a comfortable living."

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF UNICO NATIONAL

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, it is a special pleasure for me to join in honoring the 50th anniversary of UNICO National.

On August 19, at the UNICO golden anniversary convention in Miami Beach, Dr. John X. R. Basile of Hartford, Conn., will be installed as national president to guide the beginning of UNICO's second 50 years. Dr. Basile has given years of dedicated service and leadership to the Connecticut chapter and to UNICO national. He initiated the Italian heritage and cultural program, founded the UNICO Foundation Century Club, edited the cultural supplement to the national magazine, and most recently, served as national executive vice president of the organization. Dr. Basile's election as national president is a well-deserved tribute to his untiring work for UNICO. All of us who live in Connecticut are proud that Dr. Basile is the first UNICO national president from New England.

UNICO's work is recognized throughout the Nation. Since Dr. Anthony P. Vastola founded the UNICO clubs in Waterbury, Conn. in 1922, and was honorary president, this admirable organization has consistently fulfilled its noble purpose: to take an active and constructive role in community life, and by so doing to represent the contributions made to America by the spirit and energy of our Italian-American citizens. During the 25 years from the founding of the UNICO clubs until 1947, Dr. Vastola and his associates vigorously promoted their organization. The UNICO clubs united men of Italian heritage to further the interests of the entire community. With success came expansion of the organization in 1947 when the UNICO clubs merged with the National Civic League, a midwestern Italian-American organization well-known for outstanding accomplishments in scholarship awards and youth work. The result was the creation of UNICO national. The years since that merger have brought Unicans national recognition as members of one of the most productive community service organizations in history.

The UNICO motto, "Service Above Self," is a philosophy of life epitomized in the activities by which Unicans throughout the country carry out their worthy objectives. Membership in a UNICO chapter encourages one to become service oriented, requires high ethical standards in one's occupation, and demands an interest in community welfare. UNICO, the Italian word for "unique," symbolizes unity, neighborliness, integrity, charity, and opportunity, the ideals fostered by the organization's dedicated business and professional men. UNICO has perpetuated these ideals through a growing scholarship program which provides an education for hundreds of the best Italian-American students.

UNICO National has demonstrated its deep concern for humanitarian programs and for improving the health and welfare of our communities through such projects as UNICO National Mental Health Research Center. I am especially grateful for strong support of the Unicans for H.R. 15474, the National Cooley's Anemia Control Act, which I sponsored and which has now passed both Houses of Congress. Calling on the country to again assume the lead in health research, Dr. Basile stated on behalf of UNICO:

> We strongly endorse the House of Representatives to take a step forward in the fight for the prevention of Cooley's Anemia.

The concern shown by such civic organizations as UNICO has helped push this vital legislation through both the House and Senate. UNICO's support for this important bill deserves the commendation and appreciation of all who suffer from Cooley's anemia.

Mr. Speaker, UNICO national has demonstrated its deep concern for humanitarian programs through its overseas relief work, and its efforts on behalf of young people, the handicapped and the needy in this country. I extend my best wishes to UNICO national and especially to Dr. Basile, as UNICO celebrates its 50th anniversary. I know this admirable service organization will continue its outstanding contributions to the civic life of America.

WILL THE REAL GEORGE McGOVERN STAND UP?

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the extent of GEORGE McGOVERN's radicalism is a matter of public record in his bills, his speeches and his writings.

Beyond his commitment to increasing sharply the tax burden on middle-level Americans to give money to those with lesser incomes, and his announced commitment to deeply reduce U.S. defense capabilities, and his support of forced busing of children to achieve racial balance in the schools, are his statements of disaffection and even hatred toward such as J. Edgar Hoover, Senators GOLDWATER and MUNDT, and President Richard M. Nixon.

He has even compared Nixon's effort to render ineffective North Vietnam's invasion of South Vietnam with Hitler's effort to exterminate Jews in Germany.

The real GEORGE McGOVERN is a radical extremist whose policies and program would be a disaster for the United States.

In this connection I commend the reading of William Buckley's column in yesterday's Washington Star-News.

The article follows:

McGOVERN'S DECENCY LIES OUTSIDE HIS RHETORIC

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

It has been frequently quoted about George McGovern that he is "the only decent man in the Senate." Now that quote is the late Robert Kennedy's, and it does, I truly believe, an injustice to the Senate. I am sure that there are other decent men there, not even counting the sainted junior senator from New York, successor to Robert Kennedy in the affections of New York's constituents. And it is not the purpose of this essay to suggest that Sen. McGovern is other than a decent man. It is rather the purpose to suggest that that which is decent about him is expressed other than in his political rhetoric.

But I fear that he has another image of himself than that which collectors of his remarks come up with, and before the campaign heats up, he should be reminded of it. Particularly before he sets his course to the deploring of the rhetorical excesses of Spiro Agnew.

Here is Nick Kotz of the Washington Post (May 17, 1972) commenting on Sen. McGovern whom he had just interviewed. "As he talked in his office, McGovern returned repeatedly to the theme that he had tried to calm rather than incite the public to anger. 'I have sought not to appeal to humanity and reason,' he said. 'There's plenty of anger and tension without our leaders adding to it. I think a conciliatory approach is needed . . ."

A conciliatory approach is not going to be tempered on McGovern rhetoric, and the gentleman's habits of harsh and uncharitable overstatement are not purely the accretions of a presidential campaign. Back in 1964 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 110, pt. 16, p. 21690), he was saying about another decent man in the Senate of the United States: "I regard Mr. Goldwater as the most unstable, radical and extremist ever to run for the presidency in either political party."

And about yet another decent colleague—from the same state—Karl Mundt of South Dakota: "I don't know how he (Mundt) felt about me . . . but I know I hated his guts . . . I hated him so much I lost my sense of balance." (Robert Sam Anson, "McGovern: A Biography," p. 93).

And one more time on a colleague: "But (Sen. Henry) Jackson destroyed whatever chance he had of becoming the Democratic nominee by embracing racism in the anti-busing campaign, Sen. McGovern said." (Chris Lydon, N.Y. Times, March 19, 1972).

And after J. Edgar Hoover died, McGovern gave an interview. (Life Magazine, July 7, 1972). "Hoover had lived beyond the normal years, so I couldn't feel the pathos I would for a young man. I could feel nothing but relief that he was no longer a public servant."

On the Indochinese war, it is hard to think of Sen. McGovern as stable. "I think the reelection of Richard Nixon in 1972 would be an open hunting right for this man to give in to all his impulses for a major war against the people of Indochina." (Speech, Catholic University, April 20, 1972). And, "I've said many times that the Nixon bombing policy on Indochina is the most barbaric action that any country has committed since Hitler's effort to exterminate Jews in Germany in the 1930s." (Interview with Gregg Herrington, AP June 29, 1972.) To liken Richard Nixon (and Lyndon Johnson) not only to Hitler but to the worst that Hitler ever did is, well, among other things, perverse.

But that is characteristic when touching on the subject of Vietnam. President Nixon "has descended to a new level of barbarism and foolhardiness for no other reason than to save his own face and to prop up the corrupt regime of Thieu." (AP, April 16, 1972). And speaking of Thieu, he is a "corrupt dictator who jails opponents, a despicable creature who doesn't merit the life of a single American soldier or for that matter a single Vietnamese." (UPI, April 7, 1972.) And "I want to be blunt about it," says Sen. McGovern. "(Nixon's) playing politics with the lives of American soldiers and with American prisoners rotting in their cells in Hanoi. He's putting his own political selfish interests ahead of the welfare of these young Americans and ahead of the taxpayers of this country who are bearing the burden."

I want to be blunt about it. Sen. McGovern's animadversions on his fellow human beings are—indecent.

MICHIGAN SOLDIER RECEIVES BRONZE STAR MEDAL

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Sp4c. Rex A. Johnson, the son of Mr. and Mrs. George Gross of River Rouge, Mich., was awarded the Bronze Star Medal for his valor while serving in the Republic of Vietnam. This young man is most deserving of this recognition and honor. Therefore, I insert the text of his Bronze Star Medal Award from the Department of the Army at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

(General Orders, Number 555)

AWARD OF THE BRONZE STAR MEDAL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY
SUPPORT COMMAND, SAIGON,
APO San Francisco, May 30, 1972.

TC 439. The following award is announced: Johnson, Rex A. [redacted] Specialist Four USA 228th Supply and Services Company (DS).

Awarded: Bronze Star Medal with "V" Device.

Date of Service: 16 April 1972.

Theater: Republic of Vietnam.

Authority: By direction of the President of the United States under the provisions of Executive Order 11046, 24 August 1962, AR 672–5–1 and USARV Supplement 1 to AR 672–5–1.

Reason: For valor, not involved in aerial flight, in connection with military operations against a hostile force in the Republic of Vietnam during the morning of 16 April 1972 and throughout the following day. SP4 Rex A. Johnson distinguished himself by exceptionally valorous performance of his duties during a rocket, mortar and small arms penetration attempt. At the onset of the attack, he was in the crucial sector designated as the most likely avenue of approach. It was at this point that this sector received small arms fire, almost simultaneously with the direct hit on the ammunition dump. Amid the onslaught of a heavy and continuous rain of shrapnel, the "Brighteyes" crew held firm in their position. Power was shortly knocked out and the "Brighteyes" crew put their high intensity light into action and immediately drew small arms fire. Together with the surrounding positions, the small arms fire was suppressed. Emergency lighting was obtained some time later, but only after the supply of flares and ammunition had been reduced to a dangerously low level. Unhesitatingly, the crew immediately volunteered to make a dash through the hail of exploding shrapnel to obtain the necessary resupply of flares and ammunition. Specialist Johnson's professionalism as a soldier and his willingness to face extreme danger, saved the sector from possible penetration. His initiative, zeal, tenacity, sound judgment and devotion to duty have been in the highest traditions of the military service and reflect great credit upon himself, his unit and the United States Army.

For the Commander:

JOHN W. MCCARTHY,
LTC, GS, Acting Chief of Staff.

OFFICIAL:

HOWARD B. SMITH,
2LT, SC, Acting Asst AG.

CITIZEN INTEREST HIGH AS CONSTITUENTS RESPOND TO COUGHLIN QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the reresults are now available for my fourth annual poll of citizens of Pennsylvania's 13th Congressional District. I am happy to report the results to my colleagues since the questions and answers are pertinent to many key issues that face the Nation.

I am also sending a copy of the results to President Nixon whose initiatives in both the foreign and domestic fields formed the basis for many of the questions.

In submitting the tabulation to my colleagues, I want to point out that the 13th Congressional District represents a cross-section of population. Represented are heavily urbanized areas, less densely populated suburban sections, and rural communities.

Many constituents, as they do daily throughout the year, took the time to write to me. In keeping with their informed and concerned view of our country, they amplified on the questionnaire and displayed a keen knowledge of the problems that confront us. While perturbed over issues, constituents overwhelmingly adopted a realistic view of difficulties and the means with which we must resolve them.

To get an idea of their overall opinion of the United States, I asked a broad question of the state of the Nation. Seven out of 10 respondents felt we are in a fair state with lots to improve. They indicated in their written comments, the traditional American urge to make things better.

A clear majority wanted our involvement in South Vietnam ended with 57 percent feeling that our commitment has been fulfilled and we should terminate all our military operations at the earliest possible date.

In other important areas, the majority of citizens were not generally satisfied with the way economic and wage-price controls are working, and favored more strict controls in every category. Opinions were diverse on spending of Federal tax dollars in specific fields.

The response was overwhelmingly against busing both for the purpose of racial balance and where boundaries result from official policies. Constituents also favored stronger consumer measures even if cost of goods are higher, supported legislation I sponsored to increase social security benefits by 20 percent—already enacted into law—and approved of national legislation to establish no-fault auto insurance.

These and other questions and answers are included in this insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The questionnaires were printed—not at Government expense—and sent to all households and boxholders in the district. There were 18,236 individual responses by the July 24, 1972, deadline. Answers were tabulated carefully under statistical procedures to guarantee that errors were at a minimum.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULT

1. Assuming any alternative must provide for the safe return of our men and release of our prisoners, which best expresses your viewpoint on iVetnam? (one only)

[All figures indicate percent]

Any commitment to South Vietnam has been fulfilled and we should terminate all our military operations at the earliest possible date	57
We have a commitment to South Vietnam and should continue combat operations to support the Saigon government	10
We should employ stronger military means to defeat the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong	17
We should accommodate Hanoi's insistence on a coalition government in South Vietnam if necessary to achieve peace	9
None of above (specify)	7

2. Are you generally satisfied with the way economic and wage price controls are working?

Yes	18
No	73
Undecided	9

If no, would you support more or less strict controls on:

Wages: More, 79; less, 21.
Prices generally: More, 92; less, 8.
Corporate profits: More, 83; less, 17.
Rents: More, 87; less, 13.
Food prices: More, 92; less 8.
Other (specify): More, 93; less, 6.
(Does not total 100 percent).

3. Federal spending involves your tax dollars. Should we spend more, less or the same Federal tax effort as presently on the following:

Education:
More, 49; less, 18; same, 33.
Aid to elderly:
More, 65; less, 5; same, 30.
Environmental protection:
More, 62; less, 10; same, 28.
Defense (other than Vietnam):
More, 13; less, 52; same, 35.
Public transportation:
More, 54; less, 16; same, 30.
Aid to poor:
More, 29; less, 32; same, 39.
Health care:
More, 51; less, 14; same, 35.
Foreign aid:
More, 2; less, 82; same, 16.

4. Which best expresses your feelings about the State of our Nation? (one only)

Good: little to improve	10
Fair: lots to improve	70
Poor: needs complete overhaul	17
Other (specify)	3

5. Court-ordered decisions on busing of school children are affecting many more school districts throughout the country.

A. Do you favor busing of school children to achieve racial balance?

Yes	9
No	85
Undecided	6

B. Do you favor busing to promote integration where Courts have found officially-sanctioned segregation or artificially-contrived school boundaries?

Yes	25
No	67
Undecided	8

6. Do you favor amnesty for those who left the country because of objections to serving in Vietnam? (one only)

Now	13
After alternate service	30
After the fighting stops and alternate service	22
Never	35

7. Do you approve the President's efforts to change the emphasis of our foreign policy from cold war confrontation to new era negotiation with Communist powers?

Yes	86
No	6
Undecided	8

8. If industry and governmental bodies are made to conform to strict anti-pollution standards, would you be willing to pay more taxes to help clean up and protect our environment?

Yes	55
No	33
Undecided	12

9. Would you favor a value-added (national sales) tax as a method to reduce local property taxes?

Yes	29
No	52
Undecided	19

10. Do you favor President Nixon's policy of continuing to supply jet aircraft to Israel for defense?

Yes	54
No	32
Undecided	14

11. Federal Courts have struck down state laws to aid non-public schools. If a Constitutional means could be found to aid non-public schools, would you favor such action?

Yes	49
No	44
Undecided	7

12. Do you feel conditions warrant increasing basic Social Security benefits by 20% as proposed in legislation I have sponsored?

Yes	67
No	24
Undecided	9

13. Do you favor national legislation to establish no-fault automobile insurance?

Yes	70
No	15
Undecided	15

14. Would you approve of stronger consumer protection measures even if they result in higher costs of goods?

Yes	53
No	33
Undecided	14

Party preference of those responding

Republican	64
Democrat	20
Non-partisan	15
Other (specify)	1

Ages of those responding

18 to 21	2
21 to 35	24
35 to 50	30
50 to 65	30
65 and over	14

SPREADING THE BIG LIE

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the American people, along with the rest of the world, have been bombarded with wild propaganda concerning the bombing of dikes in North Vietnam. This particular propaganda effort is notable only because so many individuals have been taken in by it. The Communists must sit back and chuckle when even their most outrageous claims are given credence by gullible leaders throughout the world, especially in our own country. No doubt this "dike campaign" has been successful beyond their wildest imagination.

Faced, as we are, with daily harangues about "criminal" and "murderous" acts perpetrated by our country, it is refreshing to run across an article which gives us something to think about from the other side of the coin. I include the article entitled "Spreading the Big Lie" from Aviation Week magazine, August 7, 1972, at this point in the RECORD:

[From Aviation Week magazine, Aug. 7, 1972]

SPREADING THE BIG LIE

(By Robert Hotz)

Fabricating and spreading a big lie to shift the blame for a critical domestic problem to a foreign foe has long been a standard practice of Communist nations. Most Americans have now forgotten the elaborate hoax the Chinese and North Koreans perpetrated during the Korean war to convince their own people and the rest of the world that the U.S. was waging germ warfare in Korea. But members of this magazine's staff who covered that war remember it well. There is still a residue of belief in Asia and Europe that the U.S. really sprinkled virulent bacteria from its aircraft onto North Korea when in fact it did not.

The combination of Oriental sanitation standards and the ravages of war created epidemics of serious proportions of diseases such as typhus, influenza and typhoid in North Korea and the bordering areas of China. To divert their people from the real causes of the epidemics and try to turn world opinion against the U.S., the Communists decided to invent the big lie of germ warfare. It was a cleaverly constructed campaign based on easily provable facts laced together by blatant lies. For example, the Communists said the viruses were spread by infected goose and duck feathers scattered from inside U.S. fighter fuel drop tanks.

The Communists provided traveling exhibits of U.S. bomb casings and duck feathers to which were affixed visible black bugs. Since loose duck feathers are a standard part of Oriental debris and fuel drop tanks were spattered all over Korea, this made a credible pattern. The fact that the diseases running rampant were caused by invisible bacteria and not the cockroach size bugs on display was an irrelevant detail.

The whole fabrication was tied together and given credibility by the false confessions tortured from U.S. Air Force and Marine pilots who were prisoners of war. These false confessions were so elaborately laced with air base locations, commanders names, types of bombs and operational procedures that even seasoned U.S. war correspondents, well steeped in military censorship and evasion, wondered about the truth of these charges. The Communist line on germ warfare was trumpeted to the English language press of the world by the two British Communists, Wilfred Burchett and Alan Winnington who covered the war from North Korea in much the same manner some Americans are now viewing the Vietnam war from Hanoi.

When the Korean war was over and censorship ended, there was not a single shred of valid evidence to support the Communist thesis that the U.S. had conducted germ warfare in Korea. Even the Communists quickly dropped their campaign.

Now in Vietnam they are perpetrating a similar hoax by trying to explain away the massive flooding that will occur in the Red River delta this month with the flat lie that U.S. planes are systematically bombing the dikes and flood control system of that area. In spreading this enormous lie the North Vietnamese Communists are being aided by U.S. and neutral observers who are being deliberately shown part of the facts that lead to a totally erroneous conclusion.

Here is what is really happening. Last August, the Red River delta was hit by massive flooding that caused enormous loss of life and economic damage. Pictures of this massive flooding taken by U.S. reconnaissance planes in August, 1971, when there had been absolutely no bombing in this area for three years, are shown on page 17 of this issue. These floods created severe damage to the dike and flood control system, much of which has not been repaired.

The reason very few repairs were made in the last 12 months was because most of the large labor force that would normally do this work was diverted to building supply roads and depots in the south to prepare for the massive offensive launched by North Vietnam last Easter.

Now the Hanoi government is facing another flood season with a badly damaged system of dikes. The easiest explanation, both for the population that will die and suffer in the ensuing floods and that part of the world that is always ready to believe the worst of the U.S., is that this damage is caused by U.S. bombing attacks. This is another enormous lie. It is true that some U.S. bombs have hit a few dikes where they carry a main rail or highway supply line, are near oil storage depots and protect SAM missile or anti-aircraft batteries. But the masssive damage to the flood control system in the Red River delta was caused a year ago and has been photographed in deail by U.S. reconnaissance planes for the past 11 months.

We think the Nixon Administration is being stupid in not releasing a thorough documentation of this 11-month-old flood damage along with the many pictures that show flak guns and SAM batteries emplaced on these dikes firing at U.S. aircraft.

It took a full-scale briefing with greatly magnified photo-recon pictures to convince both U.S. citizens and foreign diplomats that there really were Russian offensive ballistic missiles in Cuba in the fall of 1962. A similar exercise to expose the big lie of dike bombing in Vietnam would be equally salutary.

The testimony of Western "eyewitnesses" on bomb damage in North Vietnam is no more reliable than were the reports of Burchett and Winnington on germ warfare from North Korea. These current eyewitnesses are expertly led around by Hanoi officials who permit them to see just enough of what has transpired to let them jump to an erroneous conclusion.

Much of the alleged U.S. bomb damage they are shown has in fact been created by Russian built SAM anti-aircraft missiles fired futilely at U.S. planes. The SA-2 carries a 420-lb. high-explosive warhead encased in double metal wrapping. This is roughly the same volume of explosive carried in a standard U.S. 750-lb bomb. When a SAM misses its aerial target, it falls to earth and blows up, making a crater about the same size as a U.S. bomb and showering metal shrapnel over a 600-ft. lethal radius. Over 2,000 SA-2s have been fired in North Vietnam since April. Only a handful have exploded near U.S. planes. The surface damage in the vicinity of Hanoi and Haiphong from these spent SAMs must be enormous. How can a passing "eyewitness" tell the difference in craters or damage between a U.S. bomb and a spent SAM?

There are two salient facts in the current big lies being spread from Hanoi. First, the U.S. is not deliberately or systematically targeting or bombing the Red River delta dike system. The occasional bomb strikes have created only a tiny fraction of the massive damage still left from the 1971 flood season. Second, much of the alleged U.S. bomb damage shown to foreigners in Hanoi and Haiphong is in fact damage created by SA-2 missiles smashing back to earth. It is time the Nixon Administration abandoned its defensive posture and made clear to the American people and the rest of the world the big lies being spread on U.S. bomb damage by Hanoi.

DESTRUCTION OF REAL ESTATE SETTLEMENT REFORM

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, every American family which purchases a home is confronted by, and usually horrified by, the closing costs it must pay at the time of settlement. Most of these costs are necessary and legitimate—such things as real estate taxes, some legal fees, title search, title insurance, and so forth. But a pattern has grown up in the real estate industry of inflating the legitimate charges with all kinds of legal extortion—including kickbacks to developers, payments to lawyers who perform no services, fees to lawyers who provide service for the lender but whose fees are paid by the borrower, excessive charges for duplicated title searches, and so on.

In title IX of the housing bill pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency, we are trying to protect the homebuyer from these excessive and unconscionable charges. It is the most controversial title of the bill because it steps on, and regulates, practices which have been built into the real estate industry over many years to increase the incomes of certain firms and individuals to an indefensible degree, at the homebuyer's expense.

The Members of the House have received this week a proposed substitute for title IX which will be offered in committee and, presumably, on the House floor if not agreed to in committee.

As the sponsor of title IX, I want the Members to be forewarned of what this proposed substitute would do in destroying the main purposes of title IX. The proposed substitute is described as, in some way, strengthening consumer protections compared to existing law. That is an oversimplification. Actually, as it relates to FHA-insured or VA-guaranteed loans, the substitute for title IX takes away significant consumer protections.

Mr. Speaker, what this proposal really does is destroy the effectiveness of most of title IX as it now exists.

