

Lawrence Pizzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

187. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Commission, Miami, Fla., relative to a Federal antirecession and full employment law; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

188. Also, petition of the national convention of the Speech Communication Association, New York, N.Y., relative to the Congressional Record; to the Committee on House Administration.

189. Also, petition of the mayor and Council of the Borough of Harrington Park, N.J., relative to extending the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

190. Also, petition of mayor and Council of the Town of Index, Wash., relative to Federal-State revenue sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COMMEMORATION OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to acknowledge on behalf of all Lithuanian Americans the commemoration this month of the 721st anniversary of the Lithuanian State, established in the year 1251, and the 54th anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918.

It has now been nearly 32 years since the illegal incorporation of the free and independent Republic of Lithuania by the Communists into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, one of the brutal tragedies of all time.

Mr. President, I have recently received a statement from the Lithuanian American Community of the U.S.A. entitled "Lithuania's Seven-Century Quest for Freedom" which I feel is an excellent summary of the case for a free Lithuania, whose right of self-determination we have supported since June of 1940 when the Communist takeover of Lithuania occurred.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement entitled "Lithuania's Seven-Century Quest for Freedom" and the text of House Concurrent Resolution 416 supporting Lithuanian freedom, adopted by the 89th Congress on June 23, 1966, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LITHUANIA'S SEVEN-CENTURY QUEST FOR FREEDOM

(The Land of Simas Kudirka)

"I have nothing to add to what I have already said, only one wish, more specifically, a request to the supreme court and the government of the Soviet Union: I ask that you grant my homeland, Lithuania, independence."—From appeal of Simas Kudirka during his trial.

The Kremlin is fond of saying that Russian imperialism died with the czar. But the fate of the Baltic nations—Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia—shows this to be cruel fiction. The Communist regime did not come to power in the Baltic States by legal or democratic process. The Soviets invaded and occupied the Baltic States in June of 1940, and the Baltic peoples have been suffering in Russian-Communist slavery for more than 30 years.

700-YEAR-OLD STATE

The Lithuanians are proud people who have lived peacefully on the shores of the Baltic from time immemorial. For instance, this year marks the 721st anniversary of the for-

mation of the Lithuanian state. Mindaugas the Great unified Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251.

The Baltic peoples have suffered for centuries from the "accident of geography." From the West they were invaded by the Teutonic Knights, from the East by the Russians. It took remarkable spiritual and ethnic strength to survive the pressures from both sides. The Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians, it should be kept in mind, are ethnically related neither to the Germans nor the Russians.

After the Nazis and Soviets smashed Poland in September of 1939, the Kremlin moved troops into the Baltic republics and annexed them in June of 1940. In one of history's greatest frauds, "elections" were held under the Red army guns. The Kremlin then claimed that Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia voted for inclusion in the Soviet empire.

MOST BRUTAL OCCUPATION OF ALL TIME

Then began one of the most brutal occupations of all time. Hundreds of thousands of Balts were dragged to trains and jammed into cars without food and water. Many died from suffocation. The pitiful survivors were dumped out in the Arctic or Siberia. The Baltic peoples have never experienced such an extermination and annihilation of their people in their long history through centuries as during the last three decades. Since June 15, 1940, these three nations have lost more than one-fourth of their entire population. The genocidal operations and practices being carried out by the Soviets continue with no end in sight.

Since the very beginning of Soviet Russian occupation, however, the Balts have waged an intensive fight for freedom. During the period between 1940 and 1952 alone, some 30,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters lost their lives in an organized resistance movement against the invaders. The cessation of armed guerrilla warfare in 1952 did not spell the end of the Baltic resistance against Soviet domination. On the contrary, resistance by passive means gained a new impetus.

SUCCESSFUL REVOLT AGAINST SOVIETS

The year of 1971 marked the 30th anniversary of Lithuania's successful revolt against the Soviet Union. During the second part of June of 1941 the people of Lithuania succeeded in getting rid of the Communist regime in the country: freedom and independence were restored and a free government was re-established. This free, provisional government remained in existence for more than six weeks. At that time Lithuania was overrun by the Nazis who suppressed all the activities of this free government and the government itself.

The Government of the United States of America has refused to recognize the seizure and forced "incorporation" of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia by the Communists into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Our Government maintains diplomatic relations with the former free Governments of the Baltic States. Since June of 1940, when the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, all the Presidents of the United States (Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, and Richard M.

Nixon) have stated, restated and confirmed our country's nonrecognition policy of the occupation of the Baltic States by the Kremlin dictators. However, our country has done very little, if anything, to help the suffering Baltic peoples to get rid of the Communist regimes in their countries.

RESTORATION OF INDEPENDENCE TO LITHUANIA

The case of the Baltic States is not a question about the right of self-rule of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, since this is established beyond any reasonable doubt, but the question is how to stop the Soviet crime and restore freedom and independence to these countries. The Select Committee of the House of Representatives to Investigate the Incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R., created by the 83rd Congress, after having held 50 public hearings during which the testimony of 335 persons was taken, made a number of recommendations to our Government pertaining to the whole question of liberation of the Baltic States. According to the findings of this House committee, "no nation, including the Russian Federated Soviet Republic, has ever voluntarily adopted communism." All of them were enslaved by the use of infiltration, subversion, and force. The American foreign policy toward the Communist enslaved nations, the aforesaid House committee stated, must be guided by "the moral and political principles of the American Declaration of Independence." The present generation of Americans, this committee suggested, should recognize that the bonds which many Americans have with enslaved lands of their ancestry are a great asset to the struggle against communism and that, furthermore, the Communist danger should be abolished during the present generation. The only hope of avoiding a new world war, according to this committee, is a "bold, positive political offensive by the United States and the entire free world." The committee included a declaration of the U.S. Congress which states that the eventual liberation and self-determination of nations are "firm and unchanging parts of our policy."

RIGHT STEP IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

The United States Congress has made a right step in the right direction by unanimously adopting H. Con. Res. 416 (89th Congress) that calls for freedom for Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. All freedom-loving Americans should urge the President of the United States to implement this very important legislation by bringing the issue of the liberation of the Baltic States in the United Nations and requesting the Soviets withdraw from Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. The time has come for the whole world to demand that the principle of self-determination be respected and that the nations of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, too, shall be free from domination and be permitted to choose their own form of government. We should have a single standard for freedom. Its denial in the whole or in part, in any place in the world, including the Soviet Union, is surely intolerable.

H. CON. RES. 416

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation

constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people:

Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S SULFUR TAX LEGISLATION

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1972

MR. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, last week the President sent to Congress, as a part of his environmental message, his proposal to place a tax on sulfur emissions from stationary sources. Last session, 24 Members of the House joined me in co-sponsoring sulfur tax legislation which would place a 20 cents tax per pound on all sulfur emissions.

While I applaud the administration for introducing its sulfur tax proposal, I believe its proposal is woefully inadequate. I would like today to place in the RECORD a copy of a recent letter I sent to the President concerning his legislation. I also include in the RECORD a statement on the Nixon sulfur tax bill by the Coalition To Tax Pollution—a group of pollution organizations supporting strong pollution incentive legislation.

Those two items follow:

FEBRUARY 10, 1972.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I was extremely pleased to see that the Administration sulfur tax bill was sent to Congress last week. I think the Administration deserves real praise for introducing the sulfur tax bill since this will serve to bring to light the advantages of pollution tax incentives. But I do not believe that the Administration's proposal accurately or adequately reflects the real advantage of pollution tax incentives.

As you know, the purpose of a pollution tax is to provide an immediate and continuing incentive for an industry to reduce its pollution as much as is technologically possible. There are two very basic things wrong with the Administration's proposal. First, there is no incentive for a polluter to reduce its sulfur emissions below the standards set by the Clean Air Act amendments. Second, one of the real advantages of tax incentive legislation is that it can be put into effect quickly, at an escalating rate, to provide an immediate incentive to the polluter to abate. By waiting until 1976, the Administration's proposal completely negates this advantage.

One of the most unfortunate aspects of the Administration's proposal is that it would have the effect of actually increasing air pollution in certain regions of the country by encouraging sulfur polluters to move to regions where there is relatively little sulfur pollution and which are likely to be well under the sulfur standards set by the Clean Air Act amendments. Thus, the basic net effect of your legislation might well be to transfer sulfur pollution rather than reduce it. This is so because, under your proposal, even if one industry is exceeding the Clean Air Act standards, if the region as a whole is below those standards, none of the industries within the region will be taxed. Conversely, if one industry has done everything possible to reduce its sulfur emissions, but its region exceeds the standards, then the industry will be taxed along with all others in the region. While this transferring of sulfur pollution from one region to others is not necessarily bad per se, it would be far better to reduce sulfur pollution in all regions—which is what pollution tax incentive legislation is designed to accomplish.

In short, I believe the Administration's proposal is inadequate, deceptive, and distorts the very purpose of using tax incentives to reduce pollution. I hope the Administration will be amenable to changes which will strengthen the legislation if, and when, it receives committee hearings.

Sincerely,

LES ASPIN,
Member of Congress.

COALITION TO TAX POLLUTION—ENVIRONMENTALISTS CRITICIZE NIXON SULFUR TAX PLAN

The Coalition to Tax Pollution, an organization of major environmental groups supporting an effective tax on sulfur emissions, notes with pleasure that the Administration has come forth with its long-awaited proposal to tax sulfur pollution. A spokesman from the Coalition expressed hope that hearings will be scheduled promptly by the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, to discuss the entire issue of the taxation of sulfur pollution, and to consider the other bills which have been introduced on the subject.

However, the Coalition expressed concern about the main features of the Administration bill, citing several weaknesses. The Coalition stated:

"The Administration's sulfur tax proposal is distressingly weak. The close meshing with the Clean Air Act involves loopholes, complications, and an open invitation to polluters to redistribute rather than reduce the sulfur pollution problem. The Administration does not seem to understand that a tax scheme and a regulatory scheme can operate complementarily without being totally interwoven—that a tax is strong precisely where the regulations are weak, and vice versa. By putting them together, they detract from the virtues of both.

The level of the tax, even in the dirtiest areas, is not high enough, and the stimulus it will provide for degradation of the many areas which presently do better than the secondary standards (in which there will be no tax whatsoever) is an important and unfortunate consequence of this proposal.

By exempting clean air regions, the concept of a tax as an effort to make polluters responsible for the social costs of pollution, by making production costs reflect those social costs, is ignored.

We support a strong sulfur tax proposal—a national tax at the rate of twenty cents per pound. We hope that in discussions of the sulfur tax, the weaknesses of the Administration's bill will be recognized, and that Congress will strive to pass an effective sulfur tax. We do not wish to see a good idea lost because of a bad proposal."

The Coalition had the following criticisms of the Nixon bill:

1. Since polluters in regions with air better than the secondary standards will pay no tax, this measure will promote the degradation of these regions. Much of this country presently has air of better quality than that defined by the secondary standards. This feature of the tax is a serious example of the Administration's abandonment of a policy of non-degradation.

2. The proposed tax levels—15 cents per pound of sulfur in the worst areas, 10 cents in those areas which are meeting primary but not secondary standards—are not high enough. Much abatement costs more than 10 cents per pound of sulfur abated, and a significant amount costs more than 15 cents as well. For example, stack gas cleaning costs about 11.4 cents per pound of sulfur abated, and fuel oil desulfurization to .3% sulfur will cost about 19 cents per pound. Thus, even the higher tax will leave a severe urban problem—sulfur pollution from building heating—virtually untouched.

3. There will be no tax until 1976, when, by law, the primary standards must be met anyway. The Administration is postponing the use of the incentive device until after the problem is supposed to be well on its way to being solved.

4. The ambient air over a certain piece of the country does not give a true picture of the air pollution problem, because air pollution does not necessarily obey the boundaries of regions defined under the Clean Air Act. A system which taxes according to these regions ignores this fact. Sweden, in its case study for the 1972 U.N. Conference on the environment, cites severe damage from sulfur in the rain far from the source of pollution (England), and argues for reduction of total emissions, as well as control of local air concentration problems. In this country an air pollution episode in Oklahoma was traced by meteorologists to emissions in Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and West Virginia.

5. The President stated in his environmental message that the tax is "an application of the principle that the costs of pollution should be included in the price of the product." Why then is there no tax in a major part of the country? Clearly, the social cost of pollution in these areas, although they have cleaner air generally, is not zero.

The Coalition also stated that basing the tax on ambient air rather than simply on emissions creates an unfair situation. Ambient air quality depends as much on weather and the behavior of other polluters as it does on the actions of individual polluters. Yet these circumstances will determine whether the tax is levied on an individual polluter.

The Coalition supports a sulfur tax proposal which has none of the above weaknesses. It has been introduced as a bill by Senator Proxmire (S. 3057) and Congressman Aspin (H.R. 10890). It has the following features:

1. The target level of the tax is 20 cents per pound of sulfur, reached in 5-cent increments from 1972 to 1975. The phase-in period gives polluters a chance to adjust to pollution control, and make major expenditures on pollution control processes, yet it provides an incentive to do so immediately.

2. The tax is national in scope—it tolerates no degradation anywhere; it provides no stimulus to send pollution to clean air regions rather than preventing it. Pollution travels great distances (the residence time of sulfur in the air is about one week) and hence integrated control over large areas is necessary.

3. The level of the tax, 20 cents per pound of sulfur, is higher than most estimated costs of abatement, and will therefore promote a high level of abatement, and a continuing incentive to develop better and cheaper methods to control sulfur pollution.

The Coalition to Tax Pollution includes among its national cooperating organizations the following groups, as well as almost 50 groups from around the country:

Environmental Action
Federation of American Scientists
Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs
Friends of the Earth
Sierra Club
The Wilderness Society
Zero Population Growth

NEWS BULLETIN OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I call my colleagues' attention to the first item that appears in the February 14 edition of the ARBC news bulletin. Representatives of the bicentennial commissions of the 50 States and the territories will be in Washington for the National Bicentennial Conference. The event will be held Tuesday, February 22, and Wednesday, February 23, at the Pan American Health Organization Building.

The conference will provide information vital to the establishment and operation of State bicentennial programs. Those attending will be filling a leadership role in their States.

The American Revolution Bicentennial Commission was formed by Congress in 1966, and each Congress since that time has contributed to the Commission's operation. A word of support from Members of Congress at this critical time could be most helpful to a successful celebration in 1976 for each State and community.

I am also including a list of persons attending the conference and the States they represent. Members wishing to arrange a personal meeting with their State's delegation should contact ARBC Congressional Liaison. May I suggest this is an opportunity that should not be overlooked to express interest in the bicentennial.

I insert the news bulletin at this point in the RECORD, followed by a list of State delegates to the National Bicentennial Conference.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION, FEBRUARY 14, 1972

The full ARBC Commission meeting will be held on Monday, February 21, at 9:00 a.m. in the Pan American Health Organization Building, Room B. On Tuesday, February 22, The Fifty States National Bicentennial Conference will convene at 9:00 a.m., at the Washington Hilton Hotel. Chairman Mahoney will report on the current status of the ARBC in a kickoff speech. On Wednesday,

February 23, the Conference will convene at 9:00 a.m. and will include a keynote speech by Mr. Pat Dodson, chairman of the Florida ARBC.

ARBC Communications Chairman James Copley has announced that his committee and staff have been working with U.S. News and World Report on a special bicentennial article that will appear in the February 28 issue available on newsstands next week. The article includes a chart showing plans and projects in all Fifty States.

The House last week by a 329 to 36 vote passed the ARBC authorization, S. 1857. The bill now goes to the Senate for action.

"The bicentennial era, I am convinced, is the right time for Washington to gain a new and more expansive sense of itself and to find in its dual identity an opportunity for dual excellence unparalleled among American cities," President Nixon observed on February 4 in outlining his action plan for the Capital's 1976 commemoration, and he added: "The seat of government can excel as an exemplary living city, at the same time the home of 750,000 local residents excels as a gracious host to fellow citizens and foreign visitors who may number 40 million during 1976 alone."

The president of Bryn Mawr College in Philadelphia, Harris Wofford, has announced a bicentennial program consisting of a series of seminars, symposia and conferences covering the next five years to investigate "how our country has succeeded or failed to carry out objectives of the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights." Some of the "1976 studies program" will be open to the public. A report on findings and recommendations will be made in 1976.

The Smithsonian Institution plans to open a new Hall of American Maritime Enterprise in time for the bicentennial. Funds for construction of the hall, which will cost about \$1.5 million, are being sought from individual donors and maritime organizations. A highlight of the new hall, which will depict "the importance to America of the sea, the lakes and the rivers from colonial days to the present," will be a completely equipped engine room of a small steam vessel.

Last week some 5,000 boy scouts, cubs and explorers between the ages of eight and 80 participated in the Cincinnati tri-county area's "Expo '76" to acquaint the public with the wide range of activities the Boy Scouts of America has to offer. This was the third of the scout's thundercloud district's five annual programs that will culminate with the commemoration of the bicentennial.

The Iowa American Revolution Bicentennial Commission has hired Phaene Hibbs of Charlton as its first field representative. Commission chairman Robert Dillon said Mr. Hibbs will visit all Iowa communities to encourage local committees to plan bicentennial programs. Mr. Hibbs will also act as a clearinghouse for program dates and ideas on the commemoration.

The Connecticut ARBC has voted to seek a feasibility study of the establishment of a state historical museum as a permanent contribution to the National Bicentennial in Connecticut. Commission Chairman Eric Hatch stated that its two legislative members, Senator Jay Jackson and Representative Robert Orcutt would introduce legislation authorizing the feasibility study.

Texas A&M University's agricultural extension service has initiated a project dubbed "3.76 in '76." Carried out in cooperation with both public and private agricultural agencies throughout the state, it is designed to increase agricultural income by \$1 billion in 1976 as well as laying down guidelines for improving food quality.

Last week the House supported unanimously a resolution to hold the 1976 Olympics in Denver.

Prologue: The Journal of the National Archives will publish a special bicentennial issue in the fall 1972 and invites interested persons to submit articles on the revolution-

ary period for consideration. Research for such articles would not have to be based primarily on the records of the national archives and records service. Manuscripts should be sent to Herman J. Viola, National Archives Building, Washington, D.C. 20408.

A Washington Post editorial commenting on the administration's D.C. bicentennial message stated: "In calling for a vast package of new construction projects costing some \$150 million (not to mention plans already endorsed for riot-corridor renewal and completion of the Federal triangle), Mr. Nixon has hammered home the need for speed and cooperation to meet the historic—and inflexible—deadline on which everything now hinges . . . all of us who have been behind the dream of doing great things for this city in time for the Nation's 200th birthday must find renewed determination to make them happen now that we are assured of deep commitment from the White House."

Recently the Dayton (Ohio) Journal Herald reported that a private, non-profit Dayton firm, let's promote America, Inc. assisted by advice from the Ohio ARBC, is putting together a traveling exhibit that will tour the country preceding the opening of the bicentennial year.

In the first meeting of the advisory council of the Connecticut ARBC recently Governor Thomas J. Meskill told bicentennial planners: "I am sure that none of you has joined in this bicentennial effort with the idea that it will consist solely of planning and staging a big parade or something of the sort. There is widespread agreement, all over the country, that if we are going to do no more than that for the bicentennial, we may as well forget it."

Congratulations to Dr. Charles E. Perry, President of Florida International University and a member of the Florida ARBC, who was recently honored by the U.S. Jaycees as one of America's 10 outstanding young men for 1971.

STATES ARBC REPRESENTATIVES ATTENDING NATIONAL BICENTENNIAL CONFERENCE

(Arrival/departure dates appear in parentheses after names.)

(Asterisk indicates spouse will accompany.)

ALABAMA

Honorable Sage Lyons, Chairman, Alabama ARBC (21-23).

Mr. Doug Benton, Executive Director, Alabama ARBC (21-23).

ALASKA

Mr. Michael Kennedy, Director, Alaska State Museum (20-23).

ARIZONA

Mr. John H. Eversole, Chairman, Arizona ARBC (21-25).

Mrs. Mildred May, Vice Chairman, Arizona ARBC (21-25).

Mr. Maurice M. Giss, Department of Economic Planning and Development (21-25).

AMERICAN SAMOA

Mr. M. W. Bales, Office of Territories, Department of the Interior.

High Chief A. U. Fuimaono, Delegate-at-Large to Washington.

ARKANSAS

Mr. Lou Oberste, Secretary, Arkansas Bicentennial Celebration Cmte. (21-23).

Mrs. Thomas F. Dodson, Arkansas State Regent, DAR (21-23).

CALIFORNIA

Mr. Charles J. Conrad, Chairman, California ARBC (20-24).

COLORADO

Mr. Alexis McKinney (representing Chairman, Colorado 1976 Centennial-Bicentennial Commission) (21-25).

Mr. J. R. Albi, Executive Director, Colorado 1976 Centennial-Bicentennial Commission (21-24).

CONNECTICUT

Mr. Eric Hatch, Chairman, Connecticut ARBC (21-23).
Mr. William Morris, Director, Connecticut ARBC (20-23).

DELAWARE

Dr. E. A. Trabant, Chairman, Delaware ARBC (21-23).

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. James Gibson, Chairman, Bicentennial Commission of the District of Columbia.
Mr. G. Dewey Arnold, Vice Chairman, Bicentennial Commission of D.C.
Mrs. Patricia Mathews.

FLORIDA

Mr. Pat Dodson, Chairman, Florida Bicentennial Commission, (21-23).
Mr. E. Jones, Pres., Third Century USA, Inc., (21-24).
Mr. D. Fountain, Office of Secretary of State of Florida, (21-23).
Mr. N. E. Bill Miller, Exec. Dir., Florida Bicentennial Commission, (21-23).
Mr. W. Owens, Office of the Governor, (21-23).
Mr. J. Henry, Staff of the Lieutenant Governor, (21-23).
Mr. N. Landrum, Director, Division of Recreation & Parks, (21-23).

GEORGIA

Mr. Ernest G. Key, Jr., Chairman, Georgia Commission for the National Bicentennial Celebration, (21-23).

HAWAII

Mrs. Hazel Smith, Hawaii ARBC (21-23).

IDAHO

Honorable W. Anthony Park, Chairman, Idaho ARBC, (21-23).

ILLINOIS

Mr. Andrew McNally, III, Chairman, Illinois Bicentennial Commission, (21-23).
Mr. Samuel A. Lilly, Executive Director, Illinois Bicentennial Commission, (21-23).

INDIANA

Miss Marcelle Foote, Secretary, Indiana State Bicentennial Commission, (21-23).

IOWA

Mr. Robert W. Dillon, Chairman, Iowa ARBC, (21-23).
Mr. Kenneth R. Fulk, Secretary, Iowa ARBC, (21-23).
Mr. Phane Hibbs, Field Representative, Iowa ARBC, (21-23).

KANSAS

Mr. Morris Krouse, Chairman, Kansas ARBC, (20-24).

KENTUCKY

Mr. Clyde Webb, Chairman, Historical Events Celebration Commission, (21-23).

LOUISIANA

Mr. Ben C. Toledano (representing Chairman, Louisiana Bicentennial Commission), (21-23).

*Mr. Michael Hackett, Louisiana Tourist Development Commission, (21-23).

MAINE

*Mr. Roy A. Whitcomb, Jr., Executive Assistant to the Governor, (21-24).
Dr. Ronald Banks, Chairman, ARBC Planning Commission, (21-24).
Honorable Walter Blrt, State House of Representatives, (21-24).
Mr. Robert Damm, Vice Chairman, Maine ARBC Planning Commission, (21-24).

MARYLAND

Mr. Bruce Price, Exec. Dir., Maryland Bicentennial Commission, (21-23).

MASSACHUSETTS

*Mr. Francis W. Sidiaskas, Executive Director, Revolutionary War Bicentennial Commission, (21-23).

MICHIGAN

Mr. Robert H. Sisson, Acting Chairman, Michigan ARBC, (21-23).

MINNESOTA

Mrs. Wenda Moore, Bicentennial Representative for Minnesota, (21-24).

MISSISSIPPI

*Dr. R. A. McLemore, Director, Department of Archives and History, State of Mississippi, (20-23).

MISSOURI

Mr. James Pasley, Executive Director, ARBC of Missouri, (21-23).

MONTANA

Mr. Alec Hansen, Assistant to the Governor of Montana, (21-23).

NEBRASKA

Mr. James Potter, State Archivist, State Historical Society, (21-23).

NEVADA

Mr. Fred Gale, Chairman, Nevada Bicentennial Celebration Committee, (20-24).

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. Henry Monroe, Member New Hampshire ARBC, (22-24).

NEW JERSEY

Mr. John T. Cunningham, Chairman, New Jersey Historical Commission, (21-23).

Mr. Bernard Bush, Executive Director, New Jersey Historical Commission, (21-23).

Mr. Walter T. Peters, Jr., Spec. Representative of the Governor's Office, (21-23).

NEW MEXICO

*Mr. Joseph J. Mullins, Chairman, New Mexico ARBC, (19-23).

NEW YORK

Dr. Louis L. Tucker, Executive Director, New York State ARBC, (22-23).

NORTH CAROLINA

Honorable Hector MacLean, Chairman, North Carolina ARBC, (21-23).

Mr. Richard F. Gibbs, Executive Director, North Carolina ARBC, (21-23).

NORTH DAKOTA

*Mr. John Conrad, Chairman North Dakota Bicentennial Commission (19-23).

OHIO

Mr. Daniel R. Porter, Director, The Ohio Historical Society, (21-23).

OKLAHOMA

Mrs. Gladys Warren, Director, Oklahoma Bicentennial Commission, (21-23).

OREGON

Mrs. L. A. Baumhover, member ARBC of Oregon, (21-23).

PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. George H. Ebner, Executive Director, Bicentennial Commission of Pennsylvania, (21-23).

PUERTO RICO

*Mr. Charles Pasarell, Chairman, Puerto Rico Bicentennial Commission, (21-24).

RHODE ISLAND

Honorable George F. McDonald, Jr., Chairman, Rhode Island Bicentennial Commission, (21-23).

SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. P. Bradley Morrah, Chairman, South Carolina ARBC, (21-23).

*Mr. Robert Hickman, Director, Department Parks, Recreation and Tourism (21-23).

SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. Les Helgeland, Chairman, South Dakota ARBC (20-25).

TENNESSEE

*Mrs. H. T. Spoden, representing Tennessee ARBC, (21-23).

TEXAS

*Mr. Sam Kinch, Sr., Chairman, ARBC of Texas, (21-23).

Mrs. Gene J. Riddle, Associate Executive Director, ARBC of Texas, (21-24).

Mr. Jack Newman, Member San Antonio Bicentennial Committee, (21-23).

Mrs. Vivian Hamlin, Member San Antonio Bicentennial Committee, (21-23).

Mrs. R. V. Allen, Member ARBC, (21-23).

Mrs. W. W. McAllister, (21-23).

UTAH

Mr. Milton L. Wellenmann, Executive Director, Department of Development Services (State of Utah), (20-23).

VERMONT

Mr. Peter R. Martin, Executive Assistant to the Governor, (21-23).

VIRGINIA

Mr. Lewis A. McMurran, Jr., Chairman, Virginia Independence Bicentennial Commission, (21-23).

Mr. Parke Rouse, Jr., Acting Director, Virginia Independence Bicentennial Commission, (21-23).

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mrs. Doris Rosas, Asst. to the Attorney General of the Virgin Islands, (21-23).

WASHINGTON

Mr. Bruce Le Roy, Chairman, Washington ARBC, (20-24).

WEST VIRGINIA

Dr. Carolyn J. Zinn, State Historian and Bicentennial Chairman, (21-24).

WISCONSIN

Mr. James Morton Smith, Director, The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, (21-24).

WYOMING

Mrs. Katherine Halverson, Wyoming State Archives and Historical Department, (21-24).

ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

Honorable Alfonso J. Cervantes, Mayor of St. Louis.

OPPOSITION TO THE PRESIDENT'S VIETNAM PROPOSAL

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is a tragic state of affairs when prominent leaders in our country immediately criticized the President's unprecedented offer for peace in Vietnam even before Hanoi had responded to U.S. concessions Hanoi demanded. In my judgment, this continuous aid to the enemy has been one of the principal factors for failure in the negotiations and the release of U.S. prisoners.

It is noted that many editorials concur with this opinion. I shall quote a significant paragraph from the January 20, 1972, issue of the Stars and Stripes—the National Tribune:

The politicians seeking votes through using the prisoner of war issue have no more assurance than does the President that Hanoi would release these mistreated men if the United States surrendered completely and met all other demands the North Vietnamese have made through their lackeys in America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Aiding

the Enemy" be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

EDITORIAL—AIDING THE ENEMY

It is more than regrettable that certain politicians seeking the highest office in the land will stoop to the low level of throwing out false hopes to the relatives of prisoners held by Hanoi. Blandly, they assure voters that they would get the prisoners released by the simple expedient of pulling out every last American in uniform from Vietnam and ceasing all aid to the South Vietnamese in their battle against the aggressors in the north.

At no time has Hanoi given any definite pledge on when and under what circumstances it would release the unhappy Americans held in its stockades and cells. To get such a pledge has been a prime purpose of the Paris talks with the enemy. Nothing has come from them except tirades against the United States.

The President long back said he intended to wind down the war. The massive withdrawal of our troops gives proof that he is standing behind his promise.

The United States some years back gave up any hope of winning this war against a fifth rate power. All it seeks to do is to get out of the Southeast Asia war without witnessing the slaughter of the hapless Vietnamese who have bravely tried to take over the job of defending themselves.

The politicians seeking votes through using the prisoner of war issue have no more assurance than does the President that Hanoi would release these mistreated men if the United States surrendered completely and met all other demands the North Vietnamese have made through their lackeys in America.

Obviously, Mr. Nixon wants these prisoners released. He has concern for distraught wives and other relatives. If not thwarted in his current moves, he probably has a better chance of accomplishing release than any of the ambitious candidates who have nothing to lose themselves, but who could seal the fate of a lot of brave men languishing in Hanoi's prisons.

Immediately on the announcement of the heavy bombing raids against North Vietnam last month, "spontaneous" demonstrations sprang up in numerous major American cities. Undoubtedly, Hanoi's military situation was being hurt. Its friends over the United States lost no time in breaking out with anti-bombing demonstrations. Although not in the same camp with these Hanoi sympathizers, the candidates playing on the prisoner of war issue are working to the same end—to help the enemy.

REPUBLICAN DUPLICITY: PHASE II

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I have today come into possession of a letter being circulated on behalf of the Republican presidential candidate which reveals a cynical effort to circumvent the spirit, if not the letter, of the campaign spending law even before that legislation becomes effective as the law of the land.

This letter, bearing the signature of one Lawrence Lewis, Jr., of the Republican National Finance Committee, is ad-

ressed to the fat cats of the Republican Party, asking them to take part in a million-dollar fund-raising blitz before the new law takes effect in April.

Specifically, the letter says that it is asking Candidate Nixon's "major supporters" to make their 1972 political contributions "in the next 59 days"—in other words, before the new law becomes operative. It urges them to swell, still further, the GOP's coffers—and to do it without coming under the disclosure provisions of the Campaign Spending Law.

Let me quote one sentence from Mr. Lewis' letter which illustrates the cynical disregard which he has for the law of the land:

The new Campaign Spending Law will require, among other things, that persons making political contributions of \$100 or over must be identified and reported by election officials effective about April 8th.

Those are Mr. Lewis' own words, Mr. Speaker. In other words, Republican contributors are being told that a contribution now avoids public disclosure later. It is consistent with the stance taken by the Republican Party's candidate, who in 1970 vetoed a campaign spending measure passed by the Congress, and who last year—through his henchmen on Capitol Hill—put serious strictures on our efforts to enact broader spending reforms than we finally were able to pass.

Not satisfied even with this milder version, Candidate Nixon now is seeking to further weaken the effectiveness of this legislation by getting his supporters to bankroll the 1972 Republican campaign before April 8—so that the American people will not fully know where the millions of Nixon dollars have come from.

This is a sorry echo of the campaign of 1968, when the Nixon campaign manager, John Mitchell, openly flaunted the Corrupt Practices Act by ignoring reporting deadlines—a violation duly reported by the Clerk of the House to the Justice Department, but a violation which went unpunished because Campaign Manager Mitchell had, by that time, become Attorney General Mitchell, and exonerated himself of any wrongdoing.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Lewis addressed his letter particularly to a group of Nixon backers known as RN Associates. As the letter indicates, founding members of this select group contribute \$3,000 each, while annual members contribute \$1,000 each.

Mr. Lewis sent his letter to Virginia fat cat contributors. I have no doubt that members of the Republican National Finance Committee from 49 other States and the District of Columbia have sent similar letters, as part of the biggest and most cynical political fund-raising blitz in history.

The real question is whether Candidate Nixon—either by stealth or any other means—will be able to buy another presidential election. The only people who can supply that answer are the American voters—and I believe they will see through this cynical maneuver by a man whose operatives in the past had no respect for the law then on the books, and whose operatives today are

trying their best to render the new law totally ineffective.

Mr. Speaker, I include the full text of Mr. Lewis' letter at this point:

RICHMOND, VA.,
February 14, 1972.

Because of the new Campaign Spending Law which goes into effect on or about April 8th of this year, I am writing to all of President Nixon's major supporters in this area—and particularly RN Associates—to suggest that any contributions you intend to make to the President in this crucial election year be made in the next 59 days for two very important reasons—but first, let me thank those of you who have already sent your checks to Washington and the report of which may not have reached me.

Two reasons why you should send your contributions to re-elect Richard Nixon to: Republican National Finance Committee, 310 First Street S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003

1. The new Campaign Spending Law will require, among other things, that persons making political contributions of \$100 or over must be identified and reported by election officials effective about April 8th.

2. Contributions received early in this election year are actually more valuable than those received late in the year because of the need now to build a nationwide volunteer organization and to pay for campaign literature, publicity and advertising.

Your contribution now is an investment for a Republican Victory in 1972.

RN Associates founding member, \$3,000.

RN Associates annual member, \$1,000.

These checks should be made payable to RN Associates.

But remember, every contribution helps and checks for lesser amounts should be made payable to Republican National Finance Committee.

It would be helpful to me if you would ask that your check be credited to Virginia.

Think about the alternatives the Democrats are offering the country—and send your check now. Thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE LEWIS, JR.,
Republican National Finance Committee.

ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES

HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply moved by a letter I received from Atlantic City black contractor Joseph J. Mobley and a clipping of a newspaper article about his inspiring success story.

Joe Mobley has long been my constituent and my friend. Having recently been awarded a \$4.7-million contract for a large construction project in Bridgeton, Joe Mobley is living proof, as he says it, "that it is finally possible for minorities to have equal opportunities in America."

Here is a determined man who has worked hard for the success he now enjoys. His story is best told in a recent column by Sonny Schwartz in the Atlantic City Press.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper column and Mr. Mobley's excellent letter to me be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MOBLEY CONSTRUCTION Co., INC.,
GENERAL CONTRACTORS AND BUILDERS,
Atlantic City, N.J., February 7, 1972.
Hon. CHARLES SANDMAN, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Since you've always taken a personal interest in helping minority groups, and particularly me, in my struggle to obtain bonding for building contracts, I think you'll be pleased to know that my firm, Mobley Construction Company has been awarded a \$4.7 million contract for the construction of a 200-unit townhouse and garden-apartment complex in Bridgeton, New Jersey.

