Col. Eugene B. Sterling [redacted] FR, Regular Air Force.
Col Lyle E. Mann, [redacted] FR, Regular Air Force.
Col. Robert E. Sadler, [redacted] FR, Regular Air Force.
Col. James S. Murphy, [redacted] FR, Regular Air Force.
Col. William H. Ginn, Jr. [redacted] FR (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Col. Bennie L. Davis, [redacted] FR (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Col. James A. Young, [redacted] FR, Regular Air Force.
Col. Charles G. Cleveland, [redacted] FR (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Col. Charles A. Gabriel, [redacted] FR (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Col. Winfield W. Scott, Jr., [redacted] FR (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Col. Thomas P. Stafford, [redacted] FR (major, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Col. Richard M. Baughn, [redacted] FR, Regular Air Force.
Col. Richard H. Schoeneman, [redacted] FR (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Col. Robert F. Titus, [redacted] FR (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Col. Thomas M. Sadler [redacted] FR (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Col. Kenneth P. Miles, [redacted] FR (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Col. Fred A. Treyz, [redacted] FR (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Col. David E. Rippetoe, Jr., [redacted] FR (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Col. Freddie L. Poston, [redacted] FR (major, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Col. Lovic P. Hodnette, Jr., [redacted] FR (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Col. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Jr. [redacted] FR (major, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Col. Billy F. Rogers [redacted] FR (major, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Col. Richard L. Lawson, [redacted] FR (major, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Col. Walter D. Druen, Jr., [redacted] FR (major, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Col. James R. Brickel [redacted] FR (major, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Col. James O. Putnam [redacted] FR (major, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Col. Leland C. Shepard, Jr., [redacted] FR, Regular Air Force.
Col. Rupert H. Burris, [redacted] FR, Regular Air Force.
Col. George M. Wentsch, [redacted] FR (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Col. John C. Toomay, [redacted] FR, Regular Air Force.
Col. James R. Hildreth [redacted] FR (major, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force
Col. Louis G. Leiser, [redacted] FR (lieutenant colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Col. John F. Barnes, [redacted] FR (major, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.
Col. Henry J. Meade, [redacted] FR (major, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, Chaplain.

U.S. NAVY

Rear Adm. William W. Behrens, Jr., U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral for the duration of his service in duties determined by the President to be of importance and responsibility within the contemplation of subsection (a), title 10, United States Code, section 5231.

Adm. Horacio Rivero, Jr., U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral on the retired list pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Vice Adm. Richard G. Colbert, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties of great importance and responsibility determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving.

Rear Adm. Julien J. Le Bourgeois, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties of great importance and responsibility determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of major general:

Richard Mulberry, Jr.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Robert E. Friederich
Paul E. Godfrey

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Joseph L. Perry, to be major, and ending Steven A. Zurian, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 31, 1972; and

The nominations beginning Bobby E. Bogard, to be major, and ending James H. Zetti, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 31, 1972.

IN THE NAVY

The nominations beginning Max N. Akers, to be commander, and ending William L. Wood, to be commander, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 31, 1972; and

The nominations beginning Seth E. Anderson, Jr., to be commander, and ending Richard A. McGonigal, to be a permanent lieutenant commander and temporary commander, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 7, 1972.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Jesse W. Addison, to be first lieutenant, and ending Robert A. Yaskovic, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 7, 1972.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## NATIONAL NEW IDEA DAY

## HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I received a short note from an old friend reminding me that February 16 had been declared "National New Idea Day" in Chases' Calendar of Annual Events for 1972.

There's nothing as fleeting or fragile—or as powerful—as a good idea. But it has to be put into action; it has to be shared.

Andrew Ettinger's reminder has remained in my thoughts throughout the day and the more I reflected upon his suggestion, the more enthusiastic I have become. How many of us, he asks, have set aside 15 minutes a day to utilize our individual ability to think and to judge by creating, formulating and expressing ideas of our own?