The substitute would eliminate section 902, the heart of title IX, which authorizes and directs the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish maximum settlement charges for most conventional, as well as all federally insured and guaranteed, residential mortgages.

Moreover, the substitute to be offered would repeal section 701 of the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970, which empowers the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to determine whether maximum settlement charges should be established for federally insured and guaranteed mortgages and to set such maximums. In the 2 years since enactment of this legislation HUD has conducted an exhaustive study of settlement transactions in various regions throughout the country. The findings of this study strongly indicate the need for establishment of maximum settlement charges. Accordingly, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development issued a notice of proposed rulemaking on maximum charges, fees, or discounts for federally insured and guaranteed mortgages and insured home improvement loans in late June. It is expected that the maximum settlement charges promulgated by HUD would become effective some time this fall.

Adoption of the substitute for title IX would prevent HUD from implementing regulations which will save federally insured and guaranteed residential mortgage borrowers 50 to 75 percent of the settlement costs they would otherwise have to pay in some sections of the Nation. A vote for the substitute represents a vote for inflated and unjustified settlement charges.

The substitute would offer a new section 902 which simply directs the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to determine within 1 year if it is necessary to establish maximum settlement charges and whether such maximum charges can be effectively imposed through State or local regulation which meets federally established minimum standards. This contrasts with the present proposals in title IX which would be enforced by the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, agencies which have the experience and capacity to do so.

The effect of the substitute proposal is to send HUD back over the same ground it has already covered. State and local governments are not effectively regulating real estate settlement transactions and in recent years the Federal Government has assumed major responsibilities in the area of residential housing.

Mr. Speaker, the substitute for title IX is nothing more than a thinly disguised effort to cripple the residential real estate settlement reform proposals now in the housing bill being considered by the Banking and Currency Committee. Any regulation of settlement charges under the substitute proposal would be dead for the foreseeable future. If the substitute is approved this Congress will have utterly failed to respond to the settlement scandals that have bilked homeowners throughout the Nation of millions of dollars. By the same token, the way will have been left clear for continuation of these abusive practices on the part of those mortgage lenders, developers, attorneys, appraisers, title companies and others involved in real estate settlement transactions which have victimized home buyers by excessive charges.

Mr. Speaker, the substitute also cripples other important provisions of title IX.

Section 903 directs the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to develop a standard form for the statement of settlement charges and section 905 requires residential mortgage lenders to provide home buyers with a statement of these charges at least 10 days prior to settlement, so that borrowers will have an opportunity to examine individual items and take whatever action is necessary to protect their interests.

The substitute amendment provides that the 10 days notification requirement may be waived. There is little doubt in my mind that some, or many, lenders and settlement attorneys will not hesitate to pressure home buyers into waiving the 10-day notification requirement. This will result in the settlement charges not being presented to the buyer until the closing, when there is little opportunity to determine their validity or fairness. In effect the substitute proposal will permit continuation of the present indefensible practice of presenting the home buyer at settlement with a confusing welter of documents and charges which cannot be questioned.

Section 904 of title IX directs the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to prepare and distribute special booklets designed to help home buyers understand the nature and the cost of settlement. An itemized list indicating the maximum amounts which the homebuyer should reasonably be prepared to pay is required to be included in the booklet. The substitute proposal would eliminate the listing of reasonable maximum charges from the booklet, this preventing the home buyer from having any guideline by which to make a judgment about the fairness of such charges.

Section 912 provides that title companies which are qualified to issue title insurance are authorized to perform all settlement services. The section reflects the recognition that title insurance companies which issue title insurance can provide full settlement services at substantial savings to the home buyer, but in some States are prevented from doing so by laws or regulations which reserve this right to attorneys. One example is the District of Columbia where title companies can and do provide full title services at savings of hundreds of dollars at settlement as compared to the cost of settlement services provided by attorneys in Maryland and Virginia.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware of the concern voiced by attorneys about the possibility of unqualified employees of title companies performing legal services. To remedy the situation, I intend to offer an amendment to section 912 which requires that title companies employ qualified attorneys to perform legal services in connection with settlement transactions.

Finally, the substitute provides that any legal action to recover damages in connection with violations of title IX provisions must be brought within 1 year from the date of the occurrence of the violation. In essence, this says that the home buyer is out of luck if he fails to determine within a year following the transaction that he has been cheated. A 3-year statute of limitations, at least, should apply to violations of the title.

Mr. Speaker, adoption of the substitute for title IX eliminates the most important provisions of the settlement reform proposals now in the housing bill. It leaves the home buyer of the Nation unprotected against continued victimization in terms of inflated and erroneous settlement charges. It says there is no meaningful response to the residential real estate settlement and housing speculation scandals that have been well documented in the press throughout the Nation for more than a year.

I for one cannot accept this sorry conclusion to all the effort that has gone into the task of trying to protect the home buyers of the Nation from extortionate or fraudulent abuses. Any housing act which does not contain the protections afforded the consumer in title IX as presently written constitutes nothing less than a monumental disservice to the home buyers of the Nation.

THE PLIGHT OF SOVIET JEWS

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, in May of this year I submitted to the RECORD the transcript of a recorded conversation between Stuart Lotwin of Los Angeles and Lev Lerner of the Soviet Union.

At this time, I would like to enter another revealing exchange between these two men, which further underlines the difficulties and harassment individuals who desire to emigrate from U.S.S.R. to Israel are experiencing. The text of the conversations follows:

TELEPHONE CONVERSATION, JUNE 11, 1972, BETWEEN LEV LERNER, LENINGRAD, U.S.S.R. AND S. J. LOTWIN, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

S.L. Hello.

L.L. Hello. Mr. Lotwin, sometime ago two American Senators wrote the Leningrad OVIR with the request to give us the permission for going to Israel. Their names—Jim Bergland and John Brademas—and some days ago we got the negative answer on this application.

S.L. You received a negative answer! What reason did they give?

L.L. They say the same as before—we were refused the permission for going to Israel.

S.L. Did they tell you why?

L.L. No, very difficult to ask why. The reason is as before.

S.L. The reason as before—still 1974?

L.L. Yes, yes.

S.L. Lev,

L. L. And we want to send with you our gratitude to these Senators.

S.L. I see. We and people in the United States Government are trying to get the visa for you.

L.S. Thank you very much.

L.L. Yes.

S.L. Could you do this, Lev?

S.L. Could you politely and formally ask OVIR why they have given the negative answer.

L.L. Yes, I can tell you now. I was told that it was connected with and if I was connected with the secret work in my work last.

S.L. Is that why?

L.L. If I was connected with the secret work.

S.L. Oh, you were connected with the secret work?

L.L. No, I was never connected with the secret work.

S.L. You were not! No, no; I know that. You told me that before, so could you ask them why they have given a negative answer?

L.L. On this application?

S.L. Yes.

L.L. Yes, we shall ask the Leningrad OVIR about this.

S.L. Good! Lev, what we are going to do is . . .

L.L. We shall apply once more.

S.L. Yes, please do; apply again, apply again.

L.L. Yes, and we shall apply everytime after the negative answer too. After one negative answer we shall apply once more.

S.L. Excellent, good! Now, Lev, listen carefully. At about 8:30 at night, your time in Leningrad, on either Monday June 19, June 26, or July 3; or Friday, June 23, June 30 or July 7, I am going to call you again.

L.L. Yes, it would be night?

S.L. Right, your night, not mine. I will call with some important people including Congressman Bell who is trying to help you.

L.L. Thank you very much.

S.L. Congressman Bell and other people in my government, the American Government, are publishing for the other members of the American Government transcripts of our telephone conversations and your letters to me. They are doing everything they can within our government to have OVIR say yes soon. So they are trying to help you.

L.L. Yes, thank you very much. This is our hope.

S.L. Yes, and that is their hope as well.

L.L. Yes, thank you very much.

S.L. Now, Lev, we were unable to call you on the telephone on May 22 through May 30. Were you home or were you called in the Army?

L.L. No, I was not called to Army.

S.L. No.

L.L. Yes, because I have the medical.

S.L. I see. Were you home with your family at that time?

L.L. Yes, I was at home with my family.

S.L. I see; well we could not get through to talk to you. We were trying but we could not get through.

L.L. Yes, I can say that only one day—the day when Nixon was in Leningrad—I was arrested.

S.L. You were arrested on the day he was in Leningrad, but for one day only.

L.L. Yes, this was for seven hours. This was during the visit of Mr. Nixon.

S.L. I see, I understand. I will forward that to people who are interested in that because we tried to call you for over a week and were told there was no answer on your telephone.

L.L. This isn't the truth because in the evening I am at home.

S.L. Yes, I thought so. I am glad that you are well and that you are safe; that was my primary concern about you. Are you working?

L.L. Yes, I am working.

S.L. Good. No change in your job.

L.L. My new job?

S.L. Your new job?

L.L. Yes, I got the new job after I was forced to dismiss from my last job.

S.L. What kind of work is your new job?

L.L. I am an engineer, not in my profession.

S.L. Not in your profession.

L.L. No, not in my profession.

S.L. I see, what type of work now?

L.L. Now I am an engineer of textile machinery.

S.L. What about Zina, is she working?

L.L. Yes, she is working too, but the situation on her work is very, very hard.

S.L. Is she going to be dismissed?

L.L. No, no. She is on (unintelligible).

S.L. She's on what work? What kind of work?

L.L. She is an engineer of communications.

S.L. And she is still working in communications?

L.L. Yes, in the field of communications.

S.L. How is your family; your mother and father? Are they well?

L.L. No, they have not been very well, but they wait for permission for going to Israel. The waiting for them is very hard.

S.L. Yes. I know. Your mother-in-law Zina's mother, how is she?

L.L. She is at home too, and she waits for permission too.

S.L. And she's well?

L.L. Yes, she is O.K.

S.L. Good. I understand that Zina has relatives in Cleveland, Ohio. Is that true?

L.L. Yes, this is true.

S.L. Good. What is their name?

L.L. Of relatives?

S.L. Yes.

L.L. His name is Abraham Wachter. I give to you the address.

S.L. I can get it here. Don't bother, I will get it here.

L.L. Yes, yes. Abraham Wachter is the brother of my mother-in-law, and Jerry Wachter is his son.

S.L. O.K. I will get in touch with him. Who were you talking to in Israel?

L.L. One hour ago we were talking with Israel.

S.L. Yes, with whom? Were these former Soviet's or friends in Israel?

L.L. With whom we were talking?

S.L. Yes.

L.L. Yes, now we were talking to this Mrs. Kominsky. She is the wife of Kominsky who now is in prison.

S.L. I see. I know the name. How is she, is she O.K.?

L.L. She is O.K., but she wants to be with husband.

S.L. The other thing is we received your letter and the pictures.

L.L. And my pictures?

S.L. You have a very handsome family.

L.L. We are three in this picture? Taken with my wife?

S.L. Yes, that's the picture and then I got another picture, just of you.

L.L. Yes, from my friend?

S.L. Yes, from your friend. Did you receive a letter from me?

L.L. I received from you only one letter.

S.L. Well, I wrote a second letter. I am going to mail to you copies of what is called in the United States the Congressional Record. This is where the Senators and Congressmen have been publishing our telephone conversations. So, I will mail you a copy so you can read the conversations.

L.L. Yes, thank you very much. And, a copy of your second letter?

S.L. Good. I am glad you are working, you will apply again for a visas, and you will ask for the reason for not letting you go now.

L.L. Yes, thank you I shall ask.

S.L. O.K., we will speak to you again, soon.

L.L. Yes.

S.L. In the meantime, you take care of yourself, keep your strength and courage going——

L.L. Yes.

S.L. And, with the help of all the people who are concerned with you, I am sure we are going to meet in Israel soon.

L.L. Yes, thank you.

S.L. So please give our best to your wife, to your daughter and to your family.

L.L. Yes, thank you. And send our best greetings to your family and to our friends, too.

S.L. Absolutely. I will speak to you soon. Please write to me again, will you?

L.L. Yes, yes, of course.

S.L. Good. Alright.

L.L. Yes.

S.L. Shalom and goodbye.

L.L. Goodbye, Shalom.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF SETTLEMENTS AND NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers adopted a series of resolutions at its annual meeting in May.

These resolutions deal with such critical issues as education, health, child care, housing, and economic development, and I am pleased to share them with my colleagues at this time.

The resolutions follow:

ANNUAL MEETING ADOPTS RESOLUTIONS ON MAJOR ISSUES

The Annual Meeting of the National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, which met in Chicago on May 26, during the 47th Biennial Conference, adopted the following important resolutions.

SOCIAL POLICY PLATFORM

The National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers (NFS) reaffirms and readopts the Social Policy Platform adopted by its Annual Meeting, May 30, 1970 in Cincinnati, Ohio. In addition, it singles out the following areas of high priority concerns for immediate attention and action by NFS and its affiliates.

HOUSING

The Congress of the United States, in the Housing Act of 1949, stated that our national objective was to provide "housing which is decent, safe and sanitary for all Americans at prices and rents they can afford to pay." This promise is far from realization. Large areas of our inner cities are being virtually abandoned because of abuse or seriously flawed federal housing programs, a decline in public safety and public services, and because of racial and economic polarization.

NFS calls upon Congress and the President of the United States to declare a state of emergency and enact such new laws or amend existing laws as is necessary to prevent exploitation by speculators, prevent further abandonment and provide an adequate supply of new and renewed housing, available and accessible to those excluded from the total housing market.

NFS, to achieve the foregoing goals, will convene a national convocation, "To Save our Cities." It will bring together representatives of the poor, racial minorities and national organizations to call further attention to this national crisis in housing and to find new, appropriate approaches to the solution of this critical problem.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

NFS is committed to healthy, over-all economic development but is particularly concerned about the need for economic development in inner city ghettos and barrios. NFS endorses policies and programs, public and private, which are essential to assure high levels of employment and production, the raising of living standards and the improvement of conditions of work.

NFS endorses public works programs which are beneficial to the community and the economy as a whole. It calls on government—federal, state and local—to provide opportunities for public service employment. It also endorses programs of training, supportive services and placement in the private sector, and wages adequate to meet the soaring cost of living.

NFS sees a need for redress of major past inequities through the development of minority-owned businesses, industries and services, and calls for appropriate federal legislation and private measures to make such economic development feasible. Such programs should include low-cost loans, availability of bonding, training in management and production skills and compensatory practices in the issuance of grants, contracts and work orders.

ASSURED INCOME

NFS calls for an adequate program of assured annual income. It opposes Title IV of the Social Security Amendments of 1971 (HR 1) as approved by the House of Representatives, as completely inadequate with respect to income guarantees and punitive in its work provisions. NFS similarly, opposes the General Employment (Long) measure as reported to the Senate by the Senate Finance Committee since it does not provide an assured income and is punitive and regressive.

NFS calls for the adoption by Congress of more equitable measures which assure adequate annual income based on the Bureau of Labor Statistics' findings. It asks that Congress adopt such related measures as tax reform, improved Social Security benefits, increased minimum wages and the inclusion under their coverage of new categories of workers including household employees and farm workers.

EDUCATION

NFS believes that overcrowded schools, poor teaching, inadequate facilities and discrimination are a detriment not only to the resultant under-educated individual but also to society as a whole. We urge efforts to ensure that every person has equal and full opportunity to realize his ultimate potential for intellectual growth, including the provision of programs designed to overcome the limiting handicaps imposed by social, racial and economic discrimination.

We call for federal programs and fiscal grants to eliminate the inequities and the wide range of differences in the funding of education, state-by-state, and within the political subdivisions of the state. We ask that funding be based on educational need, fiscal capacity and equalization of opportunity for all on a non-segregated basis.

We view busing of children as one device for helping to achieve this end and are opposed to legislation which would prevent its continuance. We believe, along with the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights that, "What has divided the nation on school busing is not so much sharp disagreement on the merits but confusion as to what the issues really are. The complex matters of overcoming in a few years the inequities of the long past through the medium of desegregated schools has been reduced to the question of whether one is for busing."

NFS continues its support for achieving desegregation and the elimination of inferior schools through the use not only of busing but also such additional techniques as redrawing school attendance lines, pairing schools and establishing central schools and school parks.

HEALTH INSURANCE

NFS calls for the enactment of a federal health measure which (1) recognizes health care as a right of every citizen and (2) provides one excellent quality of health care for all regardless of differences in age, income, racial origin, etc.

NFS further calls for the provision of a high quality of preventive health services and medical services available at the neighborhood level to all individuals and families and with full participation by consumers in all policymaking settings.

NFS believes that this quality of health care cannot be made universally available through enactment of the Nixon Administration's Health Care Bill. It would provide two qualities of program—one for employed persons under private health insurance policies and another for the unemployed and the poor, similar to Medicaid, with the regulation of the private insurers left to the states.

NFS calls for the elimination from the environment of elements dangerous to health such as the use of lead in the household paints.

NFS calls for effective federal programs directed at eliminating hunger and malnutrition and racially-related diseases such as Sickle Cell Anemia.

DRUG USE

NFS urges the immediate elimination of the penalty for the possession and use of marijuana by an individual, but endorses penalties for the amassing and sale of it.

NFS calls for effective education in the dangers of drug abuse, including not only heroin and other hard drugs but also barbiturates, amphetamines, and similar drugs, and will endorse legislation which: (1) provides effective preventive and treatment programs for drug addicts and, (2) seeks to stop the flow of illegal, addictive drugs from overseas through negotiation. Where this fails to halt the flow, NFS urges the cessation of foreign aid to such country and the cut-off of all foreign trade with it.

Further, NFS calls for intensive local programs directed at stopping the corruption of law enforcement personnel by the pushers of illegal drugs and their criminal organizations.

LEGISLATIVE COMMUNICATION

In 1962, Congress extended to business the ability to conduct legislative efforts with tax-deductible funds, so that legislators could benefit from businessmen's knowledge in considering legislation. This reasoning applies with equal force to voluntary agencies supported by tax-deductible gifts.

NFS, therefore, calls upon the Congress of the United States to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit voluntarily funded organizations such as NFS and its affiliates to engage in communications with legislative bodies and committees and members thereof, and with their members or contributors with respect to legislation or proposed legislation of direct interest to the organization.

CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT

NFS urges enactment of a comprehensive child care bill which incorporates the following: funding at the highest feasible level, with continuation of existing Headstart programs, local prime sponsorship of programs, parent participation in policy-making and operation of programs, multiple services to families, and delivery of services by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

NFS urges that adequate, licensed child care facilities for pre-school and after-school programs be made available for all children of working mothers or single parents and funded by the federal government.

Further, that no mother be required to accept child care by untrained or uncertified persons or organizations, either in child care centers, family homes or in their own homes; that federal funds be provided for appropriate training of any persons authorized to undertake child care, and that the open-ended provisions of the 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act which enable child care to be provided on the basis of 75% federal and 25% local funds for child care for the children of former, current, or potential recipients of public assistance be retained.

REORDERING PRIORITIES

NFS proposes, in order to help achieve these goals, a complete and continual re-ordering of national priorities, the reduction of defense expenditures and the re-allocation of such monies for domestic programs aimed at the elimination of poverty and racism.

NFS supports all efforts to replace war as an instrument of international relations by negotiation, mediation, and conciliation. To this end, we urge a cessation of hostilities in Indochina and the strengthening of the ability of the United Nations to settle disputes and maintain peace.

THE WHITE HOUSE FELLOWS PROGRAM AND NATIONAL LEADERSHIP

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, it is time we take a closer look at the leadership programs which are managed by the Federal Government and for which Congress appropriates funds. My office has been looking into the participation of women and minority groups in a number of programs conducted by the Federal Government: Smithsonian Institution fellows, Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars, National Foundation for the Arts, National Foundation for the Humanities, Atomic Energy Commission Fellowships.

Today I would like to focus some attention on the White House Fellows program. One of the most alarming aspects of this program is the steady increase over the past 3 years of the number of military participants. Since we fund the War College, and a number of other higher level training institutions for the military, it is difficult to justify their intrusion into what was intended to be a totally civilian endeavor. When the White House fellows program was created in 1964—Executive Order No. 11183—it specified that only "non-Federal" applicants were eligible. This effectively excluded any members of the armed services and the Federal Government. In the past 3 years members of the active Armed Forces have composed over 25 percent of each class. The original Executive order was not amended until this year, February 16, 1972.

In a program that purports to trace back to the spirit of leadership and national pride of Franklin, Jefferson, and Washington—the intensity of military participation is somewhat questionable. In addition I question the real contribution to the leadership of the Nation by the reinforcement of the idea that there is a military input to all our national problems.

I am inserting into the RECORD a chart of the participants of the past 3 years in hopes of raising a discussion of whether or not this is the kind of program we want to continue to support with taxpayers funds. Clearly the Nixon administration has given a very different emphasis to the nature of the participants and the goals of the program.

Women's groups are rightly criticizing the program on the basis of the negligible number of women in the program and the apparent lack of perception of women in leadership positions.

Finally, there is some question as to whether or not the program is fulfilling its stated goal—that of sending young people back to their local States and communities with an increased commitment to making Government work at the local level. We badly need leadership at the State and community level but the White House Fellows have by and large remained in Washington lining up better jobs for themselves. Mike Causey in the Federal Register column in the Washington Post reports his discussions with numbers of high Government officials and their reactions to the White House Fellows program.

The material follows:

WHITE HOUSE FELLOWS DRAWS PROTEST

(By Mike Causey)

In this day of semantic sensitivity, nobody quarrels with the sexist title of the elite White House Fellows program. When they say fellows, in this case, they mean associates.

Launched during the Johnson administration, the WHF system was and is aimed at injecting bright, young (under 35) people into the government for one-year tours.

The idea was to give the WHF—future leaders in industry, education and the military—a sample of how the federal machine works from the top. As a bit of fallout, it is hoped the fellows return to their chosen careers with a sympathetic attitude toward the bureaucracy and help convince young people that Uncle Sam really wants their input.

Critics of the program, however, say it has two basic faults. First, that only 10 of the 119 fellows have been women, and secondly, that it has proved so rewarding that many of the fellows don't want to go home.

A battle-scarred bureaucrat, who has seen every WHF "class" since 1964, says, "It's a lot like that old song 'How You Going To Keep Them Down On The Farm After They've Seen Paree.'" A lot of the fellows, he estimated 20 per cent, get incurable cases of Potomac Fever and remain in government, defeating the cross-fertilization aspects of the program.

A group called Women's Equity Action League (WEAL) says the program is male-dominated, and that the recent trend of including more midcareer military officers in WHF classes makes it even tougher for women to make the grade.

The White House announced yesterday the 17 fellows (one a woman) for the 1972–73 year that begins in September. They are:

Douglas C. Bauer, 34, Pittsburgh; Air Force Maj. Robert H. Baxter, Las Vegas; James E. Bostic, Asheville, N.C.; Joseph P. Carroll, 29, Paris, France; AF Maj. John C. Fryer, 31; James H. Gross, 30, Columbus, Ohio; Stephen G. McConahey, 28, Alexandria; William E. McGlashan, 30, Los Altos, Calif.; John B. Mumford, 32, Orlando; Luis G. Nogales, 28, Stanford; Maj. Lee R. Nunn, Jr., Air Force Academy; Lt. Col. Colin L. Powell, 35, Woodbridge; Ann S. Ramsey, 29, New Seabury, Mass.; David W. Schrempf, 30, Oberlin, Ohio; AF Maj. Donald J. Stukel, 34, Fairborn, Ohio; George B. Weathersby, 27, Berkeley, and John B. Yasinksy, 32, Pittsburgh.