The development is being financed through the New Jersey State Housing Finance Agency and is sponsored by the Bridgeton Neighborhood Improvement Association, a non-profit black organization, headed by Howard Russell, president and the Rev. Robert F. Davis, secretary, in conjunction with the St. Philip Baptist Church and Union Baptist Temple.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for providing me with a tremendous amount of inspiration, sincerity and motivation over the years.

Many thanks to you, Mr. Congressman.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH J. MOBLEY.

[From the Atlantic City Press, Feb. 9, 1972]

SONNY SIDE UP: JOE'S DREAM COMES TRUE

(By Sonny Schwartz)

Joe Mobley's busy these days.

Busy writing letters.

President Nixon can expect to hear from Joe Mobley by the end of the week.

So can Gov. Bill Cahill. Rep. Charlie Sandman will receive a Mobley message. And another missive will be mailed to John P. Renna, Jr., executive director of the New Jersey Housing Finance Agency.

Mobley, a black general building contractor with offices at 725 Arctic Ave., Atlantic City, feels he owes a debt of gratitude to the President, Gov. Cahill, Congressman Sandman and Renna.

In one manner or another, Mobley believes, all four men were indirectly responsible for his obtaining a \$4.7-million contract to construct a 200-unit townhouse and garden-apartment complex in Bridgeton.

Mobley views his acquisition of the contract as a significant breakthrough.

"It is a great credit to all minority groups," the soft-spoken Mobley was saying the other afternoon seated at a desk in his office.

"I think it will create a better relationship between all residents of Bridgeton and will prove to minority groups that by working together in a harmonious fashion, a dream can become a reality."

KNOWS ALL ABOUT IT

Joe Mobley knows all about dreams.

He's had more than his share during his 46 years.

Born in Tampa, Fla., Mobley at an early age aspired to a career in construction. His father was a carpenter and Mobley learned quickly about working with his hands. He also learned quickly that jobs he felt equipped to handle, were instead going to whites.

Then World War II broke out.

The 18-year-old Mobley enlisted in the Air Force in 1943 and rose to the rank of technical sergeant before his discharge in 1946.

He returned to Tampa and majored in carpentry, estimating and blueprint reading courses at Florida Trade School.

Upon graduation, he went to work for his father for several years. In 1950, Mobley decided to pull up roots and head North. He settled in Atlantic City, but soon discovered that employment for blacks in the construction field was about the same as it had been in the South.

"I found there were very few doors open to a black man in the building and trades industry," Mobley lamented.

He went into business for himself and after a series of small renovation and repair jobs, Mobley, in 1958, landed his first major contract—the construction of the Sahara Motel in Atlantic City.

CONSTANT STRUGGLE

"But as a black general contractor, I still had a constant struggle to keep my head above water," Mobley explains.

In 1968 President Nixon appointed Mobley to serve on the Small Business Administration Advisory Council. The following year, Mobley completed several SBA seminars on bookkeeping, business and finance and business administration. A short time later, he graduated from a business administration night school course at LaSalle University in Philadelphia.

Three years ago, Mobley received the first "8-A" Federal Government contract, administered through the SBA Act in New Jersey. It was for renovations at NAFEC, in Pomona and marked the first instance a black general contractor had been awarded a contract at that Federal facility.

In 1970, President Nixon was in touch with Mobley again. This time the Prez presented Mobley a citation for his "community, civic and building achievements."

Still Mobley, who is current president of both the Atlantic-Cape May County Chapter of the National Business League and the Atlantic Community Housing Corporation, insists his boyhood dream really came true with the recent awarding of the Bridgeton contract.

ON MAILING LIST

The \$4.7-million mortgage loan authorization for the project sponsored by the Bridgeton Neighborhood Improvement Association, a non-profit black organization, in conjunction with the St. Philip Baptist Church and Union Baptist Temple, was announced by Renna. That's why he's on Mobley's mailing list.

Gov. Cahill gets a Mobley letter for his "assistance and encouragement in this project."

When the postman arrives at Congressman Sandman's door, Charlie will learn that he's provided "a tremendous amount of inspiration, sincerity and motivation" to Mobley the past few years.

And what will the letter to President Nixon say?

"I'm just telling him that a small black contractor like Joe Mobley, who was raised in the South, appreciates the fact that it is finally possible for minorities to have equal opportunities in America."

Besides, it's Joe Mobley's turn to write the President, anyhow...

URBAN PLANNERS SEEK TO EXPLOIT LOUISVILLE JETPORT

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on January 19 of this year, here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I pointed out some parallels between the proposed Louisville International Jetport and the multimillion dollar "White elephant," Dulles Airport which has been constructed at taxpayers' expense outside of Washington.

I noted that Dulles' original projected cost was \$40 million, but eventually rose to the astounding figure of \$120 million.

I noted that airport planners had overshot their calculations and that Dulles is now handling only 20 percent of the region's air traffic.

I noted that Dulles Airport is inaccessible; that an airport should be accessible to the citizens it is supposed to serve. The Louisville proposal would be located about the same distance from Louisville as Dulles is from Washington.

I noted that Dulles, the "airport of the future" for the Nation's Capital, required 10,000 acres for its construction. Yet, despite the fact that the Washington area has over three times the population of the Louisville metropolitan area, and that Washington—as the Capital—can expect an inordinate level of traffic, the Louisville planners say they require a 35,000-acre site.

There are other dangerous parallels between the two.

But the matter assumes a different perspective when one considers that there is close cooperation between urban planners and air board officials for the purpose—not simply of building an airport—but also surrounding it with a new town—designed by the urban planners to house 80,000 to 100,000 people from Appalachia and inner-city poverty areas. This would involve wholesale relocation of all these people into the rural airport site outside Louisville.

It becomes clear that the urban planners seek to perpetuate themselves through this long-range relocation and development project—and that they are employing the guise of the jetport development to do so.

Much light has been thrown on this ruse by Mr. John M. Berry, Jr., a New Castle, Ky., lawyer who is understandably concerned that such a development would mean great inconvenience and many problems—and possibly disaster—for the area where he lives.

Mr. Berry recently delivered a speech on this subject before the New Castle Lions Club. I believe this speech is one of the most significant statements to appear in the controversy over the proposed jetport.

The speech follows:

SPEECH OF JOHN M. BERRY, JR.

On Monday, November 1, 1970, the New Castle Lions Club held its anniversary dinner. The guest speaker for the evening was Mr. Joseph Maloney, the director of the Urban Studies Center. In the absence of the Program Chairman, I was asked to introduce the speaker. Consequently, I sat at the speaker's table with Mr. Maloney and during the meal we discussed the objectives of the Urban Studies program extensively. I was told by Mr. Maloney that the Center was considering the establishment of a model city and he inquired about land values in the area of the Henry-Trimble County line. After further inquiry I learned from Mr. Maloney that the idea was for the government to purchase several thousand acres of land and to establish an independent municipal government or model city; that this city would be populated by some 80,000 to 100,000 persons from urban poverty areas and from Appalachia; that an industrial complex would be created composed of well established, financially sound domestic manufacturers who would be induced to locate their plants in the area by favorable tax rates, land costs, and the availability of labor; and that the biggest obstacle in the path of a successful realization of the plan was obtaining the necessary

federal appropriation of funds and that this obstacle might be overcome by joining forces with the Louisville Air Board.

On Tuesday, April 6, 1971, my brother, Wendell, and I had a conference with James Thompson, Air Board Chairman, in Louisville. During the course of our conversation I asked Thompson if it were not true that the chances of both the Air Board and the Urban Studies Center receiving a federal appropriation would be enhanced by combining their projects. He replied that it was true.

In May, 1971, Mr. Don Williams of the Urban Studies Center spoke to the New Castle Lions Club. With him was a young lady whom he introduced as a newcomer to the Urban Studies program who was just getting acquainted with the various problems dealt with by the Center and learning how to speak to the people in communities such as ours. Throughout the speech and the ensuing discussion, we noted that the young lady was attentive and taking notes.

After Mr. Williams finished his talk, the floor was opened for discussion and Mr. Williams was asked how the construction of an airport and industrial complex could benefit our economy in light of the fact that from 80,000 to 100,000 employees would be moved into the complex from Appalachia and other poverty stricken areas to take the jobs.

He replied that there was no such plan. He was further asked if there was any collaboration between the Urban Studies Center and the Air Board in order to enhance the possibilities of a federal appropriation and he emphatically denied that there was much a plan and denied that any such statement could have been made by James Thompson or Joseph Maloney.

In June, 1971, Dr. Charles C. Schimperler, director of the Office of Planning and Research for the Louisville Air Board, spoke to the New Castle Lions Club. Throughout his talk, it was apparent that he was addressing his remarks to the arguments that we had advanced against the location of the airport in Henry, Shelby and Oldham Counties. In fact, at the close of his talk he quoted verbatim many of the questions and arguments that were advanced by Lions Club members to Mr. Williams previously. The real identification of the young lady who accompanied Mr. Williams at that meeting was thereby disclosed. She was a very competent stenographer who had been brought into our meeting by deception to stenographically record our arguments and questions. Dr. Schimperler was asked the same questions concerning collaboration between the Urban Studies Center and Air Board and the importation of residents for the model city that were asked Mr. Williams and again we received the same emphatic denial. He denied any collaboration even in the face of the fact that his presentation was based upon research at least partially done by Mr. Williams and his lady friend, both of the Urban Studies Center.

On November 26, 1971, Dr. Schimperler again appeared in Henry County. This time to speak at the request of the Farm Bureau. He advised the farmers who were present that the Air Board expected to pay from \$1200.00 to \$1500.00 per acre for the land to be used in the 35,000 acre airport site. This fact was printed by the Henry County Local as if it were true and without any reservation or inquiry. The fact of the matter is that any land taken for use by the airport must be taken by condemnation proceedings. The landowners will be paid the fair market value of their land. Fair market value is determined primarily by comparable sales and there is no comparable sale in Henry County, Kentucky, to justify \$1500.00 per acre for farm land and a very few that would establish one half that amount.

Dr. Schimperler went on to say that the construction of the airport and the proposed industrial complex would solve the unemployment problems of Henry County. He said that there were approximately 10,000 people

in the county and approximately 4,000 jobs, indicating that there was an unemployment problem. If the average family consists of four people and if an average of one and one-half persons per family are gainfully employed, then there are 3,750 available employees in Henry County to fill the more than 4,000 jobs.

It must also be considered that a large percentage of the people who live in Henry County have chosen to make it their home while working in Frankfort, Louisville and Carrollton, Kentucky and Madison, Indiana. This simply means that, contrary to the impression that Dr. Schimperler was attempting to create, the problem in Henry County, as most farmers well know, is a shortage of labor rather than unemployment.

Keeping in mind the fact that Dr. Schimperler on at least two occasions denied that there was any collaboration between the Air Board and the Urban Studies Center and on at least one occasion denied that there was any plan to import people from poverty areas, I call your attention to the "Technical Paper" prepared by Dr. Schimperler for presentation at the American Institute of Planners in Minneapolis, Minnesota, in October of 1970:

"In the Louisville metropolitan area, two essentially independent programs are being formulated to serve current and projected regional and national needs. The Louisville and Jefferson County Air Board recently embarked upon a program of in-depth studies of feasibility for a third and major airport for the region. These studies are justified by existing traffic congestion and limited expansion potential at Standiford Field. At the same time, the Urban Studies Center of the University of Louisville has begun to define a new community and regional development relocation system to serve the needs of the rural poor, particularly those in Appalachia, and the inter-city poor, as well as the needs of other income groups.

"Both programs have progressed sufficiently to identify a basic justification for further intensive study. It is the potential to interrelate the two programs that offers great opportunity for the Louisville Region. The Air Board is proposing to acquire 30-35,000 acres for its new intercontinental airport, dedicating 12,000 acres for aeronautical purposes and reserving the rest for related activity including industrial, commercial and even selective residential usage. Simultaneously, the Urban Studies Center is seeking a 10-12,000 acre site for a prototype "new community" that would demonstrate the feasibility of bringing together jobs and job-seekers in a physically and socially supportive "new town" environment.

"The potential opportunities for linking the two projects are obvious. The related job-producing capabilities of the airport development along with the planned reservation of 10-15,000 acres for such related developments provides an almost perfect "fit" for the needs of the new community planners. Basic are the assumptions of an urban region with a new major aviation facility and a new community. The objective of the program is to define the relationship between the activity centers that will produce the most effective and positive impact on the development of each and upon the region they will serve."

It should be further noted from this paper that, although Dr. Schimperler has stated on several occasions that the land owners in the proposed area would derive the benefit from the conversion of their land from farm to industrial use by receiving a substantially greater sales price, on page 14 he says:

"Central to feasibility of a total development complex in the 30,000-plus-acre range, as envisioned here, is the marketability of a substantial part of the site as income-producing real estate."

In other words, the condemning agency will speculate on and derive the benefit from

condemned land making the project more feasible.

Although Mr. Williams and Dr. Schimperler denied to the New Castle Lions Club that the Urban Studies Center proposed the relocation of some 80,000 persons in the model city, the Courier-Journal and Louisville Times on Sunday, January 16, 1972, published a map of the areas under consideration for the model city and reported that it was secured from the Urban Studies Center with the information that it contained the five sites for locating the new community for 80,000 persons. One of the sites and a portion of a second are indicated by the map to be in Henry County.

Early in 1971, I had occasion to examine a report containing the recommendations of a Louisville public relations firm to the Louisville Air Board. The report suggested numerous ways that the Louisville Air Board might undertake to sell the idea of a jetport to the people in the counties where it would be located.

The report included such things as: "The committee should include individuals who might otherwise be outspoken critics of the airport. They need not favor the airport. But rather they would need to accept it as something likely to happen."

"By serving on the committee their advice can help make the inevitable more palatable to their fellow environmentalists and to themselves."

"Ideally, this committee could help present the airport's environmental plan at public hearings. At the very least, they should provide a sounding board—an early warning—to let us know what form of opposition we might eventually expect from organized and powerful conservationist groups."

"If there are some concessions beyond those already incorporated in the environmental plan that must be made, perhaps they can be granted behind closed doors—rather than in the heat of public debate which influences our other publics."

"Opponents of the airport are likely to try to link it to the SST or air pollution from jet exhausts or any other cause which already has some degree of unpopularity. Such debates can be at least partially side-stepped with careful attention to comments—particularly during Q and A sessions before news reporters."

"So far as good communication can prevent it, it is important that environmental organizations not join forces with displaced property owners."

"We are hopeful the environmental plan for the airport can be unveiled and widely publicized with the backing of the environmental advisory committee before final site selection is announced. As the first environmentally planned airport in the U.S. (possibly the second in the world) the plan could be heralded as a step forward and model for other communities."

"All the 'facts' some editors or producers might need to blast the airport concept is that some 50 to 60 square miles of rural land are about to be converted into an airport. The job of communications is to make certain as we can that no one anywhere gets news of the planned airport without simultaneously getting news of the environmental planning."

"We recommend, at some point, the Air Board consider hiring an extraordinarily articulate landscape architect who would be the principal spokesman for the environmental aspects of the plan. We would attempt to get this individual on every program around the country likely to develop widespread national or Louisville area publicity. He would talk on how Louisville's Intercontinental Airport is planned to enhance its environment."

"In summary, we must mount such an aggressive campaign to communicate these environmental planning aspects of the new airport that those who would base opposition

to the airport on present concepts never have a chance to get started. We need to answer the questions of ecologists before the questions are raised, made public and turned to false rumor."

"Ideally, the environmentally planned airport concept should become entrenched in the minds of potential airport opponents before site selection is announced, before serious land speculation begins and before we have to deal with other kinds of opposition."

Shortly thereafter, and on March 15, 1971, the Courier-Journal carried an article concerning the report of the public relations firm and the results of an interview with James Thompson, Chairman of the Louisville Air Board. Thompson stated that the report was neither solicited nor authorized by the Air Board and that it was examined by the Air Board and rejected. Obviously, once the report became public, the Air Board would have to publicly disavow any knowledge of it or any intention to use it because of the extent to which it was based upon deception.

Although it was rejected by the Air Board, many, if not most, of the recommended tactics have been employed by both the Air Board and the Urban Studies Center in selling their proposal to the people of Henry, Shelby and Oldham Counties.

I have intentionally avoided a discussion of the environmental, social and economic consequences of the construction of the airport and model city. I have simply tried to point to the facts which in my opinion establish:

1. That the Louisville Air Board and the Urban Studies Center are collaborating, each hoping that the realization of its project will be enhanced by its association with the other, and,

2. That the Air Board is engaged in a large scale brainwashing campaign with the advice and assistance of the Urban Studies Center in the affected rural counties using distorted facts and deceptive practices.

Just as the Public Relations firm recommended, Dr. Schimperler, "an extraordinarily articulate landscape architect" is getting on every program that he can in an effort to sell the airport idea to the people of the locality. In doing this he begins with the assumption that we are victims of an economic disaster area whose only hope of salvation lies in the construction of the airport. He tells us that the proposed industrial complex will provide jobs while carefully avoiding the fact that the proposed project contemplates the relocation of thousands of people to fill the jobs. He tells us that it will provide a place for our children to work after college so they can return home which is saying only that, instead of our children having to go to the city and work, they will bring the city to us. Most of us live in the country by choice willing to make the resulting sacrifices. We cannot consistently choose to live in the country and at the same time choose to transform the country to a city. He tells us that we will receive fantastic prices for our farmland, prices for which there is no basis in law or fact. He tells us that we can expect to derive great benefit from the sale of land for industrial use when in fact the condemning authority will receive it.

He makes it a point to mention that 95% of the people of one of the other counties favor the project and that those who oppose it constitute a very small minority standing in the path of progress. He has been challenged to support this assertion but cannot and it is untrue. What he is saying is propaganda, very carefully prepared and delivered, and designed to brainwash the people of this three county area. The sad fact is that, with many people, it has worked and unless they are stopped and the truth made known, they will wind up with the necessary public sentiment on their side.

If they fail to corral the necessary public support or if the environmental study is unfavorable, there probably would be no airport. If there is no airport, there probably would be no model city. Hence the Urban Studies Center is as vitally interested in the airport as the Air Board. How can such a group make an independent, objective, accurate and honest determination of the environmental consequences? This question becomes especially pertinent in light of the dishonest and deceptive methods they have utilized in corraling public support. They are a governmentally financed propaganda machine, well staffed and supported by our own tax dollars. We have neither the human nor financial resources necessary to effectively combat them. It is my hope that the federal government itself will examine what they are doing and assist us in our cause. Neither the study of urban problems nor the determination of the need for an airport are being conducted with objectivity. Both projects are tainted by the designs of contractors, engineers, architects, planners, consultants, big business and other exploiters of the environment.

It is now clear that, in addition to the grave financial reasons for being skeptical about the proposed jetport, there are other reasons as well. The taxpayers are being asked not only to finance another multimillion dollar potential "white elephant" airport, they are also being asked to go along with an immense and dubious instance of social engineering.

Mr. Berry's remarks bring us closer to a truer picture of the jetport question.

I shall have much more to say on this subject—including another pertinent comparison—tomorrow.

THE SAD STORY OF THE WABASH COUNTY HOSPITAL

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, the authority that the Congress gave to the President to place controls on wages, prices, salaries, and rents, will expire on April 30, 1973, unless we extend it. While my position has been and remains that some form of control on a run-away, inflationary economy is desirable, I now seriously question the manner in which those controls are being exercised; and I felt an experience in my own State of Indiana should be shared. Perhaps Congress should begin to reevaluate that "blank check" legislation which we provided the executive in the imposition of such controls.

Wabash County, Ind., has a population in excess of 35,000 people and only one hospital—a small community, nonprofit operation which in 51 years of operation has netted \$6,000, and has taken serious losses in recent years. It is the only hospital facility in the county, currently authorized to have 114 beds. Other hospital facilities in adjacent counties are from 15 to 35 miles away and have overloaded facilities now. Even if county residents find doctors in other areas and are willing to travel there for hospital care, the facilities are simply unable to absorb the medical cases coming in from

Wabash County. In essence, if you get sick in Wabash County—particularly if you are inadequate enough to become emergent—you wind up in the Wabash County Hospital.

Faced with crowded conditions in an unsatisfactory building built in 1920, the hospital finally was able to construct a new wing in 1971 with Hill-Burton funds and with a bond issue. Not only was the facility constructed to increase the number of beds in the hospital, but new services were planned. These included an intensive coronary care unit, something which the age of county residents, rather high, made desirable. The new wing was to be manned by an additional 25 employees, an increment in cost to the pay-as-you-go facility which, among other items, forced the hospital to plan a modest increase in prices. The new unit was ready for occupancy and the new rates set by the hospital board last August 15 when the President instituted the wage-price freeze.

Unable to pay for the additional costs, the hospital kept its new wing closed and "waited out" the freeze. Personnel hired in anticipation of the wing's opening were released. Beds were placed in the halls when the hospital exceeded capacity. This caused great consternation among residents of the community, among them a minister who contracted me unable to believe that the people he saw in beds along the corridors were really there because of a price freeze.

Then, last December 15, the hospital obtained permission from the Indianapolis Internal Revenue Service office to raise its rates, thereby allowing for the opening of the facility. On December 29, however, the Price Commission altered its regulations and reversed the approval. The hospital then applied for an exception to the normal guidelines in rate raises, following the prescribed procedure, on January 12, 1972. The State Advisory Board for hospital rate increases approved the 13-percent increase as did the Indiana Internal Revenue Service office and the IRS in Washington. However, without informing either the hospital or any of these decisionmaking bodies, the Price Commission on December 30 drew up new guidelines for information which hospitals were to be required to submit in applying for exceptions. After the application arrived at the Price Commission, the personnel there refused to review it because it was not in the "proper" form—a form which was completely proper when it was submitted. It languished there another 15 days before a meeting was held between Wabash County Hospital representatives, representatives of the Indiana Hospital Association, Blue Cross of Indiana, one of my staff members, IRS officials, and members of the Price Commission. The hospital representatives arrived with a new application, having reworked their information so that it would conform to the newly issued mandates, and the Commission agreed that it did indeed hold all of the information necessary in order to come to a decision on the request. My office was told, as were the hospital delegates, that the application would be reviewed that same week.

As of today, no final decision has been

reached. The hospital, authorized to have only 114 beds, actually has additional ones in the corridor because it refuses to turn away sick people. Not only is this medically unwise and inconvenient for persons unfortunate enough to get sick at this time—they have to ring a cow bell for help because they have no buzzers, try to sleep with hall lights in their eyes, and endure various dehumanizing procedures—but the State board of health, the hospital licensing council, the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals, the Wabash Fire Department, the Hartford Insurance Co., the Wabash County Hospital medical staff and the Comprehensive Health Planning Council of Wabash County have all protested this unsavory practice of keeping beds more than 3 feet wide in those 6-foot wide 1920 corridors. Because of the crowding, the hospital has cancelled as many as 16 surgeries in one day and averages cancellations of two or three per week. Anybody can wind up in the hallway except new-born babies and isolation cases; the hospital distributes rooms on a first-come, first-serve basis. The hospital is on the verge, on Friday, of firing its skilled personnel who were hired to man its new wing, with no promise of rehiring them. It is not as though these people were unnecessary; the hospital is well and efficiently run, planning a staff-patient ratio of 2.4 with the new wing in operation. The last available statistic for community hospitals in Indiana—the category in which Wabash County Hospital falls—from the American Hospital Association is for 1970, and at that time this type of hospital in Indiana averaged a staff-patient ratio of 2.7. Since the trend is for that figure to go up each year, it appears that Wabash is doing a heroic job in attempting to treat patients with a very lean staff. If the hospital is ever permitted to open that new wing, it will have in effect caused a 28 percent increase in capacity for its requested 13 percent price hike—hardly an example of needless, inflationary gouging.

My own efforts at securing a decision for the hospital have, as of today, met with no success. The board which promised to meet last week on this matter did not in fact meet until Monday of this week, and its decision is not final. Some other group must now convene to consider it, a procedure which was not pointed out to me earlier, and no one can tell me when that will occur. In addition, repeated phone calls from my staff to the one person who holds the power to call that meeting have gone unanswered for over 2 days.

The last report on national health strategy sent to Congress by the President contains the statement:

It does little good . . . to increase the demand for care unless we also increase the supply.

Secretary Richardson appeared last year before the Senate Committee on Finance and reiterated that thought:

We learned the hard way that the addition of demand for health care services without provision for increases in supply of services is seriously inflationary. . . .

Well, here we have a hospital trying its level best to do just that—increase its

ability to provide health services. Yet it cannot even obtain, after months of trying, a decision on whether it will be able to cover that increased service with a modest increase in its prices. No wonder the bureaucratic bungling, broken promises, and "let them eat cake" attitude apparent in the Price Commission's actions have caused people to view the Federal Government with increased cynicism. And it is not just the citizenry of Wabash County experiencing this demise of confidence. At one point one of my own frustrated staff members, attempting futilely to obtain information as to when a decision would be reached from a man who finally admitted he had not even looked at the application, blurted out, "Well, what do you think this hospital is supposed to do?" The response to the complex situation was a remarkable clinché: "Tighten your belt and increase productivity."

The Wabash County Hospital is doing very well with its productivity output. I would prescribe that the Price Commission take a little of its own medicine.

FACTS AND FANCIES ABOUT MEDICAL CARE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the gigantic scale of public concern regarding national health care and the legislation now pending in the Congress to improve the present system of delivery and care.

One of the aspects to this highly complex issue is the manpower shortage now affecting medical care systems, and the terrific burden that will be placed on the manpower now available if sweeping reforms are not forthcoming in the next few years.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Robert Erickson, of Moraga, Calif., recently brought to my attention an excellent article on this very subject.

The article, which appeared in the American Journal of Public Health, volume 59, No. 5, May, 1969, is by Eli Ginzberg, Ph. D.

I think it would behoove all the Members of Congress to give the comments of Dr. Ginzberg full consideration while deliberating on various health care bills. The article follows:

FACTS AND FANCIES ABOUT MEDICAL CARE

(By Eli Ginzberg, Ph. D.)

Every so often, it is salutary to be brought up short and forced to re-examine ideas and concepts which have been accepted for some time as valid. A rigid reappraisal is stimulating for the mind and conducive to clarifying one's thoughts. This paper by Professor Ginzberg does just that. Read it and argue with him.

These have been brave new years. But only the innocent still believe that poverty, racial discrimination, inferior education, inadequate housing, and urban blight will soon vanish from the face of the United States. The gap between promise and accomplishment is plainly visible to all. With regard to medical care, though, the situation is some-

what different. The radical new federal health legislation implementing Medicare and Medicaid is sufficiently recent that the intrinsic shortcomings of the system have not yet become apparent.

The reformers will be the first to admit that many more changes must be introduced before the system is fully reconstructed. There is need to expand group practice units, to broaden comprehensive prepayment plans, to relate ambulatory to inpatient services, to control quality. The leaders are particularly concerned about the rapid increases in costs that show no signs of abating. But they are confident that after years of frustration they have broken the back of AMA reaction, and soon additional measures will be enacted that will extend to every American the benefits of quality medical care without financial strain. Ten classic propositions that together comprise the decalogue of medical reform are here subjected to critical review and evaluation.

MEDICAL CARE IS UNIQUE—IT INVOLVES LIFE OR DEATH

This is unquestionably true—but life or death is involved in less than 1 percent of all medical services rendered. For the person who has been run down by a truck or has been shot, the speed with which he is transferred to a hospital and is operated upon may well determine whether he lives or dies. But it is a distortion of reality to see medical care primarily in this dramatic light.

An alternative formulation would be that if the newborn is healthy, as is generally the case, and if he has healthy forebears, he is likely to grow up with little attention from physicians beyond routine pediatric services. In the absence of an inflamed appendix or some trauma, he (women of child-bearing age are excepted) may have only casual contact with the health services industry until his person begins to deteriorate, at which point medical specialists may have little objective help to offer him.

Despite the substantial increases in expenditures for medical care, there has been no significant increase in male longevity during the past decade. Thus, unless man learns how to improve on the biblical standard of three score and ten (with an additional decade for the righteous), medical care will remain what it has always been, largely supportive and ameliorative.

To put it differently, disease itself is largely self-limiting. People who are ill, even seriously ill, will generally get well without the active intervention of a physician. If the medical profession is ever moved to undertake a basic self-appraisal, it would be important to study the histories of patients with similar symptoms and conditions in terms of the interventions to which they were subjected. It is just possible that those who were treated least made the best progress.

IMPROVED MEDICAL CARE—KEY TO BETTER HEALTH

This is the assumption on which rests the long-time agitation for an improved system of medical care. But we all know, though we tend to forget, that clean water and clean food and other environmental defenses have made the greatest contributions to raising levels of health and decreasing the death rate. Nevertheless, we have been unable and unwilling to build on the implications of medical history. Modern preventive medicine would force society to control automotive speeds, since motor vehicle accidents are the single most important cause of death among the young and a major source of severe disability. Serious efforts to reduce the consumption of cigarettes would be undertaken. For the first time in our history more people die prematurely because they eat too much rather than too little. Too much alcohol, too many drugs, promiscuous sexual relations also take heavy tolls. On these fronts we are

making little or no headway. In fact, we are probably retrogressing. Therapeutic medicine is not relevant and effective preventive measures remain to be designed.

Admittedly people with inadequate incomes suffer from inadequate medical care, but improved nutrition and housing might contribute more to their health and longevity than easier access to physicians and hospitals. Many citizens would surely benefit from more and better medical care. But socioeconomic factors and the limitations of current scientific knowledge present real bounds to the promise of medical services for improved health.

IMPROVED MEDICAL CARE IS A PRODUCTIVE INVESTMENT

The last years have seen a reformulation of economics to include investment in human beings within the main corpus. Increased public and private expenditures for health have been said to pay off in enhanced productivity of the labor force.

But unless it can be shown how more money for medical care will minimize respiratory diseases, the major cause of absenteeism; or alcoholism, a destroyer of talent; or heart disease and cancer, the principal causes of death in middle life; or accidents, which take a heavy toll among youth—unless larger expenditures for medical care can reduce these causes of morbidity and mortality, they cannot be justified as effective inputs for improved productivity, however desirable they may be for humanitarian and social reasons.

GOOD MEDICAL CARE IS A RIGHT

How can one question this proposition, especially if one recalls the AMA's unyielding adherence to the contention that good medical care is a privilege? But restiveness with a theory that emphasizes the consumer's dollars as determinants of effective demand does not validate the other extreme, that quality medical care is a right inherent in citizenship. Access to emergency care should be universally and unqualifiedly available; but this is not the issue here since most medical care is not of this nature: it is more closely geared to alleviating pain and discomfort and providing reassurance and support.

Generalizations about the right of every citizen to a high quality of medical care are easy to formulate but they cannot be translated into policy until their proponents meet four preliminary tests: "cost out" the program; specify the sources of financing; present evidence that additional public efforts in this realm will yield benefits equal to or greater than if applied to other areas; and delineate how the services will in fact be provided.

OTHER COUNTRIES HAVE A MORE EFFICIENT SYSTEM OF MEDICAL CARE

With the exception of Canada, no nation in the world has achieved more than half the per capita income of the United States. Yet it is contended that with limited resources many countries, notably Great Britain, Soviet Russia, and the Scandinavian countries, have succeeded in developing systems of medical care which are superior to that of the United States. Special attention has been drawn to our rates of infant mortality and male longevity which lag substantially behind those of many other western countries.

There is no possible justification for infant mortality rates to vary by some 400 per cent within the metropolitan borough of Brooklyn. Much of the difference must be ascribed to poor medical care. But we cannot ignore additional factors such as race, age, marital status, income, housing, employment, which combine and interact to produce this shocking differential. None of the countries of western Europe is confronted with such wide differences among classes and castes, and unless we succeed in eliminating the principal

causes of these differences we will not be able to accomplish much by focusing solely on improving the structure of medical care.

The reasons for the shorter life expectancy of American middle class white males remain obscure. Clearly there is more to the story than income. We suggested earlier that overeating tends to increase mortality. And the same is probably true of excessive use of cigarettes and alcohol. But consumption patterns aside, there may be something else imbedded in the quality of contemporary life in the United States. The pace at which we work, travel, and play, and the frustrations that persist even in the face of a growing affluence, may hold the clue.

Key indexes not only reveal that other countries lead the United States in national health standards, but they do so at a resources cost for medical care that is proportionately not higher than our own—and absolutely much less. In fact, it is so much less that we should be cautioned against assuming that much higher expenditures for medical care are likely to be reflected in lowered mortality.

THE COMPETITIVE MARKET IS A POOR INSTRUMENT FOR ALLOCATING MEDICAL RESOURCES AND DISTRIBUTING MEDICAL CARE

We have already acknowledged that it would be irresponsible on both humanitarian and political grounds to deny emergency services to an individual simply because he cannot pay. The regrettable fact is that occasionally we do just that although the instances are declining. Actually, we have never relied exclusively on the consumer to pay for health services.

Assuming that improved medical care is desirable and that the provision of additional good medical services requires the investment of additional scarce resources, it follows that society must rely on some rationing principle to allocate these services. Large-scale governmental financing can shift the relative position of various groups in their access to medical services, but there is little or no prospect—no matter how much money government invests—to equalize the claims of all citizens so that need, rather than income, determines the services rendered to each individual. Rationing according to need would require that government control all of the strategic resources—particularly manpower. Only if the individual physician, nurse, and technician were subject to direct control could such a system be structured.

The United States is a country of continental proportions historically committed to the doctrine of freedom of choice in work. Moreover, there are major differences in the distribution of income among regions and within regions, among families and individuals. And our heterogeneous population encompasses racial and ethnic groups that have been only partially incorporated into the dominant society. Given these overriding geographic, economic, and demographic variables, any serious proposal to establish a more equitable system of medical care within our present society has no prospect of success unless profound structural alterations occur in our free-market economy.

First, government financial inputs on behalf of the poor would have to be extremely large. Simultaneously, competitive bidding for medical services by the upper and middle income classes would have to cease or at least abate substantially. And finally, decision-making by critical producers of services, particularly physicians, with regard to locus, field, and mode of practice would have to be controlled. With none of these changes even remotely possible, augmented purchasing power in the hands of the poor cannot effect any significant redistribution of medical services.

To continue the argument a step further. If supply creates its own demand—and there is strong evidence that this is true at least for certain types of medical services—then

no amount of money that government would appropriate for this purpose would eliminate the necessity of introducing some rationing system. This being the case, the most reasonable system would be one based on the principle of need. But when have human systems been known to obey the laws of logic?

Dissatisfaction with the competitive market is justified. Its worst effects can surely be mitigated by judicious interferences. But to contend that it is only a question of more federal money or the introduction of a comprehensive system of medical insurance that stands in the way of providing adequate medical care to all citizens is social fantasy.