The Latin, Greek, and French languages in unison construct the word "idea" from the root "to see." The connection between ideas and seeing further reinforces Mr. Ettinger's suggestion. Each of us possess the gift of sight and through this gift we distinctly and individually view our society, its purposes and our location in this entire complex scheme. If each man. therefore, sees settings and situations in his own unique way, why should he not carry through his perceptions into the form of concrete and clearly defined ideas. Perhaps if we set aside these 15 minutes to be employed in this specific manner, meanings would become less clouded, reasons more clear, understanding a little easier and communication more beneficial.

Mr. Ettinger, director of Montclair New Jersey's Marketing Directions Group, has established the following format for practically implementing his suggestion:

To help in switching on the thinking cells to full power, MDG developed a short, mind-jogging checklist of idea-generating techniques. The list, they say, can be applied to any problem or situation:

1. Isolate the problem so you can visualize it clearly. Get it down on paper with a short, simple sentence, a drawing or a doodle. Think of the problem as a unit; then as separate parts. Think of each part as one of a set of children's building blocks. Mentally regroup them into different combinations.

2. Be an optimist. Be confident that there is a solution. Don't discard partial solutions. The full answer may have to develop in stages.

3. Make language work for you, not against you. Rename the parts of the problem to avoid getting hung up on traditional terminology. Try substituting numbers or symbols for words.

4. Let your experience be your take-off point, not your cage. Don't be hemmed in by conformity. If one approach doesn't succeed, completely reverse direction. Try another point of view—look at the problem from a different angle.

5. If the problem has physical dimensions, think of it in different shapes, sizes, weights, colors or textures. Think of a new use for it, however outrageous or unrelated to its present function. Don't be afraid to be laughed at.

6. Don't let mistakes or set-backs stop you. Even if some of your discoveries prove not to be new (that's called re-inventing the wheel), each can be as exciting to you as it was to the first one who conceived it. Keep charging the barriers of habit to gain that important "fresh" vantage point.

It must be stressed that this format may only be successful if the attitude is

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

stressed that all ideas are to be seriously considered and sincerely applied. The seventh point of Mr. Ettinger's format was that once the ideas were formulated, they must be shared. I have taken his suggestion in sharing his ideas with you at this time. I hope that each of us in our own ways will take advantage of this format and apply the concepts behind "National New Idea Day" through the remaining days of this and every calendar year.

## CONSTITUTIONAL SCHOLARS' COMMENT ON BUSING AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

### HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in order to assist Members of the House in assessing the many facets to the issue of pupil assignment and transportation in the context of a proposed amendment to the Constitution, I insert in the RECORD letters from six outstanding constitutional law authorities who comment on House Joint Resolution 620. The authors of these communications include:

Prof. Archibald Cox, Harvard Law School.

Prof. Alexander M. Bickel, Yale Law School.

Prof. Charles L. Black, Jr., Yale Law School.

Prof. Anthony G. Amsterdam, Stanford Law School.

Prof. Harold W. Horowitz, University of California Law School.

Prof. William Van Alstyne, Duke University Law School.

The letters follow:

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
*January 27, 1972.*

Re H.J. Res. 620.

Congressman EMANUEL CELLER,
*Chairman, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: In response to your inquiry of January 6 I am glad to record my opposition to H.J. Res. 620 proposing a Constitutional amendment prohibiting the assignment of a public school student to a particular school because of his race, creed, or color.

One fundamental objection to the proposal is the very great danger inherent in adopting specific constitutional amendments to a specific question of immediate public and political interest. One of the prime values of our Constitutional system is the fact that the Constitution speaks in fundamental principles having an enduring generality. This characteristic, coupled with the power of the Supreme Court to project the great fundamental issues upon particular occasions, gives our political ideals a permanence not subject to alteration by violent short-run surges of public feeling or the desire of office holders for political advantage.

H.J. Res. 620 is wholly inconsistent with this tradition. It seeks to deal in short-range terms with an immediate problem upon which public opinion might hold one view today and another tomorrow. A single departure from our wise constitutional tradition could scarcely spell disaster, but it would set dangerous precedent which others would come under pressure to follow.