The Women's Equity Action League has already challenged more than 300 universities and colleges, claiming they discriminate against women in faculty assignments and pay in violation of federal equal-rights rules for contractors.

Now, WEAL is protesting the White House Fellows program, saying that women candidates have been subjected to "discrimatory" questioning about their marital and family status; that almost no women are on selection boards and that only one married woman has been appointed a WHF.

WEAL President Arvonne Fraser, in a letter to President Nixon, said 50 per cent of the future selectees should be women. A total of 68 candidates were approved by regional boards this year, six of them women.

Federal agencies who take WHF for the one-year terms (usually about 15 are selected) have other complaints about the program. They range from jealousy of older staff members at the salaries and red carpet treatment given the WHF, to the fact that many of them don't want to live up to the "gentleman's agreement" and leave government at the end of a year.

Salaries for WHF are negotiated by the agencies, based on what the candidate was getting in his or her job in industry. Some, however, do manage to bargain for more, with Grade 15—a salary of $25,583 to $33,260—the ceiling.

"A couple of years back, we got a candidate who was about 28 years old and said he was making nearly $30,000 with a food chain on the West Coast," a federal official said. "We checked and found out he was, so we paid him that," even though it was much higher than most senior career officials made at the time.

Some Cabinet members have been reluctant to take on WHF assigned to them, either because they want "their own men" in the sensitive posts or because they don't trust "short-timers" who are likely to write books about what happens "or pull a Wally Hickel." The famous Hickel letter to the President, which resulted in his being fired as Secretary of the Interior, was inspired, if not drafted, by a young staff member.

"I think the program has been a success, except in its primary aim of getting the WHF to go back to their jobs," one top career man said. "They get the social rush from embassies here, parties and what not, and they enjoy the power or association with power that comes from working directly with a Cabinet officer. They get Potomac Fever pretty fast, and a lot of them spend most of their tour here trying to line up a comparable job in government."

One former Cabinet officer refused to take a WHF last year. He gave as his reason the fact that he would be leaving government soon and didn't want his successor to be saddled with someone he might not like. In private, however the Cabinet man said the WHF-types "got under his skin, were always underfoot," and he thought, spent too much time trying to build a constituency with young people in the agency, and not enough doing routine work. His successor, however, did pick a WHF who now serves as an executive assistant.

WHITE HOUSE FELLOWS PROGRAM—1969-73

Year	Military	University	Business	Minorities	Other
1969-70 total 18	From 1964 to 1970—No military participants.	7 (Professors, consultants etc., 2 Black, 1 assistant to president of Johns Hopkins). — 7	2 (Black). 1 (Richard Ramsden). 1 General Foods. 1 IBM. — 5	1 Woman (lawyer). 1 Woman (Puerto Rican). 1 Indian. — 3	2 Lawyers (Harvard). 1 Journalist. — 3
1970-71 total 17.	1 Captain, Air Force. 1 Lieutenant commander, Navy. 1 Captain, Air Force. 1 Lieutenant colonel, Army. 1 Lieutenant colonel, Army. — 5	1 (Dean sci. of business administration, University of Texas). 1 (Assistant to president, University of Hawaii). — 2	1 MBA (McKinsey). 1 3M of Minnesota. 1 Burlington Industry. 1 Westinghouse (Bettis Atom. Power Laboratory). 1 RCA. 1 Continental Oil. — 6	1 Woman.	2 Local government. 1 Lawyer (former Vietnam Army major). — 3
1971-72 total 16.	1 Major, Army. 1 Major, Marine. 1 Major, Marine. 1 Lieutenant colonel, Army. — 4	1 (Director, nuclear reactor laboratory, University of Texas). — 1	1 (Jewel companies) Osco Drug, Inc. 1 J. Walter Thompson. 1 Boise Cascade, Inc. 1 McKinsey & Co. 1 Arthur Andersen & Co. — 5	1 Mexican-American (urban plan). 1 Woman (Black, oceanographer). 1 Woman (lawyer). 1 Indian (Harvard law school). — 4	1 (Dartmouth MBA, former Army captain) 1st sergeant, N.Y. Police Force, Tactical Patrol. — 2
1972-73 total 17.	1 Lieutenant colonel, Army. 1 Major, Air Force. 1 Major, Air Force. 1 Major, Air Force. (Special Assistant to Secretary of Defense, East Asia and Pacific region). 1 Major, Army. — 5	1 (Assistant to president, Stanford University, Spanish American). 1 (Director Ford Foundation, project on Univ. Admin.). — 2	2 Westinghouse (Bettis Atomic Lab.). 1 American Standard, Inc. 1 Walt Disney World. 1 McKinsey & Co. 1 W. R. Grace & Co. 1 Enka Research Corp. 1 Syva Co. — 8	1 Woman (drugs).	1 Lawyer.

MELISSA BELOTE, SPRINGFIELD, VA., SETS WORLD SWIMMING RECORD AT OLYMPIC TRIALS IN CHICAGO

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, Jr. Mr. President, Miss Melissa Belote of Springfield, Va., this month set a world swimming record at the Olympic trials in Chicago.

I am sure that all Virginians share pride in the accomplishments of this young woman, who is a sophomore at Robert E. Lee High School. On the day when she broke the record for the 200-meter backstroke, she won both a preliminary and a final race in this event. At the age of 15, she obviously is one of the Nation's outstanding swimmers.

The Washington Post of August 6 contains an article describing Miss Belote's victory and her reactions after the races.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Record-Setting Miss Belote Double Winner in Trials," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

RECORD-SETTING MISS BELOTE DOUBLE WINNER IN TRIALS

(By George Solomon)

CHICAGO, August 5.—Melissa Belote grew up tonight. The 15-year-old wondergirl forgot her lucky toy fish back at the motel and still won the 200-meter backstroke before 5,000 people in the Olympic trials at the Portage Park pool.

Earlier in the day Miss Belote, a sophomore at Robert E. Lee High School in Springfield, Va., set a world record in the 200, whipping through the water in 2:20.64 in a preliminary heat.

The previous world record was 2:21.5, held by Susie Atwood of Lakewood Calif.

Tonight Miss Belote's time was 2:21.771, more than a second slower than her brilliant effort this afternoon but still far enough to leave the bewildered Miss Atwood in her wake. Miss Atwood was clocked in 2:24.359, finishing a distant second.

"Coach Solotar (Ed) told me not to worry about the record tonight," Miss Belote said afterward. "I didn't think my stroke was as smooth tonight. I didn't have enough left to bring it back."

Miss Belote, who had enough confidence to pack her suitcase for a week of training with the Olympic team in Knoxville, Tenn., is the only woman to have won two events at the trials so far. The meet ends Sunday.

Misses Belote and Atwood previously finished one-two in the 100-meter backstroke.

While Miss Belote headed back to the motel with a second bouquet of roses under her arm, Mark Spitz climbed the victory stand for the fourth time in as many nights, the most dominant figure in world swimming.

Spitz, a handsome 22-year old and one of the few swimmers sporting a mustache, captured the 100-meter freestyle in 51.919. Earlier in the day he established his fifth world record of the meet, churning the 100 in 51.47 in a preliminary heat.

"I hope I can keep this up at Munich," said Spitz, who four years ago in Mexico City was favored to win four individual gold medals but wound up being shut out.

"I know I'm the best in the world tonight," Spitz said. "But it won't matter unless I win at Munich. Four years ago I had done well prior to Mexico City. Then I folded. I'm trying to see that I don't fold again."

Spitz finished ahead of Jerry Heidenreich of Dallas, John Murphy of Hinsdale, Ill., and Dave Edgar of Fort Lauderdale, Fla., all of whom made the team.

Frank Heckl, an outstanding swimmer at Southern California and prime contender to make the team, was again blanked, finishing a disappointing eighth in a field of eight.

There was no world records tonight, though Miss Belote, Spitz, Mitch Ivey (200 backstroke, 2.04.827), Brian Job (200 breaststroke), 2:23.36) and John Hencken (200 breaststroke, 2:22.79) bettered the world standards in preliminary heats.

SOUTH CAROLINA VOLUNTEER READING PROGRAM

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, as we deal daily in this Chamber with the increasing challenges of modern society, I remind Senators that 21 million of our fellow Americans are functionally illiterate in this Nation.

They cannot read, Mr. President. They cannot participate in the democratic process. They cannot understand a job application, make out a driver's license application, or fill in a loan form at a bank.

These stark facts are revealed in a Louis R. Harris survey conducted for the National Reading Center of Washington, D.C.

I am pleased to report that the citizens of South Carolina are aware of this problem, and are taking volunteer action to help the children of our state to get a firm foundation in reading ability.

Recently, in the city of Columbia, 100 South Carolina volunteers attended a reading tutor-trainer workshop, sponsored by our State department of education and conducted by the National Reading Center at no cost to the volunteers.

Other sponsors included: South Carolina Education Association, League of Women Voters of South Carolina, Midlands Community Action Agency, and the South Carolina Congress of Parents and Teachers.

The 100 volunteer trainers and coordinators came from 28 of our School districts, and among them were representatives from the University of South Carolina, Columbia College, and Winthrop

College. Other counties will be sharing the training received by the 100 participants who attended the state-level workshop.

These volunteer trainers have now returned to their home communities. They are recruiting and training many more volunteers to go into their neighborhood primary schools and tutor children in learning to read.

Mr. President, there are 8 million youngsters in our Nation's elementary schools who need special help in reading instruction.

These children need individual attention. There is not enough money, there are not enough teachers, and the teachers do not have the time to provide such individual help.

Only through the dedicated volunteer efforts of citizens, who work under direction of the classroom teacher, can our national reading problem be solved.

I am proud that my fellow—citizens of South Carolina are responding to the needs of children in our state.

Particularly, I commend our State department of education and the National Reading Center for bringing this national tutor-training program to South Carolina, as one of the first 20 States in the Union to lead in this volunteer effort to help America's children become good readers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Columbia Record newspaper entitled "S.C. Volunteer Tutor Program Opens To Aid School Pupils," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my comments.

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

S.C. VOLUNTEER TUTOR PROGRAM OPENS TO AID SCHOOL PUPILS

South Carolina's part in a nationwide effort to improve the reading of elementary pupils by using volunteer tutors will be inaugurated today in Columbia.

Representatives of service organizations and the 93 school districts of the state were invited to the conference in the auditorium of the J. Marion Sims Building of the State Board of Health.

The tutoring program is a project of the National Reading Center, Washington, D. C. Its goal is to train 200,000 volunteer reading tutors in the nation to help children in grades one through three improve their reading ability.

Reading deficiencies are a main cause of failure in early grades, according to Mrs. Mary L. Beach, reading consultant for the South Carolina Department of Education. She is coordinating the South Carolina Volunteer Reading Program.

The program is sponsored by the State Department of Education, South Carolina Education Association, League of Women Voters of South Carolina, Midlands Community Action Agency, and South Carolina Congress of Parents and Teachers.

During the conference participants heard an explanation of the national Right to Read program established in 1970, and information concerning the South Carolina Volunteer Reading Program.

South Carolina is one of 21 states holding tutor-trainer workshops this spring. Following a two-day workshop June 5-6, tutor-trainers return to their communities to train locally recruited volunteers who will receive 16-20 hours of instruction, including six to eight hours of practical experience working with children.

Reading tutors will work in grades one, two and three under supervision of the regular classroom teacher.

Educators estimate that about 43 per cent of elementary school children are in urgent need of help in reading, and that 15-20 per cent cannot keep up with their classmates without special reading assistance.

THE DIKES OF NORTH VIETNAM

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, with all the charges and countercharges that have arisen over the dikes of North Vietnam, I am pleased to see an article that moves toward laying the blame for this furor squarely where it belongs—on the North Vietnamese.

I ask unanimous consent that an article, entitled "Behind the Furor Over Bombs on Red River Dikes," published in U.S. News & World Report of August 14, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From U.S. News & World Report, Aug. 14, 1972]

BEHIND THE FUROR OVER BOMBS ON RED RIVER DIKES

The approach of a potentially devastating flood season in North Vietnam means that the furor over U.S. bombing of Communist dikes is likely to reach new heights in days ahead.

Hanoi is pulling out all stops in a determined propaganda campaign to convince the world that American warplanes are deliberately destroying North Vietnam's dikes and threatening hundreds of thousands of persons with drowning or starvation.

The U.S.—with President Nixon leading the way—is denying just as strenuously that there is any calculated plan to wreck North Vietnam's elaborate system of flood control.

Said the President in a White House news conference on July 27: "If it were the policy of the United States to bomb the dikes, we could take them out—the significant part of them out—in a week."

Next day, the State Department, in an unusual move, released a report on aerial-reconnaissance photos of North Vietnam that showed only a dozen bomb craters on dikes. Even the largest crater, it said, could be repaired in a day with "a crew of less than 50 men with wheelbarrows and hand tools." Highlights of the State Department report are on page 20.

The truth is, American officials contend, that Hanoi—looking ahead to heavy rains in August and September—is seeking to cover up its own failure to repair dikes badly damaged in last summer's destructive floods.

Says one ranking military observer: "Rather than divert the men necessary to make the repairs, Hanoi apparently decided to let the floods come and to blame the U.S.—in advance—for any disaster that might occur."

DELTA'S HISTORY

For a full understanding of the exchange of charges and countercharges between Hanoi and Washington, a detailed picture of North Vietnam's dike system is necessary.

North Vietnam is a country of dikes. A network of between 2,700 and 3,000 miles of them protects the nation from the ever-dangerous Red River and insures the country's food supply by regulating the flow of water to the rice fields.

Dikes play a vital role in the Red River Delta, an ancient rice-producing center. Great quantities of water are channeled by the dikes and spread on the paddies through a system of sluices. Rice seedlings then are planted by hand. When the rice matures, the sluices are opened to drain the fields. The water is channeled back to the river, and the grain is harvested.

Since centuries before Christ, the North Vietnamese have been at battle with the Red River. Every year, the river rises to flood proportions in August and September, threatening the surrounding countryside where the great majority of the people live and work.

Every year new dikes are added and damaged dikes are repaired in a never-ending process that over the centuries has resulted in a system so complex that no single dike is responsible for holding back flood waters.

Primary dikes—up to 50 feet high, 150 feet thick at the base and 80 feet wide at the top, channel the Red River through Hanoi and the Delta to the ocean. Other primary dikes on the coast prevent salt water from damaging valuable riceland.

Secondary dikes up to 50 feet thick back up the primary system, so that no one break will overwhelm flood defenses. The smallest dikes—the tertiary system—distribute water to individual fields.

DEFENSELESS?

At first glance, North Vietnam's system appears to be defenseless against air attack. And if actually breached in flood stage, the dikes would unleash billions of gallons of water on Hanoi and the surrounding countryside, flooding up to 6,000 square miles.

However, U.S. experts liken the Red River Delta to a warship in which watertight compartments virtually insure against destruction by a hit from a single torpedo.

Despite President Nixon's assertion that major dikes could be destroyed in a week, some military strategists figure that all U.S. fighter-bombers in Southeast Asia would have to fly daily strikes for up to two months to effectively knock out the system.

Lang Chi Dam and a half dozen smaller dams upstream from Hanoi could be destroyed in a day with guided "smart bombs," they say. But it would take repeated hits with 2,000-pound guided bombs to uproot the massive dikes themselves, 15 feet at a time.

Such an operation, U.S. commanders warn, would expose American pilots repeatedly to withering enemy fire, and would divert them from more productive military targets.

"It's just not worth it," explains one general.

ASSIGNED TARGETS

U.S. officials concede that some dikes are being hit during attacks on military targets either on or near the dikes. North Vietnam is so riddled with dikes that it is impossible to do otherwise, they say, even though pilots are told to bomb only assigned targets and to do as little collateral damage as possible.

According to one military man:

"Dikes are an integral part of the country. To put an absolute quarantine on hitting dikes is like telling your kids to stay off the sand at the beach."

Aerial photographs confirm that the tops of dikes are used by the Communists for anti-aircraft guns and missile emplacements, pumping stations for oil pipelines, and storage areas for surface-to-air missiles. Many dikes also are topped by roads which are used by trucks and other military traffic—natural targets for U.S. bombers.

GUIDED TOURS

Western visitors to North Vietnam routinely are taken on guided tours of damaged dikes, and journalists in Hanoi report what appears to them to be deliberate U.S. bombing of the system.

Yet American analysts insist that most of the damage to North Vietnam's dikes has been caused by last year's floods, which were among the most severe in the country's history.

American experts report that four major breaches in primary dikes along the Red River flooded an estimated 1.1 million acres of riceland. Much of the primary and secondary systems were silted or undermined, and great stretches of the tertiary were broken.

Radio Hanoi, although it gave no casualty figures, said at the time that the disaster surpassed even the flood and famine of 1945, which killed huge numbers of people.

The North Vietnamese recognize the problem—at home, if not in their international propaganda. Mayor Tran Duy Hung of Hanoi wrote in the publication "New Hanoi" on June 30:

"In some places the repair of the dike portions that were damaged by torrential rains in 1971 has not yet met technical requirements. A number of thin and weakened dikes which are probably full of termite colonies and holes have not yet been detected for repair."

Despite the obvious dangers, the Hanoi leadership has not diverted the 300,000 or more men, women and children needed to repair the damage. Instead, the labor force has been kept at tasks essential to the North Vietnamese invasion of South Vietnam.

U.S. flood-control authorities say this means that even the normal August-September rise in the Red River will cause some overflow in the Delta region. A heavy rainfall could bring severe floods and widespread damage to Hanoi.

THE STAGE IS SET

Most American officials are convinced that the U.S. will be blamed for any flooding. Says one Defense Department expert:

"The stage is set. When the floods come, there is nothing we can do to counter the propaganda that we are responsible."

Another military man explains Hanoi's campaign this way:

"The North Vietnamese have lived in the shadow of dikes all their lives. They see bombs cratering a dike, and they know what could happen if there were a concentrated campaign against the dikes. So they are doing some 'preventive propaganda.' They are hollering as loud as they can now in an effort to forestall such a bombing campaign in the future—even before the U.S. thinks seriously about it."

HEADS I WIN, TAILS YOU LOSE

Some military commanders worry that the Nixon Administration, in an effort to counter North Vietnam's propaganda, will so restrict the U.S. bombing campaign that it would be made useless or needlessly endanger the lives of American pilots. Says one officer:

"Hanoi can blame the U.S. for any break in the dike system. At the same time, the enemy would profit from any change in American bombing strategy. It's a kind of 'heads I win, tails you lose' proposition."

NO MAJOR DIKE HAS BEEN BREACHED

(The U.S. State Department on July 28 issued a formal statement refuting charges of intentional bombings of dikes in North Vietnam. From the official text:)

In recent weeks Hanoi has tried to convince the world that its elaborate dike system is a direct and deliberate target of U.S. attacks.

This is not ture. Photographic evidence shows conclusively that there has been no intentional bombing of the dikes. A few dikes have been hit by stray bombs directed at military-associated targets nearby. The damage is minor and no major dike has been breached. The damage can be easily repaired—in a matter of a few days—and has not been sufficient to cause any flooding. No damage has been observed in the Hanoi area or against the primary dike system protecting that city.

Hanoi no doubt is genuinely concerned about the dike system. North Vietnam's rainy season will soon reach its peak, and damage in the dikes caused by last year's very extensive flooding has not yet been fully repaired. . . .

Dikes are particularly resistant to bomb damage. Those in the primary system could be breached only by a series of overlapping craters across the entire top of a dike, and the lips of the craters would have to be sufficiently lower than the river surface to initiate the flow and subsequent scouring action of water rushing through the breach. . . .

North Vietnam's official press agencies and radio service have repeatedly described alleged U.S. bombing attacks on the dike system. In April and May, the North Vietnamese made more than 40 specific allegations, and on 30 June the official press quoted the Deputy Minister of Hydraulics as saying that 20 bombing attacks had been made on dikes during that month. Foreign diplomats, newsmen, and, most recently, actress Jane Fonda have ben escorted to dikes to view damage—most of it around Haiduong, southeast of Hanoi.

A detailed examination has been made of photography of mid-July of the North Vietnamese Red River Delta and bomb craters were detected at 12 locations. None of the damage has been in the Hanoi area, where destruction of the dikes would result in the greatest damage to North Vietnam's economy and logistics effort. Nearly all the damage has been scattered downstream from Hanoi, as well as downstream from the areas of major breaks resulting from the 1971 floods. . . .

All identified points of dike damage are located within close range of specific targets of military value. Of the 12 locations where damage has occurred, 10 are close to identified individual targets such as petroleum-storage facilities, and the other two are adjacent to road and river-transport lines. Because a large number of North Vietnamese dikes serve as bases for roadways, the maze they create throughout the delta makes it almost inevitable that air attacks directed against transportation targets cause scattered damage to dikes.

The bomb craters verified by photography can be repaired easily with a minimum of local labor and equipment. . . .

Repairs to all the dikes could be completed within a week, as the necessary equipment is available throughout the delta.

Local labor historically mobilizes to strengthen and repair dikes to avoid serious flooding. An occasional bomb falling on a dike does not add significantly to the burden of annual repair work normally required. North Vietnam must, however, complete the repair of damage caused by the 1971 floods before next month when this year's rainy season will reach its peak.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE BARTER THEATRE, ABINGDON, VA.

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star and the News of August 12 contains an excellent editorial about the achievements of the Barter Theatre in Abingdon, Va., and its founder and former director, Robert H. Porterfield, who died last October.

A product of the Great Depression, the theater was established to provide work for unemployed actors and actresses. But it survived the depression era and earned an enviable reputation for excellence for production through the years. Today the people of Abingdon are launching a Robert H. Porterfield Memorial Fund to maintain the quality of the offerings at the Barter Theatre.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Small-Town Drama," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

SMALL-TOWN DRAMA

Very few travelers have been more surprised in years past than those who drifted unawares into Abingdon, Virginia, at day's end and found that Shakespeare was playing on Main Street. Or that, instead of a wild-west movie, the local theater was offering a stage play straight off Broadway. That improbable small-town playhouse would have been the Barter Theatre, founded by Robert H. Porterfield during the Great Depression as a haven for out-of-work actors. They literally bartered their talents, collecting hams, and other farm produce in return for Hamlet, and thereby avoiding the soup lines.

Somehow, to the surprise of many, the theater caught hold there in the sparsely populated hills. When times got better, a good many people were willing to pay cash at the box office, and youths in that area developed a zest for drama seldom found in rural places. Even the General Assembly got captivated by the experiment, providing some modest state subsidies to keep the theater from folding. (Hence its somewhat grandiose designation as "The State Theatre of Virginia.") But in recent years the Barter has been a success in its own right, drawing people from all over the country to its performances, growing in fame as the only one of its kind.