CONSUMER SATISFACTION WITH TECHNICAL CARE

Economists have long recognized that the nub of a competitive system is one in which the consumer decides how to spend his money. He determines whether one good or service is better than another at or near the same price, and he backs his judgment with his money. To behave rationally the consumer must be competent, he must have access to market information, and be able to choose among competing products and producers.

However, this model, as many economists recognize, is not adequate to the market for medical care. Even the intelligent and the educated are unable to make discriminatory judgments about a professional service, except indirectly—that is in terms of outcome: does the patient recover? Without relevant information and criteria for evaluation the layman is in a poor position to judge the quality of medical care.

What then determines consumer behavior and satisfaction? The patient at least knows whether he likes a physician. Since, often, the care he seeks and receives is essentially reassurance and support, he can best obtain these from a physician with whom he establishes rapport. Frequently he relies on the recommendation of relatives or friends, whose assessment is based on prior experience. The more sophisticated purchaser may apply certain objective criteria: whether the physician is board-certified, his hospital affiliations, and similar stigmata.

Like any group of professionals, physicians differ. Some are concerned with optimizing their income. Others are determined to practice medicine according to the standards which they have been taught and to which they adhere. Most effect a compromise: they want a good income and they want to practice good medicine. But they know the consumer (with money to spend) chooses among physicians.

While good hospitals can effectively govern the quality of medicine and surgery practiced within their halls, there is little peer control on the outside where traditional ethics constrain physicians to maintain silence about one another's work. As a consequence, many consumers spend a great amount of money in the search for cures that cannot be found; others have unnecessary operations; and more than a few lose their life as a result of faulty diagnosis and inept intervention. Every major hospital counts among its patients a minority who are there because they have been poorly treated previously, and often seriously. Some patients never have a second opportunity.

Since this is the manner in which the system of medical care operates, the reform movement might assess again the gains that would accrue from facilitating consumer-choice of physician. Those who consider Medicaid an unalloyed boon might rethink all the implications of transferring medical care of the poor out of its traditional site—the clinics of teaching hospitals, at least in large eastern cities, and into the open market of private practice.

Without contending that physicians are greedy or that most patients are hypochondriacal, we should admit that the chief deterrents to over-treatment are the current

tautness in physician supply (which enables the practitioner to reduce the number of visits per patient to a minimum at no loss of income to himself) and the fee-for-service payment system (a major consumer constraint).

A critical limitation of the consumer's ability to assess objectively the quality of the care which he receives is a function of the fact that much of the physician's efficacy rests upon his ability to develop a rapport with his patient. While psyche and soma can interact to produce subjective improvement, this is not necessarily the same as relieving the patient of the pathological causes of his symptomatology. A modern system of medical care cannot rest on consumer satisfaction any more than it can rely on the discipline of the medical profession. Here, as elsewhere, reasonable rather than optimum solutions will have to suffice.

MEDICAL MANPOWER IS IN SHORT SUPPLY

No single position is so widely or unquestioningly held at present as the assumption that the principal difficulties on the American medical scene reflect a shortage of critical types of specialized manpower, particularly physicians, nurses, and technicians.

What are the facts and how can we interpret them? Those who contend that there is a physician shortage have resorted to various desired ratios between the number of active practitioners and the total population. When these data revealed that there had been no slippage over the last quarter century and even a slight improvement (depending on the base year selected), attention shifted to the census of physicians in private practice or of those who are in general family practice, as distinct from specialists. This usually produced the looked-for statistical result.

None of the analysts has taken into account that the radical shift toward specialization must be associated with substantive improvements in the structure of medical care, and that it is a travesty to use manpower criteria based on utilization patterns of the 1930's to judge adequacy in the late 1960's. Moreover, factors contributing to enhanced utilization of physician's time, such as the decline of home visits in favor of office and hospital services, have usually been omitted from these calculations. In addition, the statisticians have paid little attention to the spectacular development of paramedical manpower which has grown much more rapidly than almost any other group in the entire economy. As a final resort, the advocates of the shortage argument have insisted that the radical expansion in per capita demand for physician services must be taken into account. A public that wants to spend more money for physicians' services either directly or through taxes is surely entitled to do so, they say, and it is the responsibility of the public and professional leadership to assure that the required personnel is educated and available. The last point has particular relevance with regard to the nursing profession, where the ratios between registered and practical nurses and nurse's aides and the population show large increases.

It has been suggested that medical care may represent an unusual situation in which the supply creates the demand. It follows that accelerating further the supply of medical manpower (in which the rate of employment from 1950-1965 has grown at about five times the rate for the nation at large) holds little promise of eliminating shortages. New criteria must be introduced to assess the number and quality of medical personnel in whose preparation and employment society should invest.

THE AMA IS RESPONSIBLE FOR MANY SHORTCOMINGS IN THE PREVAILING SYSTEM OF MEDICAL CARE

It would be difficult to find a professional or trade association that has more con-

sistently or more vigorously supported the wrong side of every public issue in which it had a major stake than the AMA in recent years. For a long time the leaders of organized medicine obstructed the establishment of prepaid group practice units; until recently they were opposed to the expansion of medical education; to this day they have successfully resisted federal subsidization of medical education with the result that entrance into the profession is blocked for most young Americans whose parents do not have ample income. The AMA fought the passage of Medicare every step of the way, and when it capitulated it insisted that the law provide reimbursement to physicians on a fee-for-service basis, which may or may not prove to be untenable—and the former is more likely. Recently it passed resolutions opposing the innovative techniques undertaken by the Office of Economic Opportunity to bring health services to the poor. In addition to blocking practically every effort to modify the existing market structure for medical care, it has moved slowly to provide leadership in such vital areas as improving controls over the quality of medical care that the American people receive.

Despite these indictments—and the list of commissions and omissions could be extended—it is an error to contend that the present structure of American medicine would be vastly different were it not for the conservative stance of the AMA.

Every group in the United States is dedicated to advancing its own special interests; usually these are held to be consonant with the national interest. This holds for the military, business, university professors, lawyers—every group is organized. There is no reason to expect physicians to act otherwise.

Before we can conclude that the AMA alone is responsible for most of the shortcomings of the prevailing structure of medical care, let us consider some other facts. Hospitals have come to occupy an ever more important role in the provision of critical medical services and most hospitals are under the control of voluntary organizations whose lay leaders are formally and legally invested with policy-making powers. If hospitals do not operate effectively, the trustees bear the ultimate responsibility. No one familiar with the hospital scene will deny that most trustees are poorly qualified to exercise their responsibilities and, in fact, most do not.

Nor can we ignore established consumer-behavior. Many persons would be willing to forego the privilege of choosing their own physician if they had assurance that an alternative system of medical care would provide optimal attention. But there are many others to whom the free choice of physician is no shibboleth but a basic right for which they are willing to pay; even dearly. This is easily proved by the number of middle income members of various pre-payment plans who choose to go outside the plan when they must undergo surgery and pay the fees of a nonaffiliated surgeon.

Furthermore, third parties, such as government, Blue Cross, commercial insurance, and labor-management groups, are heavily involved in the purchase of medical care. Not every third party acts with fiduciary and social responsibility to see that the dollars they spend for health are used effectively.

In our social and economic system, in which each organized group operates in the interest of its members, we cannot single out the AMA as the major villain. Although the leaders of organized medicine have failed to lead, so have the leaders of hospitals (governmental and nonprofit), of health agencies, of business and trade unions that are major purchasers, and of other strategic groups, including the progressive leaders of medical education who have recently been singled out as the executors of all the unfinished business of medical reform.

BETTER PLANNING IS THE ANSWER

The growing concern with the large-scale and sustained rise in medical costs has led more and more persons, in and out of government, to look at the present system of medical care in the hope of identifying how present and prospective resources could be better deployed and more effectively utilized. As early as the 1930's experiments in regionalization were initiated. Within narrow limits we can point to some modest successes of regional planning and integration of historically autonomous services. We might even anticipate further successes in the years ahead as a result of the deeper financial involvement of government and pressure from various groups in the population who are deprived of access to quality care or who find it difficult to meet the steeply mounting costs.

But some questions arise. Agreement among voluntary and governmental agencies working in the same arena is difficult to achieve. The concern of medical schools with teaching and research are not readily reconcilable with the desire of the urban and rural poor for greater access to routine medical services. There is a chasm between public health agencies and hospitals that has seldom been bridged.

But the nub of the difficulty lies deeper than the institutional level. Effective planning in large communities comes face to face with basic economics. Why should a physician on the outside turn over "his" patient to an insider? And how can the hospital be restructured to serve as the fulcrum for an improved system of medical care unless there is a place on the hospital's staff for every physician in the community to share in its work and its income?

There are a limited number of communities in this large country where a new and improved system of relating patients to physicians and physicians to hospitals has been instituted. But the successful experiments are still few and almost every one reflects the presence of a special factor—outstanding professional leadership or financial subsidy by business or government.

The presumption is that planning will continue and that it will chalk up modest victories, but there is little prospect under the present realities of a free society and a free economy that the major participants from physicians to patients will be able to move far or fast to reshape the existing system significantly through planning. And relying on medical schools to assume effective leadership, as the reformers do, is an act of faith, not reason. Historically, no major institution has been more estranged from the community and its concerns than the university.

It has not been difficult to raise objections to the conventional wisdom about medical care and its overdue reformation. But it would be unsporting not to propose a modest alternative approach to the desideratum of improved health care. In place of an unrealistic brave new world in which all the shortcomings of the present system are to disappear in short order by new methods of planning, organization, financing, and control, a limited number of modest priority objectives have been singled out together with summary suggestions as to how they might conceivably be implemented.

The scarcity of medical services for the rural population cannot be eliminated. It can, however, be alleviated through the development of state and federal scholarships for medical students given with the proviso that upon graduation the young doctors will accept appointment for a limited period, say three years or so, in a rural area, preferably near an area hospital. Since experience with this approach has had a mixed record, we should also place reliance on a program of upgrading public health nurses to serve as a corps of primary medical screener-therapists

in isolated areas. Patients with complications would be referred by these nurses to the nearest hospital with ambulatory as well as inpatient services. The charge that this would leave rural America underdoctored is admitted. The important question here is whether this approach of relying on a nurse-screener-therapist-educator offers a prospect of modest progress.

The urban poor have also encountered difficulties in obtaining proper medical attention, but their presence and pressure have stimulated the development within teaching hospitals of comprehensive outpatient departments and the expansion of emergency room services. The present tendency to deprecate these facilities is wrong. Instead, emphasis should be placed on strengthening them and making them more efficient and effective. They hold the best promise of providing care for the urban poor.

Secondly, rather than seeking to attract private physicians into the ghetto or devising ways of enabling the poor to buy services outside of their area, it might prove more sensible to attach to each urban hospital a corps of nurses specially trained to visit families at home for the purpose of screening and referral and once again to serve as health educators.

The third approach would be to improve the diagnostic, referral, and follow-up mechanisms of school health programs in poor neighborhoods so that children with medical problems which might otherwise remain neglected can be identified and appropriate therapeutic and rehabilitative procedures initiated.

Such an approach offers the urban poor, like the rural poor, much less than the reformers have proposed, but more than they now have and even more than they are likely to have under ambitious programs such as Medicaid or with elaborate community health centers which are likely to collapse under their own weight.

Next to improving medical care for the rural and urban poor, the major challenge is to prevent middle income groups from suffering financial hardships as a result of illness or disability. The best prospect of making significant progress toward this objective would be new and improved programs of catastrophic insurance with reasonable deductibles and co-insurance. Let us be clear. Short of a compulsory system of national health insurance and probably not even then, there is no way to provide all citizens with complete prepaid coverage for all their medical needs. Nor is there any need, unless one takes seriously the claims—and these have never been adequately documented—that much ill health among lower income groups is attributable to a lack of preventive services together with the failure of these groups to seek therapeutic services because of cost. There is merit to these claims but we do not know how much.

The quality of medical care for rich and poor alike is far below what it could be if the profession and government introduced more systematic efforts to monitor the services that are provided in hospitals and in the community. The challenge, however, is to achieve greater comprehension by all parties—the public, the politicians, and the physicians—of the right laymen to such protection and the social gains that would accrue. Here is one major line of reform where the prospective costs are small, the prospective gains large. The range of instruments is wide—from statistical reporting and evaluation through continuing education for doctors and greater efforts to associate every practicing physician with a general hospital. More contentious devices such as periodic re-examination for licensure can be held in abeyance until more acceptable reforms have been instituted and evaluated.

It is generally agreed that the present utilization of medical resources is poor because of the perverse ways in which medical

services are produced and distributed. To mention three outstanding shortcomings: community planning and individual hospital management are weak; hospital insurance that is limited to inpatient services tends to inflate costs; and fee-for-service is the most costly method of physician reimbursement. Unless key groups, such as third parties who purchase care and hospital trustees, exercise leadership to improve planning and management, there is little prospect that total medical expenditures can be brought under control. We may be on the way to raising our total annual outlays from \$50 billion to \$100 billion within less than one decade, with little likelihood of getting much more or much better care than we do now.

Clearly we need innovation in insurance so that coverage can be extended to include diagnostic work performed on ambulatory patients. The minor experiments now under way need to be increased and evaluated, and if the results are favorable new policies should be forthcoming.

Finally, we have had sufficient experience in the last few years to be on guard against infusing new money into the system without exacting a return. Money is leverage and it should be used to extract concessions from the major interest groups so that the prevailing system can slowly be rationalized. Otherwise we will pour more and more money into a system that is characterized by consumer ignorance, a seller's monopoly, inefficiency, lack of accountability—all of which can lead only to further dissipation of resources.

The medical reformer may have disdain for the modest proposals set out above. He will emphasize that the major shortcomings that now characterize the medical care of American citizens will not be eliminated, not even substantially reduced, even if all of the proposals were put into effect. This is granted. But they have been put forward on the following premise: There is no way of equalizing the share of the poor in high quality, privately produced American medicine (the so-called "mainstream"), and we should therefore attempt to improve the services to which they have access. There is no way of removing the financial hurdles to quality medical care for families with modest incomes but the expansion of catastrophic insurance could help. There is no way of using additional public and private resources intelligently unless the planning, organization, and management of the system is improved; and this can come about only as the public, the politicians, and the physicians understand the issues and are willing to act. We cannot speedily devise a good system of medical care for all even if we were willing to pay the price.

There is a great deal that is wrong with the prevailing system of medical care in the United States. But this is true of every other major aspect of our national life—education, housing, employment, urban communities, race relations. Democracy means that the rate of reform is determined by the level of discontent of the majority. It does not appear that the American public is ready or nearly ready to abolish the existing system of medical care. Surely the physicians are not. And no politician is offering a radically new program. It looks as if we will be forced to muddle ahead. Even to muddle, we need to be responsive to facts, not fancies.

Acknowledgment—The author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Mrs. Miriam Ostow of the Conservation of Human Resources staff in the preparation of this paper.

Dr. Ginzberg is Professor of Economics and Director of Conservation of Human Resources, Columbia University (116th Street and Broadway—525 UrIs), New York, N.Y. 10027.

This paper was submitted for publication in December, 1968. It is an abbreviated version of a longer piece to appear in his book "Men, Money, and Medicine," to be published by Columbia University Press later this year.

A NEW CALL FOR TAX REFORM

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 weeks we have witnessed much hue and cry about the need for comprehensive tax reform now. While I certainly recognize that there are numerous preferences and incentives in our tax code that probably cannot be justified either on a cost-benefit basis or on the grounds of equity, it should also be pointed out that the tax code is enormously complex, has far-reaching ramifications on the functioning of our economy and is therefore something that should not be drastically overhauled in one fell-swoop as some Members of the other party were advocating last week.

My colleague from New York (Mr. CONABLE), who is one of the most able and informed Members in the entire House on the question of taxation, has provided some sober and pertinent reflections on tax reform in a recent report to his constituents. He points out that "in tax reform one man's meat is another man's poison" and that the tens of billions of dollars that some of our more ardent tax reformers see slipping through "unfair loopholes" may serve important social and economic objectives. Congressman CONABLE also points out that the 112 tax returns with adjusted gross incomes of more than \$200,000 on which no income tax was paid last year do not provide prima facie evidence that the 1969 Tax Reform Act is ineffective; these returns have not yet been audited and contain large deductions for charitable contributions and business interest payments which were not included under the minimum tax provision for obvious reasons.

Mr. Speaker, I include Congressman CONABLE's report at this point in the Record and urge that all of my colleagues interested in genuine tax reform take note of it:

A NEW CALL FOR TAX REFORM

Nobody is ever happy about the size of his taxes or the manner in which they are levied. It is therefore to be expected that the fiscal history of any country will be liberally sprinkled with recurring calls for tax reform. Since reform means different things to different people, and the harassed taxpayer always assumes that it's the other fellow who is not paying his fair share of the tax burden, calling for tax reform is also a durable political siren song.

Last week during the debate on the raising of the national debt ceiling, a large bloc of House liberals served notice that they would oppose any further debt ceiling increase unless the President first "permitted" Congress to enact comprehensive tax reforms. I hope that no one will take this ploy too seriously. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee who vigorously pressed for the Tax Reform Act of 1969, I have some acquaintance with this subject.

In tax reform one man's meat is another man's poison, and so less than comprehensive reform always raises the question of discrimination among taxpayers. Major changes were not made between 1954 and 1969, and once we undertook it, the overhauling of the income tax alone occupied our Committee daily for over seven months. One problem with quickly repeated reform efforts is that

some of the last reforms we passed did not take effect immediately and are still being phased in. Another problem in a new tax reform effort is that inevitably tax reform leads to or is combined with tax relief, as in the 1969 Act. With a \$38 billion federal deficit in prospect this year, the government cannot afford a further loss of revenue.

Then why are people here pushing for a new tax reform effort, if there are so many reasons working against a prompt and successful conclusion? Apart from the possible devious motivation of those who don't like to tax, only to spend, or those who don't like to borrow, only to make borrowing inevitable, the impetus behind this new agitation seems to be deriving from new disclosures that in 1970 there were 112 taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes of \$200,000 or more who paid no income tax.

I am afraid this is not a very solid statistic. Almost all these returns have yet to be audited, and in many cases the taxpayer appears to be in error when he thinks he owes no tax, according to officials. But even if they are not in error, a preliminary check has shown that they are not necessarily taking advantage of unusual or invidious tax privilege.

For instance, interest on debts is the biggest deduction taken on their returns. A minimum tax is payable on some types of investment interests as opposed to business interest, but there is a gray area between the definitions of the two types of interest and so the full deductibility of interest is subject to dispute under this new minimum tax provision. Some of these people claim charitable tax deductions of 50 percent of their income, legitimate under the law, and few Americans would question the appropriateness of reasonable charitable deductions. Others paid large state income taxes on the April 15 following the year of a big taxable transaction and had this large deduction to take in a year of lower income.

The point is that the existence of the unholy 112 does not necessarily mean that further tax reform, willy-nilly, is necessary, and it would be premature to assume so. Those in Congress who draw that immediate conclusion and trumpet their dissatisfaction with the system are reaping personal publicity at the expense of the credibility of government, not furthering tax reform.

Tax reform will go forward in the years to come after we digest the reforms recently placed on the books. If the government spends more money than it takes in through taxes, the ceiling on the government debt will have to be readjusted also. But in the meantime, there is no magic relationship between the two that is not totally explained in terms of short-term manipulative politics.

OIL IMPORT RESTRICTIONS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is all too evident the United States' oil import control program is an unfair and ineffective method of assuring the necessary domestic petroleum reserves to meet a national emergency. As is pointed out in an article appearing in the January 17, 1972 Washington Post, the present controls on foreign oil imports cost the American consumer billions of dollars in higher fuel costs and, in addition, reduce sorely needed tax revenue by an estimated \$1 billion. Of even graver concern,

is the fact import controls offer no assurance the required oil reserves will be available should a national emergency arise at some time in the future.

The executive branch over the last 2 years has increased allowable oil imports to insure there will be no shortage in supply. We are left, however, with artificially inflated prices and the very real possibility of critical shortages in the event of a national emergency.

I believe the Congress must live up to its responsibilities and correct this situation. At the very least, a system of national defense petroleum reserves should be established, as provided in H.R. 9244. Once this is done import controls should be abolished and the savings passed on to over-burdened consumers.

The Post item and pertinent bills follow:

ARE WE SUBSIDIZING SUCCESS, OR . . . ARE OIL QUOTAS OF IMPORTANCE TO NATIONAL SECURITY?

(By Morton Mintz)

The federal government has a greater direct impact on the prices of petroleum products—before, during or after price controls—than on the prices charged by any other industry.

Each of 50 million American families, for example, pays an average of \$100 per year more for fuels because of the import quotas that restrict inexpensive foreign oil.

In addition to this estimated \$5 billion annual cost of quotas, the Treasury grants an estimated \$4 billion a year in assorted tax breaks.

Why we grant such subsidies is, clearly, an important question; and now, in three days of hearings, a Joint Economic subcommittee has explored it.

Much of the testimony concerned the quotas. By keeping out foreign oil, the theory is, they stimulate domestic exploration. This assures that the supply of oil needed by the civilian economy will continue without interruption. The national security is thereby protected, or so the argument goes. That is the key, because national security is the only legal reason for the quota system.

The major oil companies (through trade associations they control), the Interior Department and a pro-industry legislator all strongly urged this line of reasoning.

In contrast, subcommittee chairman William Proxmire (D-Wis.) and independent economists and lawyers generally saw the great bulk of the benefits of a \$9 billion annual subsidy for success flowing only to the major oil companies, which account for seven of the 20 largest industrial corporations.

An explanation indicated by evidence produced at the hearings—and, of course, rejected by advocates of federal intrusion in oil marketing mechanism—was simply that economic power was translating into political power.

The Internal Revenue Service, to take one item, determined, in the 1960s, that major firms operating in the Persian Gulf had so inflated their "posted" prices for foreign crude as to run up a \$1 billion tax deficiency; the IRS settled for half of that—and has never gotten around to investigating the domestic "posted" prices. The IRS says its rules forbid disclosure of the identities of the companies, the sums each owed and the amounts they paid.

Attorney General John N. Mitchell, it developed, had shelved a request from his Antitrust Division for the civil equivalent of subpoenas for papers on the possible anticompetitive consequences of the proposed Trans-Alaska pipeline. A recommendation by the division staff for divestiture by eight of

the nine huge firms that own Colonial Pipeline hasn't been acted on, though it was made six years ago.

One witness, Rep. Silvio O. Conte (R-Mass.), was asked to comment on the lag in the Colonial case, which actually came under investigation about nine years ago.

"The oil industry," Conte told Proxmire, "is the most powerful lobby and the most powerful unit we have in the United States."

If that seems an overstatement, try to imagine a more plausible explanation for the anomalies that fairly gushed forth at the hearing (and in earlier Capitol Hill inquiries, as well), such as:

In 1958, the year before President Eisenhower set up the quota system with an Executive Order, American oil companies listed exploration expenses of \$650 million in this country and \$255 million abroad. In 1969, after a dozen years of quotas, spending for domestic exploration had increased \$75 million (11.5 per cent), while it had gone up \$255 million (63.8 per cent) in foreign countries.

In the half-dozen years ended in 1970, the cost of quotas to the public increased by at least \$7.4 billion—2.3 times as much as the increase in the companies' domestic exploration expenditures, for gas as well as for oil. Obviously, as Proxmire pointed out, a straightforward, honest subsidy for domestic exploration would be a bargain.

By barring low-price imports, quotas have worked to "Drain America First," said S. David Freeman, who until September headed the White House Energy Policy Staff. But now, he said, we face "a major shortage of energy" unless we end the quotas—which the President can do with a stroke of the pen—or induce further domestic production. That, he said, would require increases so large that the cost of quotas could climb from \$5 billion to \$10 billion a year. And this "would be contrary to our long-term security," Freeman said, because it would mean "really draining America dry." Besides, the Phase II controls appear "to rule out the kind of price increases the oil industry feels is necessary."

Without such price increases, one major oil company has suggested, we will end up by 1985 importing half of the nation's crude primarily from Arab nations. Ironically, Freeman pointed out, large price increases and heavy future reliance on Arab oil are "the very dire consequences which industry representatives suggested would take place if the quotas were abolished."

The nation is said to have an acute shortage of natural gas. The most immediate way to relieve it is either to use more oil, or to convert oil into synthetic gas. But the import quotas, supposedly protecting national security by preventing an energy shortage, keep out the oil that could ease the shortage.

Canada has larger oil reserves than she needs for her own people. But, Freeman said, they will not be discovered, developed and brought to American markets so long as the United States maintains the quotas.

The quotas bar petrochemical feedstocks for use in a great variety of plastic and other products. "The security purpose of import controls does not apply to petrochemicals," President Nixon was told last March in a memo prepared by the Justice Department's Antitrust Division and signed by Attorney General Mitchell.

While the public, through higher prices, is "taxed" \$5 billion a year to keep foreign oil out, the major companies that are the principal beneficiaries have a tax incentive to explore and produce abroad: a 1953 Internal Revenue Service ruling allowing them to credit the "royalties" they pay foreign governments against the taxes they would owe the United States. The estimated tax loss is \$1 billion to \$1.25 billion a year.

In the 12 years of quotas, which bar independent wholesalers from importing petro-

leum products, including unleaded gasoline, their number in the Midwest has declined from 88 to 15.

The most devastating attack on the quota system—because of its source—came in February, 1970, from President Nixon's own Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Control. Of the 13 Cabinet officers and other federal officials who were members and official observers, 10 agreed that the quota program "is not adequately responsive to present and future security considerations" and "is no longer acceptable."

The task force chairman was George P. Shultz, then Secretary of Labor. The President thought enough of him to make him director of the Office of Management and Budget—but thought so little of the condemnation of quotas by Shultz and others in the majority that he did not so much as mention their recommendation of tariffs as a substitute.

Instead, Mr. Nixon called attention to the divergence of views between the majority and the minority. Then he appointed a new Oil Policy Committee which, without formal discussions or working papers, approved retention of quotas. Thus he continued a massive intervention in the free market he extols.

H.R. 9244

A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to establish national defense petroleum reserves.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) title VII of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2151 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"NATIONAL DEFENSE PETROLEUM RESERVES"

"Sec. 720. (a) The President shall establish and maintain on the public lands of the United States, national defense petroleum reserves which shall have a petroleum-producing capacity sufficient to protect the United States against a continuous one-year interruption of the importation of petroleum from those foreign countries not contiguous to the United States which the President determines to be insecure sources. To carry out the provisions of this subsection, the President is authorized to enter into contracts and other agreements. For the purpose of this subsection the term 'public lands of the United States' means all lands to which the United States has title on the date of enactment of this section, including public lands, acquired lands, submerged lands, and lands within the area comprising the Outer Continental Shelf (as defined in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act).

"(b) To the extent he deems it necessary or appropriate, the President may treat existing petroleum reserves established and maintained under other laws of the United States as part of the national petroleum reserves, and for this purpose, the President is authorized to acquire by purchase lands or interests in areas adjacent to such existing petroleum reserves and to enter into contracts or other agreements in order to protect or increase the capacity of such existing petroleum reserves.

"(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to require or authorize—

"(1) the cancellation or termination of any existing lease; or

"(2) the taking or use of any lands which are, on the date of enactment of this section, within the national parks system or which are, on that date, parts of national forests, national seashores, game refuges, or any other lands which have been otherwise set aside for purposes of recreation, conservation, or public use.

"(d) Within thirty days after the close of each quarter, the President shall submit to the Joint Committee on Defense Produc-

tion a report of the petroleum-producing capacity in the reserves maintained under this section during such quarter.

"(e) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

(b) Section 717(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "(except sections 714 and 719)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(except sections 714, 719, and 720)".

H.R. 5186

A bill to terminate the oil import control program

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1862) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) On or after January 1, 1972, no import quota or other nontariff trade restriction shall be imposed by or pursuant to law with respect to the importation into the United States of petroleum and petroleum products."

THE ECONOMY—REALITY AND ISSUE

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, in an entertaining speech before the National Press Club on February 8, Herbert Stein, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, commented reflectively on the economic as well as the political realities of 1972. In discussing the possibility of realism and responsibility in a presidential election year, Mr. Stein is both humorous and informative. And, I suspect that before the year is out Mr. Stein's sense of humor will be tested by some even more blatant arguments than those he suggests.

Mr. Speaker, I know that all of my colleagues in the Congress will be interested in Mr. Stein's remarks, and I include them in the RECORD at this time:

THE ECONOMY—REALITY AND ISSUE

(Remarks by Herbert Stein, Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers)

I see by the papers that the economy is going to be a big issue in the 1972 campaign. That is good news for economists. Every candidate is going to need, along with a make-up man and a TV prop man, at least three economists. The demand is especially great for Democratic economists, because of the large number of candidates. One of the political experts in the White House Mess told me that there were so many Democratic candidates that the party was going to divide into two conferences, with a play-off to be held at a Super-Convention after the November election.

Anyway the bidding is high for Democratic economists. Senator Muskie has offered Senator McGovern Arthur Okun and a first round draft choice from the 1972 crop of Ph.D's in exchange for Kenneth Galbraith, but McGovern says it's no deal unless Okun raises a beard. After President Nixon appointed Mrs. Whitman to the Council of Economic Advisers, Governor Wallace offered Miss Alabama the chairmanship of his Council if she could get through the Southern regional edition of Samuelson's textbook.

The demand, of course, is not so strong on the Republican side. We only have three

candidates, and Mr. Ashbrook has shown no interest in economists and Mr. McCloskey has shown no interest in Republicans. However, while the demand for Republican economists is small, so is the supply.

This Administration, despite its great performance in the field of economics, operates under a certain technical handicap in dealing with the economy as a campaign issue. I suppose the people most eligible to explain the Administration's economic policy are the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. However, our Secretary of the Treasury is a Democrat. The Director of OMB is under the Hatch Act and not able to campaign. And in this Administration the Chairman of the CEA plays a professional, non-political role. In fact, I am under instruction not to make political speeches. So I hope the press will understand that, unlike the opposition, when we talk about the economy we do so in a non-partisan, non-political way.

While it is great fun for economists that the economy will be a big campaign issue in 1972, it is not really a blessing for the economy. The U.S. economy is strong, both at home and abroad. But the last thing it needs is to be the subject of a year of demagoguery. It does not help a revival of business or consumer confidence to have the state of the economy described groundlessly as a disaster. Neither does it help to have policies recommended which are not intended to be taken seriously but only spread anxiety in the private sector. This is not a plea for a suspension of criticism and suggestions. It is only a plea for realism and responsibility. We tried to set an example of this in our Economic Report. Many commentators in the press have referred to our Report as modest. I would go further and say that it is the most modest Economic Report ever written.

Time Magazine says that the main economic issue will be unemployment. And Time is an honorable magazine; so are they all, all honorable magazines. So let us look into unemployment a little.

I can see it now. In August and September the Republicans will be pointing to a decline of the unemployment rate. The Democrats will say the rate is still higher than when they left office. The Republicans will say that the unemployment rate would be lower now if we didn't have to unwind the consequences of the Democrat's War and the Democrat's inflation. To which the Democrats will say, "Yeah? What about Herbert Hoover?" And that will be the highest point the great debate is likely to reach.

We recognize that unemployment is a serious problem. As President Nixon said in his Economic Message, it is the great problem of 1972. Six percent unemployment is too much. We are determined to reduce it and expect to reduce it. At the same time it is a travesty to call it a disaster or to compare the situation with the Great Depression. This is especially true when it is recognized that in 1971 forty-eight percent of all unemployment was accounted for by people aged 16 to 24 and another 23 percent by females 25 years of age and over.

The unemployment situation of young people is particularly misunderstood. The fact that 15 percent of the 16 to 21 year olds are unemployed is commonly described as if 15 percent of that age group is hanging around the lamp-post. The facts are that almost half of that age group is not in the labor force at all, less than 8 percent of the total age group was unemployed in 1971, 5.5 percent was unemployed and not in school, and 4.6 percent was unemployed, not in school, and seeking full-time work.

Some politicians and journalists have recently gotten on to the fact that mothers of small children who are keeping house are not considered unemployed, even though they may occasionally mutter that they

would rather be back in the nice cool office enjoying the coffee break than in the hot kitchen. The suspicion seems to be around that we have a pool of uncouneted unemployed hidden in caves in Kentucky. The fact is that the proportion of the population 16 years and over employed in the three years of the Nixon Administration was exactly as high as the proportion in the best three years of the Johnson Administration and much higher than in any of the years 1961 through 1965.

The mere recital of such facts invites the charge of not caring. It's almost like saying that Mom didn't really make very good apple pie. But the issue of unemployment is not who cares the most, which can never be determined, but who has the best policy for dealing with it.

This Administration has, I believe, the most powerful, comprehensive, coherent program for dealing with unemployment that any Administration ever had. I say that after a careful review of the history. The only competitors worth mentioning are Roosevelt's program during his first 100 days, Roosevelt's program in the Spring of 1938 after the 1937 recession, and Kennedy's 1962 tax cut proposal. The first Roosevelt program I consider weaker because it included the counter-productive NRA; the second Roosevelt program and the Kennedy program had neither the price control nor the devaluation features.

I recall this history in an effort to break through the stereotype which holds that if this is a Republican program it must be a weak, passive program. This stereotype is keeping lots of people from seeing what is going on. Let me just summarize what is going on:

1. We are running the biggest budget deficit ever, except in World War II, and one of the biggest ever relative to the GNP.

2. We have the most comprehensive price-wage control system ever except during the Korean War and World War II.

3. We have suspended the convertibility of the dollar and achieved, by negotiation, a major reduction in the exchange value of the dollar.

4. We are spending this year about \$10 billion for manpower programs and unemployment compensation. This is about \$2,000 per unemployed person. In Fiscal 1973 the manpower programs, excluding unemployment compensation, will be 20 percent higher than in 1972 and twice as high in 1970.

So what is the issue? The issue is whether anyone has a program for dealing with unemployment that is more effective than this.

Does anyone propose a more stimulative fiscal policy if that means a bigger deficit? I have discussed this subject before two Congressional committees in the last two weeks and have yet to find anyone who wants a larger deficit. All I hear is a few people who say that if we did things their way we would get more employment bang for a budget dollar and be able to reduce unemployment more with less deficit. So far, the better ideas seem to consist of rediscovering the WPA and tax loophole closings that have been gathering dust in Congress for years.

The second element in our attack on unemployment is the price-wage control system. Many observers do not seem to regard the price-wage control system as an element in the anti-unemployment program. Some of our critics—most of whom were advocating incomes policies a year ago—now consider the price-wage control system as evidence of our excessive preoccupation with inflation. Well, we are concerned with inflation, and think that we should be. But the price-wage control system reflects our concern with unemployment as much as our concern with inflation. If we had been concerned only with

inflation we could have stuck it out with the classic prescription of fiscal and monetary restraint. But as the President said in his Economic Report, it began to appear that this prescription could eradicate inflation only at the price of persistent high unemployment—"and this was a price we would not ask the American people to pay."

So the price-wage control system is an effort to control inflation in a way that will reduce not increase unemployment. The question is whether anyone in the opposition now seriously proposes a more rigorous, effective price-wage control system than the Administration has put in place.