In my view, the rule embodied in H.J. Res. 620 is thoroughly unsound. It would prevent local school boards as well as the federal courts from taking effective steps to remedy past violation of the Fourteenth Amendment guarantee against official racial discrimination. It would prevent any state or local school board from attempting to achieve racial balance in the schools. While racial balance seems to me to be a goal of paramount importance, I recognize that there is room from exercise of judgment in determining how far other desiderata should be sacrificed to achieve this purpose. Perhaps the greatest vice in the proposed amendment is that, if adopted, it would bar any and every practical effort to achieve this objective.

I should point out that the proposed amendment is totally inconsistent with any form of states rights or local responsibility for education. Its effect is to prohibit either a state or local school board from rendering any independent judgment in this regard.

Finally, no argument is necessary to make it plain that the proposed amendment would symbolize a measurable step backward in progress toward racial equality.

Sincerely,

ARCHIBALD COX.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.,
*January 18, 1972.*

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of January 6 asking for my comments on House Joint Resolution 620, proposing an amendment to the Constitution concerning neighborhood schools.

I wish to express in the strongest terms I can my opposition to this proposal. I think it altogether ill-advised.

As my writings and my testimony on two occasions before the Senate Select Committee on Educational Opportunity will amply show, I am, to use the shorthand now commonly employed, no advocate of large scale busing. But H.J. Res. 620 strikes at much more than busing. Unless I totally mistake its import, the effect of it would be to roll back the desegregation of schools in areas in which legally enforced segregation prevailed before 1954 all the way to the stage of pupil placement statutes. This would mean regression not to tokenism, but to the stage before tokenism. This seems to me utterly destructive and unacceptable.

Even an anti-busing constitutional amendment more carefully framed than this one would seem to me highly objectionable on at least two grounds, First, it trivializes the Constitution to deal by constitutional amendment with a subject enmeshed in so many variables and so local in nature. A constitutional amendment dealing with busing would be preposterously out of place in comparison with the momentous structural and substantive provisions with which the rest of our Constitution, after a fashion proper to a constitution, was written to deal. Nor do any of the amendments so far made to the Constitution, saving only prohibition and its repeal, fail to deal with subjects of the proper magnitude. We must not set our foot on the road to converting our Constitution into a code of detailed regulation, dealing with myriad passing grievances, after the fashion of so many state constitutions, which are then every so often scrapped whenever it seems advisable to make a fresh start. We must never forget, said John Marshall, that it is *a constitution* we are expounding, and whenever it considers proposing amendments, Congress should never forget that it is a constitution it is rewriting, not a common code of laws subject to change from time to time.

Secondly, the enormous symbolic significance of such an amendment, or even of Congress proposing such an amendment, must be kept in mind. H.J. Res. 620 would justly be read as repudiating *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, since to all intents and purposes it does so. Even a more closely drafted amendment could not fail to be so read. Courts that order busing purport to be implementing the *Brown* case, and a constitutional amendment that attempted to forbid busing would be viewed as a renunciation of it. That is not anything to be lightly done. So to dash the hopes and expectations, previously raised by the Federal Government, of millions of people would be an inexcusable act.

Faithfully yours,

ALEXANDER M. BICKEL.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.,
*January 19, 1972.*

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
*House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: This letter constitutes a fulfillment of my promise to comment on H.J. Res. 620, in compliance with your request contained in your letter of January 6, 1972. I shall be glad of any use you make of this letter, either for inclusion in the Record, or for duplication and dissemination by other means amongst other members of Congress.

When I reach the text of the Resolution, I find myself genuinely bewildered, because I think it impossible that it should mean the same thing to any two laymen or to any two lawyers.

It could, for example, sound like a Congressional ratification of the Brown case. Obviously, that is not what its sponsors intend, but I must say that the use of such misleading language, for purposes which are in general the reverse of those which would appear to the casual reader, comes (to say the least) very close to deserving the charge of disingenuousness. The proposal of a so-worded Resolution for the purpose of halting or curtailing school integration is not, with respect, the kind of thing one has a right to look for in public men.