There was apprehension, however, when Porterfield died last October. His strong, warm personality had been the guiding force since the curtain first went up 40 years ago, and it was hard to imagine the Barter without him. But his successors pledged that what he started would be carried on, and thus far this season the promise has been admirably kept. Good plays and bright talent are booked through the summer and the crowds these evenings are encouraging. Special children's plays now are presented in a separate building, and young people are given a chance to develop as actors. And apart from its regular productions, Barter is acquainting 15,000 Virginia school children with Shakespeare and the modern stage classics.

All this is remarkable, if not amazing, in a little town, and of course it's getting more costly all along. To keep up the momentum, Abingdon people are starting a $500,000 Robert Porterfield Memorial Fund as a three-year project. They're seeking contributions, and we hope they succeed.

TRIBUTE TO CAPT. JOSEPH L. RUZICKA, JR.

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the tragic death of Capt. Joseph L. Ruzicka, Jr., 26, of North Augusta, S.C., was felt very strongly by the many people who loved and admired this young Air Force officer.

This young man's talents and accomplishments marked him as outstanding. Joe's ability for leadership and his enthusiasm for involvement are evidenced by the diverse activities in which he participated.

During high school, Joe was voted the senior with the most school spirit and was a merit scholarship semifinalist. He reported the news for the high school to the local newspaper, and he also found time to be active in school sports, as well as presiding as president of the Beta Club.

From high school, Joe entered Clemson University at Clemson, S.C., and joined the U.S. Air Force.

Many friends have mourned the passing of this outstanding and versatile young man, and our deepest sympathies are extended to his family in this time of sorrow.

Mr. President, several articles have paid tribute to Captain Ruzicka, and I ask unanimous consent that the articles which appeared in the August 10 issue of the North Augusta Star, North Augusta, S.C., be included in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

JOSEPH L. RUZICKA, JR.

Captain Joseph L. Ruzicka, 26, a North Augusta favorite son, lost his life when the B-52 in which he was navigator crashed in a thunderstorm on a bombing mission in Indochina. Based in Thailand, Ruzicka had just reported to Thailand July 21 after being on Guam.

The son of Mrs. Lucie Ruzicka and the late Joseph L. Ruzicka, Sr., his sister, Susan, now resides in Charlotte and his grandmother, Mrs. Helen Cook, is a North Augustan. His wife, Calista, and 5½ month old daughter, Jennifer, are California residents.

Described in his North Augusta High School yearbook as animated, enthusiastic and dynamic, Joe was voted as the senior with the most school spirit in 1963. His accomplishments in high school ran the gamut from Merit Scholarship Semi-Finalist to a member of the track and tennis teams; from president of Beta Club to master of ceremonies at the Junior-Senior; from photographer to class historian.

Community interests were also paramount in his life. He wrote the school news for the Star for two years, he was the acolyte at St. Bartholomew's Church when the church was built, he was prominent in scouting, he was as his classmates described him, "an unorganized organizer."

Joe's leadership and scholastic ability extended into all phases of college life at Clemson University where his musical aptitude found him a place in the Tiger Band as well as the Air Force ROTC. He entered the service following his graduation in 1967.

A keen wit, a brilliant, inquisitive mind, an affectionate and loyal friend—many hearts are saddened by Joe's tragic death.

A memorial service was held last week at Beale Air Force Base, California for the five casualties of this accident. Interment will be in California.

A memorial service will be held locally at St. Bartholomew's Episcopal Church, the time and date to be announced. A memorial fund has been established at this church for any who wish to honor Capt. Ruzicka's memory.

SIDE GLANCES WITH SAM

Several years ago, Mim and I had a party one Christmas night for several of our younger friends. Of course, at the time, we were much younger ourselves, so the difference in age didn't appear as great as it might to some now.

Over the years, we have continued the practice. Mainly, I think, due to the fact that on that particular night many of the differences of age and social status tend to be negated by the spirit of the season. Also, we discovered that since Christmas EVE parties are more popular, attendance seems greater on Christmas night.

One of the rules is that once you were invited, the invitation lasted forever. That rule hasn't changed. One rule that we found necessary of revision, however, was that no one could come who had accrued more age than the host and hostess. When one of our younger friends married outside of that classification, we simply revised the rule to conform to the times . . . , something like the Supreme Court changes things every now and then.

I began thinking about this at this particularly un-Christmas time of year when I heard of the death of Captain Joe Ruzicka last week at some distant outpost of civilization.

My recollection of Joe, Jr., as we knew him then, dates back to one of those long time ago Christmas parties. I remember sitting in the den, everyone in stocking feet, consuming vast amounts of good things. Reb, at the time still a pup, embarked on the project of removing my socks by chewing the ends and pulling. The task seemed monumental as I guess indeed it was. But for the better part of two hours, this simple undertaking was the major source of entertainment.

I remember Joe in this particular instance since he took over cheerleading duties for the dog, pleading and cajoling with him to succeed in the vast undertaking. Joe always had a weak spot for the underdog.

And then, when the time came for high school graduation, Joe was to be one of the student speakers. Always a rebel of sorts, we talked at length on the wisdom of preparing two speeches, one to be approved by school authorities and given in rehearsal; the other to be the "real thing" which would be sprung on everyone when he stood up to speak. Fortunately, perhaps, this latter project was rejected, a concession to the establishment.

Joe never did forget those Christmas night parties. With the onset of the exposure to a college education, his appearances became later and later. He was responsible for the emergence of the 'second shift' at the parties—the late arrivals who wouldn't even appear until around 2 AM. (We found out later that he would drive past earlier in the evening just to keep a watch on when the crowd would start to thin.) And then, with others of this newly-nighted breed, the conversations would become deeper and deeper as the hour became earlier and earlier. But these early morning conversations would always leave me feeling a little bit better about the future of the human race.

Last week's events in far off Asia, however, tend to raise a question about that future.

Maybe this year's 'second shift' will have some of the answers. And Joe's absence may make some of the problems clearer.

ORDER OF AHEPA CELEBRATES ITS GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 16, 1972

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Order of Ahepa which is celebrating its golden anniversary this year.

The organization can be justly proud of past and present achievements. The Order of Ahepa is a leader in the educational field, it has helped in giving the national minorities of our country new self-respect, and the organization has helped victims of disasters in both foreign and domestic lands.

Through these and innumerable other achievements, the Order of Ahepa represents the highest ideals of American life.

COSTLY AND CONTROVERSIAL F-111 IS FULLY ACCEPTED BY AIR FORCE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and spoken—some good, some bad—about the F-111 aircraft. Those of us who continued to support the F-111 program in the face of controversy and criticisms feel that our efforts have not been in vain. Air Force pilots who have lived with the development of this plane feel it is one of the best aircraft in the U.S. inventory. This is further substantiated in a New York Times report by a very credible writer, Drew Middleton, whose article I insert in the RECORD for our colleagues to read.

The article follows:

COSTLY AND CONTROVERSIAL F-111 IS FULLY ACCEPTED BY AIR FORCE

(By Drew Middleton)

WASHINGTON.—"Any time there's anything wrong with an F-111 it's all over the newspapers," said Lieut. Col. Robert Morrison, "but believe me, I've put in plenty of hours on it and the F-111 can do more things, things the Air Force needs, than any other aircraft—and it's stable and safe, too."

Born in controversy and reared in criticism, the F-111 has been plagued by the "bugs" common to all aircraft that embody technological breakthroughs. But the F-111 and the fighter bomber version, the FB-111, are fully accepted by the Air Force.

Col. Louis Gagnon, who has been with the aircraft from the start, and Colonel Morrison said that it had "one of the better records" among combat aircraft after 150,000 hours operational flying.

The Air Force lists 30 major accidents for F-111's between January, 1967, and June 18 of this year. The accidents include the loss of three aircraft in Southeast Asia. The two-man crews of two of the latter are listed as missing in action. The other 27 accidents have claimed the lives of 19 crewmen.

MODULE SAVED CREWS

The official accident summary notes eight instances in which the lives of crews were saved by the F-111's unusual crew module. This is a self-supporting unit allowing the crew to eject from the aircraft at any moment.

An exploding wire severs the module from the fuselage and a single large rocket motor propels the module clear of the aircraft before the parachutes open.

Political doubts about the plane's capacity and its high cost—about $10-million a copy—have magnified every accident in the public mind, Air Force officers argue.

They point out that criticism of the plane flourished during its first 80,000 hours even though the F-111's record of 21 accidents in that period compared favorably with 39 for the F-4 and 33 for the F-106 in the same time frame.

WARTIME MISSION

Experienced F-111 pilots here and with the Third Air Force in Britain called the plane the best aircraft for nighttime and bad weather strikes deep inside enemy territory. In wartime, the F-111 would be assigned to interdict enemy airfields. This was the decisive mission of the Israeli Air Force in the Six Day War of 1967.

F-111 pilots believe that, if the Israelis had F-111's at that time, they would have completed their mission at night with less aircraft and greater destruction of the Egyptian Air Force.

The aircraft's advanced design enables it to perform at least three roles—tactical fighter, tactical reconnaissance and strategic bomber.

The advent of new Soviet fighters has prompted discussion of the F-111's chances with the Soviet MIG-23 or Foxbat. Intelligence sources say the MIG-23 has a ceiling of 90,000 feet and a speed of Mach 2 plus, with a 4,000-pound payload.

EFFECTIVE ALTITUDE

Aerial combat is unlikely in upper altitudes. Most such fighting takes place around 20,000 feet. There, American pilots argue, the F-111 is superior. Air Force experience in Vietnam is that the MIG-21J, the basic Soviet interceptor, was not effective against F-105's at that and lower altitudes and note that the F-111 is much faster at low altitudes than the F-105.

The MIG-23 has what airmen call a "look down, shoot down" capability, enabling it to fire missiles on fighters belows. The Air Force contends that the tail radar in the F-111 will give sufficient warning of such attacks.

The ultimate answer is that the F-111 is built to operate at night, at low altitudes and in bad weather. These are conditions that do not favor the MIG-23, according to intelligence officers. Aerial combat is not the F-111's job, they add. Its job is "destroying the other fellow's planes and bases on the ground."

TWO MAJOR ADVANCES

The F-111 incorporates two major advances in military aviation.

One is its swing or variable sweep wing. The F-111, with wings extended, takes off in less than 3,000 feet. In flight, the wing can be folded back to a delta wing configuration for high speed.

The aircraft's most remarkable attribute is its capacity to fly automatically at low level under the "eyes" of enemy radar.

It is this capacity to penetrate radar defenses that is believed to be behind the Soviet delegation's suggestion at the recent talks on the limitation of strategic arms that the F-111's be included in the discussion. It was the only aircraft mentioned by the Russians during the talks.

The F-111's Terrain-Following Radar, or TFR, can be set to fly the plane at a selected low level.

TRF guides the plane over the contours of the earth, swooping into valley and clearing mountains at a fixed altitude day or night, regardless of weather. Should any of the TFR circuits fail, the system puts the plane automatically into a climb to a higher altitude.

EVADES ENEMY RADAR

The F-111 has a speed of Mach-1 plus at sea level. Moving at that speed "on the deck," no eye, human or radar, can pick it up in time for effective action. During a short operational tour in Vietnam, the F-111 was engaged by enemy fire on only 42 per cent of its missions.

At high altitude the F-111 has a speed of Mach 2 to 2.5 times the speed of sound. (At sea level and at 32 degrees Fahrenheit, sound travels at a speed of 1,088 feet a second.)

Along with its other attributes, the F-111, a two-man aircraft, is a comfortable "fly."

"Moving from the ordinary fighter to the F-111 is like moving from a Jeep to a Cadillac," said Maj. Cornelius Kelly.

However, the aircraft has been controversial from its birth.

Early in the Kennedy Administration, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara began thinking about a multimission aircraft. He wanted a plane that could do a variety of jobs at greater cost effectiveness rather than single-mission planes.

UNPOPULAR CONCEPT

This was not a popular concept with the Air Force and the Navy. But, under pressure, they agreed and listed their individual requirements.

The Air Force wanted a long-range fighter bomber capable of flying at high speeds and low altitudes, carrying conventional or nuclear bombs. The Navy asked for a carrier-borne interceptor of medium range for fleet defense.

In January, 1968, six years after the Defense Department awarded the F-111 contract to the General Dynamics Corporation, the British, who had agreed to purchase 40 F-111's, pulled out of the program. In July, 1968, the Navy followed suit.

The effect was to increase public doubts about the plane's effectiveness.

Since then the British, in cooperation with the West Germans and Italians, have embarked on the MRCA, or Multiple Role Combat Aircraft, program to build a fighter with many of the F-111's characteristics.

RESULTS IN VIETNAM

The aircraft's history in Vietnam was not happy. A six-plane force flew 55 combat missions and then, Colonel Morrison said, "ran out of missions." It began to fly early in March, 1968, and at the end of that month the Johnson Administration stopped its bombing of North Vietnam.

Officers say the F-111 did its job. The results, as estimated from reconnaissance photographs, showed that the plane could hit its targets at night and in bad weather as effectively as other fighter bombers could do in daylight.

The F-111's cost has been another source of criticism.

The fighter version's "flyaway cost," that is, airframe and two Pratt and Whitney TF-30-P-3 turbofan engines, is about $9.5-million for the fighter and just under $10-million for the fighter bomber. When support and spares are added, the prices rise to $11.8-million and $13.9-million.

$8.8-BILLION PROGRAM

The total program cost is estimated at $6.6-billion for the fighters and $1.2-billion for the bombers. There are two wings of bombers in the United States, one at Plattsburg Air Force Base in New York and the other at Pease Air Force Base in New Hampshire. One wing of fighters, 72 aircraft, is deployed at Upper Heyford in England.

Air Force officers are generally convinced that the F-111 is worth the money in either version. This is not only because it can do things no other aircraft can do, they argue, but because it incorporates technology—the variable wing, TFR, the crew module, the main strut landing gear—that represent the future in combat aircraft.

"There is no comparable aircraft," Colonel Gagnon said.

COMMON CAUSE

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues attention the conclusion of three parts of an article on Common Cause.

The article follows:

COMMON CAUSE

Gardner's lobby helped in the fight to change the Congressional seniority system, but as Richard Conlon, staff director of the House's Democratic Study Group, correctly recalled, "There was all kind of press to change the seniority system all year long—long before Common Cause got involved. They were not the prime movers. I think [the modest reform rules] would have gone through anyway, whether or not Common Cause had helped."

Common Cause lobbied against appropriations for the continued development of the supersonic transport (SST), and Senator William Proxmire, the ringleader of the opposition, has publicly given polite thanks. But staff members in Proxmire's office, to keep the credit in balance, point out that the critical vote to kill the SST occurred in December of 1970, at which time Common Cause wasn't even lobbying the issue. Gardner's crowd did recruit help for the vote in March 1971, which delivered the *coup de grâce* to the SST, but the momentum to that end had been building for a year—thanks to the lobbying drive of 15 public-interest organizations, coordinated at the end by Friends of the Earth. They, along with Proxmire, were the real heroes.

Unquestionably Common Cause was the most vigorous peace lobby in Washington throughout 1971, and although it failed (the vote was 254 to 158) to pass an amendment in the House to cut off funds for the Vietnam war by the end of the year, Gardner's lobbyists did win a number of unlikely converts among the ethnic hawks and established a more tangible antiwar mood than had ever before been created in the House.

Common Cause lawyers have been busy. In California they sued the state and forced it to let unmarried students vote where they were attending school rather than being required to vote at the home of their parents—a victory that helped one fifth of the nation's 18-to-21-year-old voters. And in the District of Columbia, Gardner's lawyers embarrassed both national parties by suing them to obey the campaign money laws.

A full and accurate appraisal of Common Cause's work to date, however, is impossible to make. For one thing, the lobby's bookkeeping is helter-skelter. It is a bit ironic. Gardner's standard theme is that "the two great weapons against the public interest are money and secrecy." He is constantly denouncing special interests for not telling the whole story about their lobbying activities. Yet the lobbying reports Common Cause files with the clerk of the House of Representatives, as required by law, leave much untold.

These reports show that Common Cause received $4,217,668.22 in dues and gifts in 1971 and spent $847,856.29. Does this mean the lobby came through the year with a surplus of more than $3,000,000? No, it only means this was all Common Cause spent to actually lobby on *Federal* legislation. Like all its public accounting, Common Cause's record of specific lobbying expenditures is spotty. Guessing from other known Common Cause executive salaries, David Cohen, the lobby's national field director—the fellow who pulls together any letter-writing campaign from the membership—must be earning at least $24,000, but the lobbying report shows that for the last three months of 1971 he was paid a total of only $1246 for his efforts to influence legislation at the Federal level.

A number of other key salaries either are also reported only in part or are ignored altogether. Common Cause president Conway's $45,000 salary is not listed. No salary is listed for Gardner and his aides say he doesn't receive one, surviving instead on income from lecturing and from stock-market profits. Andrew J. Glass, a reporter for the *National Journal*, reminded Gardner that his refusal to disclose the specific sources of his income "appeared inconsistent with his stand against financial secrecy in lobbying operations and exposed him to conflict-of-interest suspicions"; but Gardner still refused to open up.

Efforts to put together an accurate picture of the financial outlay through direct inquiries at Common Cause headquarters are equally frustrating. The young woman who—by her and her boss's estimate—researched all and wrote 90 percent of a leaflet on delegate selection to national party conventions told me that the editorial cost had been "less than $3000." But other officials at Common Cause, insisting that the cost of secretaries and proofreaders and rewrite editors should also be counted, put the cost at $15,000. The state director of another project testified before a Congressional committee that "the total cost to us in making this effort may be estimated to have been between $10,000 and $15,000." But higher officials at national headquarters told me that the director was wrong and that the actual cost was in the neighborhood of $75,000.

If there's confusion about how the citizens' lobby spends its money, there's even more confusion about where the lobby is going and what it hopes to achieve next—confusion that was generated at the end of 1971 when, just as it seemed Gardner and his top honchos had settled on a plan of operation, there was, without warning, an upheaval and a regrouping. Some of the more successful operations were killed and a few of the C.C. executives with the best reputations were let go. The Capitol Hill lobbying staff was cut in half. Even though they'd just begun to learn how to concentrate pressure at the Federal level, suddenly there was the announcement that "from now on we intend to put more emphasis on state issues and state legislatures." A Common Cause lawyer had been cooking up a suit to force Nixon to roll back milk prices on the grounds that the G.O.P. had been bought off by the milk lobby—just the sort of lawsuit it seemed Gardner should have loved—but at the critical moment the lawyer was cut from the payroll. (So Ralph Nader stepped in and hired him, filed the lawsuit and reaped front-page publicity in *The New York Times, The Washington Post* and papers all around the country—publicity from which Common Cause could have dearly profited.)

Why the nervous reorganization? It was widely believed around town that Gardner had panicked. If there is any one thing that has been his specialty in the world of real people, it has been raising money—and suddenly, alramingly, it seemed that he was losing his touch. Common Cause had launched itself, as one of Nader's aides put it, "on nothing but a good idea and John Gardner's good name." As 1971 slumped to an end, it seemed that these were still its main, or only, assets in the public's mind. The organization's activist role in Washington had been admirable but not impressive. And the public seemed to be losing interest.

The return on the lobby's direct-mail recruiting had fallen from a high of two and a half percent—far better than the average return for direct-mail solicitation—to one percent, which is barely acceptable. For a comparison, Nader's direct-mail solicitation has sometimes had as high as a three-and-a-half-percent return and has never had less than two and a half percent.) In the fall of 1970, full-page ads in *The New York Times* had a fantastic response, pulling more than 7000 members into Common Cause. But a $10,000 full-page ad in the *Times* in November 1971 brought in only 300 members. Gardner and his advisors decided the ad route was washed out.

This is not to suggest that Common Cause is dying or that its executives feel defeated. Conway predicts the outfit will continue to grow at the rate of 15 percent a year. But it is to suggest that by spending about $1,500,000 a year in membership drives—over one third its income—the C. C. hierarchy is forced to be too concerned with what that money returns. Thus, if Federal lobbying seems to lose its sales appeal, pump more into the state level and see if that catches on better.

This is a danger Common Cause leaders seem to realize. They say they will spend much less to recruit in 1972. The experiences of 1971 had a dampening effect on some workers. At the first meeting of the Illinois state steering committee after Gardner's decision to change C. C.'s focus, one who was there recalls, "The feeling was that the Washington offices were so screwed up that no one quite knew how to approach the whole thing, that it was a mistake to switch the focus to local and state issues, since we already have the IVI [Independent Voters of Illinois], BGA [Better Government Association], etc., for that type of lobbying, and that Common Cause ought to be a national—that is, Federal Government—lobby. There was also the feeling that Common Cause was concentrating so much on membership drives and fund raising that it might possibly become simply a self-perpetuating organization, losing sight of its original goals."

Whether or not the refocusing on the states was wise, it was understandable, in a way. Aside from a couple of lawsuits, Common Cause had only one socko trophy to point to at the end of 1971: the Colorado Project. This project was so well conceived and executed—on so little money—that it was normal for Gardner to hold it in awe and to dream of duplicating it elsewhere, even if the effort ripped apart the original concept of Common Cause.

The pillars of the Colorado Project/Common Cause are a couple of exciting public-interest adventurers named David Mixner and Craig S. Barnes. Mixner, who grew up in the Seven Mountains area of Appalachia in a coal-mining family "that had been ripped off for years by the Rockefellers," as he put it, dropped out of college to join the peace movement, drifted West and in 1970 went to work trying to elect Barnes to Congress.

Barnes' background is posher. Son of a Denver civil engineer, he graduated from Stanford University in 1958 and from its law school in 1962. He joined a large Denver law firm. Part of his duties included lobbying for industry's position on pollution matters. But, says, he, "I decided I didn't want to do that for the rest of my life," and his rebellion quickly evolved to the point that he became the lawyer in a celebrated Denver school-integration case. Having cut the ties in this way, he took the next step by running as a peace candidate against the 20-year incumbent, Congressman Byron Rogers. Barnes defeated Rogers by 30 votes in the primary, but lost in the general election for two reasons: He was considered too pro-integration and he made a public statement, which he never withdrew, that he would go to jail rather than serve in Vietnam.

Thus free to do better things than serve in Congress, Barnes and Mixner looked around to see what they could do for Colorado. "We started out to discover why the average Coloradan feels that his government is corrupt," says Barnes. "Here's a progressive state with progressive leadership on both sides of the aisle, good men in the legislature, a legislature that has sporadically kicked up progressive legislation on abortion law and a children's code and things like that. Nevertheless, the typical citizen in the state thanks that all politics is corrupt, that the government somehow doesn't reflect his interest and that he's tuned out. We felt if we could find out what was wrong and what to do about it in a microcosm like Colorado, then we'd know the answer to the whole national malaise."

When the Public Service Company of Colorado—the biggest utility (gas and electricity) in the state—asked for an annual $11,300,000 rate increase, Barnes and Mixner decided that this was the test case they had been waiting for. First they pulled together data showing P.S.C.'s paralyzing hold on the state: interlocking officials in half of Denver's biggest banks, on 28 Colorado government commissions, in 19 chambers of commerce, 19 civic organizations (such as Red Cross), 32 business and professional organizations, six country clubs and eight universities and colleges.