There is a good deal of grumbling about the system. Part of it focuses on the fact that some of the Administration people involved, including me, are thought not to love the controls. But the point about the controls is not who loves them well but who does them well. And I have seen no specific suggestions for doing them better.

It seems to be obvious that a critical matter for the success of the price-wage control system—although not the only critical matter—will be effectiveness in restraining wage increases. This is especially true if the controls are considered an element in a program against unemployment. Wages are the largest part of total costs, by far, and we start from a situation in which profits are low by historic standards. The possibility of controlling prices more effectively without controlling wages more effectively is limited. And even if we could maintain a system of tight price control and loose wage control, squeezing profit margins, the result would be bad for investment, production and employment.

Does anyone believe that it will be an issue between the Republicans and the Democrats that the Democrats propose to control wages more rigorously?

The third element in our attack on the unemployment problem is the new international economic policy. The President grasped the nettle, suspended the convertibility of the dollar and brought about a reduction in the exchange rate of the dollar. This was not done primarily to expand employment, but it was helpful in giving us freedom to follow domestic expansive policies. There has been a certain amount of demagoguery putting the successors to William Jennings Bryan in the odd position of worshipping at the sacred shrine of gold. But by and large the opposition has not made an issue of international monetary policy—which is just as well.

My conclusion from this brief tour of the bases of economic policy, especially as it relates to unemployment, is that at the moment there is no issue. There is no serious, coherent policy that is an alternative to the one the Administration has initiated. There may still be an alternative program before 1972 is over. After all, there are a lot of economists on the other side. But I will not try to guess what it might be. Presumably it would depend in some part on whether the candidate is George Wallace or Shirley Chisholm.

My best guess is that there will be no alternative program. Instead we will get solemn pledges.

A pledge to reduce unemployment more and faster.

A pledge to spend more, tax less, and balance the budget.

A pledge to make the price-wage control system more rigorous but less burdensome on workers, farmers and small businesses.

A pledge to protect the American worker against imports while opening up the markets of Europe and Japan to our exports.

Well, it wouldn't be the first time. But as I heard on my television recently, that isn't good enough for 1972.

It isn't good enough for the heroes of the New Politics to campaign against Herbert Hoover.

It isn't good enough for the great innovators to rediscover the WPA.

It isn't good enough to palm off sentimentality as sincerity and platitudes as profundity.

I seem to detect a certain political note creeping into these remarks and I think that I had better stop right here.

THE 54TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA

HON. ALPHONSO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, as in past years on this date, I should again like to take this opportunity to salute the 54th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania.

This recognition is deserved not just because I have many constituents of Lithuanian descent in my district, but also because the occasion serves to remind us of the many freedoms we enjoy in the United States, but too often take for granted.

Oppression is not new to Lithuania; because of the country's particularly vulnerable position on the Baltic, threats from the Teutonic peoples on the West and Russia on the East have been frequent. In addition, during the last three decades, Lithuania has lost more than one-fourth of her population through the continued Soviet program of deportation and resettlement.

Still, the memory that remains foremost in the minds of the American public as a classic example of discrimination and suppression of national rights by the Soviet Union is the defection attempt of Simas Kudirka. This incident constituted a tragedy for both the individual seaman and for the United States because it was in direct contradiction to our tradition of granting political asylum to the downtrodden of the world. Fortunately, since the President ordered an investigation and reiterated U.S. maintenance of its asylum policy, the State Department has issued improved instructions to all concerned agencies dealing with such cases. Hopefully, this action will preclude incidents of this kind in the future.

Finally, in view of our own cherished tradition of liberty and of the many historical, cultural, and familial ties existing between the Baltic and American peoples, it is entirely appropriate that special congressional attention be focused on the plight of Lithuania today. Bringing the force of opinion of free people everywhere, and especially in the United States, to bear on this situation will further the restoration of the fundamental right of self-determination to our Baltic brethren.

THE FREEDOM TO FISH IN SEAS THAT ARE FREE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the freedom of the seas has been a part of our heritage since our inception as a nation. However, this freedom—similar to freedoms that have been guaranteed to us by the Constitution—has been eroded and is in danger.

Like the freedom of the press, the freedom of speech, and the freedom to peaceably assemble, the freedom of the seas must be protected; it must be defended, and it must be exercised.

If not, surely the freedom of the seas will wither away and no longer be ours.

Mr. Speaker, a man who served for more than 45 years in the U.S. Navy, a man who served as the commandant of the National War College, a man who is recognized as an expert on the aspects of American policy affecting national security, Vice Adm. Fitzhugh Lee has made a study of the doctrine of the freedom of the seas.

At this point, I include in the RECORD Admiral Lee's dissertation entitled "The Freedom To Fish in Seas That Are Free," and I commend this excellent article to my colleagues:

THE FREEDOM TO FISH IN SEAS THAT ARE FREE (By Fitzhugh Lee)

Too few Americans are really aware that we are a maritime nation. Many do not realize that our ability in war to control important sea areas has a profound effect on our national security. Nor do they understand that the doctrine of the freedom of the seas in peace and war has a direct relationship to the health of our high seas fishing fleets and the ability of our Navy to do its job.

The press, the TV, and the radio convey almost no appreciation of the fact that the troubles our tuna boats are having off Ecuador and Peru are embarrassingly visible evidence of the erosion of our freedom to use the seas. Nor have the media done much to help public understanding of the role that our high seas fishing fleet can and should play as a part of our national maritime power.

America needs to know these things; needs to know they are all interrelated in complex ways involving foreign and domestic policy, foreign trade, and international law in the maintenance of national security.

Why does the United States fight for international acceptance of narrow territorial seas, while a seemingly growing number of nations are asking for as much as 200 miles and more as the limit of their territorial waters? The answer is that we, as the leader of the strongest nation of the free world, must make the most effective use of sea power—our own and that of our allies. If we don't, we will weaken our side of the world power equation. Smaller nations are grasping for more territorial waters mostly in efforts to bolster their frequently faltering economies with the money they can make from them, and with little regard for the long range consequences.

More than 90% of international commerce goes by sea. There are 19,000 cargo-carrying vessels in the world's merchant fleet. A lot of cargo that goes by air must fly over territorial seas and only with the permission of the territorial "owner". The United States

and other nations on our side are critically dependent on materials from overseas for our economic well being and our national security. And the continuing freedom of much of the free world largely depends on the strength of America.

Ability to control the sea has been a major factor in deciding the outcome of war throughout history. As the free seas, and air over them, are increasingly restricted, our freedom to use maritime and air power will be correspondingly reduced. We will not, in time of stress, have full freedom to position naval forces in ways which may prevent or delay the outbreak of war. If war comes, we will be handicapped in applying force quickly in ways which can give us important advantage in the critical opening days. In the conduct of a long war the strategic mobility of our ship and aircraft would be drastically curbed in many places and in many ways.

Increasing the limits of the territorial seas from 3 to 12 miles would increase by more than a hundred the number of international straits which could be denied to us because the waters in them and the air over them would be territorial—owned by other nations.

Submarine warfare came dangerously close to gaining victory for the Germans in two world wars. The fact that submarines were not used against us gave us enormous advantages in Korea and in Viet Nam but we cannot assume we will always have this advantage. Russia has a massive and growing submarine fleet. Increasing the extent of the territorial seas potentially expands huge areas of neutral water an enemy can use clandestinely for enhancing the submarine's powers and reduces the areas which our surface and air forces can use to combat them without violating overtly the waters of neutral nations.

These are the reasons that we have sought since 1793 to preserve the 3-mile limit of the territorial sea—the band of water along a nation's coasts—and why we should continue to work for international agreement on the greatest achievable amount of free ocean area.

Let us thumb through a bit of history. For at least two thousand years the world has argued about the freedom of all nations to use the high seas and where to draw the line between everybody's high seas and the territorial seas nations consider they own as they do their land. Until about five centuries ago it was often contended that the sea could be appropriated and was not free for use by all mankind. Large tracts were divided up and many exaggerated claims were made.

Pope Alexander in 1493 divided the entire Atlantic between Spain and Portugal. In 1624 Grotius wrote a landmark (or should we say watermark?) book to uphold the right of transit on the high seas, which the Portuguese at that time were proclaiming as their monopoly. England asserted the right to free seas in 1822 and actually enforced it for most of the 18th and 19th centuries.

One of the early actions of Thomas Jefferson, our first Secretary of State, was to proclaim that we accepted 3 miles as the limit of our territorial waters. This limit England had long upheld, and most maritime nations accepted it at that time. In fact, for about the last 300 years, 3 miles has been the only limit for the territorial sea which has been agreed to internationally and widely recognized by the majority of nations, with the remainder of the oceans constituting the "high seas"—free for all to use.

In fairly recent times measures for the control of smuggling and development of mineral and fishing resources have spawned what are called "contiguous zones" between the high seas and the territorial waters. In these zones a coastal state may exercise certain privileges such as fishing, but the state cannot restrict the free navigation—known as "innocent passage"—of the ships of other nations. Twelve miles from the coast has

been widely accepted as the limit of the contiguous zones.

The great problem has been, and remains, that there is no agreed international law or covenant which says where the boundaries lie between the high seas, the contiguous zones, and the territorial seas. Even if there were, the present powers of the United Nations and its International Court of Justice are insufficient to adjudicate and enforce them.

Steps to define and set these boundaries were taken by the League of Nations in Geneva in 1930, but the required two-thirds agreement could not be reached. This, largely because of Russian intransigence. In 1945 President Truman, in order to protect our oil interests in the Gulf of Mexico, claimed for the United States the "natural resources of the sub-soil and sea bed on all of her continental shelves". These shelves occur world-wide and are something of a geological oddity.

World-wide, the shelves cover about 11 million square miles. The land of the shelves slopes very gradually from the coast line to a depth of about 600 feet and then plunges precipitously to the deep ocean floor, which may be 7 miles deep. The shelves extend from less than a mile off shore to distances as great as 750 miles but average 40 miles in width. Off Ecuador and California the shelf is very narrow; off Nova Scotia, Alaska, and Siberia, it is very wide. Truman's grandiloquent, precedent-setting and unilateral proclamation in 1945 claimed for the United States an area three times as large as Texas. Surprisingly, no other nations protested this action which did not assert fishing rights and specifically noted that free navigation by ships of all nations in the waters above the continental shelf was not affected. Indeed, the American declaration became a precedent for similar claims by other nations in which, unfortunately, mining and fishing in contiguous zones, as well as free passage through and over and the limits of the territorial seas, were all rather indiscriminately and confusingly embroiled.

"Fishing" is a loose term and can apply to catching swimming fish as well as creatures that lie on the sea bed such as oysters and in the subsoil under the sea bed, such as clams, and those like lobsters which both swim and crawl on the bottom. Most commercial fishing is done in the shallow waters of the continental shelves, but fishing for whales and the various kinds of tuna is more often done in the deep oceans.

As fish become increasingly valuable as a food source for an exploding world population, the arguments wax over who has the exclusive right to fish where. These arguments are not likely to be solved until we can get basic international agreement on the boundaries and uses of the territorial, contiguous and high seas.

The need for agreement has long been obvious. Under United Nations auspices, Conventions were held in Geneva in 1958 and again in 1960 to try to achieve them. In 1958 some important covenants were agreed to on fishing and sea bottom rights, but no agreement could be reached on the three mile or any other limit to the territorial sea. The Soviets and others held out for 12 miles; five nations claimed 200 miles, and nine claimed all the seas on their continental shelves. The United States and 20 other nations wanted 3 miles but would compromise on a 6 mile limit for territorial waters plus another 6 miles for the contiguous zone. This failed to pass by 1 vote.

Another conference in 1960 also failed to reach agreement. At the close of both of these conferences, the United States made a policy statement worth repeating. We stated that three miles was the "sole breadth of the territorial sea on which there had ever been anything like common agreement", that claims in excess thereof "are not sanc-

tioned by international law" and "conflict with the universally accepted principle of the freedom of the sea . . . Furthermore, we have made it clear that in our view there is no obligation on the part of the states adhering to the three-mile limit to recognize claims on the part of the other states to a greater breadth of the territorial sea. And on that we stand." And on that we still stand as the official position of the United States.

Noting that another Geneva Conference is scheduled in 1973 and that it "is urgent that the community of nations fix a proper breadth of the territorial sea", the United States now says that we will support a 12 miles territorial limit but only if a treaty can be negotiated having widespread international acceptance and which provides for freedom of navigation through and over international straits. At the same time, we said, we would attempt to accommodate the interests of coastal states in the fishery resources off their coasts.

We have mentioned that our tuna fishers are concerned with both foreign and domestic policies.

Rightly or wrongly—and many think the latter—a basic element of American foreign policy for the last three decades has been "detente" vis-a-vis our communist adversaries on the theory that their governments contain the seeds of their own destruction, that they will eventually mellow to the point of abandoning communist imperialism, and that time is on our side. Therefore we should accelerate the mellowing and prevent hostilities by "detente"—a relaxing and calming of international relations even if you have to stretch right and reason a bit. Detente is a French word. The French Ambassador to Washington in the mid-60's defined it being just nice enough to your enemies to make enemies of your friends. Staunch advocates of detente in our State Department have applied it also to the "third world," the underdeveloped nations, on the theory that they will be induced to stay neutral on our side or at least not espouse communism.

Unfortunately, in the maritime scene, the steadfast upholding of detente and the avoidance of any precedent for not doing so have seriously weakened the doctrine of maximum area of free seas thus weakening our ability to exploit sea power. This has been evident in many instances in our relations with nations adjacent to the strategic maritime bottlenecks of Gibraltar, Suez, Singapore, and Panama. Our State Department has been negotiating over several years a treaty with Panama which anti-detenters in Congress have been strongly opposing, because the terms would greatly inhibit our strategic mobility at sea.

When Russia objected to U.S. Naval ships going through the international waters of an international strait near Russia in the Arctic, we stopped the ships and turned them around. We did not permit our forces to enter the 12-mile territorial waters claimed by Red China in order to rescue a downed aviator. We side-stepped the question of high seas versus territorial waters in the PUEBLO incident although the ship was clearly captured on the high seas by our announced policies. Last December when Cuba seized a Panamanian flag ship we protested the ship capture of its American captain but not the capture of an American-owned ship under a foreign flag on the high seas—clearly a belligerent act, as are the captures off Ecuador.

Detente was the underlying factor in our supine acquiescence to the seizure in 1971 of more than fifty of our tuna boats on the high seas. The possible retaliatory confiscation of American business properties in Ecuador and Peru may also have been a factor, but the application of detente in the case of the tuna

boats in Latin America obviously weakens the position America will have in the 1973 Geneva conference. This meeting will bring about agreement on reasonable and sensible limits for the territorial seas and to outlaw 200 mile claims which are patently ridiculous. If they were applied worldwide, the result would be chaos.

While most Americans deplore that our high seas fishing fleets suffer, they ignore that our national security is also suffering from a continuing failure in other areas to stand up for our rights and to carry out our proclaimed foreign policies with respect to the freedom of the seas.

In our domestic policy we have over the years failed to exploit the assets which our tuna fishery can and should bring to our country.

We have not done nearly enough in strengthening our merchant marine. Russia has a modern and expanding merchant fleet; ours is just the opposite. Because of high costs of American labor, most of America's alleged merchant fleet flies the flag of a foreign nation. The fleet's availability to us in war is dubious. Our government has far less for our high seas fishermen than it has for our merchant shipping. We require that our tuna clippers be built in America, but we deny or under-subsidize their building and their support to the point where our fishermen, too, may have to seek the economic relief furnished by a foreign flag.

Russia and Japan are our principal rivals in the commercial fishing game. The governments of both have openly, lavishly, and intimately supported their fishing fleets for decades. So have most other fishing nations. We have done the opposite. That our tuna clippers have stayed solvent is almost entirely due to their pioneering fishing techniques and what we may call an esprit de corps in the industry. But man cannot live by esprit alone; the cash register also must be fed.

The Navy has been quick to capitalize in war on the use of the tuna fleets. Today's fine tuna clippers are much superior to those the Navy commandeered in previous wars for use as patrol boats. The tuna boats will probably be used in another one if it comes.

But in time of peace the Navy has done little to advocate and exploit the potential of the tuna fishermen in speeding development in several of the ocean sciences. They could be subsidized to gather in little-traveled regions a mass of data of much value in oceanography. Finding improved techniques in the search for the tuna and the search for the submarine are both heavily dependent on more knowledge of the behavior of the thermocline. This is the boundary separating a layer of warm water above a much colder layer. It hampers in unpredictable ways the sonic or electronic search of the deeper water. The Navy has spent many millions in trying to lick the problem posed by the thermocline. A subsidized program to help the high seas fishermen to lick their problem should help both parties. And it would help to keep the fishing fleets prosperous and available for use under the American flag when and if the Navy needed them.

Summing up, in my opinion, our government, in the national interest, should be doing much more than it has in support of our superb, modern, high speed, high seas fishing fleets. It should take positive steps to insure keeping them under the American flag. It should seek out and foster ways in which the Navy and the fishing fleets could coordinate and cooperate in research in oceanography and anti-submarine warfare. It should abandon the policy of detente as it has been unrewardingly practiced over the last few years. At the very least it should abandon those aspects of detente which

erode a steadfast support of the doctrine for the freedom of the seas. Surely our most visible non-support of this doctrine so important to our national security has been our pusillanimous reaction to nations molesting our ships in waters as far as 200 miles from their coasts. In the eyes of most of the free world—including most of Latin America—a shift to a strong stand by America on the doctrine of the freedom of the seas would be hailed as an intelligent and needed step toward a sensible, acceptable agreement in the 1973 Geneva Conference on the Laws of the Sea.

LITHUANIA'S BRIEF PERIOD OF FREEDOM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, 54 years ago today, the Taryba or National Council declared the independence of Lithuania. This small nation on the Baltic Sea, for over 100 years, a captive of the Russian Empire, had been occupied during World War I by the armies of the German Empire.

While the end of the first global conflict saw the extinction of both the Romanoff and Hohenzollern dynasties, it did not mean that the small nations of Europe were to remain free from the tyrannies of their larger and more powerful neighbors. New evils soon emerged, one having come to power late in 1917 while the war was yet raging and the other making its appearance in 1933. Lithuania was doomed to experience the horrors of both communism and national socialism.

Its brief period of freedom came to an end during the summer of 1940. Soviet forces invaded Lithuania on June 15 and it was absorbed by the Soviet empire on August 3, following a parliamentary election with none but Communist candidates. In 1941 the Nazis invaded and occupied Lithuania, remaining in possession until the Communists returned at the end of World War II.

Over a million people of Lithuanian background live in the United States, many thousands of them in Illinois. Many of them came to America after their native land had been seized by the Soviet Union. Thousands of others fled from Lithuania to other lands and still other thousands have been sent to Siberia and elsewhere by the tyrants in the Kremlin.

As a result of migrations, deportations, and repopulation from other sections of the Soviet Union, over half of the people now living in Lithuania are unable to speak Lithuanian. What makes this so tragic is that Lithuanian is the oldest living language in all Europe.

Mr. Speaker, the facts that I have related cannot be dismissed as ancient history. They have their current parallel in the subjugation of Czechoslovakia, the persecution of the Jewish inhabitants of the Soviet Union, and the denial of freedom to the people of Lithuania.

MASSIVE BUSING: A WASTE

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the issue of busing and the Constitution are under serious study now and the following article by William Raspberry in the Washington Post of February 16, 1972, expresses one view of the problem:

MASSIVE BUSING: A WASTE

(By William Raspberry)

If this weren't an election year, it just might be possible to do something rational about school integration and busing.

But not only is it an election year; it is also a year in which all sorts of people, in all parts of the country and of all political persuasions are expressing their strong misgivings about the prospects of massive busing for the purpose of racial integration of public schools.

And with that kind of mandate, you can count on the politicians to see their duty—and overdo it. Already presidential candidate Jackson is pushing "freedom of choice." Haven't we heard that one before?

Others are talking up constitutional amendment.

It's a bit of an embarrassment, all things considered, but I happen to agree with Vice President Agnew on this one. I agree with him that massive busing solely for purposes of racial integration is a waste. And I agree with his opposition to a constitutional amendment as the way to end the waste.

The artificial separation of people, in schools or out, based on their race is wrong. It is, for one thing, psychologically destructive of the minority members who are separated out.

But to send black children chasing to hell and gone behind white children is also wrong and psychologically destructive. It reinforces in white children whatever racial superiority feelings they may harbor, and its says to black children that they are somehow improved by the presence of white schoolmates.

My favorite nightmare is of all the white people in the country moving to Alaska, and all the black children in the country following them in an endless line of buses.

Integration is a noble goal. But there comes a time when thoughtful men wonder with Joseph Alsop: "Is it really worth it?"

If white people, either because they wish to avoid contact with black people or for any other reason, choose to move far from where most black people live, how can it make sense—in terms of education or common sense—to send black kids chasing after them?

At some point, it becomes obvious that there must be cheaper way to achieve the goal which is the education of our children.

But even the goals gets confused. Some of the advocates of massive busing, it seems to me, are being guided by the wrong ideal.

The start off with the assumption that in melting-pot America, racial integration is a good thing. But they take the melting pot metaphor altogether too literally, and it becomes their goal to make every classroom of every school (and every block of every neighborhood) an accurate cross-section of the makeup of the total population.

They would like to put us all into that metaphorical melting pot and ladle out enough portions of homogenized Americans to fill every schoolroom, work-room and living room in the country.

Well, what's so ideal about mathematically precise distribution of human beings? What's so inherently evil about a block in

which all the homeowners (or a classroom in which all the pupils) happen to be black? Or white?

This is no brief for a return to the lie of separate but equal. It is an appeal for rational priorities, a plea that we make the test of a school whether it does what schools are supposed to do—educate our children.

It is both evil and illegal to say to a child: You cannot attend this school because it is a white school. But how much better is it to say: You must attend this school because it is integrated and we need you for racial balance?

The ideal is a situation in which race is irrelevant to assignment. Preoccupation with mathematical precision, unfortunately, is not the way to achieve that idea.

But no constitutional amendments, please. The effort that route would require would be bound to make too many of us feel that we were solving the problem of education in a pluralistic society. It would in fact solve nothing at all, except to return us to where we were the day before yesterday.

The Vice President was right again when he said:

"I think that there is almost a Pavlovian reaction. Whenever a subject becomes highly controversial, you must turn to a constitutional amendment. I think these things are capable of being handled within the normal statutory framework and constitutional framework of our existing Constitution."

But only if we deal with the situation and stop looking for new ways to run.

YORK COLLEGE CAMPUS IN JAMAICA, QUEENS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a bill to provide Federal funds for the construction of the York College campus in Jamaica, Queens. The need for this campus is quite overwhelming, and the veto of funds for its construction by the Governor of New York is incomprehensible.

The City University of New York is severely strained. Its tuition-free policy and open admission program will be difficult enough to maintain even with State cooperation. Now, however, as Albany has become increasingly hostile to both methods of insuring quality higher education for city students, the entire future of CUNY is in question. The most immediate problem is Governor Rockefeller's veto of funds for the CUNY 1968 master plan, which included \$62.5 million for York College construction.

York College will extend higher education opportunities to over 6,000 of our students and relieves some of the overcrowding at all the other CUNY campuses. Presently, however, York College students meet in a rented warehouse—throughout the city, CUNY's per space ratio is 75 square feet per student while SUNY's is over 200 square feet per student. The State Board of Regents certified the importance of the York construction by approving it last August.

I need not detail the benefits of open admissions and tuition free higher education—increased social mobility, strong incentives for students to stay in sec-

ondary school, equally strong incentives for their parents to remain in New York City, not to mention the benefits to the entire city that educated people can bring. Charges that the open admissions program has cut enrollment at private colleges in the New York City area are at best tenuous, as a survey by the State Education Department shows.

York College, however, will not only serve as an educational institution. It will be the cornerstone of much needed redevelopment efforts in South Jamaica. York has been approved and supported community planning boards, by civic and business groups, the city planning commission, and the mayor. I certainly hope this legislation will be given a hearing and an evaluation at the earliest possible time. It is time we faced up to our responsibilities to our students and to our cities.

CLOSING THE FISCAL AND BUDGETARY INFORMATION GAP

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, Congress has seen few products of executive branch efforts over the last decade to improve the acquisition, reporting, and analysis of fiscal, budgetary and program-related data.

Our Federal budget is enormous and—as evidenced by the President's presentation for fiscal 1973—enormously confusing.

That confusion will be compounded in the months ahead, as the various congressional committees seek the detailed information basic to intelligent program review and policy determination. In some instances data will be withheld, delayed, or manipulated for political reasons. In others it simply will not be available in usable form.

On March 1, the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations will begin hearings on this problem. Our primary concern will be development by the Office of Management and Budget and the Treasury Department of the Federal fiscal and budgetary data system envisioned in title II of the 1970 Legislative Reorganization Act. The intent of title II is clear: To give Congress—along with other users—ready access to meaningful fiscal, budgetary and program-related data in the executive departments and agencies.

Title II requires congressional participation, through the office of the Comptroller General, in such systems development.

Our purpose is reviewing implementation efforts over the past year is to get—

First, a clear and concise description of what the OMB-Treasury approach is; Second, a statement of the improvements in acquisition and reporting of fiscal, budgetary, and related program data that are expected to result from it; and

Third, assurance that whatever benefits do result—for executive managers—

are not only consistent with congressional interests but applicable to congressional needs as well.

SUMMER JOBS IN AGRICULTURE

HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. HICKS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, many people have a stake in harvesting our crops, particularly those which require a great deal of hand labor such as flower bulbs, berries, vegetables, and tree fruits. Participation of youth in these harvests and the payment of equitable wages for all continue to be matters of concern, not only to farmers and agricultural workers, but also to communities and the public at large. I commend to your attention the following two resolutions from the Western Washington Horticultural Association:

RESOLUTION

Whereas summer employment in agriculture is the primary source of income for many people, especially students, senior citizens and the disadvantaged; and

Whereas this employment under proper supervision and working conditions is healthful and socially beneficial—teaching self reliance, thrift, discipline and other attributes necessary for successful permanent employment; and

Whereas piece-rate payment is the only way to allow people of different abilities to work together (examples: handicapped, elderly or young people can vary widely in their physical ability and motivation); therefore

Be it resolved that the Western Washington Horticultural Association ask the Representatives and Senators from Washington State to ensure that provisions be contained in H.R. 7130 and its companion bill S. 1861 which will, (1) allow children to gain employment in agriculture, and (2) retain piece-rate payment for agricultural labor. The Association recognizes the need for education of children and agrees with the provisions in those bills that limit child employment during school hours. The Association also agrees with the establishment of minimum hourly rates provided such standards do not conflict with the principle of piece-rate wage payment: where that method has customarily been used.

RESOLUTION

Whereas we believe that the employment of youth in agricultural pursuits under suitable supervision and working conditions, especially during the summer school vacation period, can be socially and economically beneficial to these young people; and

Whereas we believe that the recent survey¹ conducted by the National Committee on Education of Migrant Children under the sponsorship of the American Friends Service Committee on child labor in agriculture not only badly distorts the facts, but also failed to acknowledge the many benefits which accrue from the participation of the youth in crop harvest—flower bulbs, berries, vegetables, apples and other tree fruit crops; and

Whereas we maintain that there is a very distinct difference between the children of migrant laborers who move from area to area for the purpose of agricultural employment

and the children of permanent residents of a community who work primarily to earn extra spending money for their own use; and

Whereas the majority of the children that help in the harvest of our crops are the children of local permanent residents; and

Whereas we feel that the recommendations made in the study referred to above, i.e. barring children from the farm labor force outright, requiring a minimum wage etc., would result in a highly detrimental environment for our youth, increased crime, lower the economic status of these youths and cause undue hardship on the producers of specialty crops that require considerable hand labor, therefore

Be it resolved that the Western Washington Horticultural Association makes the following recommendations:

1. The American Friends Service Committee, The National Committee on Education of Migrant Children and any other interested group is encouraged to extend their study of the involvement of children in agriculture—working with producers, medical and psychological experts as well as the workers themselves, and to include both children of migrant workers and those that commute daily from their permanent residence.

2. Legislators, both state and national, must carefully weigh possible effects of child labor legislation and minimum wage legislation so as to avoid economically and socially harming the very citizen that the laws are designed to protect.

3. Children should not be denied the right to work experience by agricultural and any other type of employment.

AMERICAN FOLKLIFE FOUNDATION SUPPORTED

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to establish within the Library of Congress an American Folklife Foundation to encourage research and scholarship into this Nation's diverse folk cultures with the purpose of increasing public appreciation of the music, crafts, customs, and legends that constitute the social heritage of all Americans.

It is fitting that this should be done, for at this time an ever growing number of Americans of all ages are searching for new meanings for their lives—meanings that are more enduring than the values of our shopping center and interstate highway culture of today.

And many of these Americans are developing a greater appreciation for their own and other ethnic folk cultures. Many of these rediscovered legends and songs have a greater meaning for us today than they did in the past.

Consider for a moment the legend and ballad, born in the hills of my home State of West Virginia, of John Henry. Today this legend symbolizes the oppression of the black man as well as man's struggle against the machine.

There are countless other legends, whether from Appalachia, the Old West or New England, that remain to be rediscovered and appreciated.

We have often heard it said with pride that America is a melting pot of many

cultures. To me it would be a statement of greater pride to be able to add that each and every one of our folk cultures, legends, customs, and songs has not been, and will not be, forgotten.

LEGEND OF "WAVING GIRL" PERPETUATED

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of Savannah, Ga., on February 5, 1972, perpetuated a legend that is worldwide in shipping circles, when they dedicated a monument to "The Waving Girl", Miss Florence Martus. Miss Martus gained international fame for her greetings to ships for more than 44 years from her home on Elba Island near the mouth of the Savannah River. She lived with her brother who was the lighthouse keeper.

The statue shows Miss Martus waving a kerchief, flanked by one of her favorite colliers who was faithful to alert her when a ship approached the lighthouse. It was sculpted by Felix de Weldon, internationally famous for his sculptures of world leaders, including several kings.

Ships coming and going in the Savannah harbor have already adopted the custom of saluting the statue facing the river, with a blast from the ship's whistle.

The news story about the dedication carried in the Savannah Morning News of February 7, 1972, is as follows:

"WAVING GIRL"—FOREVER SHE'LL WAVE

Red carnations from a Danish admirer Saturday were placed at the base of the "Waving Girl" memorial at Riverside Park which was dedicated in honor of Savannah's legendary Florence Martus.

The flowers from Alex Born of Nastvard, Denmark, were sent with a card "In loving memory of a sweetheart of a girl whose unflinching greeting warmed the heart of seafaring men the world over."

Miss Martus gained international fame for her greetings to ships from her Elba Island home on the Savannah River.

For more than 44 years she waved, with a handkerchief by day and a lantern by night, to ships passing in and out of the port of Savannah.

The statue depicts her with handkerchief, lantern and one of her beloved collidogs that alerted her whenever a ship passed.

According to mayor pro tem Frank Rossiter, Miss Martus explained her faithful greetings saying, "I was young and it was sort of lonely on the island for a girl."

Miss Martus, who never traveled beyond the boundaries of Chatham County was born Aug. 7, 1868, the daughter of a lighthouse keeper. She moved to Elba Island in 1887 where she lived with her brother, lighthouse keeper George Washington Martus until his death in 1931.

Through the years numerous legends, most of them laced with tales of romance, grew up around the "waving girl," said by her family to be "a lady of simple tastes—deeply religious."

"She waved herself into the hearts of seafarers all over the world," Rossiter said. They never forgot her, always looking for her to greet them when they passed her home, he said.

Guest speaker Rep. G. Elliott Hagan recalled childhood memories of boating trips

¹ Child Labor in Agriculture, Summer 1970, American Friends Service Committee, 160 15th Street, Philadelphia, Penn. 19102, January 1971.

when he saw Miss Martus waving from the terrace of her home. "The horn on the boat would blow and everyone would go out on the deck to wave at her when she came out," he said.

Viennese sculptor Felix de Weldon, who produced the statue, and his wife also attended the ceremonies. De Weldon said he modeled the statue on photographs of Miss Martus and attempted "to visualize her" the way he thought the sailors saw her.

Work first began in 1966 on the project spear headed by the Altrusa Club, a women's service club.

GEN. ROBERT E. WOOD: SOLDIER,
PANAMA CANAL BUILDER, AND
GREAT AMERICAN PRINCE, 1879-
1969

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Military Academy at West Point has produced many illustrious leaders but few have attained the stature in broad achievement as did the late Gen. Robert E. Wood, who was born in Kansas City, Mo., on June 13, 1879 and died in Lake Forrest, Ill., on November 6, 1969, at the age of 90.

As a student of Panama Canal history and problems, I long ago came to know the important contributions of General Wood to that majestic project, which he later described in his 1963 book published by the Encyclopaedia Britannica as a "Monument for the World."

General Wood arrived on the Isthmus in March 1905, at the time of a yellow fever epidemic and remained with the canal organization until May 1915, a period of 10 years that covered the era of construction.

During those years he experienced the resignation of Chief Engineer John F. Wallace, 1904-05; the arrival of Chief Engineer John F. Stevens, 1905-07, who rescued the canal from disaster and prepared the plan eventually adopted by the President and the Congress, and who Wood described as a "truly great leader;" the administration of Chief Engineer George W. Goethals, 1907-14, and the launching of the canal into the era operations under Governor Goethals, 1914-17. It was General Wood's service in the construction of the Panama Canal that later caused him to say that it formed a solid foundation of experience for his later career.

Among many fundamental works under Chief Engineer Stevens was the construction of commissaries necessary for supplying food and other essentials to employees. Years later in the mid 1920's the seeds planted in General Wood's fertile brain at Panama sprouted in the form of mass retail selling from stores with adequate automobile parking spaces near them, making him the originator of the modern shopping center.

In the summer, 1971, issue of Assembly, the quarterly magazine of the Association of Graduates of the U.S. Military Academy, there was published a notable obituary of General Wood prepared by

Gen. William H. Wilbur, distinguished soldier and author, and lifelong friend. When it is read one will understand why General Wilbur concluded that General Wood's life "exemplified the tenacity, judgment, vision, and honesty of George Washington, the simplicity and deep humanity of Abraham Lincoln, and the driving, whirlwind energy of Teddy Roosevelt."

After reading General Wilbur's fine memorialization of the life and career of General Wood and recalling his own association with the latter during the construction of the Panama Canal, our distinguished former colleague, Maurice H. Thatcher of Kentucky, the sole surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, wrote a splendid tribute in sonnet form, which I quote together for they should be an inspiration to the youth of our great country:

ROBERT E. WOOD: A TRIBUTE

(By Maurice H. Thatcher)

He was a man of deeds—effective, strong;
Possessed of great integrity and force;
Instinctively he sensed the right and wrong,
And always chose the first to guide his course.

He loved his home, his labors, and his tasks;
In peace and war he served his country well.

Opportunity is all a brave man asks!
His Midas-touch was wise as time will tell.

In Isthmia-land, a-many years ago
He and I, in separate roles, gave aid
To the forging of the Link which joins the flow
Of oceans twain—so long delayed.