The Brown case, of course, needs no ratification by Congress, and has in any event already been ratified by Congress, and by the Presidency, in several civil rights statutes. It has been the standing law of the land for seventeen years, and whatever may happen on the present Court, there is no prospect whatever of its being overruled in its central holding. This is conclusively demonstrated by unanimous decisions since the accession of two Justices appointed by Mr. Nixon. Anybody who votes for this Resolution under the theory that he is ratifying the Brown case is, therefore, being misled, whether deliberately or not.

When one reaches the question, or rather the illimitable set of questions, as to what this Amendment can in fact possibly mean, two general difficulties stand out before one approaches particulars.

First, the usual aid to the interpretation of delphic language much as this—"legislative history" in Congress—is hardly available to its full extent in the case of constitutional amendments. The final coming into force of an amendment is the result, not of the notion of Congress, but of the actions of thirty-eight separate state legislatures, many of which do not even keep a record of their debates. A consonance of understanding amongst these thirty-eight legislatures, as to language such as this, is not to be looked for. The processes of proposal and ratification, therefore, could not help very much in the final interpretation of this language.

Secondly, both because of the multiple ambiguity of the language used and because of the futility of the expectation of help from the processes of proposal and ratification, it is certain that a very great deal of wasteful and dilatory relitigation of settled questions will have to take place, whatever the outcome in each case. It could be contended, for example, that in a small town of two school districts, the intentional drawing of the line in such a way as to produce integration,

where it could also be drawn in such a way as to produce segregation, constitutes a sending of public school students to one school rather than another on the basis of their "race, creed, or color." I believe this contention would be without merit, and would almost certainly be rejected by the courts, but meanwhile we will have had to go through all over again a part of the litigation process which it has taken seventeen years to complete. This is tendered only as an example; almost every question about the merits of steps taken to effect integration would have to be relitigated, because somebody could always contend that *any* such step was taken, in some sense, because of the "race" of the pupils concerned, and that therefore some of them were being forced into some school because of their race.

It seems to me that, in adverting to these possibilities of litigation, I have, in effect, done about all that one can do on the general merits of the proposal, because, looked at from another angle, what I have implicitly said is that there is a danger that this language may produce some measure of retrogression in the thorough-going use of judicial power to implement the Brown decision in all its implications. I am sure that the Supreme Court would not interpret this Amendment in the extreme way which I have used as an illustration of an example of possible litigation. But it is all too likely that, feeling an obligation to give some meaning to the Amendment, the Court would find it to command some cutback in desegregation measures. Such a cutback, whatever its dimensions, or whatever the precise lines reached, is the only possible result of this Amendment. When one has said that, I think one has said that the Amendment is highly undesirable.

It might, for example, be held that the Amendment forbids the busing of children to schools specifically designed to be interracial, even though that busing was no more extensive than busing which had in past years taken place for the purpose of maintaining segregation, and even though the segregation pattern was one that had been created and fostered by the past actions of the state or local governments concerned. Nobody would dare come out in the open at this time and suggest that such retrogression would be a proper step. But I think there is a real danger that it might take place if this misleading language is thrown to the Supreme Court for interpretation. In such a case as the one I have just sketched (and, of course, it is far from an unimaginable case) it would be true, in a fairly normal sense of the word, that some pupils, both white and black, were being sent to particular schools "because of . . . race". Yet in such a case such assignment is entirely benign, results in no more busing than took place before, and quite clearly aims at the correction of a situation produced by public authority itself. It would be very foolish to run the risk of such an interpretation—unless that is what one really wants, though one dares not say so in plain words.

If we come to the practice which may be the principal one aimed at by the proponents of the Amendment, and which is, in any case, the one opposition to which would be the principal component in public opinion in support of such an amendment—the long-distance busing of ghetto children out and suburban children in for purposes of integration—then one is indeed faced with a question which I think anyone of common sense must regard as a troublesome one. I am not a full-throated and thoroughly happy advocate of that type of busing, because I am sure that it is not an optimal solution to the problem, and because it does, of course, produce a substantial inconvenience to all concerned, and a good deal of understandable resentment. After much reading and thought and conversation on the subject, I have concluded that it is the lesser of two evils, since the alternative is simply to leave the ghetto schools segregated, with no motivation on the part of the white majority to improve them, and thus to freeze in being a two-race school system, with only rare exceptions. I think we must support this least desirable form of busing, not because we like it, but because we dislike it less than we dislike its alternative.