"We sent out fact sheets to thousands of Common Cause members," says Barnes, "to tell them what was at stake here: the country clubs we were financing through our electric bills, the political movies we were financing through our electric bills, the inflationary salary increases we were financing; the failure of the company to do anything about pollution control at the same time it spent nearly $3,000,000 a year on advertising for a monopoly it didn't need to advertise. We sent all that information out to the public, and wow, they weren't apathetic at all. They came streaming in."

Indeed they did. It was the largest public participation in a rate hearing in the state's history. Barnes and Mixner had welded together a coalition that would have made the ghosts of the old Populists give a cheer. Every Steelworkers local in Colorado joined. The women's auxiliaries of the Steelworkers joined. The National Farmers Union came in. So did the environmentalists and the peace people. Mixner calls it "a 'coalition' of the exploited,' to use Senator Fred Harris' phrase. These are the people who are getting together, who have been divided by the wealthy in this country. The people in our coalition, why, they weren't even *talking* to each other a year ago."

The public showing in the rate hearing was so overwhelming that the utilities commission, notoriously in the pocket of the industry, decided that the safest thing to do was whack $3,900,000 off the $11,300,000 rate-increase request. And in their appeal from this ruling the Public Service Company lawyers were reduced to complaining that—and these are their very words—the Colorado Project leaders had injected an "emotional element" into the hearing and that this was "improper." Nobody can whine like a corporation lawyer when he's been trounced.

Moving from Gardner to Barnes/Mixner, one moves to an entirely different altitude. Here the air is crisp and biting. No sludgy *Reader's Digest* wishfulness. No tips of the hat to Rockefeller, Whitney, Ford and company. "We are gearing up to the day when we can force the states to require different criteria for chartering corporations so that corporations will have their public responsibilities as well as profit motives," says Barnes. "Isn't it Saul Alinsky who says what we need is an American form of communism? That we need a fairer way to restrain corporate power and the profit ethic, but something that just isn't as unethical as Marxist communism? I would agree with that. I think this is a political movement. I think the climate is right to have another progressive revolution. The facts are right. The 30-year period of consolidation of corporate power is almost complete, so that the President can deal with 500 corporations and feel that he's got the problem under control. Mintz and Cohen say (in *America, Inc.*) there are only 200 corporations that you have to worry about, standing astride the economy of the country. Well, the time has come, and those of us who are involved are at the genesis of a movement to do something about the subversion of the democratic process by corporate power."

The point in quoting so extensively from these two Colorado chaps is to show one potential of Common Cause. Both in the Federal capital and out in the states it has surfaced a number of tough do-gooders like Barnes and Mixner, and occasionally the money raised by Gardner trickles down to them and they do marvelous things with it. Maybe the trickling will increase.

Meanwhile, what more could you ask from $15 than the surprise of finding yourself lobbying hand in hand with Jack Valenti and Arlene Francis?

A PROFILE OF THE HONORABLE F. EDWARD HÉBERT

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BOB WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, those of us who serve with Armed Services Committee Chairman, F. EDWARD HÉBERT, have great respect for him and his earnest desire for fairness in the operations of our committee. Recently a profile of Chairman HÉBERT was published in the Washington Star and Daily News which captures the colorful character of this unusual man. I insert this article by Orr Kelly to be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

SOME CHANGES SINCE RIVERS—ARMS AND MR. HEBERT

(By Orr Kelly)

In the glacial movement of congressional seniority, it took Eddie Hebert 30 years from the time he entered Congress to become chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and thus one of the half dozen or so most powerful men in Washington.

"There's no kidding. The chairman's got power!" Hebert says.

"An admiral was in here the other day. There was a little 'dilution' going to take place in the Eighth Naval District. The admiral was sitting down where you are sitting.

"And I looked at him and said, 'Admiral, I don't know whether you heard it or not but Mendel Rivers died a year and a half ago. Have you heard? He's dead!'

"Well, he got the message."

Rep. F. Edward Hebert, D-La., has a particular concern for the welfare of the congressman from Louisiana's First Congressional District.

"The only election I take in is every two years in the First Congressional District of Louisiana when I support the incumbent with vigor," he says.

If you live in Hebert's New Orleans district, you have to be 53 years old to have voted for anyone else who was elected to Congress. He confidently expects to be elected for the 17th time this November—more times than anyone has been elected to public office in the history of Louisiana.

STAYING POWER

It is this remarkable staying power that made it possible for Hebert to be there when the chairmanship of the committee opened up with the death of Rivers in 1970. A Louisiana friend has a theory of how Hebert got the chairmanship, and thus his present position of power.

Hebert, a Jesuit-educated Roman Catholic, tells the story this way:

"He says, that Fella upstairs wanted Hebert. He wanted one of His boys to be chairman instead of that Baptist, Mendel Rivers. So what does He do? (Rep. Philip J.) Philbin's in the way. He's blockin'. So He goes over there to Boston, gets that Jesuit (the Rev. Robert F.) Drinan—another one of the boys—to beat Philbin. So that clears the way for Hebert. Then He grabs Rivers and takes him off."

Whether he got there by accident of age or politics or by divine intervention, the way the former newspaperman from New Orleans has chosen to use his immense power in the last year and a half has been interesting and not entirely predictable.

When Hebert came to Congress in 1941 as part of a political deal, he was 38 years old and had behind him a career as a newspaperman in which he had broken a major scandal in Louisiana.

In 1952, as head of the House investigating subcommittee, he conducted a series of widely publicized hearings on Pentagon waste and procurement mistakes.

"I'm supposed to be the patsy of the Pentagon," he says. "I know that's what people think. But way before Proxmire ever could spell 'waste,' let alone get it in print, I had a chamber of horrors. That was one of the most devastating investigations of the Pentagon that was ever conducted."

In another investigation, he uncovered a scandal in the airframe industry and saw a corrupt labor leader hustled off to jail.

But now that he is chairman, Hebert's investigative zeal seems to have cooled. Instead, he has concentrated on reforms within the committee—a committee on which the chairman has traditionally been a stern autocrat.

Asked in a recent interview what image he would like to create, Hebert replied:

"The image I'd like to have is that I'm fair, that I'm not swayed by partisanship and that I believe in giving every man his day in court. That I'm trustworthy and that when I say something I mean it. I think that's the image I'd want most."

Thus, under Hebert's chairmanship, each member of the committee is allowed just five minutes to question witnesses and then wait his turn again. Each is called in the order of seniority among those present when the session begins. This contrasts with hearings under Rivers, when the chairman did most of the questioning and his friends—including Hebert—did the rest, or with the days of Carl Vinson, who didn't even know the names of the junior members on his committee.

Even with those members of the committee with whom he has the greatest political, ideological and generational differences, Hebert has generally managed to maintain a friendly personal relationship, and he has given some of them important assignments they would not have received under Rivers.

Rep. Lucien N. Nedzi, D-Mich., for example, has been made chairman of the special subcommittee on the Central Intelligence Agency with the mandate to take a close look at the government's whole intelligence operation.

Hebert's relations even seem to be reasonably good with Rep. Michael Harrington, D-Mass., who is just half as old as Hebert and who has gotten into a couple of rather nasty little exchanges with him in committee sessions.

"I think he would say mine is the minority of the minority point of view," Harrington said.

He agreed that Hebert has made an effort at fairness in running the committee—partly because Hebert has the votes, both in the commitee and in Congress.

"But I think there is much more the form of fairness than the substance of fairness," Harrington said. "They can play a pretty rough sub-surface game."

Harrington's complaint is that some staff members and the more senior—and generally more conservative—members of the committee play things close to the vest.

"I have a feeling that there is a reluctance to share information," he said.

As committee chairman, Hebert dispenses what he calls the "goodies"—generally airplane rides to interesting places. He encourages the committee members to travel because "the best way that a man knows what he's doing is to absolutely touch the thing and see it."

Thus, when Harrington, a brand new member of the committee, wanted to go to Southeast Asia, Hebert told him he was welcome to go to South Vietnam—but not to Laos or Cambodia.

"He couldn't understand that," Hebert said. "I said, well, I got enough trouble . . ."

"We fenced for a year on Laos and Cambodia," Harrington said. "Finally, I said I surrendered and would agree to his ground rules.

Even Hebert's critics don't accuse him of using his power to influence the location of military bases or the awarding of military contracts for political purposes—aside from his acknowledged protection of installations already in the New Orleans area.

But the fact that military installations and defense contracts are economically important in many parts of the country has made it difficult—virtually impossible, in any meaningful sense—for the would-be rebels on Hebert's committee to get together in a concerted effort to make major changes in the defense budgets in committee.

And yet, it is only in committee that there is a realistic chance to make changes. This year, for example, the committee cut the administration's $23 billion military procurement and research bill by $1.5 billion—but Hebert proudly notes that there was not a single change made in the bill on the House floor.

LIKES LAIRD

The committee handles two major chunks of the defense budget each year—the procurement and research budget of about $22 billion and the military construction budget of about $2 billion. But it also has a strong influence on the operations and maintenance account, and it sets the pay scales. In effect, it thus has direct or indirect control over the entire defense budget of about $85 billion.

Hebert's concentration on reform within the committee is probably based to some extent on his general feeling that things are going pretty well at the Pentagon under Defense Secretary Melvin Laird.

"I think Laird's a great man," Hebert said. "I put Laird in the class with Forrestal. Forrestal is my favorite." The late James Forrestal was the first secretary of defense.

But Hebert, who talks with an accent peculiar to certain parts of New Orleans—an accent more like that of Brooklyn than the South—would probably run the committee quite different if Robert S. McNamara were still secretary.

"I used to get a kick out of that man," he said. "I had fun with him. I'd tell him things deliberately, you know, just to annoy him. He didn't talk my language at all.

"Oh, I used to tell him the goddamndest, most outrageous things. One day he was sitting right over there, and I told him, 'Robert, you know, you just a transient here. . . . I said I've seen 'em come and I've seen 'em go and I'll be here when you're gone.'

"I am. . . . And I am!"

Hebert has an irrepressible and ribald sense of humor and a lasting appreciation for the finer things in life.

He rides around in a Cadillac and owns three homes. In each home is a complete expensive wardrobe, so he never has to pack a bag. Since he first came to town, some of the nicest looking girls in Washington have graced his offices.

When the Rayburn House Office Building was under construction, he prowled around and found a place where the design would provide one office of extraordinary size. It is now the fanciest office on the Hill, complete with a foyer with fountain.

Off his private office are two other rooms. One he calls the "Adult Room." It is a little bar decorated with seductive pictures of naked ladies and a street sign from Bourbon Street, which used to be in Hebert's district and was part of his beat as a reporter.

The other is furnished with a television set, chairs and a couch.

"That's the 'Adultery Room,'" Hebert chuckles.

It took Hebert 30 years to get where he is now—and he likes his job.

"I know I'm in the twilight stages," he acknowledges. "I'll be 71 on Oct. 12. Times are changing. You feel like. . . . Take those kids, imagine those kids 18, 19, 20. Me, I'm just a name to them."

But now that he's chairman, he shows no signs of wanting to move on.

"TESTING FOR VIRUSES AT DALECARLIA"

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, Washington, D.C. and its suburbs, without appropriate planning, can face a water shortage sometime in the next decade—the projected flow of the Potomac River will simply not be sufficient to meet the growing demand indefinitely. Washington's water problem is, however, symptomatic of the water situation in many other municipalities throughout the United States. It is no news that the time is long overdue to begin exploring and developing the potential of recycled wastewater and polluted surface waters as supplements to our existing sources of potable and recreational waters. As a matter of fact, reuse of water in America is hardly a revolutionary or novel concept. An exhaustive study of one-third of our American cities in 1961 demonstrated that these municipalities included from 0 to 18 percent municipal waste water from upstream in their drinking water with the average city having 3.5 percent recycled waste water in its supply.

One of the major concerns to use of polluted and recycled waste waters is viral contamination. Enteric viruses, which cause such diseases as infectious hepatitis, polio, and a variety of gastrointestinal disorders, are commonly found in raw sewage and polluted waters. However, before the means to remove or inactivate viruses can be fully developed, the extent of their presence must be determined.

Last week I visited the Dalecarlia Water Treatment Plant to observe the Army Corps of Engineers' virus testing operations. The Corps of Engineers, responsible for Washington's water supply, has recently awarded the Woodard Research Corp. a contract to test regularly both the raw and treated water at Dalecarlia for viruses. The data provided by this study will go a long way toward answering questions on the effectiveness of current water treatment processes, from the standpoint of viral contamination. And too, this study will contribute to the refinement of techniques for detecting small quantities of virus in large quantities of water, techniques that are now prohibitive because of the complexity, expense, and time involved. Just as water is now monitored for bacterial contaminants—that once constituted major public health hazards—we can soon expect viral monitoring to become the rule rather than the exception in municipal water and sewage treatment plants.

It is to the great credit of the Corps' skilled professional and technical personnel that despite raw sewage contamination received at the intake, Washington area residents are guaranteed wholesome, potable water. The Dalecarlia intake receives upstream water with an estimated one-half to two-thirds million gallons of sewage overflow from the Cabin John watershed; this contamination is of a higher degree than would be found in water from the upper estuary.

For all these reasons the Army Corps of Engineers is doing research on the effects of chlorination on enteric viruses and is studying the potential of the Potomac Estuary as a supplemental water source for Washington. These three projects will provide much needed information for all concerned to avert a water crisis in Washington, and ultimately the Nation. The Army Corps of Engineers is to be commended for their foresight and leadership in the field of water supply; and I sincerely hope that others will follow their example and direct their efforts toward developing new sources of "cool, clean water."

A POSITIVE APPROACH TO CONSUMERISM

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. H. W. Close delivered a very timely and superb address recently to the South Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association at Sea Island, Ga. Mr. Close is providing outstanding leadership as president of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute and as chairman of the board of directors of the fabulous Springs Mills. I commend this great address to the attention of the Congress and to the American people:

A POSITIVE APPROACH TO CONSUMERISM

(By H. W. Close)

The greatest challenge to business survival is the array of demands, desires, decrees and doubts we call consumerism.

Consumerism is a fact of business life.

It's not just a noisy phase that will pass if we ignore it. It's here to stay. And it's changing the way we run our businesses.

Look at the time, energy and money all of us have invested in recent months to meet the immediate requirements of the new consumerism—regulations on flammability, labeling, packaging, and so on. Often we are working in the face of arbitrary deadlines and impractical standards.

That's more than just a noisy phase. Every time you look at your cost statement it gets more real.

But the noise—the overkill, the exaggeration, the emotion, the overreaction—has tended to make a positive response to the consumer movement difficult.

One reason is that consumerism is assessed differently by different people.

Some businessmen, for example, might think it's a costly, bloody nuisance.

The reform-hungry zealots see consumerism as a way to inflict vengeance—they call it "justice"—on a business community which has exploited the consumer.

Some politicians think it's a great vehicle for vote-getting.

Some bureaucrats think it's a great vehicle for empire-building.

Many of the leading consumer advocates, I'm sure, see the movement as a means of giving voice to millions of silent but aggrieved consumers.

But I'm not sure whether the real consumer—the Lady with the Pocketbook at the retail counter—cares about the movement, or realizes what is being promoted in her behalf.

The consumer, of course, is the very reason for the businessman's existence. If there is anything we value more than a customer, it is a satisfied customer who comes back . . . and brings a friend.

That's called good will. Good will is earned by performance. And you are never better than your last performance.

OMINOUS IMPLICATIONS

So we have reason to be concerned, not only about the immediate pressures of consumerism, but about some of the long-range implications of the movement. They are ominous.

They are aimed at destroying the credibility of business with its customers, and they threaten the free enterprise system that has done more for consumers than any other system in the history of the world.

Our credibility is already eroding when a Gallup Poll shows Americans think business makes 28 per cent net profit on sales. . . . Somebody said they just misplaced the decimal point.

Our credibility is undermined when a United States Senator is quoted widely as saying $30 of every $100 spent by the average consumer is lost due to overpricing, underquality, unnecessary surcharges, or plain fraud.

Our credibility is suspect when nearly two-thirds of the public, according to a survey made by Opinion Research Corporation, feel that the issue of "advertisers making false claims" is a serious moral problem. The FTC compounds the suspicion with its movement toward "full disclosure" product advertising.

Our credibility is jeopardized in an extremely ironic way when an outfit in Boston starts selling, by mail order, something called the Telagripe Complaint Kit, complete with sample letters to company presidents. Only one dollar.

You and I can fume in outrage.

But while we're steaming, our opposition is making points with our customers and putting new rules in the lawbooks.

It makes it tough to take a positive approach to consumerism.

TIME FOR OBJECTIVITY

But a positive approach is necessary. Because a punitive philosophy which makes business the whipping boy will hurt the consumer as much as business in the long run.

How, then, do we put consumerism in perspective?

For one thing, it is time that informed, respected, objective, credible voices made themselves heard in the consumer clamor.

We recently held the first meeting of Springs Mills' Consumer Advisory Panel. This group is composed of six women college professors from across the nation, all professional home economists. They represent an organization of 2,200 professors of textiles and clothing at 400 universities and colleges throughout this country, Canada and Puerto Rico.

We thought of them as moderate, informed consumer advocates.

That perception didn't really prepare us for their first session with our marketing executives.

Much of what these consumer advocates had to say was at odds with what the better publicized leaders of the movement constantly offer.

One of them said: "Some of the current trends in consumerism are going to result in eliminating the freedom of choice the consumer should have when she makes a purchase."

Another one said: "I don't think consumers are aware of what is being done for them by industry, because industry isn't telling its story. Maybe education isn't helping tell the story either."

Other comments from this group of women—they're consumers, too, as well as experts in the field of textile consumer research—tended to support the contention that increased regulation would limit consumer freedom, and increase costs.

We are hopeful that this influential group, with knowledge of industry as well as consumers, will begin to make its voice heard in consumerist and government circles as a result of our effort to open communications with them.

One panel member went so far as to say we're putting too much quality into our fashion products. She contended that extra durability meant extra cost that was unnecessary in a product with a brief fashion life. For example, she complained she'd had the same bedspread for 20 years, and was sick of it.

Now I'll have to admit that this is a new one on me.

But maybe it's also a new one on the professional consumer movers who're advocating that we build every product to last a lifetime, and limit the choices the customer faces at the retail counter.

Those are two extremes. And maybe the real answer lies somewhere in between, neither too much nor too little.

To get an answer, of course, you have to ask a question.

ASK THE CONSUMER WHAT SHE WANTS

We have to break out of our comfortable shells of preconception and ask the emerging American consumer direct questions: What does she really want, what is she really willing to pay for, where does she want to go to get it? That's called market research.

Then we must answer our own questions: Can we make it, how much will it cost, how soon can we get it to her? That's called product research.

If we do that, I think we are getting to the eye of the hurricane: True consumerism is giving the consumer what she wants and will pay for, not what anybody else says she wants.

In England a few years ago, government flammability standards were made very stiff. So stiff, in fact, that the only goods available on the counters didn't have the feel or look customers wanted. They wouldn't sell.

Mothers started sewing pajamas and nightgowns for their children. Or they let the children sleep in their underwear in place of the sleepwear they couldn't find in the store.

That's consumerism gone berserk—protection so thorough and so sound it protects no one and limits the consumer's selection in the process.

It is the consumer—not government, nor business, nor self-appointed guardians—who must determine freely what goods and services will survive in the marketplace.

The new American consumer is not a wild, loud radical (although some who say they represent her might be).

She is a fashion-conscious, independent, better-educated, more affluent person who looks for value in products, and integrity in companies which make products.

If we in business take no initiative to serve her interests in a positive way, it is obvious she will look to someone else for attention—and we will have to live (or die) with the consequences.

How can business take a positive approach to consumerism?

There are several ways:

1. Short-term, of course, we must comply with the new regulations if we wish to continue marketing products.

2. But we can also begin an aggressive policy of informing the consumer about the free enterprise system, and the benefits she can and has derived from it.

One of our college teacher panel members talked about a model curriculum now being introduced in some public schools as far down as kindergarten. It is aimed at providing a base for understanding product value—we economists would call it the cost/benefit relationship.

Opening the doors of communication at this and countless other levels is a long-range antidote to anti-business attitudes. Someone has called this form of economics ignorance "attitude pollution."

The result of "attitude pollution" is a wealth of doubt and criticism about business, and very few practical solutions.

3. We can provide our customers with clear, concise and practical information about our products—whether it's through schools, retail clerks, advertising or labels.

4. We can take a closer look at our own companies to make sure channels of communication between us and the customers are open. Let's think of consumers as human beings, not some homogeneous entity out there somewhere.

If the lady's sheet doesn't fit her bed, we ought to want to know about it. The lady, in turn, doesn't want a short course in sheet-making technology, or form-letter bafflegab from a remote computer. She simply wants a sheet that fits her bed. And quickly.

5. We can coordinate our product lines and our product development work more closely with our market research.

If we are to improve our profitability at the same time we improve our response to the consumer, we are going to have to become more selective about the products we offer. We are going to have to be sure they are meeting a distinct consumer demand.

6. Finally, we can improve our liaison with government at all levels, in an effort to make reason and practicality important elements in regulatory guidelines—more important than crusading zeal, presumptuous advocacy or misguided enthusiasm.

But let's put the lady first, not the textile industry, not Betty Furness, not the FTC.

If she wants to buy a red dress for a special occasion, or a flowered bed spread that she'll tire of soon, or a printed shift to wear around the house for two years, then she has a perfect right to indulge herself. That's pure consumerism, and we can live with it.

The consumerism movement, however, can be disastrous to us if we sit back and let it, ignoring its enormous implications.

But if we approach it positively and flexibly, we can minimize the dangers. We can make consumerism what it ought to be—a mechanism that listens to and responds to the consumer.

They said it a long time ago, and it's still true: The customer is always right. That response, for business in a time of change, should never change.

THE GUARANTEED STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

HON. WILLIAM R. ROY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, today this body is focusing its attention on our system of elementary and secondary education. While I think that this discussion is a necessary one, I think that we should also be aware of some recent occurrences that may have an adverse effect on our system of higher education. Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the situation now being encountered by thousands of students under the recent changes in the guaranteed student loan program.

The Congress completed its action on the Education Amendments of 1972 in late June. In its deliberations, it was made clear that the Congress sought to expand and enlarge the guaranteed student loan program, which has been so successful in the past. However, now that these amendments are public law, and are being implemented, the actual intent and the actual effect of the law are in conflict.

Because of some ambiguities in the language of the legislation, the guaranteed student loan program has come to a virtual stop. Students who had been eligible for and had received loans in the past are now finding that they can no longer receive this aid. With this comes the increasing possibility that many of the students who have benefited under this loan program in the past may not be able to obtain the necessary assistance they are counting on to return to school this fall.

Mr. Speaker, we must act immediately to correct this problem. The fall semester will begin in just a few weeks, and yet literally thousands of students are still left hanging in the balance. The students need to know whether or not they will be able to get the money to return to school. The passage of emergency legislation is most certainly in order. We must act before the close of business tomorrow, before we recess, if we are to have any effect at all.