His honors were outstanding. Grave on his tomb,
"All that he did was blest with strength and bloom!"

JANUARY 31, 1972.

[From Assembly, Summer, 1971]

ROBERT ELKINGTON WOOD

(No. 3952—Class of 1900)

Died 6 November 1969 in Chicago, Illinois, aged 90 years. Interment: Lake Forest Cemetery, Lake Forest, Illinois.

General Robert E. Wood died on 6 November 1969 at his home in Lake Forest, Illinois. He was ninety years old. He is survived by his widow, Mary Hardwick Wood; a son, Robert Whitney Wood; four daughters, Mrs. William H. Mitchell, Mrs. Calvin Fentress, Mrs. A. Watson Armour III and Mrs. Hugo V. Neuhaus; fifteen grandchildren; and thirty-five great-grandchildren.

General Wood's life exemplified sturdy moral character, great courage, leadership and intelligence. It was marked by tremendous energy and initiative, and was always coupled with modesty, generosity, and great consideration for others. He achieved outstanding success in every one of the several important fields of activity that he entered. This included the active direction of the largest private business in the world for more than a quarter of a century, a highly important contribution to the building of the Panama Canal, and outstanding service as a soldier during the Philippine Insurrection and in two wars.

Robert Elkington Wood was born on 13 June 1879, the eldest child of a family in which there were five children. He was justly proud of the fact that his father and one of his grandfathers were Captains in the Union Army during the Civil War.

Young Robert entered West Point with the class of 1900 and graduated number thirteen in that class, which graduated fifty-four.

General Wood stated to the writer on several occasions, "I owe everything I am to West Point. When I entered the Military Academy I was just a careless, undisciplined kid. At first I complained a bit about the strict regulations and the constant emphasis on obedience and perfection, but it made a man of me. It taught me discipline."

Throughout his entire life General Wood was an ardent supporter of the Military Academy and of the methods of teaching and training which made it superior to all other American schools.

Second Lieutenant Wood's first duty was in command of a cavalry troop in the Philippine Islands. He spent two years engaged in tough guerrilla fighting. When Aguinaldo's insurgents were finally subdued, Lieutenant Wood was returned to the States for duty at an isolated Army post in Montana.

Young Lieutenant Wood wanted more action than the bleak Montana plains afforded. Thus, he welcomed an opportunity to serve as an instructor at the Military Academy. At this time the question of the construction of a large ship canal through the Isthmus of Panama was the major item of public interest in our country. Young Wood resolved to be a participant in this great endeavor. His first applications for assignment appear to have been filed without great consideration, but finally his tenacity was rewarded and he was ordered to Panama.

He arrived there in the spring of 1905. At that time all the top men in the organization were civilians. (Colonel Goethals did not arrive until two years later.) The Americans had only recently taken over from the French, hence there was great disorganization. Thousands of workers were being hired; they had to be housed, fed and supervised. Wood gloried in organizing this aspect of the great undertaking.

The climate was not friendly; yellow fever, the dread killer, had not been mastered. A few weeks after Wood arrived a yellow fever epidemic spread through the American contingent. Death struck viciously and swiftly. Men who appeared in excellent health one day were dead a few days later.

In later years General Wood said, "The yellow fever epidemic was so severe that several of the top staff died; others decided to return to the States. I did not get the fever, but I was bitten by the same mosquitoes that bit my comrades."

He went on, "Anyone who stuck it out was promoted; I was promoted every month for three months, and so reached a position near the top of the organization at the very beginning of the work."

General Wood thus modestly ignored his own intelligence, leadership and capacity for everlasting drive, initiative and common sense. The record tells us that he had an amazing succession of important assignments and that he filled them all with great efficiency. These included assistant to the Chief Quartermaster, Chief of the Building Department, Chief of requisition, purchase and distribution of all supplies, Director of the Panama Railroad and Steamship Lines, and Chief of all building construction.

Something over a year after Colonel Goethals took charge, Wood was promoted to one of the most important jobs in the canal organization, i.e. Chief Quartermaster charged with all supply and commissary affairs for the project. At that time the American effort was well under way. The construction of the great concrete locks and dams had been initiated, and one of the most critical duties of the Chief Quartermaster was the maintenance of a constant flow of cement. This vital item was gulped down by the construction projects at the rate of 5,000 barrels every working day. Thus, although there were millions of dollars worth of other supplies to be procured, it may well be said that cement was the life blood of the construction job.

The maintenance of a steady flow of this essential commodity to the construction sites was difficult, as the tropical climate made it impossible to store cement on the isthmus for any appreciable length of time.

In later years General Wood enjoyed telling of the day that Colonel Goethals appointed him to be Chief Quartermaster.

When the previous Chief Quartermaster became ill and returned to the United States, everyone expected that a replacement would come from the States. But one day Colonel Goethals sent for Wood; he reported expecting to receive routine instructions. Instead Colonel Goethals with his usual bluntness said, "Wood, I am making you Chief Quartermaster. The day the supply of cement runs out, you're fired."

General Wood usually added with a twinkle, "It didn't run out."

During his ten years on the Canal, General Wood met and solved almost every possible problem of supply. He was largely responsible for the fact that the construction of the Canal, which involved the expenditure of four hundred million dollars, was successfully completed without a single taint of theft or misappropriation of government funds.

Early in the period of his service on the Canal, although he was a very busy man, Wood found time to marry Miss Mary Butler Hardwick of Augusta, Georgia. Their life together covered a period of over sixty years of love, respect and teamwork. General Wood never failed to give Mrs. Wood abundant credit and praise for her very important part in making it possible for him to live a very busy, very eventful life, one that was full of surprises, of abrupt changes, of great vision, and great achievement. He frequently expressed the idea that "the greatest success in life comes not from money, power or fame, but from a happy marriage, a happy family and a happy home."

In 1915 the Canal was completed, and Captain Wood retired under the provisions of a law which rewarded a few Army Officers who had been most responsible for the successful completion of the great task by permitting them to retire with an advance of one grade.

Major Wood's first position after retirement was with the E. I. Dupont de Nemours Co. as assistant to the Vice President. Many years later he told the writer that although he enjoyed working for Dupont and had learned much about civilian business methods, nevertheless he soon came to realize that there were a considerable number of men in top positions of the organization who were ahead of him and who were younger than he was. It looked as though he would never be able to reach the top position in the company, so he resigned. Dupont tried to keep him, told him he could name his own salary, if he would stay.

His next position was an assistant to the President of the General Asphalt Co., where he was given charge of operations in Trinidad and Venezuela in addition to supervision of manufacturing operations and mining in the United States.

Then came World War I. As soon as the United States declared war (6 April 1917), Major Wood volunteered his services to the government. The tremendous abilities and the vision that he had demonstrated in Panama were well-known. He was, therefore, assigned to an amazing succession of important, difficult jobs. The first task was to organize the Purchasing Department of the new Emergency Fleet Corporation. When this task was completed, he was promoted to Colonel of Infantry and went to France with the 42d Division (Commanded by General MacArthur). Very soon after reaching France, General Headquarters (GHQ) reached down and took him for duty on the General Staff.

Promptly thereafter he was placed in charge of the Army Transport Service. In this

assignment he directed all American port, water terminal, and shipping activities in France and England.

In April of 1918 General Goethals requested Wood's services in Washington, and he was returned to the United States where he was given the dual assignment of Acting Quartermaster General of the Army and Director of Purchase and Storage. In this position his task covered the purchase and distribution of all food, clothing and personal needs for a force of over four million men.

The new position carried with it promotion to the grade of General Officer. Wood was then only thirty-nine years old—one of the youngest men ever to be promoted to that grade in the history of our modern army.

It is difficult to overestimate the enormity of the load and responsibility that the young General was expected to carry. He was charged with the task of spending hundreds of millions of dollars to procure an amazing variety of large and small items, together with the effective distribution of all these items through commissaries spread over an area larger than that of the United States. All this was expected to be accomplished under war-time demands for immediate action, with high efficiency, and total integrity. General Wood achieved all of these difficult goals and was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal.

Upon the cessation of hostilities General Wood retired a second time; he obtained a position with Montgomery Ward as a Vice President in charge of merchandising. Montgomery Ward, like Sears Roebuck, was, at that time, solely a mail order business. While operating as a highly efficient mail order executive, General Wood studied census figures, population flow, and automobile ownership, and concluded that a drastic change was about to occur in the buying habits of the nation. He was convinced that his army experience, in organizing a vast number of commissaries, fitted him to organize and operate a large number of department stores, in which articles of good quality could be sold at minimum prices by the use of mass purchasing techniques.

General Wood spent 5 years with Montgomery Ward and repeatedly urged that a large number of retail stores be established in the path of the shifting population. An essential part of his proposal included decentralized locations with ample adjacent parking areas, the modern shopping center. Montgomery Ward turned down his idea, so General Wood resigned. That was 1924.

Julius Rosenwald, then Chairman of the Board of Sears, Roebuck and Co., promptly hired General Wood as a Vice President. The atmosphere at Sears was very much to the General's liking. Mr. Rosenwald had already established a profit sharing plan, and the company was very prosperous.

It took some time for General Wood to convince Mr. Rosenwald of the feasibility of his proposal to operate retail stores, but finally Mr. Rosenwald gave his approval, this notwithstanding the fact that practically all the top men in the Sears organization were strongly opposed to it. In later years General Wood explained, "They thought it would ruin the mail order business. I was convinced that it would not."

The General applied his tremendous capacity for hard work and his amazingly keen mind to the new project. Starting with a pilot store in a corner of the Chicago mail order plant, the new project grew rapidly. By 1929 the expansion was so rapid that stores were opened at the unbelievable rate of one store every other day. By the end of 1931 Sears retail store division had surpassed the mail order division in sales volume. It was the great success story of the American business world at that time.

A highly important part of the General's business philosophy was that an organization cannot stand still; it must grow or it

will decline. Applying this philosophy General Wood proposed, in the middle of the recession, that Sears establish an automobile insurance business. "It was quite a job," he said later, "to get the Board of Directors to appropriate half a million dollars, this in the middle of a serious depression, but they finally did, with many misgivings."

The result was a flourishing new department of the Sears business empire. By the time General Wood relinquished control of Sears, the Allstate Insurance Company had assets of over a billion dollars.

In January 1928 the retail store concept was flourishing, and General Wood became President of Sears, Roebuck. For the next twenty-six years he was the active head of the company. Those years were marked by healthy growth in the mail order business, by continual expansion of the retail store business in the United States, and by a daring expansion of the company into many countries in Central and South America.

Another triumph of General Wood's sagacity came in 1952 when he successfully entered Canada by means of a joint agreement with the most important retail chain in that country.

Simultaneously with the establishment of its great national retail system, General Wood put Sears into extensive manufacturing. Many of the articles which Sears sold were Sears conceived, manufactured by Sears, and sold to the retail customer in a Sears store.

In World War II General Wood promptly offered his services to the Government. He served as civilian advisor to the Chicago Ordnance district and its Chief of Purchasing. His major service in the war was to the Air Force as an inspector and advisor. He traveled tremendous distances, went round the world twice and spent much of his time at air stations all over the United States.

General Wood was a great merchant prince; he was also a great philanthropist, a great humanitarian, and a great patriot. Boys' Clubs all over the United States were tremendously benefited by his efforts and personal financial support. He contributed generously to civic endeavors of every kind.

The list of honors which were bestowed on the General is a measure of his achievements. He was named to the Boys' Club Hall of Fame. A Boys' Club in Chicago was named "The General Robert E. Wood Boys' Club" in his honor.

In 1950 this great American was presented with the Cunningham Award for "outstanding service in Inter-American relations." In 1952 his patriotism was recognized by the Illinois Chapter of the Sons of the American Revolution when they awarded him the annual Patriotic Service Award. Loyola University conferred an honorary degree of Doctor of Laws on him, and General and Mrs. Wood were honored as the Grandfather and Grandmother of the Year.

He received the Golden Keystone Award from the Boys' Clubs of America. This was presented by former President Herbert Hoover.

In 1954 General Wood was designated "Man of the Year" by the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry. In 1955 he was elected to the Chicago Merchandise Mart Hall of Fame. He was Honorary President of the Northshore Area Council of Boy Scouts of America, a life trustee of Lake Forest Academy, as well as of the Chicago Lyric Opera. He was designated an honorary trustee of Presbyterian St. Luke's Hospital and was made a Northwestern University Associate.

General Wood was a founding member of the Business Advisory Council. He maintained an active interest in it until his death. After his resignation from the Board of Sears, Roebuck and Co., he was named Honorary Chairman of the Board, the first person to be so honored.

The list of honors and positions of responsibility which he filled goes on and on. His judgment, vision and generosity made him a valuable addition to any governing body. Hence, he served as a director of many large corporations, banks and railroads. The scope of his activity and service is indicated by the fact that he was a Director of the Cradle Society and a Trustee of the Museum of Science and Industry, as well as of the Army Distaff Foundation.

In 1968 he was designated an illustrious graduate of West Point. This was his most cherished honor.

General Wood's standing in the business world is reflected in the statement of a prominent American industrialist. He quipped, "Three of the most important influences in American business are General Motors, General Electric and General Wood."

An almost countless list of honors is reflected in the large number of laudatory plaques which were bestowed in his memory.

Sears, Roebuck, itself, is a permanent monument to his keen intellect, his courage, tenacity and leadership. It is also a monument to his philosophy of life, and a lasting demonstration that American business can be successfully conducted by honoring the truth, and by giving a high place to the interests of the employees. General Wood once said, "Many corporations have made a few top men enormously rich; we are making 150,000 very comfortable."

The profit sharing system which the General perfected was highly effective. Many thousands of Sears' employees who had served for thirty or more years at relatively simple tasks received, on retirement, Sears' stock worth anything from forty to more than a hundred thousand dollars.

Our beloved country has lost a man of outstanding stature. His life exemplified the tenacity, judgment, vision and honesty of George Washington, the simplicity and deep humanity of Abraham Lincoln, and the driving, whirlwind energy of Teddy Roosevelt. In honoring his memory we are paying our respects to a truly great American, a loyal, worthy son of West Point, a son who measured up completely to all that such a designation may mean.

WILLIAM H. WILBUR.

COMMUNISTS PUSH FOR MILITARY SUPERIORITY

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, I want to pause for a moment to take note of the dramatic arrest of an alleged Soviet spy this week in New York. Valeriy I. Markelov was arrested by the FBI after he reportedly obtained classified documents on the United States' new F-14 fighter jet.

The 32-year-old Russian was employed as a translator in the United Nations Secretariat. He attempted to bribe an employee of the Grumman Aircraft Co. for the information on the F-14. The patriotic employee immediately informed the FBI of the request from the apparent Communist agent.

I am not contending that the Communists have launched any new international espionage effort in this country. On the contrary, it seems obvious that Soviet espionage is an ongoing effort on our shores. I do contend that this risk

by the Soviets, of such an international incident, clearly demonstrates their overwhelming desire to surpass the United States militarily. Unfortunately, these incidents are all too often buried on the back pages of our Nation's newspapers.

Gentlemen, America's military superiority is, in fact, slipping. The President has said so. Many of you have said so. Last year, an already reduced defense budget was slashed even more. The significance of the arrest of this Soviet spy clearly demonstrates that unilateral disarmament—or even partial disarmament—in the face of a treacherous enemy is insanity.

WISDOM OF THE FROG

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor commented editorially on January 20, 1972, on pending water pollution control legislation.

I would like to share the Monitor's comments with my colleagues and include the text of the editorial at this point in the RECORD.

WISDOM OF THE FROG

Scheduled to come up soon in Congress is House consideration of the water antipollution bill that passed the Senate 86 to 0 last November.

That legislation was of landmark caliber. It set up an interim goal of federal water quality standards until 1981, and a second-place goal of eliminating all discharge of pollutants into navigable waterways by 1985. In recognition of the heavy cost burden this would impose on municipalities which have been dumping raw sewage, the Senate authorized \$14 billion of federal money over the next four years. These funds would pay 70 percent of the cost of building municipal sewage treatment plants.

Industry, however, which must bear an even greater burden in cleaning up its water-polluting habits, which it has come to regard as inherent rights over the years, is fighting hard to scuttle the legislation. The House of Representatives is the scene of this battle, and the White House has come down on the side of those who would hamstring the law. (However, White House attitudes on this score may be about to change. Maurice Stans, who is about to resign as Secretary of Commerce to take over Mr. Nixon's reelection campaign funding program, has been the loudest opponent of the water bill. Rumor has it that he will be replaced by Peter Peterson, assistant to the President on international economic affairs, who may not feel the need to use environmental issues as has Mr. Stans to solidify his credentials with the business community.)

The argument, as always, centers on economics and White House officials have floated an estimate of \$100 billion over the next five years. In a trillion-dollar economy, that would amount to 2 percent annually.

This figure, however, is suspect. And one source for suspecting it is none other than Dr. Paul McCracken, until recently President Nixon's chief economic adviser. Word is being leaked to a study, headed by Dr. McCracken, of the costs of going all out to clean up the national environment. His estimate is that such a program would depress the GNP by only 0.5 percent to 0.7 per-

cent a year, between 1972 and 1976. And in the major industries studied, it would raise prices by less than 0.5 percent annually.

Doubtless there will be reams of data arguing cost estimates from both sides of this issue as the House debate wears on. The danger here is that the vital issue—that of saving the environment for the future as against exploiting it destructively for monetary gain—will be buried in numbers. As the legislators are besieged by claims and counterclaims, it is to be hoped that they might listen with their inner ear to an Indian proverb, quoted recently in this newspaper:

"The frog does not drink up the pond in which he lives."

GOVERNMENT APPEAL AGENTS

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been corresponding with an attorney in my congressional district who is concerned about the decision of the Selective Service system to eliminate the position of Government appeal agent for local Draft Boards. Director Tarr ordered that this position be eliminated effective December 10, 1971.

The position of Government appeal agent has served both local boards and individual registrants well over the years and I share the concern of my constituent. The Selective Service system proposes to substitute for the services formerly provided by these agents by the establishment of the position of adviser to registrants. The difficulty here is that the adviser position is not required of the local boards, nor is the adviser required to possess any particular qualifications for his position.

Most of the Government appeal agents who served local boards were attorneys and were eminently qualified to provide the kind of technical advice consistent with the complexity of Selective Service regulations. While the Congress and the President have made great strides in streamlining the regulatory aspects of the system no one can deny that many young men still become confused and that competent assistance should be available to them.

The following is the text of a letter which I received from the Director's office in response to my inquiries regarding the proposed change:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 21, 1972.

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CEDERBERG: Thank you for your letter of January eighteenth. I can assure you that we abolished the position of Government Appeal Agent with a great deal of reluctance.

The main reason for doing so was the strenuous opposition of the Committee on Ethics of the American Bar Association. The committee took the view that they no longer would agree to a lawyer serving both the local board and the registrant. They felt this dual responsibility placed the lawyer in such a position of conflicting interest that he no longer could carry out his professional responsibilities.

It seemed only prudent for us to take into account this opposition. After all, without the cooperation of the American Bar Association, we would encounter difficulty staffing the position. As you point out, without someone in that position we could be criticized and perhaps face defeat in the courts, something we all must strive to avoid. Thus it seemed that the upgrading of the position to Advisor to Registrants was the appropriate alternative. This is the reason that we have acted as we have.

I appreciate very much your concern for a problem that has concerned us as well.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL R. SHAW,
Legislation and Liaison Officer.

I think that it is interesting to note that, if a conflict of interest situation truly existed, it is like throwing the baby out with the bathwater to eliminate not only the conflict but to deprive the individual registrant of his right to adequate and competent assistance in his dealings with a local board. At the very least, the new position of adviser to registrants ought to be required and the appointee should be qualified.

I submit for the consideration of my colleagues two resolutions which were brought to my attention in regard to this new regulation. I believe that the concerns expressed in these statements should be considered as we move to eliminate some of the inequities and ambiguities which characterized previous selective service law. I hope that the Director will reconsider his action and move in the direction of assuring each and every young man that adequate and impartial assistance is available to him in his dealings with local selective service boards.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION

To whom it may concern:

We, the undersigned, being the Government Appeal Agents and Associate Government Appeal Agents past and present, for local Board No. 9, Bay County, Michigan, Selective Service System, do hereby express our strong opposition to the recent decision announced by the National Headquarters of the Selective Service System abolishing the positions of Government Appeal Agents and Associate Government Appeal Agents in the nationwide Selective Service Systems.

We note that no reason was given for this action which is particularly bewildering in view of statements by Arthur A. Holmes, Michigan State Director, Selective Service System, that Appeal Agents have made "important contributions" to the "effective operation of Selective Service", and expressing "the appreciation of your local board and all of our staff here at State Headquarters for your unselfish, patriotic service". Like many other Government Appeal Agents and Associate Government Appeal Agents in this country who were and are attorneys at law in private practice, we have given freely of our time, knowledge and professional ability as a gratuitous public service in assisting not only local boards but also Selective Service registrants. We believe that we, together with our fellows lawyers acting as Appeal Agents throughout our nation over the past thirty years, have provided without charge, effective advice and assistance to many thousands of Selective Service registrants who, for the most part, were unknowledgeable as to the appeal and classification rights. To deprive future registrants of this source of help is, to us, unreasonable especially since there is no cost involved to the registrant or the Federal Government.

We, therefore, jointly urge that appropriate steps be taken at once by the Federal Government to reverse this decision and to re-establish the positions of Government Appeal Agents and Associate Government Appeal Agents.

Dated at Bay City, Michigan this 8th day of December, 1971.

WENDELL G. PHILLIPS,
JOHN C. LEAMING,
SCOTT NEWCOMB,
RALPH I. SELBY,
JOHN T. MITCHELL,
GEORGE T. STERNBERG,
Attorneys at Law.

RESOLUTION OF THE BAY COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION, BAY COUNTY, MICH.

Whereas, During the past thirty years thousands of American lawyers, by presidential appointment, have patriotically and unselfishly and without pay served as Government Appeal Agents and Associate Government Appeal Agents in the Selective Service System throughout our nation; and,

Whereas, Untold numbers of Selective Service registrants have been provided, as a public service, with free, effective legal counsel and assistance by said lawyer-appeal agents regarding classification and appeal rights including the drafting and filing of appeal briefs; and,

Whereas, Over this period of some three decades said Appeals Agents and Associate Appeal Agents have in the finest tradition of the legal profession been instrumental in safeguarding registrants' legal and constitutional rights and preventing injustice as well as assisting local Selective Service boards in protecting the interest of the United States Government, thereby making valuable and important contributions to the fair and effective operation of the Selective Service System as constituted; and,

Whereas, The National Headquarters of the Selective Service System has recently advised that the positions of Government Appeal Agent and Associate Government Appeal Agent will be abolished as of December 10, 1971 with no reason being given for this decision;

Therefore, be it resolved: That the Bay County Bar Association hereby condemns said action abolishing the positions of Government Appeal Agent and Associate Government Appeal Agent as unwise, arbitrary and detrimental not only to the effective operation of the Selective Service System but also to the proper protection of the legal rights of Selective Service registrants, and,

Be it further resolved, That the Federal Government take immediate steps to rescind said action and promptly reinstate and continue the positions of Government Appeal Agent and Associate Appeal Agent, for the reasons heretofore stated, and,

Be it further resolved, That copies of this Resolution be furnished to the White House, the National Director of the Selective Service System, United States Senators Robert Griffin and Phillip Hart, Congressman Elford A. Cederberg, the Michigan State Director of Selective Service, the President of the State Bar of Michigan and the news media.

HON. WILFRED X. JOHNSON

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the passing of the Honorable Wilfred Xavier Johnson on January 31. He was

the first black man to be elected to the Connecticut General Assembly where he represented the people of Hartford with distinction for 8 years. During part of this legislative term he served as acting speaker of the house of representatives, again the first of his race to be honored.

Mr. Johnson's service to his community and country began during World War II as a member of the U.S. Army.

Though born in Dawson, Ga., in 1920, Mr. Johnson attended schools in Hartford, graduating from Weaver High School in 1939. He then attended Hillier College and the American Institute of Banking.

Mr. Johnson will be missed by the many civic and political organizations to which he contributed generously of his time and talent.

But even more, he will be missed by his wife of 23 years, Gertrude Hayes Johnson, and his five children. Their loss is great and I hope that they draw some comfort from the knowledge that their devoted husband and father gave much to them and to his adopted community.

THE TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, of all the public works projects considered throughout the history of this Nation, I am quite sure more has been recorded in the records of this body about the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway than any similar project unless it be the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Time and time again proponents of the project have proved its worth, not only to the Tombigbee Valley area but to the entire Nation. And just as often some uninformed or biased person, or group of persons, would show up and throw a delaying barrier across the way.

After years of effort, a few of us who have been in the forefront of advancing the project finally got it moving. Backed with a strong benefit-cost ratio from the Army Corps of Engineers, we enlisted and secured the powerful support of President Nixon. The President is completely satisfied that this is a sound and desirable project and has become an enthusiastic supporter of same.

The first dollar ever budgeted by a President for construction was included by President Nixon in his budget recommendations for the fiscal year 1972. Thereafter the amount recommended by the President was approved by the Congress without the slightest objection. And then the roof again fell in.

An environmental organization located in the city of New York, with no genuine interest of any kind in the project, joined by two or three citizens in the area of Columbus, Miss., filed a suit in the Federal Court of the District of Columbia to stop the project. Quite recently this suit was moved by a wise judge of the District of Columbia Federal Court to the Federal

Court of the Northern District of Mississippi. If there was any merit at all to the suit, it should have been filed there in the first place.

As regards all of the above, an interesting editorial recently appeared in the Nashville Banner of Nashville, Tenn. I include this editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

IN PERSPECTIVE

Advocates of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway are encouraged over the decision to transfer from Washington to North Mississippi the federal court suit seeking to halt permanently the construction of the 253-mile project.

U.S. District Judge Lewis Smith of Washington ordered the Environmental Defense Fund's case moved to Aberdeen, Miss. The change was sought by the Army Corps of Engineers and the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway Development Authority, of which Tennessee Gov. Winfield Dunn is a member.

Waterway advocates contended the Environmental Defense Fund took its case to Washington simply because it was shopping around for a forum to its liking. Transfer of the hearing will insure a fairer study of the waterway and will make it possible for more persons affected by the project to testify.

Because it strikes to the heart of a dispute between a small band of ecologists and a development council working to upgrade a depressed economic base, the federal suit carries national implications.

The question is: Do we preserve an area's natural state, even if it means forfeiting the opportunity to inject economic vitality into communities that are dying on the vine?

Ecological zealots contend the question is simpler than that: Do we want clean air and clean water? Of course, we want clean air and clean water, just like we want apple pie and the virtues of motherhood.

But we want a lot more. And the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway promises to be the catalyst for major economic development in an area that needs it the worst.

The president of the Tennessee River Valley Association, Barrett C. Shelton Sr. of Decatur, Ala., was in Nashville last week and put the issue in proper perspective.

"These ecologists are losing sight of the fact that people have to have jobs first. Of course we are for clean air and clean water, but we are also for industrial opportunities. We are seeking a balance in this ecological thing," he said.

Water resource programs can and should play a major role in the nation's rural redevelopment. Water programs are uniquely suited for rural revitalization.

Since the Tennessee-Tombigbee offers so much for Mid-South area, it is fitting that the court suit determining the project's fate will be heard in this area.

to be right to the point and I would like to bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

THE POLICEMAN

A policeman is a composite of what all men are . . . a mingling of saint and sinner . . . dust and deity. Cold statistics wave the fan over the stinkers . . . underscore instances of dishonesty and brutality because they are news. What that really means is they are exceptional, unusual—not commonplace. Buried under the froth is the fact that less than one half of one percent of policemen misfit that uniform. And that's a better average than among clergymen.

What is a policeman made of? He of all men is at once the most needed and the most unwanted . . . a strangely nameless creature who is "sir" to his face . . . and "fuzz" behind his back.

He must be such a diplomat that he can settle differences between individuals . . . so that each will think he won . . . but . . . if the policeman is neat, he's conceited. If he's careless, he's a bum. If he's pleasant, he's a flirt. If he's not, he's a grouch.

In an instant he must make decisions which require months for a lawyer. But if he hurries, he's careless. If he's deliberate, he's lazy.

He must be first to an accident . . . infallible with a diagnosis. . . . He must be able to start breathing, stop bleeding, tie splints and above all be sure the victim goes home without a limp, or expect to be sued.

The police officer must know every gun . . . draw on the run . . . and hit where it doesn't hurt.

He must be able to whip two men his size and half his age . . . without damaging his uniform and without being brutal. If you hit him, he's a coward. If he hits you, he's a bully.

The policeman must know everything and not tell. He must know where all the sin is and not partake.

The policeman must, from a single human hair, be able to describe the crime, the weapon and the criminal . . . and tell you where the criminal is hiding. But if he catches the criminal he's lucky . . . if he doesn't, he's a dunce.

If he gets promoted he has a political pull. If he doesn't, he's a dullard.

The policeman must chase bum leads to a dead end and stake out ten nights to tag one witness who saw it happen, but refuses to remember.

He runs files and writes reports until his eyes ache to build a case against some felon who will get dealt out by a shameless shamus or an honorable who isn't.

A policeman must be a minister . . . a social worker . . . a diplomat . . . a tough guy . . . and a gentleman. And of course he will have to be a genius, for he will have to feed a family on a policeman's salary.

Silver Medal in the Olympic games recently held in Sapporo, Japan. The eighth medal to be won by the United States was won the final day of competition by the U.S. hockey team which featured the youngest athletes of the six teams in the round-robin tournament. The U.S. hockey squad was picked to finish last in the competition, but won three of its five games including a 5 to 1 triumph over Czechoslovakia. Coach Murray Williamson described the triumph as "Unbelievable—it was a courageous performance—every kid played to the fullest of his potential." Michael Curran, the goal tender said the victory was "a storybook ending."

I offer my congratulations and best wishes for further success to Coach Williamson and his team.

REGIONAL GOVERNMENT — THE NEW FEDERAL SOVIETS BY EXECUTIVE ORDER

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Federal bureaucracy has now become so large and cumbersome that, supposedly in keeping with his commitments to restore the workings of Government closer to the people, President Nixon on February 10, 1972, signed Executive Order No. 11647, Federal Regional Councils. This Executive order appears in the Federal Register, volume 37, No. 30, for Saturday, February 12, 1972.

We now have 50 States, but the States are managed by elected officials. So, it has become necessary to redive the country into 10 new geographical divisions each to be headed by an appointed bureaucrat carrying the title of sub-cabinet status. Governors of the States are now to be insulated from the Federal hierarchy by Under Secretaries for regional councils.

In earlier remarks—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 117, part 25, pages 33523-33536—I referred to the vast powers which, without congressional approval, Executive Order 11490 placed in the hands of the President and his heads of departments and agencies over food supply, money and credit, transportation, communications, public utilities, and other facets of the lives of our people.

In a recent newsletter, commentator Don Bell in a discerning article "Executive Orders: The Broad Highway to Dictatorship" points out how through Executive orders the President can convert this Republic into a bureaucratic dictatorship.

I include Executive Order No. 11647, "Federal Regional Councils," and a portion of Mr. Bell's article following my remarks at this point:

THE PRESIDENT

EXECUTIVE ORDER 11647

Federal Regional Councils

The proper functioning of Government requires the development of closer working re-

THE POLICEMAN

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the man in uniform is important to the security of every citizen of our country. The value of a policeman is not truly known until one is needed and then he is indispensable.

The February issue of the Newsletter of the Nassau County Patrolmen's Benevolent Association contained a description of a policeman. It seemed to me

OLYMPIC MEDAL WINNER

HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleagues in the House to join with me and my constituents in honoring a young athlete who performed admirably in the recent Olympic games. The Ninth Congressional District of Massachusetts is indeed beaming with tremendous pride—one of the members of the U.S. hockey squad, Robbie Ftorek, 20, of 27 Horace Street, Needham, Mass., is the recipient of the

relationships between major Federal grant-making agencies and State and local government and improved coordination of the categorical grant system.

I have heretofore directed the Domestic Council to:

(1) receive and develop information necessary for assessing national domestic needs and defining national domestic goals, and to develop for the President alternative proposals for reaching those goals;

(2) collaborate with the Office of Management and Budget and others in the determination of national domestic priorities for the allocation of available resources;

(3) collaborate with the Office of Management and Budget and others to assure a continuing review of ongoing programs from the standpoint of their relative contributions to national goals as compared with their use of available resources; and

(4) provide policy advice to the President on domestic issues.

Furthermore, I have assigned to the Office of Management and Budget the responsibility for assisting the President in developing efficient coordinating mechanisms to implement Government activities and to expand inter-agency cooperation. Three years ago I directed that the senior regional officials of certain of the grantmaking agencies convene themselves in regional councils to better coordinate their services to Governors, Mayors, and the public.

I have now determined that the measures prescribed by this Order would assure improved service to the public.

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, it is hereby ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. Federal Regional Councils. (a) There is hereby established a Federal Regional Council for each of the ten standard Federal regions. Each Council shall be composed of the directors of the regional offices of the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Housing and Urban Development, the Secretarial Representative of the Department of Transportation, and the directors of the regional offices of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The President shall designate one member of each such Council as Chairman of that Council and such Chairman shall serve at the pleasure of the President. Representatives of the Office of Management and Budget may participate in any deliberations of each Council.

(b) Each member of each Council may designate an alternate who shall serve as a member of the Council involved whenever the regular member is unable to attend any meeting of the Council.

(c) When the Chairman determines that matters which significantly affect the interests of Federal agencies which are not represented on any such Council are to be considered by that Council, he shall invite the regional director or other appropriate representative of the agency involved to participate in the deliberations of the Council.

Sec. 2. Functions of the Councils. Each Federal Regional Council shall be constituted as a body within which the participating agencies will, under the general policy formulation of the Under Secretaries Group, and to the maximum extent feasible, conduct their grantmaking activities in concert through:

(1) the development of short-term regional interagency strategies and mechanisms for program delivery;

(2) the development of integrated program and funding plans with Governors and local chief executives;

(3) the encouragement of joint and complementary grant applications for related programs;

(4) the expeditious resolution of inter-agency conflicts and coordination problems;

(5) the evaluation of programs in which two or more member agencies participate;

(6) the development of long-term regional interagency and intergovernmental strategies for resource allocations to better respond to the needs of States and local communities;

(7) the supervision of regional interagency program coordination mechanisms; and

(8) the development of administrative procedures to facilitate day-to-day interagency and intergovernmental cooperation.

Sec. 3. Under Secretaries Group for Regional Operations. There is hereby established an "Under Secretaries Group for Regional Operations" which shall be composed of the Under Secretaries of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, and Transportation, the Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Associate Director of the Office of Management and Budget, who shall serve as the Chairman of the Group. When the Chairman determines that matters which significantly affect the interest of Federal agencies which are not represented on the Group are to be considered by the Group, he shall invite an appropriate representative of the agency involved to participate in the deliberations of the Group. The Under Secretaries Group for Regional Operations shall, consistent with the objectives and priorities established by the President and the Domestic Council, establish policy with respect to Federal Regional Council matters, provide guidance to the Councils, respond to their initiatives, and seek to resolve policy issues referred to it by the Councils. The Under Secretaries Group, under the Chairmanship of the Associate Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall be responsible for the proper functioning of the system established by this Order.