This question could be and has been argued at great length. It is not an easy question. The point about this Amendment is that it does not address itself with any specificity whatever to this question, but disguises any intent which it may have to deal with this question behind the facade of scattergun language that might be interpreted in ways of which nobody with a minimally sincere desire to solve the racial problem could possibly approve. If an amendment were to be drawn prohibiting this one type of bussing, which so many people quite erroneously regard as the only type of bussing in issue, a great deal of light could be shed on the question, and a decision could be made. I would oppose such an amendment, both for the reason I have given, and because I think this remedial issue is not of dimensions suitable for constitutional amendment, but can more fittingly be dealt with from time to time by the good sense of the courts and by such action as Congress might take under Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment.

But the essential point is that this proposal does not address itself to this question with any specificity. It might be construed to prohibit all bussing motivated by a desire for integration even though no incidental inconvenience to anyone results. It might be construed to prohibit the redrawing of school district lines in such a manner as to produce greater integration. It might indeed be construed to prohibit every step that could possibly be taken to further integration, however harmless such a step might be, because any step taken in aid of integration inevitably does, in some sense, involve the assignment of pupils to schools on the basis of race.

To summarize, the Amendment is misleading because, on first perusal, it seems to do no more than ratify the Brown case, which is both unnecessary and the exact opposite of what its proponents want. It is unintelligible because it literally prohibits assignment on the basis of race in situations where it could not possibly be intended by two-thirds of both Houses of Congress and three-quarters of the state legislatures that steps taken in integration should be prohibited, and yet it gives us no aid in its text to determine which of these situations shall be covered, and which shall not. Since it is unintelligible, it will inevitably be productive of an enormous volume of litigation, traveling over the same ground which has been so painfully traversed in the last seventeen years. Since it is unintelligible, moreover, and since it is literally interpretable as forbidding every step taken in integration, it is extremely dangerous, because no one can say how far the Supreme Court might feel it is obliged to follow this possible literal meaning of the words of the Amendment.

This Amendment is bad law, therefore, on multiple grounds. I hope that you and your Committee will act unfavorably on it.

If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Very sincerely,

CHARLES L. BLACK, JR.,
*Luce Professor of Jurisprudence.*

---

STANFORD, CALIF., *January 28, 1972.*

Representative EMANUEL CELLER,
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CELLER: Thank you for your letter of January 6, inviting my observations on H.J. Res. 620. Please forgive the delay in my reply. I have been out of town.

H.J. Res. 620 proposes a constitutional amendment providing that no public school student shall be assigned to or required to attend a particular school because of his race. In my judgment, the proposal is extremely ill-conceived for two reasons.

*First*, the deceptively simple language of the proposed amendment is in fact susceptible of four quite different interpretations:

(1) The amendment specifically ratifies the desegregation decisions of the Supreme Court from *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954), through *Swann* v. *Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education*, 402 U.S. 1 (1971), and immunizes those decisions against any overruling or erosion which might otherwise occur as a result of change of personnel on the Supreme Court. In terms, of course, the amendment says exactly what the Supreme Court has said in these cases: that the assignment of a child to a particular school "because of race" is unconstitutional.

(2) The amendment goes beyond the Supreme Court decisions and outlaws *de facto* segregation. Notice that, unlike the Fourteenth Amendment, the proposed amendment contains no "state action" requirement.

(3) The amendment forbids any racial assignment of pupils except insofar as required by the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Such a reading would harmonize the Fourteenth Amendment and the proposed amendment. As you know, it is a commonplace of constitutional adjudication to construe statutes and constitutional provisions in such a way as to reconcile them if at all possible; and I tend to think that the courts, confronted with the unprecedented situation of two possibly inconsistent constitutional provisions, would take the same approach and construe the new amendment harmoniously with the Fourteenth.