I was glad to learn that, yesterday, the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 260 which delays the implementation of the guaranteed student loan program provisions of the Education Amendments of 1972 so that lenders may continue to provide student loans on the same basis as they did last year. This action on the part of the Senate is to be applauded. I now call on the House of Representatives to do the same. We cannot afford to do less.

FIRST UKRAINIAN-AMERICAN DAY

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday I had the privilege of attending the first annual Ukrainian-American Day in western New York. This event celebrated the first settlers in western New York to come from the Ukraine 90 years ago. It was a day of pride in heritage and a day that made all of us proud for the many wonderful and strong strands that make up the warp and woof of the United States of America. The words of Wasyl Sharvan, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee, Buffalo Chapter, delivered on this happy occasion, were as follows:

ADDRESS BY WASYL SHARVAN

Most Reverend Clergy, Honorable Edward Regan, Congressman Dulski, Congressman Kemp, Congressman Smith, Honorable Frank Sedita, Mayor of Buffalo, Mayors of our neighboring towns of Lackawana and Cheektowaga members of the honorary committee of this First Ukrainian-American Day, ladies and gentlemen, fellow citizens:

It gives me great pleasure to greet everyone of you participating at this First Ukrainian-American Day in our Erie County, honoring the 90th Anniversary of the first Ukrainian settlers in the Buffalo area. In planning this special and memorable day, we hope to initiate a similar annual gathering for all Ukrainian Americans and their friends; to give them ample opportunities of deepening and widening steadfast friendships. We gather here today, to reminisce with old friends and to meet new ones whose honorable opinions and ideas will be of great help in dealing with our community activities.

While celebrating this memorable occasion, it would be quite impossible to single out the pioneers whose endless struggles and hardships well preserved the Ukrainian identity in a new land—through innumerable contributions into the social life of the Ukrainian ethnic community. The period after the 2nd World War brought into this country and also into our community many fine families of Ukrainian emigrants who, immediately upon their arrival have included themselves entirely into this ethnic movement. Here are some of the many examples of the persistent work that today is being accented with the greatest possible appraisal: Ukrainian churches of the Eastern rite, traditionally decorated Ukrainian homes, fraternity organizations, auxiliary organizations and others.

This festive occasion makes it possible for us and equally for all others to admit—and we do it with a note of pride—that in spite of our small group, as far as other ethnic groups are concerned, we—as the Ukrainian American minority group, are being constantly praised for being well organized, disciplined, conscientious and well respected in this community of various nationalities.

I'm convinced that this celebration of the First Ukrainian-American Day will bring together all Americans of Ukrainian descent much closer in order to achieve our goals. Such we will do—through better understanding and more dedicated work in our community. Consequently, we will be able to better fulfill the demands of this wonderful country—the United States of America—where everyone of us can practice the rights of a free people, and also fulfill the demands of Ukraine—the fatherland of our ancestors—which now, unfortunately, enslaved by the Communist regime is deprived of all equality and human rights which we here freely enjoy. Thank you.

WE MUST STEP UP OUR FIGHT AGAINST CANCER

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, the thousands of Americans dying of cancer each year cry out for an accelerated drive against this terrible affliction. Over a year ago, the Congress took a significant step forward in the battle against cancer with the passage of the National Cancer Act. Already, in fiscal year 1971, almost $300 million were spent for pure research under the auspices of this act. However, the passage of this act and the expenditure of Federal moneys are no more than a beginning and we must not slacken our efforts to wipe out cancer.

It is a rare family which has not been touched by cancer in one way or another. I recently received an eloquent letter from a Bronxville, N.Y., mother and wife whose family has been tragically affected by this disease.

I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

BRONXVILLE, N.Y.

DEAR CONGESSMAN PEYSER: I am so permeated with grief and fear that I pray you will read my letter, give it your serious consideration, and hopefully, take effective action.

Last June, after a thirteen year battle with Cystic Fibrosis, we lost our daughter, Lynn. The cure for which we had prayed so long did not come in time! When we lost Lynn, we lost a precious little gem!

Two weeks after Lynn died my husband was operated on for removal of a second intestinal polyp (malignant). The first polyp was removed, and a colostomy performed in December, 1970. I have been numb since hearing this.

Passage of the Cancer Act, along with an announcement from Dr. Judah Folkman of Children's Hospital in Boston, have provided a light at the end of a seemingly dark tunnel. I have enclosed a copy of the article which talks of a major breakthrough, of a possible vaccine for cancer. For the first time, a malignant tumor has been held in the dormant state! Dr. Folkman estimates a treatment method may be available within 2 to 5 years. This doctor has given hope and inspiration to millions. The enormous multitude of cancer victims has been thrown a life-line; but Congressman Peyser, how long can they hang on?? Dr. Folkman mentions having a 12 man team and that 6 other labs have excitedly joined in the search. To a drowning man, this seems like a "token" force!!

Certainly, with time such a precious commodity in this race against death, this area of such great promise should be stepped up to a round-the-clock basis! Time is of the utmost if the present cancer victims are to be saved. What a blessing that the Cancer Act has been passed, what a boon to mankind, and yet, what has been done?? On a recent WINS broadcast, Dr. Watson of the Cancer Board reported that they have this large appropriation of money for six months now, but nothing has been done! How can we explain this or justify political nonsense, government red tape, inefficiency, and blundering to cancer victims and their families? We cannot tolerate this floundering for a few years before we decide what's needed to have the program move forward and really play a tremendously significant role in benefitting mankind.

Would you Congressman Peyser, please push for a "crash program" in this vital area of *finding* a *control* or *vaccine?* Areas of research showing great promise such as Dr. Folkman's should take *"top priority."* In the words of Irving I. Rimer, Vice President for Public Information of the American Cancer Society, Inc., "Dr. Folkman's work holds great promise and the Society and the National Cancer Institute will support him fully. It looks like Congress will appropriate major increases for research. This is what the scientific community has been demanding and *needs* to get on with the job." If this is what's needed Congressman Peyser, please act *now!!!*

I feel so strongly that great numbers of men of expertise in the field of Immunology should be directed to join Dr. Folkman as a back-up team in his life-saving search. Certainly, *more labs* should join in this vital search and attack on this national menace—this dread disease.

Doesn't this crisis open our eyes enough to see that it is absolutely essential for the National Cancer Institute to secure Doctor Folkman's services on a *full time!!!* basis, so that this Chief of Surgery at Children's Hospital in Boston could devote his time *solely* to this urgent area of *accelerating* an intensive search for a vaccine to conquer this deadly peril!

We cry out against the loss of life in Vietnam and at the slaughter of innocent angels in abortion, and rightfully so! But what about the cancer battlefront that is constantly with us and its continually mounting death toll—its pain, suffering and heartbreak? Spiraling taxes, catastrophic medical expenses and the insidious threat ever hanging over us! I've lived in fear for 13 years only to bury a sweet little angel who loved life and all it had to offer, a beautiful little girl just going into her teens. We lost the battle with Cystic Fibrosis. Every three months my husband and I took Lynn to Children's Hospital in Boston to see Dr. Harry S. Livachman. Now, Dr. Folkman is in the same hospital.

Don't let a cure be so near and yet so far! Stop the growth and spread of the tumor with a vaccine or control, as Dr. Folkman is endeavoring to do, and save precious human lives as quickly as possible, *before these cancer victims have crossed the threshold of no return*!!! Then, we can fill in the remaining pieces of the puzzle—the cause and prevention. The *acute* cry for help is from the *present* cancer patients hoping to be saved. This is an "SOS" for salvation!

Congressman Peyser, I pray that you will put the vast resources of our nation to work for the public good in this most vital area and *demand* a national *crash priority program* in order to accelerate and make the headway necessary to end this war on cancer. People protest and introduce all kinds of legislation, but so much of it is "trivial" in comparison to a plea for human life! We deplore the loss of our natural resources, but what more precious resource than life itself?

We are abdicating our responsibility, as are the men in the key positions of the Cancer Program, if we allow blundering and laxity and government red tape to hinder an intense search. Unnecessary delays cannot be tolerated! The question, "What has been done?" should be answered. The people are entitled to that answer. We worry about helping people in other countries, and we do not hear the multitude crying at home.

If we were to think in terms of a war effort, as in the Manhattan Project and Space Programs, with research labs working "round-the-clock," this type of speed-up program would increase productivity, could bring the day of a cure closer to becoming a reality! Try to get a Doctor on a weekend. Hospitals operate on a skeleton force, and those research labs are *idle* and *closed*. This should never be when millions of people are fighting time—waiting for help—their lives hanging in the balance! Death and suffering take no holiday!

We must function at *full spead* in this disaster area, in this desperate battle for life, to eradicate this dread menace, this nightmare that now exists for hundreds of thousands of cancer patients and their families.

I pray that you will make a strong *demand* before Congress for a showdown *immediately* for the necessary appropriation needed for research in this vital area—a "crash program" in the area of a vaccine or cure! I hope you will get much exposure for this cause before the people. What more sane or humane cause—what cause more in the interests of the people? Hardly a family has not been touched by this dread disease. The government must cooperate and take effective action now before more citizens are claimed as victims. No feet should be dragging when time lost means lives lost! You men who are holding the reins should get the wheels in motion and keep them moving. Dr. Folkman's search must be accelerated in every possible way and our efforts concentrated in this area *first*, when time is running out. We must *act now* if we are to save the lives of all the cancer victims who have been given hope. These hopes must not be disappointed!

Again, Congressman Peyser, don't let a cure be so near and yet so far! I am fighting for the most precious person in all the world to me, my husband. I pray that Dr. Folkman and hundreds of other dedicated doctors will work *feverishly*. I pray that he will devote himself solely to the pursuit of his vaccine to stop the growth and spread of malignant tumors. I pray that his search will be intensified and greatly *accelerated* on a round-the-clock basis with every conceivable kind of sophisticated equipment at his disposal. I pray that his team will be greatly enlarged. Please, please shout this appeal, and I know you will be heard!

Please God, be with us. Bring this cure to us. We have been living on Death Row. Now, there is hope for a pardon! Help us to live. Help my husband and me to realize our hopes and dreams, to raise our other three children. My husband is my life. To ever face this world alone makes me tremble with fear to even think of it. I love him and need him so desperately!

Please Congressman Peyser, help make this vaccine attainable. What greater cause, what more precious gift to all mankind than life itself? I can think of no more worthy endeavor than the one I leave with you.

My eternal thanks for anything you can do to help.

Sincerely yours,

EILEEN LASKOSKI.

P.S. The key factor is the *time* factor. These cancer patients are fighting time! Fight for a speed-up for Dr. Folkman's search and *immediate* increase for research!

KANSANS IN THE OLYMPICS

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it was most appropriate for the House of Representatives today to receive members of the United States Olympic Team prior to their departure for the 1972 Summer Olympics in Munich, Germany. It was an inspiring and meaningful tribute to America's finest athletes.

The Wichita, Kansas Eagle gave its editorial best wishes to four Kansans who are members of this outstanding team. The editorial follows:

KANSANS IN THE OLYMPICS

The best wishes of all of us Kansans who must stay home go with four Sunflower State athletes who will compete in the 20th Olympic Games beginning August 26 in Munich, Germany.

There, Kansas will be represented by Wichita's star miler Jim Ryun in the 1,500-meter events; former Clay Center high school and Kansas State University runner Ken Swenson in the 800-meter races; former Wichita State University assistant track coach Preston Carrington in the long-jump events; and self-taught archer Dennis McCormak in the first bow-and-arrow competition ever held in the Olympics.

This will be the third Olympics competition for Ryun, who in 1967 ran the world's fastest mile in 3:51:1 minutes. Now, on leave of absence from his California job, the Wichitan has been living recently in Lawrence, Kan., so that he might train under his former high school coach, Bob Timmons, now track coach at the University of Kansas.

Swenson, a 1970 graduate of Kansas State University, is in the U.S. Army and has been transferred to Ft. Riley in order to train with his college coach, DeLoss Dodds, at neighboring Manhattan. While at high schooler at Clay Center, he was the State half-mile champion.

Carrington is WSU's first Olympian since Harold Manning placed fifth in the steeplechase events in 1936. With a top jump of 26 feet 4 inches in the Olympic trials, he has been rated ninth best long jumper in the world by Track and Field Magazine.

Twenty-year-old McCormak was one of six Americans qualifying for the new Olympics archery event in national trials at Oxford, Ohio, recently. He got his first bow and arrow at the age of 14 and taught himself how to use it. The Columbus, Kan., resident, now a student at Kansas State College, Pittsburg, has never had formal archery training.

The hopes of these four, as they go into competition with the best of the world's athletes in Munich will be matched by the good wishes of their fellow Kansans. The young men should be proud that they were chosen to represent the United States in the international games, and Kansas is rightfully proud of them.

"NEWSMEN'S PRIVILEGE ACT"

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, 18 months ago, 25 Members of Congress, including myself, introduced the Newsmen's Privilege Act. That bill was designed to protect the right of newsgatherers to maintain confidential sources, a right essential to full reporting of the news. As you know, the Supreme Court recently decided three cases in this area, ruling by a 5 to 4 vote that newsmen did not have such a constitutional right under the first amendment's free press guarantee. The decision poses a threat to our free press which Congress must act to avert.

In that opinion, the authority of Congress to create such a privilege was not denied. Several bills pending in the House Judiciary Committee which would grant such a right to newsmen have been held up for over 14 months awaiting a report from the Justice Department. I have urged Attorney General Kliendienst to hasten his completion of the report, but it has not yet been issued. Further delay by the Justice Department only worsens the situation for newsmen trying to obtain information from controversial sources. The result is that the public is deprived of a considerable degree of knowledge about events, because many are reluctant to disclose information to reporters whose pledge of confidence may now be circumvented by any grand jury. It is essential that we fill this gap in the first amendment before the concept of a free press itself becomes an empty promise.

An article in yesterday's Washington Post by William Raspberry advances some of the arguments for the passage of a Newsmans Privilege Act. I am inserting it in the RECORD. I am also inserting an article written by Earl Caldwell in the August 5, 1972 Saturday Review. Caldwell was one of the reporters involved in the Court decisions, and his article provides a dramatic first-hand account of how reporters operate, and how damaging the denial of newsman's privilege actually is to newsgathering in America.

I urge members to read these articles, so that with a full understanding of the problem we may act quickly to defend the first amendment's guarantee of a free press from the damaging effects of the recent Court decision.

The articles follow:

ON NEWSMAN'S PRIVILEGE

(By William Raspberry)

So soon after Jack Anderson's goof in the Eagleton affair may not be the best time to talk about newsman's privilege; public opinion may be too much the other way.

But it seems clear, to me and to most newsmen, that we should be able to offer some sort of assurance to our confidential sources that their confidences will not be betrayed. It also seems clear to many of us, in light of the June ruling of the U.S. Supreme Court in the Earl Caldwell case, that we cannot offer any such assurance now, except, perhaps, a vow that we'd go to jail before betraying a confidence.

That's too high a price for an individual to pay for what is, in effect, an act in the public interest.

The Caldwell case stemmed from that newsman's reports, in The New York Times, on the activities of the Black Panther Party—reports that he was able to write only after he gained the confidence of Black Panther members, and after promises that he would honor their restrictions on what was not to be published.

But after Caldwell wrote his series, he found himself summoned to testify before a grand jury investigating Black Panther activities.

His refusal, on First Amendment grounds, was fought all the way up to the Supreme Court, and he lost. The free-press guarantee of the First Amendment, the Court held, neither prevents the subpoenaing of reporters by grand juries nor protects them from punishment if they choose to remain silent.

Until that ruling, some newsmen had discouraged attempts to write into law any provision aimed at protecting reporters' sources. Their feeling was that it was better to have newsman's privilege accepted as a matter of common law—as with doctors and lawyers—than to have it enacted. Pass it as a piece of legislation, and a subsequent legislature could repeal it.

That argument is worthless in light of the Supreme Court ruling. What demands attention now is what kind of law can best serve the purpose. It must be strong enough to provide real protection for confidences, and yet not so strong as to risk turning newsmen into tyrants.

That's why the Anderson-Eagleton affair comes to mind. At the time Anderson made his claim about Eagleton's alleged drunk-driving record, he said he got his information from a former Missouri official—that is to say, a confidential source.

He later acknowledged that the information was false. But suppose he hadn't. Clearly no law ought to give Anderson the right to make an unfounded allegation against anyone else. If it came to that, I could write any scandalous thing about anyone I didn't like, claim I learned the scandal from a confidential source and get away clean.

I obviously can't do that. Nor does any legislative proposal I have seen propose to let me do that. The essential protection being sought is of sources, not of newsmen. The laws against libel would remain intact.

One proposal that seems to fit the bill has been drawn up by Cecelia Matthews for her legislative drafting class at George Washington University Law School.

Essentially, it would prevent mandatory disclosure of any communication between a news source and a newsman "whenever, and for as long as, the passage of the communication, the content of the communication, or the source of the communication is designated as confidential by the news source in order to provide for, or facilitate, the free flow of information to the public through the news media.

"A newsman may not be adjudged in contempt (of court, grand jury or Congress) for refusing or failing to disclose any matter (so) protected."

The protection could be waived *after a hearing* in the interest of national security, to prevent a miscarriage of justice or in a public emergency.

That seems fair enough.

"ASK ME. I KNOW. I WAS THE TEST CASE."

(By Earl Caldwell)

NEW YORK, N.Y.—At this point I am already so far past my deadline that my editor has given up listening to my excuses. She has parked outside my office and has informed me that she will not leave until the piece is finished. All this to pull loose my reaction to the Supreme Court's June 29 decision that the government has, if it chooses, a perfect right to subpoena me, or any other newsman, to testify before a grand jury—in my case, one investigating the Black Panther party.

The article should be easy to write. I've got so much to say that I feel about to burst. But I can't put anything on paper. I can't let anyone know. I have to keep it to myself. That's the rule of the game. Just this once, though, I'd like to say: The hell with it—the hell with what the Justice Department might do—the hell with what the *New York Times* thinks. I owe this one to myself. I know what I've been through these past two years. Let me get this off my chest.

The day the decision came down I stayed at home. A friend called to say that I had lost. Later that morning I phoned the *Times*, and Gene Roberts, the national editor, told me that the decision had been 5 to 4. Justice Rehnquist had made the difference. The deciding vote had been cast by a man who had been deeply involved in the subpoena issue when he was in the Justice Department.

I thought back to the day, February 2, 1970, when the first subpoena was served. It required me to appear in San Francisco before a federal grand jury that was probing the activities of Black Panthers. I had been counseled—not by my attorney, but by other legal experts and by people prominent in the newspaper industry—against being so anxious to go to court to fight the issue. They argued that I risked having a bad law made in an area where none had existed. In other words, I shouldn't go to court because I might lose. It would be better, they said, if we could work something out.

There was nothing to work out. I'm a journalist and, as quiet as it's kept, serious about my work. I grin a lot and try to give the impression that I'm always happy. That's the facade black folks must put up. So when I said that I wasn't going to appear before any grand jury investigating the Black Panther party, nobody believed that I was serious. Perhaps they didn't know now where I'd been for the past five or six years.

I was on the balcony with Martin Luther King in 1968, and I saw him die. I saw the blood come out of his neck and stack up around his head. I watched Ralph Abernathy cradle King's head in his arms. I was there, and I looked into King's eyes and watched him die.

Before that I had done my time in the streets. I wasn't just in Newark or Detroit. I was on Blue Hill Avenue in Boston. I was on the west side in Dayton. I was in Cincinnati and Watts and Sacramento and Chicago and a lot of other places where black folks showed their anger and rebelled during the summer of 1967.

I remember being in Newark and visiting a young kid in his home just after his mother had been fatally shot. There were twelve in that family, and their father was dead. Their mother had locked them inside the apartment when the rioting broke out, and she was lying on a couch. She got up—maybe to get a drink of water or may to see about the food on the stove. It makes no difference. The thing that's worth remembering is that when she got up a bullet came through a window and tore her neck apart. When I arrived, with my press card, there was only a pool of blood left and holes in the walls that were bigger than your fist. The next morning the stories in my paper were not about police and National Guardsmen firing weapons so powerful that they dug walls apart. The *Times* headlined stories about snipers—snipers who the governor of New Jersey said were operating in the black community and who were highly professional (in spite of the fact that they never killed anyone).

Out of that summer came Rap Brown. I went across the country with him, and I watched thousands of black folks who were fed up, who were so filled with rage that they, too, were about to explode. Out of all that came the Black Panther party.

When I linked up with the Panthers late in 1968 on the West Coast, they called me a cop. I had to be a cop, they reasoned: The *New York Times* was not about to send a black reporter 3,000 miles just to cover them.

I had friends who knew Kathleen Cleaver; she was my first contact with the party. But to make it, you had to be able to deal with the Panthers in the streets, the Panthers whose names you never asked, whose names you never read in the paper. They were the one who showed me what I needed to know. Late one night in San Francisco they yanked an old couch away from a wall in a cramped apartment, exposing stacks of guns of every sort. I could tell my readers then to take these people seriously, and I did.

I watched the Panthers' breakfast program before other reporters knew it existed. I wrote about it in the *Times*. If I've ever written a page-one story, that was it. The story was all there, but it was buried somewhere in the thickness of the Sunday edition. I told how painstakingly they went about their work, cooking big breakfasts—eggs, bacon, ham, grits, biscuits—they had it all. But they also added politics, in the songs they sang, in the literature they gave to the kids. Nobody tried to hide the political part from me—the reporter from the *New York Times*. Every now and then I'd get the third degree. "C'mon now, Caldwell; we know you're a cop," they'd say. But I kept coming back, and I kept telling them: "I'm a reporter. That's my job. That's the only reason—the only reason I'm here." Somewhere along the line they began to believe me.

On the morning before he went into hiding and eventually slipped out of the country I visited Eldridge Cleaver in his San Francisco home. I remember him sitting there at his typewriter with his shoes off and telling me that the time was coming when the Panthers would have to move against black journalists. Once, he explained, it hadn't made any difference what we wrote because nobody—nobody black, that is—read us. But with blacks beginning to read more, what was being written about them was becoming more important. "What good do you do, anyhow?" he asked me. I wrestled with the question then; it is even more difficult to answer now.

As I became more deeply involved with the Panthers, I began to keep all kinds of files on them. On Panther personalities. On off-the-record conversations. I kept tapes, too, and I would write my personal reactions to everything involving the Panthers that I covered. At this point they were under attack by police groups across the country. At a time when the party was shutting out reporters, I was closer to it than ever. I would sit nights at the national headquarters on Shattuck Avenue in Berkeley, talking with anyone who would talk. Often I would not leave until 3 or 4 in the morning. The party trusted me so much that, I did not have to ask for permission to bring along a tape recorder. Some writers hinted on occasion that I was a member of the party: I wrote that off as professional jealousy.

But I was never permitted to follow the story through to the end. The FBI saw to that. I had my first encounter with FBI agents when I wrote about the Panthers' guns, but that time they left me alone when I assured them that all the information was available in the newspaper. Then, late in 1969, they began to interfere with my work. They wanted to pick my brain. They wanted me to slip about behind my news sources, to act like the double agents I saw on old movie reruns on TV.