Sec. 4. Construction. Nothing in this Order shall be construed as subjecting any department, establishment, or other instrumentality of the executive branch of the Federal Government or the head thereof, or any function vested by law in or assigned pursuant to law to any such agency or head, to the authority of any other such agency or head or as abrogating, modifying, or restricting any such function in any manner.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 10, 1972.

[Don Bell Reports of Feb. 4, 1972]

EXECUTIVE ORDERS: THE BROAD HIGHWAY TO DICTATORSHIP

The Federal Register, vol. 34, No. 209, October 30, 1969, contains the full text of Executive Order 11490 "assigning emergency preparedness functions to federal departments and agencies" to be put into operation if and when the President of the United States declares a State of National Emergency.

On August 17, 1971, President Nixon did declare a State of National Emergency; but he did not order all the Federal Departments and agencies covered in his original Executive Order to go into emergency action. He did order the Office of Emergency Preparedness to set into motion a carefully prepared plan calling for what we now remember as Phase One of federal wage, price and rent controls.

By the issuance of Executive Orders he set up the machinery now known as Phase Two of the New Economic Plan.

Perhaps more important, but receiving less publicity, is the fact that Nixon, in order to make his economics dictatorship more effective and pave the way for future dictatorial plans, he divided—by Executive Order—the whole Nation into Ten Regions, to be governed from Ten Capitol Cities: Boston, New York City, Philadelphia, Atlanta, Chicago, Dallas, Kansas City, Denver, San Francisco, and Seattle.

The creation of these "Ten Provinces" has received little or no publicity; or is it generally known that if and when the President of the United States finds it expedient or necessary, he can invoke Executive Order 11490, convert this Republic into a Bureaucratic Dictatorship governed absolutely from Washington, D.C. through these Ten Regions and their Ten Capitol Cities, bypassing and ignoring all State, County, City and Local Governments!

One part of the overall plan has not yet been put into actual operation, because Congress has frowned upon the scheme and might take positive action to prevent its culmination. This has to do with the reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government at the Cabinet level. It calls for the scrapping of all Cabinet Departments having to do with domestic functions, and then creation of four new departments to take their places; these four new Departments to be administered regionally from the four regional capitals!

When this final reorganization plan is completed, know that total dictatorship is nigh.

SOVIET MILITARY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the problem of secrecy in Government is a constant source of bewilderment and vexation to which I have drawn attention on numerous occasions. As Senator FULBRIGHT has commented:

Excessive secrecy tends to perpetuate mistaken policies, and undermines the democratic principles upon which this country is founded.

It stimulates the mistrust of the public toward the actions and policies of Government and elected and appointed officials. It undermines the functioning of Congress as an effective legislative institution.

There are a number of proposals currently before Congress for changing the classification system and procedures. Hopefully some concrete action will be taken this year. A report released by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in December 1971, "Security Classification as a Problem in the Congressional Role in Foreign Policy," should be read by all who share the concern about secrecy and are searching for reform of present practices.

A recent important victory in the struggle against overclassification was achieved by the General Accounting Office in its successful effort to obtain the agreement of the intelligence community for the declassification of a previously secret GAO staff study on "Department of Defense Methodology for Assessing United States and Soviet Union Military Research and Development Efforts." At my request the GAO began last September the difficult task of processing a declassified version of their study through the labyrinth of assorted military and intelligence agencies concerned in this matter. It was a tough fight but recently the study was finally available for public distribution. The GAO is to be

congratulated and encouraged to continue to strive for maximum feasible openness.

The substance of the GAO's staff study reinforces the conclusion of the GAO's report of July 23, 1971 on the comparison of military R. & D. expenditures of the United States and the Soviet Union:

On the basis of the limited information available to us, we believe that extreme secretiveness by the Soviet Union results in data which are insufficient for a realistic measurement of its military R&D efforts. . . . Consequently, although we believe that the DOD methodology with its limited data base may be useful in indicating trends and the apparent magnitude of the Soviet Union military R&D threat, we have reservations as to its usefulness in quantifying relative efforts or spending gaps between the countries.

I was pleased to note Secretary Laird's statement in this year's posture statement that:

There may be some debate as to whether—or how much—the Soviet Union is outspending us in Research and Development.

The possibility that the Defense Department may exaggerate the Soviet military R. & D. effort should be kept in mind in considering the fiscal 1973 defense budget now before Congress which contains a billion dollar increase for U.S. military research programs. I understand that a number of studies on comparative U.S. and Soviet military R. & D. and defense spending are currently underway within the Defense Department. One may hope that it will be possible for these studies to be released soon for open examination and that DOD has in fact substantially improved its analysis and estimates.

The declassified GAO study of estimates of Soviet military R. & D. follows:

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE STAFF STUDY FOR THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. SENATE

(By the Comptroller General of the United States)

CHAPTER 3.—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE METHODOLOGY FOR ASSESSING UNITED STATES AND SOVIET UNION MILITARY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS

This is a declassified version of part II of a General Accounting Office staff study previously issued in response to a request dated April 1, 1971, from the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development, Senate Committee on Armed Services.¹ The classified version of part II of the staff study was issued in conjunction with a report dated July 23, 1971 (B-172553), to the Chairman. At the request of Representative Michael J. Harrington, a declassified version has been prepared and is being issued to all recipients of the classified part II.

This part describes and evaluates the methodology developed and the data used by the Department of Defense (DOD) to assess the current military R&D efforts of the Soviet Union relative to those of the United States. Because of the limited time available, we have been unable to review, in detail, many judgmental factors used by DOD in developing the data and in arriving at its conclusions; however, we are presenting tentative evaluations where possible.

In general the DOD methodology is designed to quantify the Soviet Union military R&D efforts in terms of their equivalents for comparison with United States efforts. First,

to accomplish this end, the intelligence community made studies of Soviet Union budgetary science data, to estimate the financial inputs into Soviet Union military R&D activities and to compare these estimates with their known United States equivalents. Second, DOD made comparative technological assessments of United States and Soviet Union weapons systems, to estimate the relative level of their technological outputs. Third, the resulting estimates of relative financial inputs and technological outputs were correlated by DOD, to test the reliability of the estimates of Soviet Union financial inputs as expressed in dollar equivalents.

On the basis of a reported correlation between the estimated financial inputs and technological outputs, the Office of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering (ODDR&E) expressed confidence in the intelligence community's estimates of Soviet Union military R&D budgets. By comparing these Soviet Union budget estimates with similar United States financial data, ODDR&E determined that the Soviet Union military R&D expenditures had been exceeding those of the United States in increasing amounts from 1968.

ODDR&E has stated that its best estimates indicate that the Soviet Union currently has an annual \$3 billion spending advantage in military R&D and that, if current trends continue in likely ways, the United States technological lead of 2 to 3 years could be reduced to zero or even minus several years (a technological lag) by 1976.

The DOD methodology and its supporting data are discussed in further detail in subsequent sections.

Estimating Soviet Union military R. & D. expenditures

ODDR&E officials reported that the U.S. intelligence community had performed studies to determine the Soviet Union's military R&D expenditures in rubles from 1950 through 1970 and to translate these ruble expenditures into their dollar equivalents. We were not permitted to review the intelligence community's supporting documentation for its determinations or estimates.

As discussed below, however, we were advised that these estimates had been derived from the Soviet Union's budgets and the intelligence community's estimates of the equivalent costs of Soviet Union efforts in military and space technology. Also our study showed that the estimates had a direct and consistent relationship with the Soviet Union series of national science expenditures based on estimated budgeted outlays.

In particular ODDR&E officials informed us that the Soviet Union military-related R&D activities were funded primarily from the classified part of the so-called all-union science budget. The all-union category refers to those science activities having national significance. The classified subcategory refers to the unitemized or secret part of the all-union category.

ODDR&E officials reported that, on the basis of an assumed conversion rate of \$2 for 1 ruble,² the classified part of the all-union science budget increased steadily from about \$5 billion in 1960 to about \$13 billion in 1968. The officials believed that expenditures of such amounts for R&D efforts would show impressive results. Since spectacular results were observed only in the areas of military weapons, space, and atomic energy, they concluded that the classified part of the all-union science budget had provided the funds for the high-priority and secret R&D activities in these areas. The officials also stated their belief that it would be difficult to find another place in the Soviet Union budget for military, space, and atomic energy R&D.

ODDR&E officials reported also that, after identifying the funding for military, space, and atomic energy R&D activities, the data were refined to separate out the civil space

program. By using a National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) formula, the Soviet Union civil space program was costed on the basis of what the United States would have to spend to duplicate the Soviet Union's civil space facilities and accomplishments. The estimates then were subtracted from the estimated funding for military, space, and atomic energy R&D activities; these activities are collectively referred to as military-related R&D. The residual is, by definition, the military R&D funds and includes R&D funding in both weapons systems and atomic energy.

Because of Soviet Union secrecy, there is presently no way to estimate R&D funding or expenditures for weapons systems under development exclusive of civil atomic energy.

ODDR&E officials acknowledged that another, more complex, analytical approach recognized the possibility that part of the Soviet Union R&D costs might be borne elsewhere in the Soviet Union budgets. They added:

"However, since most of the necessary cost does seem supportable by the All Union Science Budget, the remainder seems unlikely to amount to more than 20 to 30 percent of the total. Assuming only that the total program is 'balanced,' this remainder is likely over the years to stay at about the same percentage of the total; that is, it is likely to be proportional to the All Union Science Budget portion and thus to follow the same trends. . . . The principal advantage of this more complex model is that it makes the 'justification' . . . of some kinds of expenses somewhat easier elsewhere than merely in the All Union Science Budget. Examples are pay for military support people, general-purpose support facilities on test ranges, etc."

In view of the alleged relationship between the Soviet Union's budgets and the intelligence community's estimates of R&D expenditures, we compared the latter's estimates with the published financial and budgetary data on Soviet Union science for calendar years 1960 to 1968.³ We found that the intelligence community's estimates of total Soviet Union R&D expenditures and of the part referred to as military-related R&D had a direct and consistent relationship to the Soviet Union series of national science expenditures, as discussed below.

The outlays shown in the Soviet Union State Budget under the heading "Science" (referred to as the Soviet Union science budget) make up only 70 to 80 percent of the national science expenditures. The remaining 20 to 30 percent of expenditures are thought by many to be funded from (1) the various economic organizations' own funds, probably under contractual arrangements, and (2) other Soviet Union State Budget headings, such as "Ministry of Defense," "National economy," and "Cadre training."

As shown below the intelligence community's estimated total R&D expenditures (col. 4) are equal to total national science expenditures plus capital investments in science (col. 1 plus col. 2). The small differences may be attributed to rounding errors.

FIGURE 1.—ESTIMATED SOVIET UNION R. & D. EXPENDITURES¹

Calendar year	[In billions of dollars]		Col. 1 plus col. 2	Estimated total Soviet Union R. & D. expenditures in constant 1968 dollars ³
	Total science expenditures (budget and other expenditures) ²	Capital investment in science ²		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1960....	\$6.6	\$1.0	\$7.6	\$8
1961....	7.6	1.4	9.0	9
1962....	8.6	1.8	10.4	10
1963....	9.4	1.8	11.2	11
1964....	10.2	2.0	12.2	12
1965....	11.8	2.2	14.0	14
1966....	13.0	2.4	15.4	15
1967....	(9)	(9)	(9)	16
1968....	(9)	(9)	(9)	17

Footnotes at end of article.

[In billions of dollars]

Calendar year	Total science expenditures (budget and other expenditures) ¹	Capital investment in science ²	Estimated total Soviet Union R. & D. expenditures plus in constant col. 2 1968 dollars ³
	(1)	(2)	(3)
1969----	(9)	(9)	(9)
1970----	(9)	(9)	(9)

¹ Conversion rate: \$2 for 1 ruble.² Science Policy in the U.S.S.R., OECD, Paris: 1969, pp. 98-100.³ Intelligence community's estimates using the same conversion rate of \$2 for 1 ruble. Estimates are rounded to nearest billion for security classification purposes.⁴ Estimated, not actual expenditures from cited reference source.⁵ Not available from cited reference source.FIGURE 2.—RELATIONSHIP OF MILITARY-RELATED R. & D. EXPENDITURES TO PUBLISHED SOVIET SCIENCE DATA¹

[Dollars in billions]

Calendar year	Soviet science budget ²	Classified all-union budget		Total national science expenditures, including capital investment for science ⁴	Col. 3 times col. 4	Estimated military-related R. & D. (military, space, and atomic energy) ⁵
		Estimated ³	Percent of col. 1			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1960-----	\$4.6	\$3.2	70	\$7.6	\$5.3	\$5.3
1961-----	5.4	3.7	69	9.0	6.2	6.3
1962-----	6.0	4.2	70	10.4	7.3	7.4
1963-----	6.9	5.0	72	11.2	8.1	8.3
1964-----	7.9	5.9	75	12.2	9.2	9.2
1965-----	8.4	6.4	76	14.0	10.6	10.5

¹ Conversion rate: \$2 for 1 ruble.² These budgeted expenditures for science consist of all-union expenditures and Republican expenditures.³ Soviet Union financial data have not shown this breakdown since 1958; consequently the intelligence community's estimates were extrapolated upwards on the basis of the 1950-57 trend. The above estimates are based on applying a consistent percentage to all-union budgeted outlays in accordance with our calculations of the trend.⁴ See fig. 1, col. 3.⁵ Intelligence community's estimates stated in constant 1968 dollars.SIPRI⁴ Analysis of Estimates

In an article entitled "U.S. Estimates of Soviet Expenditures for Military Research" in the SIPRI Yearbook of World Armaments and Disarmament 1969-70, the author surmised relationships between U.S. estimates of Soviet Union military-related R&D and published Soviet Union science data similar to those reported above. The author stated:

"... Dr. Foster's estimates⁵ show a trend so close to the trend in the published Soviet science expenditure series that it must be assumed that Soviet science data have been used in their construction."

"Dr. Foster's estimates of total Soviet R&D and space expenditure can be made to equal total Soviet science expenditures (new series) if an exchange-rate of about \$2 per ruble is used. (Judging from the range of exchange rates chosen by experts, this is not an unreasonable exchange rate, and does not exaggerate the dollar equivalent of Soviet science expenditure). It therefore seems possible that Dr. Foster's estimates are drawn directly from the science expenditure data, and that the estimates of military-space R&D expenditure have been obtained simply by taking a large and rising percentage of total science expenditures and converting the estimates at \$2 per ruble (with some allowance for inflation). In this case, practically all capital investment, All-union and 'other' expenditures for science would be included in the estimates of military-space R&D expenditure."⁶

The author reported that experts who had made detailed studies of Soviet Union science data either had made no estimates or had made only rough order-of-magnitude estimates. Even those experts who made order-

Our study showed that the intelligence community's estimates of military-related R&D expenditures bore practically the same relationship to total R&D expenditures as the classified part of the all-union budget outlay bore to the total Soviet Union science budget. In noting the possibility of these relationships, ODDR&E officials stated that, assuming the Soviet Union R&D program was balanced, any additional R&D expenditures outside the science category of the Soviet Union State Budget were likely to be proportional to the all-union science budget part and to follow the same trends. The relationships are illustrated below—column 2 is to column 1 what columns 5 and/or 6 are to column 4.

Although the official exchange rate is about \$1.11 for 1 ruble, authorities generally agree that use of the official rate would seriously underestimate the magnitude of the Soviet Union R&D effort. Further, many, if not most, experts believe that a reasonable conversion rate for Soviet Union military R&D work would be from \$2 to \$3 for 1 ruble. Consequently the use of the \$2 rate may raise a question of whether it underestimates the dollar equivalent of the Soviet Union R&D effort.

ODDR&E officials, however, indicated that the exchange rate would be adjusted to match the number of identified rubles with the dollar cost estimates of observed outputs. In recognizing the possibility that Soviet Union R&D costs may be borne elsewhere than in the classified part of the all-union science budget,¹⁰ these officials observed that the dollar-to-ruble ratio depended on ruble input because the output results remained the same.

"... in analytic terms, because the output results are fixed, the dollar to ruble ratio and the fractions of the All Union Science Budget for military and space RDT&E are coupled. Knowing one determines the other; * * *"

Direct Costing of Space Program

ODDR&E officials reported that direct costing of the Soviet Union space program had reduced uncertainty about the financial inputs, including the rubles-to-dollars conversion factor, for defense and space R&D. They stated that, by looking at the more open Soviet Union space program, it was possible to compare Soviet Union budgets and results with those of the United States. The officials added that:

"The analysts could reasonably calculate what it would cost the United States to do what the Russians had done in space and consequently could get a reasonably good average conversion factor from rubles to dollars for this kind of aerospace work."

We noted that, during recent congressional testimony,¹¹ Dr. George M. Low, the then-Acting Administrator of NASA, submitted the following comments for the record.

"First, I would like to point out that we have no easy way to compare the total R&D programs of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., much less the specific elements which make them up, such as the space program; the economies of the two societies are far from parallel and we have little solid information from the Soviets about their internal program structure, objectives, on decisionmaking framework. Therefore, we have to rely on what are often subjective assessments and scattered data points for our comparisons."

"What we can say is that there appears to be a well defined long-term Soviet R&D investment policy that has been consistently followed and supported for both pragmatic and ideological reasons. An example of that policy is the trend in Soviet R&D expenditures over the past decade: * * * an increase of 325%. And this increase has come about through a steady, year-by-year build-up of the national resources devoted to R&D, rather than through a single large jump in any one year or for any one program. * * *

"In terms of their total space program, both civil and military, we believe they are investing at least as much effort as is the U.S. and probably more; one measure is their record of successful space launches which first exceeded that of the U.S. in 1968 and continues to do so through the present, when they are launching two or more vehicles to every one of ours. It seems fair to say that they are maintaining and increasing their program effort and that this effort exceeds that of the U.S. * * *

"For this comparison, I am dealing with the combined civil and military space programs of both nations; to try to differentiate between civil and military activities of

of-magnitude estimates differed among themselves by as much as 50 to 100 percent or more. The author concluded, after reviewing the available "open" literature, that "reliable estimates of Soviet military R&D expenditure cannot be inferred from Soviet science data."⁷

In commenting on the SIPRI article,⁸ ODDR&E officials pointed out that the data available to the author had consisted of published budget data and unclassified statements by various officials up to mid-1970. Nevertheless ODDR&E officials stated:

"The SIPRI conclusion that valid estimates of Soviet RDT&E [research, development, test, and evaluation] are not possible (with that data base) is probably correct. Missing data includes the dollar pricing of the space program, the quantification of technological positions with time for space and military RDT&E, the manpower and facilities cross-checks, and an appreciation of the overall magnitude of the Soviet effort."

Questionable Conversion Rates

As reported previously the dollar estimates of Soviet Union expenditures represent the conversion of rubles to dollars using a consistent exchange rate of \$2 for 1 ruble. There is no generally accepted rate, however, for converting rubles expended for R&D into their dollar equivalents—the dollars needed to buy a comparable R&D effort in the United States.

The SIPRI article stated:

"... R&D exchange rates, in current expert use, which attempt to allow for the differences in wages and other costs in the two countries, vary between \$1.30 per ruble and \$3.50 per ruble. The uncertainty of the appropriate exchange rate is such that most studies drawing on Soviet data * * * do not attempt to convert ruble estimates into dollars at all."⁹

Footnotes at end of article.

the U.S.S.R. would be speculative at best."

We were not permitted to review the intelligence community's direct costing of the Soviet Union space program. Assuming, however, that the Soviet Union civil space program is sufficiently open for reliable direct costing in dollars, we do not know how the analysts were able to determine the amount of rubles in the science budget for the civil space program to establish the conversion factor for aerospace work. Also there is a question about the extent to which a conversion factor for aerospace work is applicable to the broad range of military R&D work. Finally, regardless of how accurate direct costing of the Soviet Union space program may be, the accuracy of the residual military R&D cannot be directly costed, because not enough of the individual programs are visible to permit an accumulation of program costs that will yield a reliable total.

Technological assessment of outputs

In fiscal year 1970 ODDR&E initiated a study to compare the military and space technological outputs of the United States with those of the Soviet Union during the period 1960 to 1968; ODDR&E officials stated that 1968 was the last year for which reasonably firm intelligence data existed on Soviet Union weapons systems. The study involved technical comparisons of the two countries' space achievements and about 100 of their military weapons systems. According to ODDR&E officials, the study, by making the comparisons over a period of years, was able to time technological improvements and to estimate how many years it took the Soviet Union to reach given levels of United States weapons technology.

The study found that in 1960 the United States had a 2- to 3-year technological lead in military weapons system and was about even with the Soviet Union in space technology. The study found also that by 1968 the United States had established a 2- to 3-year lead in space technology but had only maintained its 2- to 3-year lead in weapons technology.

ODDR&E reasoned that technological leads were correlated with greater relative efforts. Accordingly its study concluded that, during the period 1960-68, the United States military R&D effort must have been roughly equivalent to that of the Soviet Union and that the United States space effort must have been 10 to 20 percent greater than that of the Soviet Union.

The technological-lead assessments which compared similar weapons systems were based on intelligence data, discussions with specialists, and subjective judgments of ODDR&E. Subjective judgments were used when the data were incomplete or controversial. ODDR&E officials stated, however, that differences, when they occurred, were seldom larger than plus or minus 1 year.

The assessments were presented in individual meetings to groups of DOD managers, weapons specialists, advisors, and operations employees. After comparisons of individual weapons systems were discussed, the United States technological positions relative to the Soviet Union were summarized into five major systems categories. The proposed summaries then were modified to better reflect the consensus of informed opinions.

ODDR&E officials reported that the summaries were not specific weighted averagings of the comparisons of the individual weapons systems but were consistent with them and correlated with broader impressions and experiences of informed persons. We had neither the expertise nor the time to independently test and evaluate the individual

or summarized technological-lead assessments.

Correlation of inputs with outputs

ODDR&E officials reported that they were able to find a clear correlation between the results of their technological-lead assessments and the estimates of the two countries' military and space R&D expenditures for the period 1960 to 1968. (See fig. 3 [Not printed in *Congressional Record*].) Recognizing that there was some question about the ruble-to-dollar conversion ratio, they added that the rate of 0.5 ruble to \$1 (or \$2 for 1 ruble) could vary as much as 20 percent (shaded area in fig. 3 represents about a 10-percent variance) and that the estimated space and military expenditures still would fit the observed hardware results.

Because the United States advanced its technological lead in the space program by several years in the period 1960 to 1968, ODDR&E reasoned that the cost of the United States space effort should have been 10- to 20-percent greater than that of the Soviet Union during the same period. Using a NASA formula the intelligence community and ODDR&E produced the following expenditure data to support this reasoning.

CIVIL SPACE EXPENDITURES

[In billions of dollars]

	United States	United States over Soviet Union				
	Soviet Union	Cur- rent	GNP defla- tor ¹	R&D defla- tor ²	Cur- rent	GNP defla- tor ¹
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1960---	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.5	-0.1	0.2
1961---	0.7	0.7	0.9	1.0	0.2	0.3
1962---	1.1	1.3	1.5	1.6	-2	4
1963---	1.7	2.6	2.9	3.2	9	1.5
1964---	2.8	4.2	4.7	5.0	1.4	1.9
1965---	4.0	5.1	5.6	6.0	1.1	1.6
1966---	5.0	5.9	6.4	6.7	9	1.4
1967---	5.5	5.4	5.6	5.8	-1	1
1968 ³ ---	5.5	4.7	4.7	4.7	-8	-8
Total	26.8	30.3	32.8	34.5	3.5	6.0

¹ Soviet Union expenditures are on a calendar year basis, using the conversion rate of \$2 for 1 ruble, and United States expenditures are on a fiscal year basis.

² Gross national product deflator.

³ Base year for use of deflators.

The above schedule shows that, from 1960 through 1968, the total United States expenditures for civil space actually exceeded equivalent Soviet Union expenditures of \$26.8 billion by about (1) \$3.5 billion, or 13.6 percent, in current dollars, (2) \$6 billion, or 22.4 percent, in constant 1968 dollars using the GNP deflator,¹ or (3) \$7.7 billion, or 28.7 percent, in 1968 dollars using a special R&D deflator.²

ODDR&E officials stated that technological-lead assessments of about 100 weapons systems visible in 1960-68 showed that the "Soviet RDT&E produced about the same number of major weapons systems prototypes at about the same rate of improvement as the U.S." Although the technological lead changed for some individual weapons systems and even for some weapons systems categories, on the average the relative positions of the two countries were found by ODDR&E to be the same in 1968 as in 1960; over the 8- to 9-year period the United States had retained its 2- to 3-year technological lead.

Since output results indicated that both countries had expended about the same effective effort, ODDR&E officials reasoned that both countries should have expended about the same amount of equivalent funds in military R&D. As illustrated by figure 3, however, the United States is estimated to have expended about \$6.5 billion, or 11 percent,

more in equivalent funds for military R&D from 1960 through 1968 than the Soviet Union. If the GNP deflator is used to express the estimated United States inputs in constant 1968 dollars, figure 3 then would show United States military R&D expenditures as exceeding those of the Soviet Union by about \$13 billion, or approximately 23 percent. If a special R&D deflator is used, the difference is \$18.1 billion, or approximately 31 percent.⁴

ODDR&E officials stated that they believed:

"... their costing estimates in both civil space and military weapons ... to be accurate to about \$1 billion per year in equivalent effort. A greater difference, over an eight-year span, should have produced measurable differences in results ... these differences do not appear to exist."

The difference of \$13 billion over the 8- to 9-year period, resulting from use of the GNP deflator, represents about \$1.5 billion a year. Use of the R&D deflator shows an even greater difference, amounting to about \$2 billion a year.

Determining relative financial inputs since 1968

ODDR&E officials state that all the preceding analyses and comparisons "really have only one purpose: to quantify the Soviet military RDT&E effort in U.S. terms and identify it in the Soviet Budget." These officials believe that proof that this purpose has been achieved is the clear correlation between the United States' and the Soviet Union's relative financial inputs and technological outputs. Therefore these officials look to the intelligence community to estimate the Soviet Union's current military R&D funding on the basis of the latter's budgetary data.

As shown below the intelligence community's estimates of current Soviet Union military-related expenditures (col. 3) show a steady increase from about \$13 billion in 1968 to \$17 billion in 1972, an annual increase of 7 to 8 percent. Its estimates of Soviet Union civil space expenditures (col. 4) show a steady decrease from about \$5 billion to about \$4 billion. Consequently its estimates for the residual military R&D expenditures (col. 5) show a sharp increase from about \$8 billion to about \$13 billion, a total increase of about 60 percent during the 4 years. ODDR&E officials state that these estimates show the Soviet Union's return to allocating R&D growth to the military sector, after a period of about 6 years (1961-67) in which growth went to the space sector.

SOVIET UNION R. & D. EXPENDITURES¹¹

[In billions]

Calendar year	Total R. & D.	Total military- related R. & D.	Civil space ²	Total military R. & D.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1968-----	\$17	\$13	\$5	\$8
1969-----	19	14	5	9
1970-----	21	16	5	11
1971-----	24	16	5	11
1972-----	24	17	4	13

¹ Conversion rate: \$2 for 1 ruble.

² In constant 1968 dollars. Rounded off to nearest billion for security classification purposes.

³ Soviet Union civil space estimates are based on a NASA formula for estimating the dollar expenditures that would be required to produce similar results. Therefore these estimates are not based on identifying ruble outlays in the Soviet Union budgets or expenditure data or on the ruble-to-dollar conversion rate.

The intelligence community's estimates of U.S. R&D expenditures since 1968 are shown below.

Footnotes at end of article.

U.S. R. & D. EXPENDITURES¹

[Dollars in billions]

Inflationary factor ²	Fiscal year	Total R. & D. ³	Total military related R. & D. ⁴	NASA space ⁵	Total military R. & D. (including military AEC) ⁶
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.000-----	1968	\$25.3	\$13.2	\$4.7	\$8.7
1.080-----	1969	24.3	11.8	3.9	7.9
1.172-----	1970	23.3	10.1	3.2	6.9
1.267-----	1971	22.5	8.7	2.6	6.1
1.267-----	1972	(9)	9.3	2.6	6.7

¹ In constant 1968 dollars.² This is the R. & D. deflator. It is used to convert current-year dollars to constant 1968 R. & D. dollars. The index basis is weighted (0.6) for changes in the cost per R. & D. scientist and (0.4) for changes in procurement costs of R. & D. hardware.³ Source: National Science Foundation (NSF). 1970 and 1971 data not for attribution until release by NSF.⁴ Source: Special Analysis Q, budget of United States 1970, p. 250, and Division of Military Affairs, Atomic Energy Commission (AEC); all columns converted (deflated) to constant 1968 dollars.⁵ Not available.⁶ Programed; not actual expenditures.

The intelligence community's estimates of Soviet Union military-related R&D accounted for 70 to 75 percent of total R&D expenditures, including capital investments in science.¹⁵ By contrast, its estimates of United States military-related R&D accounted for only 52 percent of total R&D expenditures in 1968 and for only 39 percent in 1971.

As noted previously military-related estimates include R&D for military, space, and atomic energy activities. The estimates for the United States, however, do not include all R&D in the field of atomic energy but only that part related to military applications. To have included all atomic energy expenditures, as apparently was done for the Soviet Union estimates, would have added another \$0.8 billion to \$1 billion a year to both the United States military-related R&D and the United States military R&D. In addition, we believe that the U.S. figures are understated, as reported in chapter 2, part I.

The intelligence community, having estimated both the Soviet Union and the United States military R&D efforts in constant 1968 dollars, made the following comparisons.

MILITARY R. & D. EXPENDITURES¹

[In billions]

	Soviet Union	United States	Soviet Union over United States
1968-----	\$8	\$9	-\$1
1969-----	9	8	1
1970-----	11	7	4
1971-----	11	6	5

¹ In constant 1968 dollars. Rounded off to nearest billion for security classification purposes.

The above comparisons show that the crossover in military R&D spending was estimated to have occurred after 1968. The Soviet Union was estimated to be spending approximately 50 percent more in military R&D by 1970 and 92 percent more in 1971.

Using the smaller GNP deflator and a slightly different mix of expenditure categories for estimating the U.S. military R&D expenditures, ODDR&E made the following comparisons.

MILITARY R. & D. EXPENDITURES¹

[In billions]

	Soviet Union	United States	Soviet Union over United States
1968-----	\$8	\$9	-\$1
1969-----	9	8	1
1970-----	11	7	4
1971-----	11	6	5

¹ In constant 1968 dollars. Rounded off to nearest billion for security classification purposes.

ODDR&E officials report that the uncertainty in the rate of increase of the Soviet Union effort compared with the United States effort is due largely to the present uncertainty of how inflation affects the two countries. They report also that the ruble generally is assumed not to inflate due to the Soviet Union system of controlled prices and wages; however, they have stated that:

"* * * The choice of the deflator for the U.S. effort * * * does affect the conclusion of how much difference there probably is between the Soviet effort and the U.S. effort in 1971. * * * [Use of current-year dollars] leads to the smallest difference between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. in 1971 but is hardest to justify on economic grounds. The R&D deflator leads to the maximum difference but implies that there is no inflation in the Soviet R&D sector. The GNP deflator would seem to account for the differences in the general U.S. and Soviet economic systems and would imply no inflation in Soviet RDT&E relative to the general Soviet economy comparable to that of the U.S."

"Hence, the general conclusions * * * that the Soviet RDT&E effort in 1971 is probably (at least) \$3 B [billion] more than that of the U.S."

Manpower, Facilities, and Prototypes

ODDR&E officials state that the increasing difference in the two countries' military R&D efforts should be consistent with the differences in employed manpower, facilities being used, and numbers of weapons systems brought to the prototype stage. They add that these effects are now under study but that it takes time before such differences become clear and apparent.

ODDR&E has cited the following statistics, over the past 2 years, to illustrate the developing differences in manpower between the two countries.

	Engineering and natural science graduates ¹	Full-time R. & D. scientists in 1969 ^{2,4}	Number of engineers and scientists employed in R. & D. in 1968 ^{2,4}
	1960 ³	1970 ³	
Soviet Union-----	145,000	247,000	550,000
United States-----	83,000	142,000	540,000
			\$515,000

¹ Mathematics, physics, and chemistry.² DOD fiscal year 1972 posture statement on R. & D.³ DOD fiscal year 1971 posture statement on R. & D.⁴ Apparent conflict may be due, in part, to differences between full-time equivalents and numbers employed. When used alone the term "scientists" apparently includes engineers.⁵ Reference (NSF) cited by O.D.D.R. & E. shows 565,000.

The above manpower statistics, however, need further study and analysis before they will be particularly meaningful. For example, the OECD publication of 1969 commented that:

"* * * Soviet engineering graduation figures are considerably inflated by the addition of extension-correspondence and evening school graduates, who in many years comprise over 40 percent of the engineering

graduates. * * * Soviet annual engineering graduation statistics have to be viewed with a somewhat jaundiced eye."

The numbers of scientists and engineers cannot be considered separately from their (1) particular skills, (2) allocation or utilization, and (3) productivity.

In regard to productivity ODDR&E officials report that recent studies performed by the Department of the Navy and by the Department of the Air Force, Foreign Technology Division indicate that the Soviet Union is continuing to improve the quality and the quantity of its major research facilities. They report also that the United States is not making similar improvements and is not effectively using its existing R&D facilities.

As to differences in numbers of new weapons systems brought to the prototype stage, ODDR&E predicts that, starting about 1971, we can reasonably expect several technological surprises from the Soviet Union. Officials explain that Soviet Union decisions concerning the use of the additional moneys normally precede the conspicuous testing of the resulting prototypes (or their presence in the Moscow May Day Parade) by 3 to 4 years. They add that it frequently takes several more years before critical aspects of prototypes are understood enough to assess their advanced technologies.

In summary ODDR&E officials noted that the comparative manpower and facilities "data is in rather raw, unstructured form, and as a consequence has been used to support, not determine our conclusions." They explained that the data had been used as a cross-check to help answer the question of whether the Soviet Union had committed the other assets, in addition to funding, needed to produce increased military and space R&D results.

Projecting R&D Expenditures Through 1976

After estimating current R&D efforts, ODDR&E projected the military R&D funding for both countries from 1970 to 1976. For the United States ODDR&E stated that it had used simply the fiscal guidance numbers provided by the Office of the Secretary of Defense planning system. For the Soviet Union ODDR&E considered three possible alternatives.

1. Project, in a simple straight line, the trend developed over the past 20 years. This would result in annual increases due to (a) a steady 5-percent increase in GNP each year and (b) an increasing portion of GNP devoted to military R&D.

2. Peg future increases to the 3 percent of GNP that existed in 1970. This would produce annual increases resulting from the steadily growing GNP.