This is not my fantasy. The *Times* knew what was happening. They knew the FBI was calling me very day. Finally, Wallace Turner, chief of the *Times* bureau in San Francisco, arranged for an assistant in the bureau, Alma Brackett, to take all my calls. The FBI even had women call. It went on like that for months, until one day an agent told Mrs. Brackett that, if I didn't come in and talk to them, I'd be telling what I knew in court. That's when they subpoenaed me. They asked for all of my tape recordings, notebooks, and other doucments covering a period of more than fourteen months—and let me know that, if I did not come in with everything, I would go to jail. As it turned out, when I did refuse to appear before the grand jury, I was found in civil contempt and sentenced to jail until I complied with the court order. Fortunately, the court agreed to stay the execution of that order until I had a chance to appeal.

The rest is history. I met Tony Amsterdam, a good man and a brilliant lawyer, who understood why I could not appear before the grand jury. Tony was beautiful. He never asked about money. He never said that we shouldn't do this or we shouldn't do that because we might get a bad law written. He said that we were right and that we would go all the way to the Supreme Court if we had to. We did. And now the Court has ruled, and it makes me sick that the vote that beat us was cast by one of the very men who earlier sat in the Justice Department, where he could not have avoided being involved in this whole issue. So the records show that we lost—lost in a court that black folks has come to think of as their last resort for justice in the United States of America.

It's no longer important now what the government can get from me about the Panthers. I have nothing to say about them. They are not the same organization now that they were when I covered them. As for the notes and the tapes I spoke of earlier—well, they're all gone. I ripped up the notebooks. I erased the tapes and shredded almost every document that I had that dealt with the Panthers. Many of those items should have been saved, for history's sake, as much as for anything. But in America today a reporter cannot save his notes or his tapes or other documents.

That's not all. From now on no newspaper can hope to cover effectively an organization such as the Panthers. I don't care how black a reporter is, he won't get close. He won't, and he shouldn't try. He won't because he cannot be trusted as a reporter. When he goes out and cuts an interview, he may say that it's only for his paper. He may swear to it. But if he means it, the government can now put him in jail and keep him there. Ask me. I know. I was the test case. And because Justice Rehnquist did not disqualify himself, we lost.

Yes, this should be an easy piece to write. I have a lot to say. It's difficult, though, because I have a lot to think about. I am teaching this summer at Columbia University, but in another month I'll be heading back west to my job as a West Coast correspondent for the *Times*. I still have not figured out how I can go back into the black community—or any community, for that matter—and present myself as a journalist. Hell, even the Supreme Court has now said that there is nothing wrong with forcing a reporter to become a spy. But not all of the Court misunderstood.

In his dissenting opinion, Justice Douglas wrote: "A reporter is no better than his source of information. Unless he has a privilege to withhold the identity of his source, he will be the victim of governmental intrigue or aggression. If he can be summoned to testify in secret before a grand jury, his sources will dry up and the attempted exposure, the effort to enlighten the public, will be ended. If what the Court sanctions today becomes settled law, then the reporter's main function in American society will be to pass on to the public the press releases which the various departments of government issue."

"SYPHILIS AND GENOCIDE"

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the events surrounding the so-called "Tuskegee Study" to investigate the effects of untreated syphilis have shocked the entire black community. Those responsible for the "experiment" have repeatedly denied that race was a factor. However, many black Americans are discovering in these repeated "coincidences" a sick and invidious intent.

Mr. C. Sumner Stone, a highly respected journalist, raises some very important questions in his column of August 1, 1972. As he suggests, the use of the word "genocide" often brings charges of hyperbole from some quarters. But, Mr. Speaker, we would do well to remember that the Genocide Convention has yet to be ratified by the U.S. Senate.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Stone's article entitled "Syphilis and Genocide" follows."

SYPHILIS AND GENOCIDE

(By Chuck Stone)

It either takes a tough constitution or a rancid morality to sit quietly by and watch 200 men die without doing anything about it.

I call it genocide. Have you got a better name for it?

The act of genocide was even officially sanctioned by the United States Public Health Service.

The experiment began 40 years ago with about 600 black men. Of those 600, about one-third were free of the disease; two-thirds showed evidence of syphilis. Of the syphilitic group, half were treated, but the other half—about 200—received no treatment. And they received no treatment even after penicillin was developed during World War II.

At first blush, the charge of genocide may be considered extravagant rhetoric. But, those 400 black men were "systematically and deliberately destroyed" as a racial group and that's exactly what genocide is.

Even my reaction is a delayed one because I was so revulsed by this official slaughter, I shied away from a comment. What do you say about a group of sadists who wear the snow-white uniforms of medical researchers which permit them to play God with the lives of human beings?

The 13-member Congressional Black Caucus shocked me back into reality with its demand yesterday that "everyone responsible for these hideous acts of crime be brought to justice."

The Caucus also called for reparations to be paid to the families and victims of this 40-year-long experiment.

In its demand for reparations, the Caucus resurrected an idea that enjoyed a wide currency in the black community a few years ago. Former SNCC Director James Forman demanded that America's churches pay reparations to black people for supporting American racism. The idea was contemptuously dismissed as far-fetched, but the Caucus's demand of yesterday gives it a renewed respectability.

"The overall effects of this immoral revelation," continued the Caucus's statement, "extend far beyond the life-long sufferings of myriad black families and their unborn offspring. It poignantly reflects the deflated value that white people have historically placed upon black lives."

That's an extremely harsh indictment for a group of distinguished elected officials to level against the citizens of their own country.

But its harshness in no way compares to the devaluation of human life that the United States government placed upon the lives of a group of its own citizens.

Sure, in the name of scientific advance, there have been medical experiments in which the victims were injected with a disease or a virus to test the effectiveness of a newly discovered cure. They knew the possibility of death, but they also knew that the medical researchers were hanging in there all the time trying to save their lives.

Not the U.S. Public Health Service this time.

And I think that's an essential difference—that doctors or researchers who usually dedicate themselves to trying to save human beings this time sat casually by for 40 years and watched them slowly die without making any effort to help them to hold on to life.

During the last few years, there has been a rising tide of opinion in the black community that there is a "secret" or "unofficial" plot to wipe out black people.

The continued existence of "detention centers" around the country and some of the cattle round-up methods used by some officials have in dealing with dissent have not diluted that charge.

Family planning or planned parenthood has been widely viewed by many responsible black professionals and leaders as a subtle, but effective effort to destroy the black family and limit its growth.

The high rate of black veterans' deaths in Vietnam (12.5%) compared to their percentage in the armed services (9.8%) worries a black community who sees its manhood being systematically wiped out.

And now comes along a U.S.-government-stamped genocide program that takes on some of the coloration of Hitler's systematic destruction of 6 million Jews.

Sure, dismiss the analogy as ridulous and tut-tut me with the admonition that I'm really being paranoid.

But when you live in a country that deliberately facilitates the deaths of 200 of its citizens of an ethnic group of which you are a part, that's not paranoia.

That's "real-a-noia" and a lot of black people, like the Congressional Black Caucus, are wondering just how much their American citizenship is worth these days.

SOVIET OCCUPATION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there will be no freedom in Czechoslovakia until Soviet troops are removed and the iron heel of dictator's boots lifted from the backs of those who live in this great land where decency and justice has been stifled by oppression.

Now is the time, the hour and the moment for America to marshal world opinion to expose the indecency that is depriving the people of Czechoslovakia of their historic right to govern themselves in peace and freedom.

We who are free cannot rest in security until man is free everywhere. Aggression and oppression must not, cannot be tolerated by civilized nations. Those who seek to join the community of free nations as the Soviet Union is attempting today, must pay freedom's price or be denied the equality and respect it demands. Until such time, when the Soviet Government ceases its occupation and oppression, it must stand aside from the world of peace-seekers. So long as there is a single Czech or Slovak citizen deprived of his rights or his freedom there can be no trust or faith in our relations with Soviet leadership. We who are free must proclaim this rule of decency for mankind, now and tomorrow, with all the strength and insistence we command. To do less is to deny our own heritage. This we will not do as Americans. This we cannot do as decent people whose faith in justice extends to all who are now denied it.

SLICING TWO WAYS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, while I am sure that there are numerous positive aspects to the United States-Soviet grain agreement, I am deeply concerned that this $750-million deal may be paid for by the American consumer and taxpayer.

According to a Wall Street Journal article, which I will include following my remarks, the grain deal may add 1 or 2 cents per loaf of bread for the consumer and necessitate added Government export subsidies for the already overburdened taxpayer.

I am afraid that this may be another example of an international agreement, which may have a definite adverse economic impact on the average American, taking precedence over the needs of our troubled domestic economy.

The article follows:

SLICING TWO WAYS—U.S.-SOVIET GRAIN DEAL COULD LIFT BREAD PRICES AND INCREASE SUBSIDIES

(By Norman H. Fischer)

CHICAGO.—Along with all the expected benfits, the big grain deal with Russia may deliver a couple of surprise punches to U.S. consumers and taxpayers.

—Bread prices could go up. Wholesale flour prices already are rising dizzyingly, and if they stay up the big bakers say they will be forced to ask the Price Commission for permission to boost retail prices by a cent or two a loaf.

—The government will have to shell out many million of dollars in export subsidies to move U.S. grain to Russia. The Soviet Union is buying wheat here at prices generally prevalent throughout the rest of the world, while wheat prices in the U.S. are climbing to much higher levels because of the increased demand caused by the sales to Russia. The government subsidizes exporters to make up for the difference.

On the positive side, of course, selling at least $750 million of wheat, corn and other grains to the Soviet Union over the next three years will be a welcomed boost for the lagging U.S. balance of payments. The deal will benefit the U.S. economy, too, with boons for those handling the grain—farmers, elevator operators, railroads, truckers, barge lines, exporters, longshoremen and ship owners.

EASING THE STRAINS

There is no indication yet how the positive and negative repercussions will balance out. In the long run, argue Nixon administration officials who helped negotiate the deal, the U.S. stands to gain not only economically but in reduced international tensions as well. The benefits of relaxing the often-strained relations with Russia are incalculable, administration men assert.

The dollars-and-cents impact can't be pinned down now for another reason—the Russians might end up buying more grain than originally anticipated because of bad harvests in the Soviet Union and throughout Eastern Europe. When the deal was announced July 8, the $750 million was supposed to be spent largely on corn and other grains to feed Russian livestock. So far, though, the Soviets have been concentrating on buying wheat. If other grains are purchased in amounts predicted a month ago, trade sources say the three-year deal could total $1 billion.

The Russians aren't saying what their plans are, and the U.S. exporters with whom they are doing business are even more secretive. Since July 8, $127 million of wheat for export to Russia has been registered with the government's Export Marketing Service, a procedure necessary to qualify for some of the $500 million credit that the U.S. is extending Russia. That $127 million will buy about 82 million bushels.

However, sources in the grain trade say that much more wheat has been bought by Russia for cash; most of this wheat is the hard red winter type used mainly for breadmaking. Some sources figure that Russia could buy 350 million to 400 million bushels of U.S. wheat this year alone.

PUSHING PRICES UP

Such bullish reports have spurred one of the sharpest climbs in wheat prices on record. Ordinary hard red winter wheat hit a peak last week in Kansas City of $1.86 a bushel, the highest in five years and up 35 cents from the day before the Russian deal was announced. Wheat-futures trading on the Kansas City Board of Trade is setting records, and during a recent three-day period a speculator could have turned a $1,000 profit on a $500 investment on a single futures contract for 5,000 bushels.

Since Aug. 1, the New York wholesale price of 100-pound sacks of flour has increased to $7.44 from $6.57. The big baking companies, which normally are in the market at this time of year contracting for about a six months' supply, have been buying enough to keep operating on a day-to-day basis.

"It looks as if we missed the bus this year," sighs one Southwestern baker, who figures he could have saved 60 cents to 90 cents on each 100 pounds if he'd bought his supplies three weeks ago. "Our only hope is that the bottom will fall out of the wheat market, but I don't think it will."

Bread, cookie and cracker bakers say they'll be forced to raise prices sometime this fall unless the wheat and flour prices lose some of their gains. R. H. Uhlmann, president of Standard Milling Co., Kansas City, says flour costs constitute 15% of the retail price of bread, roughly six cents for a one-pound loaf. The increase in flour prices so far would justify a one-cent boost in the retail bread price, some bakers continued.

SUBSIDY PAYMENTS MOUNT

Rising wheat prices are taking their toll on Uncle Sam's pursestrings, too. A month ago, the wheat prices here and throughout the rest of the world were so close that the U.S. government had to subsidize exports from Gulf of Mexico ports by only two cents a bushel. Now, mostly because of the Russian purchases, the Gulf port subsidy has swelled to 36 cents a bushel.

One day in mid-July, when the subsidy had risen to about 15 cents, a record 77 million bushels of wheat were registered for export and covered by subsidies totaling $11.5 million. Since the Russian grain deal was announced, export subsidies have been granted for some 200 million bushels of wheat (not all of it for Russia).

On the other hand, the government might save as much as $100 million on wheat subsidy payments to farmers because of the rise in the market price. The subsidy program for U.S. wheat farmers is very complex, but basically as the market rises the subsidies decline. The government previously estimated its subsidies to wheat farmers this year would be $890 million.

Millers and bakers contend the subsidy to exporters is helping push wheat prices higher than they should be, and they are asking the government to lower that subsidy or suspend it. The Agriculture Department can do this, but hasn't given any indication that it will.

Wheat buyers also are unhappy that the government isn't unloading enough of its wheat stocks—which now amount to some 300 million bushels from surplus production in recent years—in an effort to stem the wheat price spiral. Market prices have risen far above the trigger level at which the government can sell the grain it acquired from farmers as part of its price-support program, but the government has chosen to sell at the higher market price instead of the "trigger" price. In the past two weeks, the government has sold more than 50 million bushels of wheat.

THE BRIGHTER SIDE

Enthusiasts of the Russian grain deal say the benefits to the economy will more than offset these unforeseen or at least unmentioned costs to the public.

"It's going to start right at the farm, where the little guys with maybe 5,000 bushels to sell are getting the best price in years," says a vice president of a grains export firm. "He and his family are going to use that extra money not only for a new tractor or something but also to get a new refrigerator or new car. Those Russian rubles are going to ripple through our whole economy."

The government figures that every million tons of grain exported creates 3,000 to 5,000 jobs in the U.S. Among the first to benefit are the grain handling and transportation industries, which are directly involved in gathering the wheat and other grains from across the country and moving it to the ports, mainly on the Gulf of Mexico.

Only the Western "granger" railroads will cash in on the export business; the profit-pinched Eastern roads won't get any of the business. Fortunately, there won't be a harvest-season boxcar shortage this year for the first time in many years, railroad officials say. They explain they are keeping better track of their boxcars and hopper cars with the aid of computers, and shippers are being encouraged with lower rates to load and unload faster.

BOON FOR BARGES

Barge lines' business is booming, too. Traffic down the Mississippi River to New Orleans is running 15% to 25% ahead of a year ago for five major barge operators, says John Creedy, president of the Water Transport Association. August and September are usually dull months on the river, he says, but the grain exporting firms "are booking all the barges they can find."

Even some truckers are getting grain business because shipping deadlines in some cases won't allow a leisurely barge trip or even a day's wait for a freight train. Truckers moving Russia-bound grain from the upper Midwest to Great Lakes ports recently got premiums of 10 cents a hundred pounds to make speedy delivery.

Because of the Russian orders, the total U.S. wheat exports to all customers in the year ending next June 30 could be a record one billion bushels. If so, and if domestic use is 805 million bushels as predicted, surplus U.S. wheat stocks held by this government and others on June 30, 1973, could be cut by a whopping 200 million bushels to about 620 million bushels, the smallest surfeit in several years.

As a result, there is speculation that the government may have to revise its 1973 farm program for wheat, announced late last month. The program aims at reducing wheat acreage next year and further cutting the surplus stocks by another 100 million bushels.

However, Washington sources say the Agriculture Department is unlikely to change gears now and encourage increased wheat plantings. "The farm planners think all the Russian wheat-buying is a one-shot deal," says one observer. "And if it isn't, the market price will stay up and farmers will plant more wheat anyway, farm program or no."

OUR WITHDRAWAL FROM VIETNAM

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent days there have been many thoughtless and self-serving criticisms of the President's various initiatives to end our involvement in the war in Indochina. The central theme of all this talk from those who wish to be President is that any other administration could disengage from Vietnam in an easy fashion without any trouble whatsoever. This is just not the case. Our withdrawal from Vietnam is proceeding in as expeditious a fashion as possible. A precipitous withdrawal, as some who should know better have suggested, would lead to a catastrophe in South Vietnam and cheapen the word of the United States in its relations with other countries around the world.

The lead editorial in August 14 Washington Star-News dealt with this matter in a timely and perceptive way and I believe its message should be made available to all who read the RECORD.

MASSACRE IN BINHDINH

It is a fervently held article of liberal faith that if the United States will just get out of Indochina, all will be sweetness and light among the Vietnamese people, North and South, Communist and non-Communist. Those who chant this doxology ignore the execution of thousands of Vietnamese and flight of tens of thousands more when the Communists took over in the North in 1954. They ignore the mass graves containing the bodies of more than 2,600 South Vietnamese civilians murdered at Hue during the 1968 Tet offensive. So they should have no difficulty whatsoever in glossing over the less numerous casualties of the more calculated reign of terror which has taken place at Binhdinh province on the central coast of South Vietnam the past three months.

Binhdinh fell quickly to the North Vietnamese in early April and it was not until July that Saigon's forces launched a serious effort to retake it. So the Communists had plenty of time. There was no need to hurry, as there was in Hue in 1968, when American and South Vietnamese forces counterattacked within days of the city's fall.

According to intelligence reports and on-the-spot interviews with survivors, the Communists were extremely methodical. They rounded up hamlet and village chiefs, pacification workers, policemen, militiamen, teachers, doctors, nurses, clerical workers, literally anyone who had had any connection with the Saigon government. "People's courts" executed several hundred (perhaps as many as 500) and shipped an estimated 6,000 others off to "people's prisons" in remote areas of the Communist-held Anlao valley. Most of those killed apparently were executed by rifle fire but others were buried alive, beheaded or hacked to pieces.

None of this represents any new departure in tactics on Hanoi's part. Aside from the general massacres in the North in 1954 and in the South during the 1968 Tet offensive, the murder and kidnaping of South Vietnamese officials has been part and parcel of Communist "liberation" since the war began. In the past four and a half years, nearly 25,000 South Vietnamese civilians and officials have been executed by the North Vietnamese Communists and the Viet Cong.

There have, of course, been atrocities on the Allied side. But anyone who is still prepared to maintain that a Communist takeover in South Vietnam would not lead to a bloodbath of major dimensions is simply ignoring the evidence at hand. A politician like Senator McGovern, who advocates a quick and unilateral American withdrawal from Southeast Asia, need look no farther than the shallow graves of Binhdinh province to see where the policies he advocates would lead those who have placed their trust in the United States.

EXIT FEES RISING FOR SOVIET JEWS

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, a most disturbing development in the struggle of the Jews of Russia for freedom was brought to light yesterday in Moscow. The Soviet authorities have established a new system of exit fees, ranging from $5,000 to $25,000 for educated Jews who wish to emigrate to Israel. It is quite clear that more Jewish intellectuals and technicians have been applying for exit visas lately. They have traditionally been harassed upon application for permission to emigrate, but this highly punitive measure is an unconscionable step. The new system of graduated fees—the higher the level of education, the more expensive it is to leave the country—cannot be justified. It is a clear attempt to discourage the highly qualified scientists and other intellectuals from applying for visas, if not eliminate the feasibility of their leaving altogether. I urge my colleagues to make note of this as reported in the New York Times, August 17:

SOVIET JEWS SAY EXIT FEE IS RISING FOR THE EDUCATED

(By Hedrick Smith)

MOSCOW, Aug. 15.—Jewish sources reported tonight that Soviet authorities are instituting a new system of heavy exit fees ranging from $5,000 to $25,000 for educated Jews who want to emigrate to Israel.

The sources said they learned of the new measure, replacing the old general fee of about $1,000, while some Jews were applying for exit visas with a branch of the Interior Ministry today. No official confirmation was possible.

The Government explanation, the sources said, was that the fees were necessary repayment to the Government for the costs of state-financed education. A similar reason had long been given for the earlier fee.

Earlier today, 10 Jewish intellectuals charged that the Government was discriminating against educated Jews in handling emigration requests and that harassment and delays had increased in the last two months.

Under present Government policies, the 10 said in a joint statement, there was a danger that highly qualified scientists and educated Jews were in danger of becoming "a new category of human beings—the slaves of the 20th century."

RARE NEWS CONFERENCE HELD

The statement was read at a rare news conference by Benjamin G. Levick, a 55-year-old chemist and scholar, the highest-ranking Soviet academician to apply for an exit visa to Israel. He is a corresponding member of the prestigious Academy of Science and so far the only person associated with the academy to apply for permission to emigrate.

Educated Jews have long encountered more difficulties in emigrating than blue-collar or office workers and tradesmen, and Western diplomats said tensions between Jews and Soviet authorities were evidently rising because more intellectuals had been applying for exit visas lately.

Western diplomats reported that through the first six months of this year about 15,000 Jews had been allowed to emigrate, roughly the same number as in all of 1971.

Some Jews are contending, however, that the flow since midyear has slowed down, reflecting a change in Soviet attitude. So far there has been no official confirmation, nor any confirmation from diplomats who follow such affairs closely.

GRADUATED FEE SYSTEM

A new schedule of fees for educated applicants, if put fully into practice, would be aimed not only at blocking those who have already applied but at deterring others from applying, Jewish sources said.

They reported having been told today that Jews who had graduated from a teachers institute faced fees of 4,500 rubles—$5,400. University graduates were to pay 11,000 rubles—$13,200—and holders of the candidate degree, equivalent to a Ph.D. in America, were to be charged 22,000 rubles—$26,400. Other Jewish sources reported slightly different figures but in the same range.

Even without a graduated fee scale, Dr. Levich and his colleagues contended that educated Jews were being discriminated against. "Jews wishing to leave are being divided according to their educational and intellectual level," they said in their statement. "The higher the level, the more difficult it is to get permission to get a visa."

They asserted that obstacles to intellectuals had been stepped up lately—discharge from work after applying for visas, the threat of prosecution for lack of employment, sudden military call-ups and the danger of trials for those who refused to serve, disconnection of telephones and interference with mail.

These measures, the statement asserted, came at the same time as new pressures against non-Jewish civil rights activists here and trials of liberals in Czechoslovakia.

Professor Levich, who was demoted since his unsuccessful application for an exit visa last March, said that his son, Yevgeny, a 24-year-old astrophysicist, has been ordered to report for two years' military service despite chronic physical disabilities and despite the normal exemption granted to scientists with Ph.D.'s.