3. Freeze funding at the 1970 level of \$10.5 billion.

ODDR&E chose to define "base line Soviet Strategy" as a \$10.5 billion annual military RDT&E effort from 1970 and 1971 onward. Consequently ODDR&E believes that, if the United States stays within its fiscal guidance, the Soviet Union will be investing about \$3 billion more a year in equivalent effort. Under these circumstances ODDR&E reasons that an annual Soviet Union expenditure of \$10.5 billion not only is the most conservative alternative but also is both attractive and practicable to Soviet Union planners. It would allow them to assign future R&D growth to the civilian section and, according to ODDR&E, to still reach military technological supremacy by the mid-1970's.

Summary and conclusion

ODDR&E contends that the Soviet Union is exerting relatively greater efforts than the United States is in the area of military R&D. ODDR&E is convinced that this crossover occurred in 1969, the first year of a decreas-

ing U.S. military R&D budget. To demonstrate the crossover and to communicate its mental model for comparing the two countries' past military R&D inputs with their outputs and for projecting possible future outputs on the basis of present and possible future resource inputs.

We found that extreme secretiveness by the Soviet Union resulted in data insufficient for realistic estimates of its military R&D efforts. At best, dollar valuations of Soviet Union military R&D programs are only rough guides to the Soviet Union's relative level of effort. In our opinion the general technological assessments can provide only general support for these rough guides; they cannot refine them. Consequently we believe that the usefulness of the pioneering methodology with its limited data base may be to indicate trends and the apparent magnitude of the Soviet Union military R&D threat. We have reservations, however, as to the usefulness of this methodology in quantifying relative efforts or spending gaps between the two countries.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Part I provides an introduction to the study and an analysis of U.S. military-related research and development (R&D) expenditures.

² Conversion rate used by the intelligence community to provide an appreciation of the physical size of the budgeted program by showing the level of effort—measured in dollars—that would be required to reproduce the Soviet Union programs in the United States. Dollar values derived in this way are expected to provide the basis for comparing United States and Soviet Union programs.

³ *Science Policy in the U.S.S.R.*, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Paris: 1969, pp. 95 to 107.

⁴ Stockholm International Peace Research Institute.

⁵ Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., Director of Defense Research and Engineering, estimates of military-space R&D expenditures.

⁶ *SIPRI Yearbook of World Armaments and Disarmament 1969-70*, pp. 303 to 305.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 289.

⁸ Response dated May 26, 1971, to questions raised by Representative Michael J. Harrington.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, *SIPRI Yearbook of World Armaments and Disarmament 1969-70*, p. 305.

¹⁰ See p. 4.

¹¹ Hearings before the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences on "Space Cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union," 92d Cong., 1st sess., March 17, 1971, p. 29.

¹² U.S. estimates in fig. 3 are stated in current dollars. A prime uncertainty in describing the U.S. level of effort over the 9-year period is the need to convert current dollars to constant dollars to avoid the effects of inflation. The GNP deflator, which uses the fiscal year 1968 dollar as its base, applies to the economy as a whole—all final goods and services produced in the Nation during a year.

¹³ The R&D deflator applies to R&D hardware and services. Methodology was derived from "Defense Planning in a High Inflation Economy," a paper by J. H. Augusta and C. L. Snyder, Jr., presented at the 26th Military Operation Research Symposium, Monterey, California, November 1970.

¹⁴ For ODDR&E officials' comments on the use of the deflators, see p. 24.

¹⁵ Non-military-related R&D expenditures include:

a. All-union civil R&D which is the itemized portion of the all-union budgetary outlays and expenditures for science. ODDR&E officials believe that this accounts for 15 to 20 percent of the all-union expenditures or 12 to 18 percent of the total State Science Budget.

b. Republican R&D which finances research having a local, as opposed to national, significance. In 1965 the Republican budget was about 12 percent of the total State Science Budget.

c. Proportional share of capital investments in science.

THE STRANGLING OF URBAN AMERICA

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, every major American city is strangling to death on the automobile. No evasion by any group of corporate apologists can deny or disprove this fact. Autos are larger than ever, more unsafe than ever and pollute more than ever. Rather than having urban conditions cater to individual citizens, our cities are being molded to suit even larger numbers of cars. As a result, the quality of urban life is appreciably deteriorating before our very eyes on an almost daily basis. I submit that this state of affairs is intolerable and must come to an end swiftly, or else we shall preside over the demise of urban America, with all its attendant consequences.

An alternative can and must be provided. Such a solution is available immediately in the form of updated mass urban transit. Other nations have turned to such a choice, with significant success, notably Japan, with her high speed trains between cities. It certainly is within our grasp to bring such systems into being.

Let us commence from one premise. Cities and States cannot afford to maintain, much less bring into being, such systems of transportation. Their cost is prohibitive. Only the Federal Government can attempt such an undertaking with any expectation of success over the long run.

Every western nation that is industrially developed has nationalized such systems. To leave them in private hands is to invite continual abuses of the sort that prevail in the Nation's Capital. A glance at the transportation chaos prevailing is enlightening. Private parking lot operators reap a harvest, while the poor and those of modest means, who are dependent upon mass transit, are milked and milked again to fill the coffers of a mismanaged and exploited enterprise. To repeat this on a national basis in a hundred major cities is to invite national calamity.

Urban mass transit, therefore, to be successful, must be federally backed and owned by other than private interests. It must take this form in order to remain within reach of the average working person. Nor should society expect it to return a profit. Visits abroad to foreign capitals yield astonishing revelations in the mass transit area.

In Moscow, the Russians put us to shame with their subway. The same is true in Paris. Montreal started from scratch and created a clean, fast, and quiet subway system we would do well

to emulate. Everyone has been able to solve this problem but the United States of America.

While all this goes on abroad, here at home our cities continue to clog up. The air grows ever more polluted. Parking lots bulge. Fees go up. Commuting becomes an omnipresent and menacing nightmare for scores of millions of people. The time has come to cut the gordian knot.

A combination of high speed trains, subways, and buslines is the answer. Simultaneously, programs making it unattractive for individual commuters to bring private cars into the heart of our major cities should be developed. It is ridiculous and frustrating to allow hundreds of thousands of autos to migrate daily into the cities carrying single drivers. If the private parking lot operators find this proposal difficult to accept, then so be it.

The transit industry itself is either unable or unwilling to emerge with a solution of any sort. We cannot tolerate a system or series of systems which are, by their own admission, bringing less and less service to fewer people at an ever greater cost. Pressures build up, particularly in the inner city, because of the lack of just such an elementary service as mass transit.

How can we expect the average working American to pour upwards of \$10 weekly into a fare box. It is also a well-proven fact that every time a fare rise is allowed, the result is fewer riders. In New York, the hiking of such fares will result in intolerable public reaction.

Yet every motorist and user of vehicles in the Nation contributes user taxes to the Highway Trust Fund, which is swollen with billions of dollars in surpluses. The Federal Interstate Highway System has been largely constructed with these funds. While I certainly can understand the desire and need of nonurban areas for these roads, the massive urban areas have no need for them and a growing reluctance to continue subsidy of such undertakings. This is particularly true of situations where their own tax moneys in the fund are utilized to blast speedways through established city neighborhoods, ruining living patterns and doing a special kind of violence to city dwellers.

Tapping the Highway Trust Fund for mass urban transit or setting up a similar type of fund for that same purpose is the answer. In this manner, massive, long-term funding can be arranged and guaranteed. Another method which would complement this alternative would be federally guaranteed mass transit bonds. Individual cities could float such bond issues through normal channels for undertakings of this sort, with a Federal guarantee for their payment. Major institutions utilizing urban environments for daily functions would have a vested interest in purchase of such bonds. Every major metropolitan area in the Nation would be able in such a manner to make a start toward answering its mass transit dilemma.

The Federal Government has bailed out big business in recent times. Shall we not place major cities in the same category in terms of eligibility for assistance

in the form of Federal guarantees for mass urban transit financing?

In each corporate case, several hundred thousand Americans were involved and dependent upon the survival of the industry. In the situation of mass urban transit, 90 percent of the American people are involved. That is the percentage of our citizenry now concentrated on 1 percent of our land area. Suburbia rises or falls on the survival and continued economic viability of large cities. Suburbanites must hearken to the cry and plea of our cities. The two are inextricably intertwined, like two men bound together and thrown overboard. If they do not learn to swim together for mutual survival, then both will perish together. So suburbia cannot complacently stand aside, fold its collective arms and label this the crisis of the cities alone.

Today the Federal Government makes available billions of dollars in subsidies to a variety of interest groups. Everyone has a place at the Federal trough for one subsidy or another. Farm subsidies alone consume a big bite of the taxpayer's dollar. The oil industry receives privileged tax treatment. The list is virtually as long as there are interest groups plying their trade in Washington. Is not it time that the poor average man or woman who wants to get somewhere across a metropolitan or suburban area with some regularity receives a similar break?

HISTORY OF THE LITHUANIAN PEOPLE

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks a glorious day in the history of the Lithuanian people. This date marks the anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania in 1918; a Republic which expresses the high qualities of becoming a modern sovereign state with the ability to govern itself as an independent nation.

But that Republic only lived 22 years. It was destroyed when the Soviet troops invaded and occupied Lithuania in June of 1940. Since then the Lithuanian people have been forcefully placed under Soviet rule.

To this day Soviet aggression against Lithuania and its subsequent illegal annexation has been condemned and recognized as invalid by many nations of the world. Nevertheless, for more than three decades the Lithuanian people have been subjected to an alien and suppressive rule, which has violated many of the universally recognized rights of men and nations: the right to national self-determination, freedom of religious worship and opinion.

For many years the violations of human rights in the Soviet Union have been hidden through the strict isolation of the Soviet people from the rest of the world. Since June of 1940, hundreds of

thousands of Lithuanians have been herded into trains and forced to travel for days without water or food. The result was the death of hundreds, mostly from starvation. Those who managed to survive were left in arctic Siberia to work against unbearable odds.

The people of Lithuania had never experienced such extermination and annihilation. Since that dreadful day in June 1940, Lithuania has lost more than one-fourth of her population.

Mr. Speaker, for too long too many people throughout the world have been unaware of what really happened to the people of Lithuania. The Kremlin is fond of saying that Russian imperialism died with the czars. But the fate of Lithuania has shown this to be a cruel fiction.

The Communists did not come to power in Lithuania by a legal or democratic means. It was only after the Soviet Union with the help of Nazi Germany divided up Poland in 1939, that the Kremlin leaders decided to send troops into Lithuania. The following year Lithuania was annexed by the Soviet Government without plebiscite of the people.

In one of history's greatest frauds, elections were held under the Red Guard's supervision. The Kremlin then stated that the people of Lithuania voted to join the Soviet empire.

During the last 32 years, the Lithuanian freedom fighters have waged an intensive fight for freedom. During this time the Lithuanian people have risen time and time again to express their true feelings toward the Soviet Union. About 50,000 Lithuanian patriots have lost their lives as a result.

The hypocritical gesture shown here by the Soviet's occupation of Lithuania is further proven by a statement from the "Collected Works of Lenin":

Any incorporation of a small and weak nation into a larger or stronger state without the definite, clear and voluntary desire to that effect of that nation... especially if this nation is not accorded the right to decide the problem of the form of its political existence by a free vote—implying the complete withdrawal of the troops of the incorporation is an arbitrary appropriation of a foreign country, an act of violence.

Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanians have in no sense implied a willingness to join the Soviet empire. The actions of the Lithuanian freedom fighters have proven contrary to Soviet claims. No ideology screen can hide this obvious reality.

For once the Soviet Union should abandon its double standard and start to apply their resolutions on self-determination and colonialism to the people they dominate.

At a time when the Western powers have granted freedom and independence to many nations in Africa, we must insist that the Communist colonial empire likewise extend freedom and independence to the people of Lithuania so that they may too enjoy the freedom which Western nations enjoy.

Lithuanians are proud people and it has taken remarkable spiritual and ethnic strength to survive the pressures placed on them by this Communist regime. Only the people of Lithuania know the heartaches and suffering which they

have endured since they were unlawfully and illegally subjugated to the Communist dictatorship in Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, I once again urge our Government to renew greater efforts for the restoration of freedom and independence to those freedom-loving people who are looking to us for support so that they may, once again, live a life of freedom in their homeland.

The Lithuanian-American organizations deserve our support in commemorating their anniversary during this month.

In observing this anniversary, we express our concern and desire for liberty to those oppressed people of Lithuania with assurance to their descendants in America that we have not forgotten.

CBS DIGS DEEPER HOLE

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly a year since the nostrils of America's television audience were choked with the stench of the irresponsible, politically curious presentation disguised by the title, "The Selling of the Pentagon."

The odor has never faded as is witnessed by the most recent analysis published by Accuracy in Media, an independent organization which will not let the truth die.

And after 1 year of squeamish, pusillanimous explanations by the Columbia Broadcasting System, the truth continues to emerge. The following speaks for itself:

[From AIM Bulletin, Feb. 1, 1972]

CBS REPLIES TO CRITICS' QUESTIONS ABOUT "THE SELLING OF THE PENTAGON"

February 23 will mark the anniversary of the first showing of the CBS controversial documentary, "The Selling of the Pentagon." Claude Witze of the *Air Force Journal*, Congressman F. Edward Hébert, Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and Accuracy in Media were among the severest critics of this program. On March 20, 1971, AIM sent a 7-page letter to Richard S. Salant, President of CBS News, asking for his comment on many inaccuracies or questionable points in the documentary. In our letter to Mr. Salant, we said that we agreed with a statement made by Roger Mudd in the broadcast, which said: "Nothing is more essential to a democracy than the free flow of information. Misinformation, distortion, propaganda all interrupt that flow." AIM said that "The Selling of the Pentagon" contained a great deal of misinformation and distortion. We wanted CBS to clear up the disputed points as quickly as possible.

CBS PROMISES COMPREHENSIVE REPLY

On March 29, 1971, Mr. Salant replied to AIM saying that he had decided to wait for the myriad of complaints and charges to accumulate and then prepare a comprehensive analysis. He said: "When this analysis is completed and at such time as we determine its release is appropriate, I will include you on our distribution list."

Many months passed and no reply to the questions was forthcoming. AIM raised this with CBS from time to time. We urged our

supporters to write to CBS to prod them into releasing the promised analysis. Finally, in December 1971, CBS informed us that we could find the long-awaited analysis in the Congressional Record for December 15 and December 17, beginning on pages E 13493 and E 13697. There was no press release, no announcement that CBS had met its critics head-on and had shown them to be wrong. No copy of the reply was sent to the principal critics. We all had to look it up in the Congressional Record, where it had been inserted by Congressman Ogden Reid, who said he obtained it from the president of the Radio-Television News Directors Association. The press has completely overlooked this latest word in the great controversy over the CBS documentary. It appeared that that was precisely what CBS wanted. The less publicity the better.

CBS ADMITS A FEW ERRORS

CBS does not claim to be infallible, but AIM's experience is that it will rarely admit an error. Mr. Salant appeared on TV on the night of March 23, 1971, to reply to the critics of "The Selling of the Pentagon." He said: "We are proud of 'The Selling of the Pentagon' and CBS News stands behind it." He said they could refute every charge of the critics who had appeared on the air—Cong. Hébert, Secretary Laird and Vice President Agnew. Nine months later, in the statement quietly slipped into the Congressional Record CBS admitted that not all of the criticisms could be refuted. For CBS that was quite an admission. That was why they sought no publicity for their statement, we believe.

CBS now actually concedes that five points of criticism were to some extent justified. It admits that the editing of one of the answers Assistant Secretary of Defense Henkin gave to a CBS question might not have conveyed accurately what Mr. Henkin actually said. CBS also admits that it was wrong in saying of defoliated areas that "nothing will grow there any more." It agrees that it should have mentioned that one of the Pentagon films it criticized was actually produced by CBS. CBS also concedes that it greatly exaggerated the number of offices in the Pentagon, and allows that it should not have used language that implied that it had to track down the Industrial War College team that was putting on a National Security Seminar in Peoria, Illinois.

In addition to these admissions of error, CBS makes *de facto* admissions of error in two other cases. In the broadcast, CBS had said that a still unpublished report of the prestigious 20th Century Fund had estimated real total spending by the Defense Department on public affairs at \$190 million, compared with the budget figure of \$30 million. CBS now concedes that the report of the 20th Century Fund had been published at the time the broadcast was made and that it contained no such figure. CBS tries to wriggle out of this embarrassing situation by showing that such a figure was used in some of the research done for the study. However it was also clear that the figure was not used in the published study precisely because it could not be verified and the 20th Century Fund quite properly would not accept it as valid. CBS was therefore both wrong and unethical in foisting off such a figure on its unsuspecting audience and using the prestige of the 20th Century Fund to authenticate it.

The second *de facto* admission of error relates to the CBS charge that Pentagon expenditures on public affairs in 1971 were ten times the 1959 level. CBS now admits that the 1959 figure for public affairs expenditures was not comparable to the 1971 figure because different definitions for "public affairs expenditures" were used in these two years.

ARE THE ADMITTED ERRORS SERIOUS?

Yes. Three of them are quite serious. The improper editing of the Henkin interview,

which CBS now concedes, was one of the objects of the heaviest attacks of the critics of the documentary. For example, Martin Mayer in the December 1971 issue of *Harpers* magazine said this about the editing of the Henkin interview: "This episode shows at least subconscious malice, a desire by the producers of the program that the man in charge of the Pentagon selling apparatus look bad on the home screen." Reed J. Irvine, writing in the August 10, 1971 issue of *National Review*, said that in editing the Henkin interview, CBS did more than make Mr. Henkin look bad. He stated in his reply to one of CBS's questions his justification for spending public money to inform the public of the reasons why we need national defense. Since CBS was clearly out to prove that such expenditures were wasteful, the mangling of the Henkin interview was necessary to make sure the viewers were not provided with any effective counter-arguments to the point CBS wanted to make.

CBS, of course, does not go very far in admitting that it might have done better by Mr. Henkin. Discussing the transposition of answers that Mr. Henkin gave to incorporate them as parts of answers of different questions, CBS says: "Upon review, one might judge that a fuller answer could have been broadcast by including, in the composite answer, the second sentence of the 'original' answer . . ." CBS concedes that editing involves subjective judgments and that others may disagree with the judgments of CBS. It insists, however, that in editing the Henkin interview its intent was to condense and clarify, not to deceive. The admission that it might have done better by Mr. Henkin is limited and grudging, but it is a step forward from the previous insistence by CBS President Frank Stanton that the editing was completely fair.

The two errors cited above relating to the amount of money the Department of Defense spends on public affairs are serious because in the documentary CBS placed a great deal of emphasis on the amount of money being spent on these activities. It used the false \$190 million figure in comparison with the combined news budgets of the three commercial television networks, showing a graph on the TV screen that told the viewer that the Department of Defense spent more to tell its story to the people than all three networks spent to bring them the news. The exaggeration of the size of the Pentagon expenditures at the beginning of the program helped establish the important nature of the subject of the documentary.

The other three admitted errors are significant in that they cast light on the bias and carelessness of CBS. The bias is clearly shown in the incorrect description of the results of defoliation in Vietnam. The truth could easily have been ascertained by CBS, but it would not have been so dramatic. The exaggeration of the number of offices in the Pentagon by a factor of 6 shows the same kind of bias, as does the implication that CBS had to "find" the Industrial War College lecturers. The criticism of the film, "Road to the Wall," would have been blunted if CBS had correctly attributed its production to CBS rather than to the Pentagon.

THE ERRORS CBS REFUSES TO ADMIT

The purpose of the CBS reply is not to admit and apologize for errors in *The Selling of the Pentagon*, although that is grudgingly done in a few cases. Rather, CBS set out to show that the critics, not CBS, had erred. Thus the reply is mainly an effort to rebut the numerous criticisms made of the documentary. In addition to the points already discussed, the CBS reply takes up the following criticisms:

(1) The editing of the remarks of Col. John MacNeil, which involved creating a synthetic statement from widely separated sentences in his speech;

(2) The circumstances surrounding the

appearance of the Industrial War College lecture team in Peoria, Ill., especially whether or not the visit was arranged by Caterpillar Tractor Co.;

(3) Whether or not the IWC lecturers violated regulations in discussing foreign policy;

(4) The accuracy of the statement that the Pentagon "used" sympathetic Congressmen to interview military heroes such as Maj. James Rowe to counter anti-war reporting;

(5) The charge that CBS used false pretenses to obtain a tape of the interview of Maj. Rowe by Congressman Hébert;

(6) The charge that CBS falsely suggested that the Pentagon spent about \$12 million a year on films to be shown to the public;

(7) The charge that CBS gave a misleading impression about a film narrated by Robert Stack;

(8) The charge that CBS implied that an expensive war game was staged for the benefit of a few VIP civilians;

(9) Charges that CBS selectively edited a film of a press briefing by Jerry Friedheim to make it appear that he was unresponsive to newsmen's questions;

(10) ditto for a Saigon news briefing; and

(11) Charges that CBS gave a wrong impression in saying that the U.S. had resumed bombing of North Vietnam.

CBS refuses to admit that there was merit to any of these charges, but in every case its refutation is weak and unconvincing.

(1) CBS justifies creating a synthetic statement and putting it in the mouth of Col. John MacNeil on the ground that each of the sentences used was actually said by Col. MacNeil and their meaning was not altered. It admits that one of the sentences was taken out of chronological order, but it does not mention that this is contrary to the CBS Operating Standards for News and Public Affairs, which state that this kind of transposition must not be done without informing the audience. This rule was adopted in June 1971, after the controversy about *The Selling of the Pentagon*. But if CBS says that there was nothing wrong with this kind of transposition in *The Selling of the Pentagon*, we wonder how seriously CBS intends to enforce its new regulation.

The same point can be made about the editing of the Henkin interview, which also involved clear violations of the rules against the transposing of answers to questions without giving an indication of this to the audience. In its discussion of the editing of the Henkin interview, CBS makes no mention of the fact that the editing was clearly contrary to the rules later adopted.

These are the most obvious criticisms to be made of the CBS defense of its editing of the MacNeil speech and the Henkin interview. CBS is actually dishonest in suggesting that there was no significance to the fact that it took a sentence out of proper chronological order to begin the synthetic statement it created for Col. MacNeil. The sentence was: "Well, now we're coming to the heart of the problem, Vietnam." This was then followed by a statement the colonel had made about Thailand and two sentences that he had quoted from the Premier of Laos concerning Southeast Asia. The latter two sentences were taken so completely out of context that they were not shown as quotations at all in the CBS synthetic statement.

Why was it necessary to introduce statements about Thailand, Laos, Cambodia and other Southeast Asian countries with the statement on Vietnam which CBS took out of its proper order? CBS did this for the very good reason that it wanted to lead into Col. MacNeil's synthetic statement with this: "The Army has a regulation stating: Personnel should not speak on the foreign policy implications of U.S. involvement in Vietnam." It would appear that CBS wanted to create the impression that Col. MacNeil was speaking in violation of that regulation. The easiest way to do this was to lead off the synthetic statement created for him with a

sentence taken out of order. CBS seems not to understand the meaning and importance of context. If it can still say that what it did to Col. MacNeil's statement was fair editing, then no one's words are safe with CBS.

(2) CBS described the National Security Seminar given by the Industrial War College in Peoria, Ill., this way: "The Pentagon has a team of colonels touring the country to lecture on foreign policy. We found them in Peoria, Ill., where they were invited to speak to a mixed audience of civilians and military reservists. The invitation was arranged by Peoria's Caterpillar Tractor Co., which did \$39 million of business last year with the Defense Department."

Every one of these sentences was challenged by the critics. The team did not come from the Pentagon, but from the Industrial War College. In addition to colonels, it included a Navy captain and a State Department civilian. The seminars cover 33 topics, including foreign policy, and they are given each year in seven locations throughout the country, primarily for the benefit of military reservists. They were invited to Peoria by the Association of Commerce of Peoria, which shared sponsorship with the 9th Naval District.

CBS, in a lame rejoinder, justifies its phrase, "a team of colonels," by asserting that the Navy captain is equivalent to a colonel and the State Department civilian was a reserve Lt. colonel. It does not explain why it called this a "Pentagon" team rather than identifying the responsibility of the Industrial War College (Industrial College of the Armed Forces), but it justifies the misleading term by saying that the military officers are all subject to the authority of the Pentagon. It admits that it should not have said it "found" them in Peoria. It admits that the team lectures on many subjects other than foreign policy, but it defends the misleading statement by saying that the broadcast did not say the team lectured *only* on foreign policy. Presumably if the listeners inferred that, that was their mistake.

CBS says it was justified in saying that Caterpillar arranged the invitation, because an official of Caterpillar was co-chairman of the committee that arranged the seminar and they were told that he and his associates were very helpful "in heading up the committee and making all the necessary arrangements." CBS would apparently have us believe that anything an employee of a company does, including civic activities, can be attributed to the firm that employs him.

(3) CBS accused the lecturers for the Industrial College of the Armed Forces of violating military regulations in discussing foreign policy implications of Vietnam. It was criticized for not pointing out that the talks given by these speakers had been cleared not only by Defense but by the State Department. The Assistant Secretary of Defense says this is all the regulations require. CBS insists that the talks violated regulations, no matter who cleared them. Since national defense and foreign policy are frequently intertwined, it would seem clear that the Departments of Defense and State are in a better position than CBS to determine whether or not a speech runs counter to government regulations and policy.

(4) CBS was charged with having falsely suggested that friendly Congressmen, specifically Cong. F. Edward Hébert, had been "used" by the Pentagon in broadcasting interviews that they had made with Maj. James Rowe. This was vigorously denied by Cong. Hébert, who denied that the interview with Maj. Rowe was produced at the suggestion of the Pentagon or that the broadcast to his home district involved the use of Pentagon funds. This could easily have been the inference drawn by those who heard the CBS statement. CBS says the program did not say that the Pentagon produced the Hébert-Rowe interview or that it was the Pentagon's idea.

However, it undermines this denial by stressing that Cong. Hébert thanked the colonel who served as liaison with the House Armed Services Committee for bringing Maj. Rowe to him. They do not seem to consider that Cong. Hébert might have asked the colonel to bring Maj. Rowe, who was famous for surviving five years of captivity as a VC prisoner and who successfully escaped, to see him. While denying that it meant to imply what it implied, CBS persists in conveying the same unfair implication.

(5) Cong. Hébert charged that CBS obtained the tape of his interview with Maj. Rowe by telling his office that it wanted it in connection with a documentary it was doing on prisoners of war. CBS denies this, saying that it was public knowledge that it was doing a documentary on public information activities of the Department of Defense at the time it obtained the Hébert tape. CBS asserts that no one on its staff ever represented that the tape it wanted from Cong. Hébert was to be used for a POW documentary.

On the contrary, says CBS, they said they wanted the film in connection with a documentary on Pentagon public relations activities. This is flatly contradicted by Cong. Hébert's press secretary and by the Congressman. Congressman Hébert has put into the record letters or memos from the offices of five other congressmen who assert that they were approached by the same CBS staffers who approached Congressman Hébert's office to obtain tapes of interviews with Maj. Rowe. Four of them said they were told that CBS wanted these tapes in connection with a documentary it was doing on POW's. CBS makes no mention of this evidence confirming Cong. Hébert's charge that the CBS staff sought tapes of interviews between congressmen and Maj. Rowe under the pretense that they were working on a documentary on POW's. In a delightful evasion, CBS says:

"Months after the Rowe-Hébert program was delivered to Mr. Seabrooks, Mr. Branon contacted Mr. Hébert's office and the offices of other Representatives to obtain information with respect to additional Congressional interviews with Major Rowe and other military personnel, including other former prisoners of war. It is at this point, seemingly, that the confusion began. The focus on additional Rowe interviews and other POW interviews may well have been the genesis of the misunderstanding which arose."

We are expected to believe that five Congressional offices all got the impression that CBS wanted these tapes in connection with a documentary on POW's even though they were all presumably told that CBS wanted them in connection with a documentary on Defense Department public relations activities. That is too strange a coincidence to be swallowed.

(6) CBS devoted nearly one-fourth of "The Selling of the Pentagon" to films made by the military and available to the public. It said that most of the films were made originally for troop information but a large number was later released for public showing. It said that the Pentagon spends over \$12 million a year on films. Later, in criticizing anti-communist films made by the Pentagon, CBS said: "But to the filmmakers at the Pentagon, with at least \$12 million a year to spend, 1946 seems to have lasted a whole generation." One could easily infer from these statements that a very large part of the \$12 million goes for films that are intended for public release. The Pentagon notes that the great bulk of the films are made for troop training, research development, recruiting, medical and religious use. It charges that CBS was wrong in implying that the \$12 million in films was largely used to influence the public. CBS responds that it had no intention of implying what most of the viewers probably inferred from what was said.

(7) It is charged that CBS showed Robert

Stack narrating a Defense Department film in a way that suggested that he was doing a film on the use of weapons in Vietnam when, in fact, the film was about unarmed reconnaissance pilots. The brief film clip used by CBS did give the impression that Stack was going to talk about guns in Vietnam. CBS says they had no intention of implying this and that "no such implication was created." Nevertheless, the inference was created.

(8) "The Selling of the Pentagon" gave many viewers the impression that a large military training exercise called "Brass Strike" was put on for the benefit of a small group of civilian VIP's. Describing this military exercise, CBS said: "An air and land assault on enemy territory was simulated for the visitors." The Defense Department points out that the training exercise would have taken place with or without the VIP visitors and that many other observers, including military personnel saw it. The answer CBS gives is that it did not say that the exercise would not have taken place in the absence of the VIP visitors, that it was other than a training exercise and that no other observers were present. True, CBS did not say any of those things, it only created that implication.

(9) It was charged that CBS showed Assistant Secretary of Defense Jerry Friedheim declining to answer half of the questions he was asked at a press briefing when actually at that briefing he responded to 31 of the 34 questions asked. The complaint was that CBS deliberately focused on those questions that Mr. Friedheim declined to answer for security reasons to create the impression that he did not provide the press with much information. It was charged that CBS used the same technique to indicate that press briefings in Saigon were characterized by "no comment" answers to newsmen's questions.

CBS said that at the Friedheim briefing at least 56 questions were asked and Mr. Friedheim was unable to answer 11 of these completely for varying reasons. This meant that he answered 80 per cent of the questions asked completely. CBS showed six questions being asked, the first three of which Mr. Friedheim declined to answer or could not answer. In the CBS portrayal, his response rate was only 50 per cent compared with the actual 80 per cent which CBS says prevailed for the entire briefing. CBS says: "This is a fair representation which does not reflect adversely on Mr. Friedheim." What CBS selected to show was clearly not typical of Mr. Friedheim's performance at the briefing. CBS appeared to be trying to make the point that the press briefings are an occasion when the press is trying, without much success, to extract information from unwilling Defense Department spokesmen.

In introducing Mr. Friedheim, CBS described him as an "adversary" of the press. The briefing was described as a "confrontation," and CBS said of Mr. Friedheim: "He does not, of course, tell all he knows; he wouldn't have his job long if he did." There followed the carefully selected segment from the briefing showing Mr. Friedheim avoiding answering reporters' questions. That is what CBS calls a "fair" representation. The same kind of treatment was given the press briefing in Saigon for exactly the same reason. CBS said the daily press briefing there was "known among newsmen in Saigon as the Five O'Clock Follies." It indicated that the most popular phrase at the briefing was "no comment."

It then illustrated this by showing a film clip of the briefer declining to answer questions. The Defense Department claims that this was not a typical scene. CBS does not deny that the sequence it showed was not typical. Instead it argues that the briefer should have been authorized to answer the particular questions that he was shown declining to answer. Arguable though that may

be, it does not get CBS off the hook for presenting an atypical sequence and passing it off to the viewers as completely representative of the daily briefings.

(10) CBS was criticized for saying that the phrase "protective reaction" means that the U.S. resumed the bombing of North Vietnam. The Defense Department states that "protective reaction" means a very limited kind of bombing undertaken to protect unarmed reconnaissance flights over North Vietnam. It emphasizes that this does not mean the resumption of the widespread bombing of North Vietnam carried out prior to November 1968. CBS responds that it only said the bombing had resumed, without saying that large scale bombing had been resumed. They say that the Defense Department has made it clear that "protective reaction" bombing is different from the pre-November 1968 bombing. CBS made not the slightest distinction of this kind, and many in the audience could well have been misled into thinking that the phrase, "the U.S. resumed the bombing of North Vietnam" meant that the U.S. had resumed the kind of bombing that was being carried out in 1968.

THE QUESTION CBS DID NOT EVEN TRY TO ANSWER

Although CBS once claimed to have an answer for every one of the criticisms of "The Selling of the Pentagon," its comprehensive reply to the critics leaves many questions unanswered. AIM criticized 23 points in the CBS documentary, and CBS dealt with only 13 of these in its "comprehensive" reply. Ten points, with 35 questions attached, were completely ignored.

Among the questions CBS avoided were these: (1) was it not inaccurate and unfair to suggest that John Wayne narrated Defense Department films in return for help in making "The Green Berets?" (2) How does CBS define its phrase, "Pentagon propaganda," and would any factual description of the record of communist oppression be labeled "propaganda" by CBS? Does CBS know that Walter Cronkite has changed his mind about the aggressive nature of communism, and if not why was it implied that he had changed his views?

In analyzing Pentagon films, why did CBS focus on films on communism and then complain that they dealt with communism? How does CBS reconcile its assertion that we adopted a policy of "peaceful coexistence" prior to 1961 with the Bay of Pigs invasion, the Cuban missile crisis, the building of the Berlin Wall and the Gulf of Tonkin resolution?

Many of the questions CBS did not try to answer probed the most serious flaw in "The Selling of the Pentagon," the fact that it was fundamentally dishonest. CBS says no one has refuted the basic veracity of the documentary. That is precisely what AIM did.

That is why CBS has not answered AIM's deep probing questions.

Mr. Speaker, if anyone is further interested in the type of propaganda, such as was evidenced by the "Selling of the Pentagon" program, I add this bit of information from Claude Witze's column in Air Force magazine:

[From Air Force magazine, February 1972]

In case anyone is still interested, "The Selling of the Pentagon" is available for rental. It can be obtained for a fee of \$65 from American Documentary Films, a non-profit educational organization with offices at 336 West 84th St., New York, N.Y. 10024, or from 379 Bay St., San Francisco, Calif. 94133.

American Documentary Films advertises that it circulates "Films for Agitation." In addition to the CBS masterpiece, you can select from a list that includes, for example, "79 Springtimes," described as "a brilliant impressionist biographical tribute to Ho Chi Minh." And there is "Hanoi, Martes 13," which is a "moving salute to the Vietnamese," presumably those in North Vietnam. Then there is available, "Stagolee: Bobby Seale in Prison," a film in which the Panther leader speaks out, and another picture in which Angela Davis tells it like it is, from her viewpoint in jail.

The American Documentary Film catalog does not include "Road to the Wall," a documentary produced by CBS for the Department of Defense in 1962.

SPEAKING OF PRIORITIES

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal of loud talk during the last 3 years about the urgent need for an immediate reordering of our national priorities. Much of what we have heard has been critical of the tremendous amounts spent for national defense as compared with lesser sums provided for nondefense programs.

During this month of February, when we observe the birthdays of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, we ought to remember that they, too, had to deal with problems of priorities. The former would never have become the

Father of His Country if his army had lost the struggle for independence. Victory over Cornwallis and his Redcoats at Yorktown necessarily preceded the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia.

Although millions regard Lincoln as the Great Emancipator, other millions call him the Saviour of the Union. Actually, the slaves would not have been freed if the Union had not been preserved. Negro slavery would have been perpetuated had the Confederate States been successful in securing their independence. By keeping the Union intact Lincoln made meaningful emancipation possible.

Today Richard Nixon is faced with similar problems of priorities. His critics want him to drastically curtail defense spending in order that more billions will become available for nondefense programs. Unfortunately, it is not that simple. If our defenses are curtailed to the point that our national security is jeopardized, thus encouraging attack by an enemy power, lavishly funded nondefense programs will provide small comfort.

A perusal of the budget which Mr. Nixon has submitted to the Congress for fiscal 1973 shows that the percentage allocated to national defense has declined substantially since fiscal 1970, while the percentages for such nondefense items as social security, medicare, community development and housing, and manpower training have grown annually during his administration.

As our participation in the war in Vietnam continues to deescalate, it may be possible to achieve even further economies in the Defense Establishment. Such economies must not, however, be permitted to go beyond the needs of national security. By all means, cut the fat, but not the muscle.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD a tabulation which shows how spending for national defense is declining on a percentage basis while the percentage spent on many nondefense items continues either to remain steady or to increase. Some of my colleagues may feel, as they study the figures, that the percentages for some of their favorite programs are pitifully inadequate. Let them bear in mind that each 1 percent will cost the taxpayers almost \$2,500,000,000. The tabulation follows:

Function or subfunction	Outlays in millions of dollars				Percentages of total			
	1970 actual	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate	1970 actual	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
National defense	80,295	77,661	78,030	78,310	40.8	36.7	33.0	31.8
Social security	29,045	35,874	40,053	45,501	15.1	17.0	16.9	18.5
Interest on the public debt	19,304	20,959	21,400	22,700	9.8	9.9	9.0	9.2
Veterans benefits and services	8,677	9,776	11,127	11,745	4.4	4.6	4.7	4.8
Medicare	6,783	7,875	8,974	10,436	3.5	3.7	3.8	4.2
Public assistance	5,186	7,775	10,111	10,335	2.6	3.7	4.3	4.2
Transportation (ground, air, and water)	6,757	7,713	8,354	8,633	3.4	2.6	3.5	3.5
Education	5,531	6,063	6,526	7,009	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.8
Agriculture and rural development	6,201	5,096	7,345	6,891	3.2	2.4	3.1	2.8
Retirement programs other than social security	5,344	5,123	6,147	6,291	2.7	2.4	2.6	2.6
Unemployment insurance benefits	2,886	5,324	6,454	5,255	1.4	2.5	2.7	2.1
General revenue sharing			2,250	5,000			1.0	2.0
Community development and housing	2,965	3,357	4,039	4,844	1.5	1.6	1.7	2.0
Manpower training and aids and employment services	1,771	2,603	3,644	4,305	.9	1.2	1.5	1.7
Health other than medicare and Medicaid	3,398	3,226	3,649	3,976	1.7	1.5	1.5	1.6
International affairs and finance	3,570	3,095	3,960	3,844	1.8	1.5	1.7	1.6
Medicaid	2,727	3,362	4,401	3,705	1.4	1.6	1.9	1.5
Space research and technology	3,749	3,381	3,180	3,191	1.9	1.6	1.3	1.3
Natural resources and environment	2,568	2,716	4,376	2,450	1.3	1.3	1.8	1.0
Social and individual services	1,331	1,617	2,477	2,297	.7	.8	1.0	.9
General government other than law enforcement and justice and central fiscal operations	1,399	1,597	2,356	2,270	.7	.8	1.0	.9
Central fiscal operations	1,271	1,414	1,652	1,718	.6	.7	.7	.7

Function or subfunction	Outlays in millions of dollars				Percentages of total			
	1970 actual	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate	1970 actual	1971 actual	1972 estimate	1973 estimate
Law enforcement and justice.....	666	959	1,294	1,543	.3	.5	.5	.6
Commerce other than transportation and postal service ¹	1,043	1,414	1,575	1,508	.5	.7	.7	.6
Postal service.....	1,510	2,183	1,943	1,409	.8	1.0	.8	.6
Pay raises (excluding Department of Defense).....			250	775			.1	.3
Contingencies.....			300	500			.1	.2
Interest other than on the public debt.....	-992	-1,350	-1,333	-1,539	-.5	-.6	-.6	-.6
Undistributed intragovernmental transactions.....	-6,380	-7,376	-7,877	-8,590	-3.2	-3.5	-3.3	-3.5
Miscellaneous.....	-17	-14	-47	-55	(9)	(9)	(9)	(9)
Total.....	196,588	211,425	236,610	246,257	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

¹ Net of offsetting receipts.² Development of health resources, prevention or control of health problems, deductions for offsetting receipts, etc.³ General property and records management, National Capital region, legislative and judicial functions, central personnel management (net of offsetting receipts), executive direction and management, deductions for offsetting receipts, etc.⁴ Area and regional development, advancement and regulation of business, deductions for offsetting receipts.⁵ Percentage negligible.

Note: Due to rounding, individual percentages will not add to total.

ANNUAL AUTHORIZATION BILLS: BUDGET AMOUNTS INVOLVED

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, as all Members know, each year we consider a number of annual authorization bills for ongoing programs under existing law for a number of departments and agencies. The list has been growing over the years. This year, for the first time, the budgets of the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency are subject to the annual authorization bill process.

As Members also know, lateness in enactment of some of these annual authorization bills has for some years been a cause for delay in final enactment of the related annual appropriation bills, causing uncertainties and administrative problems in managing the programs. We would very much hope that the various legislative committees will move with greater expedition this year because there is a special need to do so. I believe they will.

Processing the budget is the work of many hands. Legislative committees have an opportunity in processing the annual bills to exercise fiscal restraint by holding the authorization amounts as low as reasonably possible—something sorely needed at a time when the Federal funds budget deficit is now estimated at \$44.7 billion for the current fiscal year and tentatively projected in the new budget at \$36.2 billion for the forthcoming fiscal year 1973.

And this projected deficit for 1973 will be vastly greater if the experience of the current fiscal year is repeated.

I am inserting a current list of the annual authorization bill amounts in the budget that call for actions by the legislative committees. Large sums are involved; the total new budget authority identified for these programs in the 1973 budget is \$47,402,944,000 for fiscal 1973 and \$40,700,000 for the current fiscal year 1972.

The list follows:

1973 BUDGET: RECOMMENDED AMOUNTS REQUIRING ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZING LEGISLATION

NOTE.—These amounts are recommended in the 1973 Budget, but the Congress does

not generally act on these appropriation requests until after enactment of the authorizing legislation.

[In thousands of dollars]

Judiciary:
Commission on Bankruptcy Laws
of the United States..... 426

Executive Office of the President:
Special Action Office for Drug
Abuse..... 6,856

Funds appropriated to the President:

Office of Emergency Preparedness.....

Foreign assistance:
International security assistance:

Military assistance..... 780,000

Foreign military credit sales..... 527,000

Economic supporting assistance..... 807,400

International development assistance:

Multilateral assistance: International organizations and programs..... 175,335

Bilateral assistance:
Grants and other programs..... 539,358

Development loans..... 634,500

Contingencies..... 100,000

Office of Economic Opportunity:
Economic opportunity program..... 758,200

Total, Funds appropriated to the President..... 4,321,793

Commerce:

International activities:
Export control..... 5,507

Science and technology:
National Bureau of Standards research and technical services..... 8,786

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration:
Research, development and facilities..... 900

Fishermen's protective fund..... 61

Ocean shipping:
Maritime Administration:

Ship construction..... 250,000

Operating-differential subsidies..... 232,000

Research and development..... 30,000

Salaries and expenses..... 3,900

Maritime training..... 7,670

State marine schools..... 2,290

Total, Commerce..... 541,114

Defense—Military:
Military Procurement:

Aircraft procurement, Army..... 134,500

Missile procurement, Army..... 1,153,400

Procurement of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, Army..... 259,500

Procurement of aircraft and missiles, Navy..... 3,871,200

Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy..... 3,564,300

Other procurement, Navy..... 219,900

Procurement, Marine Corps..... 85,200

Aircraft procurement, Air Force..... 2,612,700

Missile procurement, Air Force..... 1,772,300

Research, development, test and evaluation:

Army..... 2,051,100

Navy..... 2,710,900

Air Force..... 3,178,600

Defense agencies..... 507,200

Emergency fund, Defense..... 50,000

Military construction:

Army..... 969,323

Navy..... 490,490

Air Force..... 291,285

Defense agencies..... 46,400

Army National Guard..... 40,000

Air National Guard..... 10,600

Army Reserve..... 38,200

Air Force Reserve..... 16,000

Family housing, Defense..... 977,200

Operation and maintenance, civil defense..... 29,041

Special foreign currency programs..... 3,000

Total, Defense-Military..... 25,089,339

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

Health Services and Mental Health Administration:

Health services delivery..... 155,330

Preventive health services..... 8,500

Office of Education:

Higher education..... 1,452,656

Library resources..... 13,000

Educational renewal (Follow Through)..... 62,612

Higher education facilities loan and insurance fund..... 3,352

Social and Rehabilitation Services:

Social and rehabilitation services..... 836,243

Office of Child Development (Headstart)..... 393,642

Total, Health, Education, and Welfare..... 2,925,355

Department of Housing and Urban Development:

Comprehensive planning..... 100,000

Model cities..... 515,000

Open space..... 100,000

Neighborhood facilities..... 40,000

Total, Housing and Urban Development..... 755,000

Interior:

Water and Power Resources:

Bureau of Reclamation:

Construction and rehabilitation..... 8,840

Upper Colorado River storage project	38,185
Water Quality and Research: Office of Saline Water:	
Saline water conversion	26,871
Total, Interior	73,896
Labor:	
Manpower Administration:	
Salaries and expenses	61,890
Manpower training services	1,633,366
Total, labor	1,695,256
State:	
All accounts	1,588,852
Transportation:	
Office of the Secretary:	
Grants-in-Aid for Natural Gas Pipeline Safety	1,000
Coast Guard:	
Operating expenses	297,693
Acquisition, construction, and improvements	135,660
Reserve Training	23,529
Research, development, test, and evaluation	1,348
Federal Highway Administration:	
Highway Beautification	*60,000
Highway trust fund: Federal-aid highways	*1,550,000
Forest highways	*33,000
Public lands highways	*16,000
Highway-related safety grants (Federal and Trust)	*30,000
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration:	
Traffic and highway safety	36,900
State and community highway safety	*33,333
Highway trust fund: trust fund share of highway safety programs	*66,667
Federal Railroad Administration:	
High Speed Ground Transportation and Development	60,800
Total, Transportation	2,345,930
Atomic Energy Commission:	
Operating expenses	2,072,830
(Supplemental for 1972)	(13,300)
Plant and capital equipment	366,860
(Supplemental for 1972)	(9,000)
Total, Atomic Energy Commission	2,439,690
(Supplementals for 1972)	(22,300)
*Contract authority.	
1973 BUDGET: RECOMMENDED AMOUNTS REQUIRING ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZING LEGISLATION—Continued	
[In thousands of dollars]	
Environmental Protection Agency:	
Waste treatment construction grants	2,000,000
Operation, research, and facilities	97,000
Total, Environmental Protection Agency	2,097,000
National Aeronautics and Space Administration:	
Research and development	2,600,900
Construction of facilities	77,300
Research and program management	700,800
Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration	3,379,000
Other Independent Agencies:	
Action: Operating expenses	184,700

(Supplemental for 1972)	(16,000)
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	10,000
Commission on Civil Rights	4,646
Commission on International Radio Broadcasting	38,795
Corporation for Public Broadcasting	45,000
Indian Claims Commission	1,050
National Science Foundation	653,000
American Revolution Bicentennial Commission	6,712
(Supplemental for 1972)	(2,400)
Smithsonian	275
United States Information Agency: All accounts	1,198,748
Water Resources Council	531

Total, Other Independent Agencies	1,143,457
(Supplemental for 1972)	(18,400)
Grand Total: 1973 budget authority	47,402,944
(Supplementals for 1972)	(40,700)

¹ The-Foreign Assistance Act of 1971 (S. 2819) contains a provision amending Section 701 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U.S.C. 1476), to prohibit appropriations to the Department of State and the United States Information Agency in fiscal year 1973 et seq., except as authorized by legislation enacted after the date of enactment of S. 2819.

Source of table: Office of Management and Budget, Revised January, 1972.

THE CASE FOR DISCIPLINE

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in my lifetime, I have seen a number of new words, coined to fit our advancing technology, come into existence. I have also seen a number of words from my earlier years disappear from our vocabulary either from inappropriateness or disuse. "Discipline" is such a word. To some, it seems a quaint holdover from the days of crinolines and spats. To others—myself included—it is an admirable virtue, fallen on hard times.

It was, therefore, heartening to me to read the speech offered by Rear Adm. Earl Yates, U.S. Navy, at the graduation ceremony, Naval Recruit Training Center, Orlando, Fla., on January 21 of this year.

I was extremely impressed by the manner in which Admiral Yates stated the case for discipline, and especially for self-discipline, but could not help wonder if the young people who were, after all, the targets for his presentation, could readily accept it.

You may imagine my surprise, then, when I learned that the author of these words was a young seaman apprentice only a few weeks out of boot camp.

So long as our military services can attract young people such as Seaman Share Layne Evans, we need have few apprehensions about the future of our land.

I am inserting Seaman Evans' speech,

as delivered by Admiral Yates, in the RECORD, along with a biographical note regarding the author:

REMARKS AT GRADUATION CEREMONY

Good morning, Captain Rusk, Captain Halsip, distinguished guests, and members of the graduating company of the recruit training command. It is indeed an honor and a pleasure for me to be the reviewing officer of such a fine-looking group of young men.

You will leave here today and enter the Navy during one of the most dynamic stages in its history. Never before have there been so many opportunities—such as high-quality education; interesting assignments; and pleasurable living conditions—to name just a few—as in today's Navy. You are now entering the working end of a Navy of challenge and continuous improvement where those who are diligent in the performance of their duties will reap even more rewards than ever before. It is a Navy where personal initiative and responsibility are rewarded rather than frowned upon; a Navy designed with your individual needs and desires in mind. However, this new Navy will work only if you give it something in return.

While you have been here, you have been instilled with the finest traditions of the Navy. In spite of the so-called "permissiveness" of the new Navy, you will be expected to respect these traditions. And contrary to what many might think, there is a reason for them.

Part of that reason is discipline. In order to have a highly efficient organization—whether civilian or military—the personnel within it must maintain a high degree of discipline. In organizations where this is prevalent, not only are the accomplishments of a higher quality and effectiveness, but the persons involved obtain more freedoms and responsibilities than those who simply try to "make do" with as little effort as possible. This discipline makes for a more dynamic and relevant career in the Navy. It allows more "permissiveness" because with it, standards are kept up to par.

Self-discipline is one of the ingredients of maturity, and a selfish, inconsiderate man-child will not be respected nor allowed the responsibilities and freedoms of the mature, self-disciplined individual. If for no other reason, the undisciplined individual makes things harder, not only for himself, but for all those unfortunate enough to have to work with him. His lack of discipline infringes upon the freedoms of his cohorts, and for some reason, this sort of behavior simply is not appreciated nor tolerated.

It is the policy of the Navy to treat its personnel as mature, self-disciplined individuals, and it will do so, as long as you maintain its standards of discipline and effectiveness.

I realize it is sometimes difficult to keep one's self-discipline in gear. We all have times when we want to shrug off our responsibilities for a little while. However, if you persevere in your duties, the rewards you receive will be more advantageous to you than the punishment.

In today's world, the actions of one individual increasingly influence, either directly or indirectly, another individual's life—someone he may not even know. This makes self-discipline even more important, not only as a military man, but as a private citizen. A mistake on your part because you did not feel like handling your responsibilities, just might be the reason the man down the hall is dead. We read about such incidents every day in the newspaper—some immature motorist gets angry while driving, makes a wrong move, and causes a three-car collision. This same man-child could be the one who keeps the division in turmoil, or makes a fatal move on the ship and endangers the

lives of his shipmates. So you see, your decisions affect everyone, not just you. And self-discipline will aid you in making the right decision. If you develop this discipline, you will do well in the Navy and any other venture you might attempt.

The Navy is willing to help you in every way it can, but it can do so only if you are willing to cooperate with it and assist it in accomplishing its mission.

Thank you very much.

Gentlemen, that concludes my prepared remarks. It is the second speech in my life that I had read, and the first one was a flop. The reasons I read this one might be of interest to you, and there are two or three reasons:

First—I believe very strongly in every word that was said and my own career of over 30 years service bears testimony to the wisdom of those words.

Second—I think it represents the sort of unqualified excellence that we are getting into our Navy today. This speech and your performance here today, both of which reinforce and inspire me, are outstanding examples. You see, this speech was written by a seaman apprentice—a seaman apprentice with only a few weeks in the Navy and only recently out of boot camp.

Third—I think it is further interesting and significant that it was written by a girl seaman apprentice named Share Evans who works in my office. My only instructions in asking for its preparation were: "I would appreciate it if you would jot down some comments from which I might make a speech to the recruit training center." Well, when I saw them I thought they were so good that I didn't change a single word of them; and to make sure that I didn't, I read the speech to you.

Seaman Apprentice Share Evans is very inspired with her role in the Navy and she is making a tremendous contribution to it. I look forward to serving in the Navy of the future with outstanding people like the young WAVE who wrote this speech and with the inspirational sailors who have demonstrated here today. I think this is one of the finest parades and ceremonies I have ever seen. It is an inspiration to me. I hope it is inspirational to the people—the young people, the civilians and military—who are here with us today. I thank you very much for a very fine day.

SHARE LAYNE EVANS, JOURNALIST SEAMAN
APPRENTICE, U.S. NAVY

Share Layne Evans was born on October 28, 1950 in Bluefield, West Virginia. She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. James R. Taylor of 315 Stowers Street, Bluefield, West Virginia.

Following graduation from Bluefield High School, Miss Evans attended Concord College in Athens, West Virginia. At Concord, she majored in English and philosophy. She was editor of the *Concordian*, the college newspaper; chairman, College Center Board; chairman, Freshman Orientation; and a member of the Student Affairs Council, the Senate, the Literary Society, and Alpha Psi Omega, the drama fraternity.

On March 17, 1971, Miss Evans enlisted in the United States Navy. She attended basic training at Recruit Training Command (Women) Bainbridge, Maryland.

Following basic training, she attended the Defense Information School at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana.

Miss Evans reported to Commander Amphibious Operations Support Command, U.S. Atlantic Fleet, Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Norfolk, Virginia on September 17, 1971.

She enjoys writing poetry, painting, reading, playing the guitar, classical music, and drama.

A LITTLE MORE LIGHT—PLEASE

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, we have just marked again, each in our own way, the anniversary of the birth of that great American, Abraham Lincoln.

There are endless anecdotes about Lincoln, some valid and some questionable as to origin. But one of the more persistent—and one of my favorites—involves a story Lincoln is supposed to have told when, during the Civil War, he was under vicious attack by hostile editorialists concerning whom he commented:

I guess I'm like the chap who was riding along a backwoods trail and was caught in a storm. He kept plodding ahead until his horse gave out, and then it grew dark. He had only the lightning to show him the trail. The thunder was terrifying and, when one bolt seemed to crash at his feet, he fell to his knees.

"Oh, Lord," he prayed, "if it's all the same to you, give us a little more light and a little less noise!"

At the current moment, amidst the developing thunder over the difficult and emotion-charged issue of school busing, and as we move toward possible consideration soon, here in this Chamber, of a constitutional amendment offered to deal somehow—though in about the most cumbersome way I can personally think of—with this issue, we could certainly all use all the objectivity and responsibility we can muster, and certainly "a little more light and a little less noise."

Today's lead editorial in the Wall Street Journal offers, I think, such light—and I include it now in the hopes my colleagues will read and consider it carefully, and that it will similarly be read and considered at the White House:

AN "ANTI-BUSING" AMENDMENT?

In principle we find much to be said for a constitutional amendment outlawing the use of racial quotas in schools and elsewhere, and in the end that step may yet prove necessary. Yet we are given pause by the timing of, and in some cases the spirit behind, the anti-busing amendments now offered in Congress.

President Nixon apparently has pledged to put the administration's weight behind the movement against busing to achieve racial balance, and is now considering whether a constitutional amendment is the best method of doing so. Alternatives include supporting anti-busing legislation or directing the Justice Department to intervene in court suits on behalf of the anti-busing position.

We find it hard to fault the administration for wanting to do something to recognize the growing public opposition to busing for racial balance. Public opinion polls find the overwhelming majority of whites and about half

the blacks oppose any such step. Nor, when the issue actually arises, is this a passive opposition; people are quite prepared to get excited about matters touching their children. If the courts actually do order extensive busing throughout the nation, the reaction could well be strong enough to stop the civil rights revolution in its tracks—in fact, this is the one thing we can see that might do that.

The realistic way to frame the problem is not in terms of stopping the reaction against busing, an impossible task, but in terms of channeling it in reasonably healthy directions. This means that if the administration is to take an anti-busing initiative, the important thing is to shape it in a way that is intellectually and morally respectable.

Among the distinctions this requires is a sense of what is constitutional timber and what is not. The mechanics of busing or attendance zones or school financing, these are not matters a sensible nation deals with through constitutional amendments. But underneath the "busing" debate, and underneath the court decisions requiring busing, there is an issue of truly constitutional sweep: whether government policy ought to be color-blind, or ought to require some form of racial quota.

On this issue the high ground belongs, at least as a matter of logic, to the "anti-busing" side. Certainly the higher ideal is a state where pluralistic racial and ethnic groups coexist under a law that takes no formal notice of their differences. Far higher than the "ideal" of a state that parcels out members of a racial group by quotas, with the ultimate implication that the misery of their company must be spread.

Clearly it is the pluralistic-color-blind state that we should ultimately be trying to create. That's why it's possible to conceive of an entirely respectable "anti-busing" position. That is also why, if the courts actually do follow the recent drift of their logic to the conclusion that the Constitution requires at least loose racial quotas, it's possible to conceive of a constitutional amendment writing the colorblind position into the highest law.

But, yet, matters of logic do not always prevail, and in the current context it's doubtful that an anti-quota amendment could in fact claim the high ground it deserves. Much of the support for anti-busing amendments arises from segregationist sentiments, and unfortunately the administration has nothing like the kind of rapport with blacks that might offset this taint. This is of course not a very powerful argument—that we should not do the right thing because it would not seem to be the right thing—and the courts may yet make it necessary to set such considerations aside.

As a practical matter, though, President Nixon's appointments have created a new Supreme Court, and even without that the Supreme Court far more than lower courts has usually been sensitive to developments such as the rising public opposition to busing. Also as a practical matter, the kind of loose quotas and extensive busing used to remedy *de jure* segregation in the South have obviously been useful tools for breaking the recalcitrant resistance to integration there. It's hard to condemn them so long as they can be seen as temporary and exceptional expedients, not the permanent rule by which this nation will deal with racial division.

So perhaps the administration would be wise to wait, not necessarily long but at least for a year or two, before it lends its support to anything so drastic as a constitutional amendment. The best source of a respectable "anti-busing" rationale, one that both preserves the ideal of racial justice and avoids the impasse into which the issue seems to be headed, would be the courts themselves.

A VISION FOR PEACE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the drastic threat of a cut in the Peace Corps budget—I would like to share a vision for peace so clearly expressed by President John F. Kennedy in 1963. His words resound the spirit and envision the goal of the Peace Corps as a vital part of U.S. foreign policy. To retreat from this vision would be a tragedy for America and for the countries served by our Peace Corps. The letter follows:

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND TO THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE TRANSMITTING BILL TO STRENGTHEN THE PEACE CORPS, JULY 4, 1963

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am pleased to transmit legislation which will authorize the appropriation of \$108 million for the Peace Corps in Fiscal Year 1964. It is fitting that this request is made on the 187th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. For the Peace Corps exemplifies the spirit of that revolution whose beginnings we celebrate today.

That revolution was not only a revolution for American independence and freedom. It was, as Jefferson perceived and Lincoln proclaimed, a revolution unbounded by geography, race or culture. It was a movement for the political and spiritual freedom of man.

Today, two centuries later and thousands of miles from its origin, the men and women of the Peace Corps are again affirming the universality of that revolution. Whether expressed by the community development projects of Latin America, or the panchayati raj program of India, the determination of people to be free, to govern themselves, and to share in the fruits of both the industrial and democratic revolutions, is one of the most profound forces at work in the world. To this revolution Peace Corps Volunteers are giving the same qualities of energy and spirit to which the 21 year old Lafayette and his equally youthful contemporaries gave as volunteer participants in our own revolution.

In less than two years their accomplishments have already been impressive. They constitute more than one-third of all the qualified secondary teachers in Sierra Leone, Ethiopia, and Nyasaland; they have saved a three-quarter million dollar rice crop in Pakistan; they have vaccinated over 25,000 Bolivians; they are teaching in 400 Philippines schools; they have created a thriving poultry industry in the State of Punjab in India; they are teaching in every rural secondary school in Costa Rica and virtually every secondary school in British Honduras; they have contributed to the creation of a system of farm-to-market roads in Tanganyika. But these are only isolated examples; all over the world Volunteers have surveyed roads, taught students and teachers, built schools, planted forests, drilled wells, and started local industries. In their off-hours they have conducted adult education classes, organized athletic teams, and launched programs ranging from music clubs to debating teams.

As important as these achievements are, they are far less important than the contribution Peace Corps Volunteers are making in building those human relations which must exist for a happy and peaceful understanding between people. The United States and a few other fortunate nations are part of an island of prosperity in a world-wide sea of poverty. Our affluence has at times

severed us from the great poverty stricken majority of the world's people. It is essential that we demonstrate that we continue to be aware of the responsibility we fortunate few have to assist the efforts of others at development and progress.

With Americans, Lord Tweedsmuir wrote, "the sense of common humanity is a warm and constant instinct and not a doctrine of the schools or a slogan of the hustings." By the careful selection and training of men and women in whom that instinct is a reality, the Peace Corps has already erased some stereotyped images of America and brought hundreds of thousands of people into contact with the first Americans they have ever known personally. "When the Peace Corps came to my country," wrote the Minister of Development of Jamaica, "they brought a breath of fresh air. They came and mixed with the people. They worked closely with the people. They closed the gap and crashed the barrier. And because they did this, they have paved the way for our own people to understand . . ."

It is no accident that Peace Corps Volunteers have won this kind of acceptance. Nor is it a coincidence that they have been greeted—as the Ethiopian *Herald* stated—"with open arms." They have been warmly received because they represent the best traditions of a free and democratic society—the kind of society which the people of Africa, Asia, and Latin America long for as the ultimate end of their own revolution.

The Communist system can never offer men optimum freedom as human beings. The people of the world's emerging nations know this. Their aspirations for a free society are being stimulated by the presence of Peace Corps Volunteers who have come not to usurp but to encourage the responsibility of local people and not to repress but to respect the individual characteristics and traditions of the local culture. "What is most remarkable about America," wrote German scholar, Philip Schaff, "is that over its confused diversity there broods a higher unity." Because Volunteers of different races and different religions nonetheless come from the same country, they represent the hope of building a community of free nations wherein each one, conscious of its rights and duties, will have regard for the welfare of all.

Already the Peace Corps idea has spread to other nations. Last week I attended the official inauguration of West Germany's own Peace Corps program. The first group of 250 young men and women will be ready for service next year and will eventually include more than a thousand young Germans working around the world. Three other European countries—the Netherlands, Denmark, and Norway—have started similar programs. Argentina and New Zealand have already established volunteer organizations. These efforts have been stimulated and assisted by the International Peace Corps Secretariat, established by the International Conference on Middle Level Manpower last fall in Puerto Rico. The bill I am transmitting would enable the United States to continue to encourage this movement.

The first American Volunteers are already returning to the United States after two years of Peace Corps service. They are bringing home important skills and experience which will greatly enhance our knowledge of the world and strengthen our role in international affairs. More than one-third of the 700 Volunteers returning this year have indicated a desire to work in international programs. Their ability and usefulness is attested to by the action of thirty-five universities in the United States which have established two hundred scholarships for returning Volunteers. One of these scholarships was created by the donations of the foreign students studying in California. I am also recommending a provision which would author-

ize the Peace Corps to assist these returning Volunteers to make the most of their opportunities for further usefulness to the Nation.

The funds I am requesting will enable the Peace Corps to place some 13,000 Volunteers in training or abroad by September 1964, a significant increase over the 9,000 who are expected to be enrolled before the end of this year.

Three thousand Volunteers of next year's increase are destined for service in Latin America and one thousand in Africa. In both of these areas an historic opportunity is a hand for the United States. In Latin America, the Peace Corps can, within the span of a relatively few years, write an important chapter in the history of Inter-American partnership and kindle faith in the possibilities of democratic action on the community level. In Africa the Peace Corps will concentrate its efforts on meeting a critical teacher shortage. The opportunity to teach hundreds of thousands of African students is unparalleled in our history.

It is my hope, therefore, that the Congress will enact this legislation making it possible for the Peace Corps to continue to share with the new nations of the world the experience of a democratic revolution committed to human liberty.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE 54TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, I would like to join with my colleagues in the observance of the 54th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania.

As Dr. Kazys C. Bobelis, president of the Lithuanian American Council put it—

The only country in which they will be unable to commemorate this historical event will be in Lithuania itself, because of the continuing subjugation and oppression by the Soviet Union.

Since WWII, many new and independent countries were born. The free world applauded the formation of these republics in Africa and Asia, where the principle of self-determination was honored. But how tragic that the same principle of self-determination is not honored to the countries of Eastern Europe, including Lithuania!

Again, I join with my colleagues in calling for freedom for Lithuania and the other two Baltic States, Latvia and Estonia, from Soviet oppression. I would also like to call a resolution, recently passed by the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County, to the attention of my colleagues. The resolution reads as follows:

RESOLUTION

On motion of Supervisor Debs, seconded by Supervisor Dorn, unanimously carried, the following resolution was adopted:

Whereas, this year marks the 721st Anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian State when Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251 and the 54th Anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania

on February 16, 1918 commemorated by Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent and their friends in all parts of our great Nation; and

Whereas, the Communist Regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia by legal or Democratic process; and Whereas, the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia by force of arms; and

Whereas, the government of the United States maintains diplomatic relations with the governments of the free Baltic Republics of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and consistently has refused to recognize their seizure and forced incorporation into the Soviet Union; and

Whereas, the Committee of the House of

Representatives, created by H. Res. 346 of the 83rd Congress to investigate the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union, found that the incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia was contrary to established principles of international law; and

Whereas, the House of Representatives and the United States Senate (of the 89th Congress) unanimously passed House Concurrent Resolution 416 urging the President of the United States to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and to bring the force of word opinion to bear on

behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic Peoples:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles respectfully urges the President of the United States to bring the question of liberation of the Baltic States before the United Nations and ask that body to request the Soviet Union withdraw all of its troops and release its control of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and return to their homes all Baltic exiles and deportees from prison camps in the Soviet Union; and

Be it further resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Secretary of State William P. Rogers, and United States Ambassador to the United Nations, George Bush.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, February 17, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. John W. Josupait, pastor of Zion Evangelical Lutheran Lithuanian Church, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, "our help in ages past, our hope in years to come," we beseech You to bless this august body, the House of Representatives, with wisdom and understanding, with love for righteousness and peace, that under their leadership our country may continue to enjoy Your grace and favor.

Eternal God, regard with benign mercy the sufferings and hardships of the people of Lithuania, who are eagerly longing to be free again and grant them the privilege of freedom.

Bestow, Heavenly Father, Your Holy Spirit upon the leaders of our freedom-loving Nation to seek diligently the liberation of Lithuania and other suppressed countries to attain their independence, to insure tranquillity, and to secure the blessings of liberty. In the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 524. Concurrent resolution, National Day of Prayer for cause of world peace.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3122) entitled "An act to extend sections 5(n) and 7(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, until the end of fiscal year 1972."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 596. An act to require that international agreements other than treaties, hereafter entered into by the United States, be transmitted to the Congress within 60 days after the execution thereof.

NO AMNESTY FOR DRAFT DODGERS AND DESERTERS

(Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, of late a few weak voices have spoken out suggesting amnesty for draft dodgers and those who have deserted our Armed Forces. Incidentally, I understand that one of those who thinks he is running for President, and possibly another, is advocating such.

Amnesty for these people is simply beyond my understanding. It is unthinkable. Except for a few scattered voices here and there, it is also beyond the understanding of the American people.

I know this has been an unpopular war. No war is popular. It is unfortunate and lamentable that we ever became involved in any war. But once we are involved, there is a duty on the part of all Americans to back the cause of our country to the limit—and at the risk of our individual lives.

During the time of every war there have always been some who desert and some who flee to sanctuaries outside the Nation to avoid duty in the Armed Forces. But thanks to the courage and patriotism instilled in the people of this great Nation, those who desert and flee are few in number.

We are a nation of laws, and laws have been on our statute books since the early days of this Republic which appropriately take care of traitors, deserters, and draft dodgers. Let the law take its course. Indeed, there should be no amnesty for those who do not measure up when our country calls.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks, the full text of a letter just received by me

from Indianola Post No. 2, the American Legion, Indianola, Miss., as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
INDIANOLA POST NO. 2,

Indianola, Miss., February 8, 1972.

To Our Senators and Congressmen:

At a regular meeting of the Indianola Post No. 2, American Legion, Feb. 8th 1972, the following motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously:

"The Indianola Post No. 2, American Legion, opposes amnesty for those of Our Armed Forces, who have deserted, from The Armed Forces Of The United States Of America, also, for those who are trying to avoid serving honorably, by going into other Countries.

Also, the Post Officers are requested to advise Our Senators and Congressmen of our actions hereby taken."

Sincerely,

INDIANOLA POST NO. 2, AMERICAN LEGION,
By BOB ELMORE, Commander.
CARL B. BETHEA, Adjutant.

VIOLATIONS OF RENT CONTROL GUIDELINES

(Mr. WRIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I called attention to exorbitant rent increases being charged by at least one large corporate landlord in the Washington metropolitan area. Since that time, my telephone has been kept almost constantly busy with calls from people reporting similar incidents.

In this morning's Washington Post appears a story written by Bob Woodward in which it is estimated that tenants in at least 120,000 Washington area apartment units will get rent increases of about 8 percent during the next 5 months.

This obviously is far above the 2.5-percent increase at which the rent control guidelines ostensibly were directed.

The Washington Post story is in error, however, in declaring that these unusually large increases are permitted under the regulations only for tenants on yearly leases and that tenants on a month-to-month basis are actually receiving rent increases of only about 2.5 percent.

Some of the cases which had been called to my attention earlier, and many