Besides the Leviches, those who endorsed the statement were Dr. David S. Azbel, 61, a retired chemistry professor who spent 16 years in Stalinist prison camps; Prof. Aleksandr V. Voronel, 41, a physicist; Prof. Boris G. Moisheson, 34, mathematician; Dr. Vladimir G. Zaylavsky, 43, molecular biologist; Viktor S. Yakhot, 28, solid-state physicist; Dmitri K. Simis, 24, sociologist formerly with the Institute of World Economics and International Relations; Gregory L. Svechinsky, 32, an engineer and teacher, and Viktor B. Nord, 27, a film director whose recent movie, "The Debut," won critical acclaim.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks:

"How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,757 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

THE NATIONAL CONGRESS ON THE WORD OF GOD

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, a "National Congress on the Word of God" will be held at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, Washington, D.C., September 5 to 7, inclusive. Hosts for this far reaching effort for a renewal in Gospel preaching are the U.S. Catholic Conference, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and, in particular, the Archbishop of Washington, Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle, D.D.

People of all faiths are invited, and several Protestant dignataries will participate as leaders in the concurrent conferences on various aspects of bringing the Word of God more fruitfully to all peoples. In these times it is encouraging that our people are giving evidence of a growing desire to study, proclaim, pursue and live what God's Word instructs through the sacred Scriptures.

People of every faith, or of none, and particularly clergymen and young people are urged to take advantage of this end-of-summer opportunity to attend one of the significant religious events of 1972.

I include the editorial from the current July-August issue of the Priest magazine, and the lead article to which it refers, "Faith Comes Through Hearing, National Congress on the Word of God," by Robert M. Donihi, in the RECORD. Mr. Donihi, an attorney of Upper Marlboro, Md., and former director of the U.S. Catholic Conference Office of Public Information, and Editor Jordan Aumann, O.P., speak for the magazine to recall the clergy to a renewal of Gospel preaching.

The material follows:

PRIMARY PRIESTLY APOSTOLATE

(By Jordan Aumann, O.P.)

It is likely that a large number of priests, especially those ordained many years ago, were puzzled and somewhat shocked to read in the *Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests* that "priests, as co-workers with their bishops, have as their primary duty the proclamation of the Gospel of God to all" (no. 4) and in Pope Paul's *Ecclesiam Suam* that "preaching is the primary apostolate." Some priests may even have interpreted these statements as an implicit downgrading of the priestly ministry of the sacraments and, in particular, of the ministry of the Eucharist.

Did not the Council of Trent, following the medieval theologians, expressly define the Catholic priesthood in terms of the Eucharist and the Mass? And even Vatican Council II stated that the Eucharist is at once the source and the summit of the Christian life: *a fortiori*, of the priesthood. How does one explain the apparent conflict of emphasis?

In order to clarify and defend the statements on preaching and at the same time to avoid erroneous conclusions and incorrect pastoral applications, a distinction is necessary. The Eucharist enjoys the primacy of excellence and therefore it transcends all other priestly ministries and, indeed, all the other sacraments. But the preaching of the Gospel has primacy in the work of evangelization, in the apostolate of the salvation of souls. Thus, when Christ gave his apostles their mission, his mandate to them was that they should preach the Gospel and baptize those who believe. But, Paul asks: "How shall they believe if they do not have the Gospel preached to them?"

The preaching of the Gospel, therefore, has the primacy in the priestly apostolate—preaching unto faith, faith unto baptism, and baptism unto reception of the Eucharist. The Eucharist is the summit or goal to which evangelization leads; it can then become the source from which the priest fashions and directs the Christian community. It is not, however, the source of unity of faith as some modern ecumenists would have us think. Faith derives from the hearing of the good news of the Gospel as proclaimed by the preacher; then comes baptism, as Christ taught; and then comes the invitation to the table of the Eucharist.

The sad fact is that today, as yesterday, there are still far too many priests who do not preach the Gospel. Even some who preach, are not preaching the Gospel. Some of them are the most vocal in attacking what they call the Trindentine concept of a cultic priest, but what they opt for is not a preacher of the Gospel; they seem to want the contemporary priest to be a composite of social worker, militant demonstrator against society's evils, and charismatic leader. Now, there have been priests—and even saints—in the Church who were one or all of these things, but they always acted within the context of Gospel teaching and with an uncanny ability to discern the spirit by which they were led.

Here we are touching on a nerve in the crisis of priestly ministry. We should bless the day that priests began to speak out and to act against the moral evils of modern society. We should emulate those dedicated priests who are sincerely trying to adapt their preaching of the Gospel to topics and problems that preoccupy the minds and hearts of their parishoners. But there is such a thin line between preaching the Gospel in this way and letting oneself be so overwhelmed by the difficulties and evils of modern society that one's preaching becomes pulpit-thumping harangue that does nothing but reveal the frustration and anger of the preacher. Most of our people know the problems as well or better than we do, and perhaps there are some who could come forth with better possible solutions. But what they want to hear from the preacher of the Gospel is an application of Christ's teaching both to their own lives and the life of society at large. They may be willing to listen to a priest's views on social problems in a discussion group or social gathering; they may listen attentively to a priest's philosophical or theological opinions; but when that priest is in the pulpit as proclaimer of the Gospel, they expect to hear him speak not in his own name, but in the name of Christ and the Church.

It is practically overwhelming to think of the conversion and renewal that would occur if all our priests throughout the United States would commit themselves unswervingly to preach the Gospel faithfully at all the Sunday Masses. And if you tend to doubt this, then just remember what the Twelve accomplished by preaching the Good News until repentance and conversion.

NATIONAL CONGRESS ON THE WORD OF GOD

(By Robert M. Donihi)

"Everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved." But how shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? And how can they believe unless they have heard of him? And how can they hear unless there is someone to preach? And how can men preach unless they are sent? Scripture says, "How beautiful are the feet of those who announce good news!" But not all have believed the gospel. Isaiah asks. "Lord, who has believed what he has heard from us?" Faith, then, comes through hearing, and what is heard is the word of Christ. (Rom. 10:13–17; inspiration for the National Congress).

When was the last time you preached a sermon that changed your life? Or when was the last time you preached a sermon that changed the lives of others?

The National Congress on the Word of God believes the lives of both of us—you as a priest and myself as a layman—should be changed for the better by your sermons.

The Puritans are credited with the saying: "Brown bread and the Gospel is good fare" (Matthew Henry, 1662–1714). To me, a former Southern Baptist, that saying still has the ring of "Gospel-truth." Simply speaking, the Baptists believe that there is something about the truth—in this case the word of God—which rings true to those who seek truth. God spoke, man recorded, but (and here's the rub) too many men misinterpreted. The result: chaos.

For Protestant and Catholic alike, the current crisis of faith was predictable, considering the nature of man himself. Each of us is tempted to prefer his own personal theology, all of which makes for a great many conflicting opinions in every pew.

But now, thanks be to God, a renewal in Gospel preaching approaches. All "who profess belief in Jesus Christ" are summoned to bear united witness to the power of the word of God against the crisis of faith at the National Congress on the Word of God, September 5 to 7 at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in Washington under the sponsorship of the Catholic University of America. One strongly feels that it will be one of those occasional moments in human history when the People of God resolutely and joyfully turn their faces away from the darkness toward the light.

The National Congress on the Word of God is peculiarly the province of pastors and all priests. It is the direct outgrowth of the Institute for Pastoral Communication and Liturgical Celebration, established at Catholic University in 1970 as a year-round operation aimed at making each sermon of the preacher so significant and each celebration of the liturgy so vivid that they can serve as vehicles for the grace of God to change the lives of those who hear him; to reestablish that tradition of the Church which recognizes preaching as the principal work of the Church and its priests, especially during the celebration of the Eucharist.

Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle, the host bishop and chancellor of Catholic University, states in his invitation to "brother bishops, fellow priests, pastors of souls and all those who profess belief in Jesus Christ" that "the National Congress on the Word of God will give us, the People of God, the opportunity to make a great hope-filled affirmation that God's word begets, strengthens and renews Christian faith when it is proclaimed by enlightened, convinced and holy preachers of his Church."

As a layman, I often listen to the sermons of the clergy, and markedly less often it seems of late, to the words of the Gospel. Sometimes I have been filled with thanksgiving and a quickening of the spirit; and sometimes with dismay. In that, I was clearly not alone.

Pope Paul speaks often, and always with

pain, of the current crisis of faith. Both religious and laymen today often feel themselves uprooted, and even that doughtily—if silently—Protestant publication, The Reader's Digest, has become so exercised by recent trends in religion as to devote major articles in three of its more recent issues to the aberrations and changes from the old-time religion within the World Council of Churches. Meanwhile, seminary professors report that the young clerics seemed to be turned off by theological hair-splitting but turned on by scriptural studies of the word of God.

In its Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests, Vatican II states: "The People of God finds its unity first of all through the word of the living God, which is quite properly sought from the lips of priests. Since no one can be saved who has not first believed, priests, as coworkers with their bishops, have as their primary duty the proclamation of the Gospel of God to all. In this way they fulfill the Lord's command: 'Go into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature' (Mark 16:15). Thus they establish and build up the People of God" (n. 4).

In Ecclesiam Suam, Pope Paul writes: "Preaching is the primary apostolate. Our apostolate, Venerable Brothers, is above all the ministry of the word of God. We know this very well, but it seems good to remind ourselves of it now, so as to direct our pastoral activities aright. We must go back to the study, not of human eloquence or human rhetoric, but of the genuine art of the sacred word."

This stress on Scripture has placed new and to some extent unfamiliar demands on the parish priest, whom one priest staff coordinator of the National Congress on the Word of God calls "the ultimate executor of the Church's pastoral directives." And Father John Burke, O.P., who heads the Institute for Pastoral Communication and Liturgical Celebration, says: "Within a few brief years the parish priest has been called upon to preach mainly on Scripture; at the same time it has been simply assumed that he has the intimate familiarity with a wide range of texts necessary to preach effectively."

All priests were exposed to scriptural studies in the seminary, nevertheless it remains difficult to arrive at the meaning of the various passages and to translate the mysteries revealed in them into terms relevant to the lives of modern congregations. Preachers, discouraged with their efforts to master Scripture, sometimes substitute psychological, social, moral and political theories for scriptural truths, merely accommodating biblical quotations to give verbal support to their preconceived ideas—some valid, some not—regarding issues.

This kind of philosophical preaching does not build a community of believers who, in spite of their difficulties, have a basically optimistic outlook because of trust in the loving power of our heavenly Father. On the contrary, passing off theological opinion for revealed truth can be divisive.

Potential results of philosophical preaching, substituted for the divinely inspired liturgical sermon on the word of God, include factionalism within congregations; condemnatory attitudes are mistaken for zeal; people begin to drift away from regular worship, discouraged because they hear nothing from the pulpit they are not already familiar with from books, magazines, newspapers and television. The "relevant" has become irrelevant to their deepest longings for personal meaning and fulfillment.

The liturgical sermon is not an ornament or enhancement. It is intrinisc to the entire divine plan of salvation to men of all ages. It is an integral element in the dynamic manifestation of Christ in salvation history. The liturgical sermon is itself a saving event in that history. It reveals Jesus and makes his sacramental actions show meaning for his worshippers. It enables the People of God to perceive the mystery which the liturgy makes present and it thereby takes its place with Scripture, the Church and the sacraments as part of the unfolding of the plan of God for the salvation of men.

As integral to the liturgy, the liturgical sermon also partakes of its characteristics. It, too, is an exercise of the priestly activity of Christ and is both an act of worship and sanctification of men. Preaching within the liturgy follows from the very nature of the Church as the image of Christ, who both reveals and makes holy, preaches and redeems.

(I apologize for parts of this article which are outside the authoritative competence of a layman and may well sound too dogmatic. The extent to which the sermon has been diverted from Scripture has been somewhat trying to me, to put it mildly. Recently I witnessed the concelebration of the liturgy of the Eucharist for a national Catholic organization composed primarily of priests, religious women and brothers, none of whom voiced protest over the movie and soundtrack disturbances deliberately thrusting audiovisual shock into the congregaton composed of more than a thousand persons. The film and sound were used to accent the homily on the theology of liberation. Though I received the Eucharist at this Mass, I did so with a sad and tired feeling. This may prove nothing but my lack of preparation, but the need for such activity at Mass in lieu of preaching on the word of God has not been explained to me satsfactorily.)

The liturgical sermon is not part of a systematic approach to solving problems of life-situations. It, especially the Eucharistic homily, has as its primary task the expounding of the mystery of Christ as that mystery is revealed in Scripture and celebrated in the liturgy. At the same time, like all instructions of the faithful, it must take into account their age, condition, way of life and standard of religious culture. In other words, the sermon on the word of God must be immediately directed to the audience of the assembly and perfectly adapted to their lives.

The bishops and other priests who have cooperated to make the National Congress a possibility are too numerous to be mentioned individually. Through their efforts, there has been a remarkable response by way of manpower and financial contributions. In no instance has there been a refusal to give help when it has been asked. Credit must be given to the Serran Clubs of the United States for primary financial backing of the Congress.

One of the founders of the Congress, Archbishop Hannan of New Orleans, comments on the phrase "primary duty" in the *Decree on Priestly Life and Ministry:* "There is no qualification about the primacy of this duty. In fact, one can hardly imagine the choice of another phrase when we recall the blunt command of Christ: 'Go into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature' (Mark 16:15). The simplicity of the command does not mean that the task is simple. We live in an age of competing communication systems. To proclaim effectively the word of God, we need specialization and thorough training.

Above all, we need the inspiration of the Spirit so that the authenticity and power of the word as uttered by us will command acceptance. Our best efforts are required to fill the hunger today for the word of God. Every poll of the People of God attests to this fact. To secure an enthusiastic hearing from any gathering of the People of God, a priest need only say that he believes deeply in improving the quality of his sermons. The response is always immediate and enthusiastic. The Congress on the Word of God is essential at this time and in this country for the advance of the kingdom of God."

In addition to concurrent conferences on a variety of topics related to preaching, the National Congress will also feature the following as homilists at the Eucharistic liturgy or as principal speakers during the day of the Congress; Archbishop Timothy Manning of Los Angeles; Archbishop Fulton J. Sheen; Father Barnabas Ahern, C.P.; Father Eugene Maly of Cincinnati; and Bishop John Quinn of Oklahoma City.

The crisis of faith is not simply an academic problem that can be resolved by enlightened discussion. It is a way of life that has been revealed. It is no longer a world or a Church in which the preacher can assume belief in the revealed Jesus; rather, it is his sacred task to beget that belief through his proclamation of the Gospel to all.

It is the purpose of the National Congress to give members of the hierarchy, leading theologians, Scripture scholars, religious educators and all the people of God an opportunity to come together to witness the power of the Word of God to resolve the crisis of faith. The Congress itself will be an act of celebration in which those participating in the various liturgical ceremonies will proclaim that the preaching of the word is the primary source for priestly formation, liturgical renewal and religious education.

If on a national level a resurgence of interest and enthusiasm can be generated about the preacher's mission in the Church today, an integral step will have been taken toward the revitalization of the Christian community. And for both priests and laymen it will make the Sunday sermon a renewed source of growth for our spiritual life.

The deposit of faith does not lie in a box to be opened or closed. What exists is a living quality of soul. The only place in the Church where the faith lives is in the hearts of believers. The National Congress is an act of faith that God's word has power for all of us.

THE DEATHS OF 24 SOVIET JEWS IN 1952 AND ITS CONTEMPORARY SIGNIFICANCE

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 17, 1972

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago, 24 of the most outstanding representatives of Soviet Jewry were executed in the basement of Moscow's notorious Lubianka Prison. They had been found guilty of being, "enemies of the U.S.S.R., agents of American imperialism, bourgeois nationalist Zionists, and rebels who sought by armed rebellion to separate the Crimea from the Soviet Union and to establish their own Jewish bourgeois, nationalist, Zionist republic there." This was the fate of the leaders of the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee which had been organized in 1942 by the Soviet Government to mobilize Soviet Jewry against the threat of Nazi Germany. Their execution was the culmination of Stalin's 5-year campaign to eradicate "rootless cosmopolitanism" from Soviet society.

On Tuesday, August 15, 1972, a memorial meeting for these martyrs was held on the steps of the Capitol. The purpose of the meeting was not only to remember the slain Jews, but also to focus attention on the plight of Soviet Jews today.

I include the following address, given at the memorial by Dr. Isaac Franck, executive vice president of the Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington:

SOVIET JEWRY'S BRIDGE 1952–72

Congressman Peyser, Other Members of the Congress, Ladies and Gentlemen: Two decades have passed since Stalin's monstrous act on August 12, 1952, a date which lives in infamy. On that date, in the dark of night, in the subterranean cellars of Moscow's notorious Liubianka prison, the bullets fired by the executioners in the employ of Stalin, extinguished one by one 24 of the leading luminaries in the firmament of Jewish cultural life and artistic creativity in the USSR. Poets, novelists, essayists, actors in the Moscow Yiddish State Theatre, young, middle aged, and old. There beloved medium of expression was the warm, colorful folk-language, the Yiddish language. Their burning desire was to keep alive the flame of the Jewish spirit which Stalin wanted to snuff out, and to contribute to the cultural and artistic creativity of the masses of Jews who had survived the Nazi Holocaust. This was their crime; for this were these 24 gentle giants of the spirit felled by the bullets of the Soviet tyrant.

The epic poet, Peretz Markish; the sensitive novelist, David Bergelson; the distinguished actor, Binyamin Zuskin; the gentle lyricist, David Hofshteyn; the benign writer of poems and stories for children, Leib Kvitko; the proud and powerful poet, Itzik Feffer; Shmuel Persov, Itsik Nusinov, Solomon Lozovsky, Eliahu Spivak, and on and on this catalogue of diabolic death continues. For, the 24 who were murdered on that night in August of 1952 were not the only victims. They were only a part of the Jewish aristocracy of the intellect whom Stalin liquidated. One historian estimates that a total of 431 outstanding Soviet Jewish arists and writers were arrested and exiled to Siberian labor camps during this period: 217 Yiddish writers and poets, 108 Yiddish actors, 87 painters and sculptors, and 19 musicians. Most of them perished in the Soviet labor camps. The first victim in this exalted assembly was Shlomo Mikhoels the great actor of the Yiddish stage, who was brutally beaten to death and then run over by a truck in Minsk, on January 13, 1948; and parts of Peretz Markish's courageous poem on Mikhoels' death will be read later in our program today.

Two decades have passed since the executions of August 12, 1952. But we here mourn and cry out against the death not only of 24, or of 431 precious persons whose lives were brutally taken because they were exponents of Jewish culture. We mourn here today, and protest against, the brutal annihilation of Jewish culture itself in the Soviet Union, by Stalin and his successors.

For across this span of years, across this bridge of years, we have witnessed a forced march of death of the culture of a people. Across this bridge of years, from Stalin's first days to this very day, driven by the whips of the Soviet Secret Police; by the terror of arrests, phony trials and imprisonment; by the whipped up hysteria in the Soviet press; by government approved anti-semitic books like Kichko's notorious "Judaism without embellishment"; by official threats and intimidations—driven, I say, by these diabolically calculated methods—a forced march to death has taken place.

Across this bridge of time the Soviet regime has driven to death and annihilation all but the remaining miserable 58 Synagogues in the USSR; all Jewish schools—in Yiddish, Hebrew, or Russian; all Jewish newspapers; all Jewish libraries; all Jewish publications except for a small monthly; all Jewish theatres; all Jewish community institutions; all production of Jewish ritual objects; all printing of the Hebrew Bible; all printing of the Hebrew Prayer Book (except for 10,000 in 1968). No other religious or nationality group in the Soviet Union has been subjected to this systematic cultural destruction. So far as one could discern, this Soviet policy and practice left three million Soviet Jews spiritually and culturally desolate; bereft of poets, writers, teachers, leaders, artists, Rabbis;—three million Jews silenced after nearly four decades without any Jewish education, victims of enforced assimilation, and on their way to oblivion as a people.

This was Stalin's plan, and his successors continued its execution. No de-Stalinization in Soviet Jewish policy followed Stalin's death. It appeared that the forced march of death for Soviet Jewry was irreversible, and that in this Stalin would succeed even after his death.

But they were mistaken. They did not count on the deathless, indomitable Jewish spirit that continued glowing under the surface, and erupted into a flame of freedom in the past three years. Secretly, at serious peril to their safety, Jews continued to study Hebrew and Yiddish; to circulate secretly reprinted Jewish books; to listen to broadcasts about Jewish life in the freedom of Israel and the United States; and to nurture the hope of liberation that would enable them to join their fellow Jews in the Holy Land.

And then it all broke out into the open. We here protested, and Soviet Jews acted publicly. They began to demand their right to emigrate to Israel where they could live freely as Jews. They applied for exit permits. Thy sat in in the offices of Soviet totalitarian officialdom. They wrote letters and manifestos of freedom and sent them out to the free world. The Soviet regime responded in a cruel but puzzled fashion. They tried to suppress this Jewish Liberation movement. In 1970 they began a series of phony trials of activist leaders among the Jews seeking liberation, and over 40 of them are languishing in Soviet prisons today. Vladimir Markma of Sverdlovsk, who was sentenced to 3 years in prison on trumped up charges only last week, is the latest among these victims whose sole crime is their desire to emigrate to Israel.

But this freedom movement of the Soviet Jews cannot be stifled. In spite of terror and intimidation, close to 100,000 Soviet Jews have applied for exit permits, at great peril to themselves and their families. The Soviet government has had to relax its closed door policy and permits a limited number of Jews to leave for Israel, in response to Soviet Jewish activism, and in response to our protests. And so, the march across the bridge of time has not turned out to be what Stalin wanted, namely, an irreversible march of death. The direction of this march *has* been reversed. And across this bridge of years there has appeared a new march, a march of renaissance, of revival; a reaffirmation by Soviet Jews of their Jewishness, and an increasingly clamoring insistence before the conscience of the world that they want to live as Jews, and that toward this end they want the right to emigrate to Israel, a right guaranteed by civilized law and international covenents.

Their struggle goes on. More and more are joining the march back to Jewish existence, even though the penalties imposed upon them by the Soviet regime are grave and often unendurable, from prison sentences, to continuous harassment, to loss of jobs and a life near destitution. This is what the widow and son of the poet Peretz Markish are enduring now, and the Soviets will not let them go.

We here, today, meeting in the sacred memory of Peretz Markish and the others who were executed in the Lubianka prison on August 12, 1952, we will continue to protest, to appeal to the conscience of the world, and we will continue to demand of the Soviet Union: free the prisoners, remove the obstacles, stop the terror and punishments, let Soviet Jews go to their freedom, and we will do this until every Soviet Jew who wishes to do so, is free to be reunited with his fellow Jews, to live freely, as a free member of the Jewish people.

SENATE—*Friday, August 18, 1972*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JOHN V. TUNNEY, a Senator from the State of California.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God of this day and of all history, come to us in this quiet of the morning hour with a fresh awareness of Thy presence. Guide us through the duties of this day with joyous hearts and confident spirits. Be ever amongst us as the unseen reality to guide, strengthen, and uplift all who serve in this place. Be with us when we separate. Give journeying mercies to all who travel. Out of the coming contests forge a new and better nation where the things that are unseen and eternal transcend the things which are seen and temporal. Lead us in paths of righteousness for Thy name's sake and bring us at last to the haven of Thy peace.

We pray in that name which is above every name. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., August 18, 1972.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. JOHN V. TUNNEY, a Senator from the State of California, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. TUNNEY 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 Thursday, August 17, 1972, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go