(4) The proposed amendment *pro tanto* repeals the Equal Protection Clause, and forbids even such racially-conscious assignments as are necessary to effect the final abolition of the segregated school systems condemned by *Brown*. I use the term "repeal" literally, for the Supreme Court has now clearly held that the Fourteenth Amendment not merely forbids racial discrimination in public education, but also requires school boards (and, in their default, courts) to take "steps adequate to abolish [the] . . . dual, segregated system" of public education that had grown up in the Southern States during many years prior to *Brown* and was perpetuated by various devices during the fifteen years after *Brown*. See *Green* v. *County School Board*, 391 U.S. 430, 437 (1968). For reasons which I shall come to shortly, the abolition of immemorially segregated school systems may require racially-conscious assignment of pupils, see *Swann* v. *Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, supra;* cf. *Brooks* v. *Beto*, 366 F. 2d 1, 21–26 (5th Cir. 1966), and therefore "an absolute prohibition against transportation of students assigned on the basis of race" is inconsistent with the Fourteenth Amendment. *North Carolina State Board of Education* v. *Swann*, 402 U.S. 43, 46 (1971).

I hardly need to underline the political and legal irresponsibility of promulgating a proposed constitutional amendment that is subject to such diverse and mutually contradictory interpretations. Those who are called to vote upon its ratification may approve it upon entirely different understandings of its meaning. In this manner, for example, persons who have altogether legitimate concerns about the inordinate bussing of children, not required to effect desegregation of segregated school systems, can be made the dupes of others who have continued by every devious means to preserve segregation since the Supreme Court declared it unlawful. (H.J. Res. 620, of course, deals with pupil assignment, not transportation; and to the exact extent that it would

forbid bussing, it would also forbid other methods of school desegergation not involving the transportation of children.) But in the end, it is unclear whether the dupes or the dupers will win out, since no one can comfortably predict how the courts will construe this ambiguous amendment.

*Second,* even if the amendment unambiguously did what I suspect it is devised to do—that is, to work a *pro tanto* repealer of the Fourteenth Amendment in favor of the "neighborhood school concept—it would seem to me tragically unwise. *Brown* v. *Board of Education* marked an historic moment in the evolution of the conscience of this Nation. But the promise of a desegregated education which it held out to hundreds of thousands of black children went largely unfulfilled for fifteen years. Finally, after a generation of procrastination, the Supreme Court ordered that *Brown* be effectively enforced. *Alexander* v. *Holmes County Board of Education,* 396 U.S. 19 (1969); *Carter* v. *West Feliciana Parish School Board,* 396 U.S. 226 (1969), 396 U.S. 290 (1970); *Swann* v. *Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education,* 402 U.S. 1 (1971). One year later, we are offered a constitutional amendment by which—just as *Brown's* meaningful implementation begins—*Brown* is to be nullified.

That this would be the effect of the amendment (assuming, as I now am, that it is clarified to subordinate the Fourteenth Amendment to the "neighborhood school" system) is perfectly plain. Whatever may be the case outside the South, southern "neighborhood" schools are the products and the perpetuators of the racial segregation that *Brown* sought to end. To understand why this is so, one needs only recognize the obvious fact that "neighborhoods" are shaped by the social conditions in which they grow and change. The "neighborhoods" of "neighborhood schools" do not come into being independently of the schools; rather the "neighborhood schools" significantly mold their own "neighborhoods."

Governmental decisions as to school location and school size necessarily define the "neighborhood" of any school; and, once those decisions have been made, people decide where they will live (to the extent that social patterns allow) in consideration of the placement of the schools. Throughout generations prior to *Brown* and one generation after, all of these decisions were made in a manner that accepted, reinforced, and frequently affirmatively promoted, racial segregation. The resultant "neighborhoods" could only become, as they now are, bastions of segregation.

School location, school construction, school size, grade structure, road patterns, highway design, and other physical planning in the South have always been—as they are everywhere—designed to foster the public convenience. In the southern states where segregation was accepted as the way of life, they were designed to foster the convenience of segregated schooling. Southern geographic convenience was thoroughly linked to segregation; and to say, now, "we will stop segregating and start assigning pupils to schools on the basis of geographic convenience," is to stop nothing but candor and to start nothing new except hypocrisy. The same kids go to the same schools; they go there because of the color of their skins; they are just as segregated as they ever were, and by the same devices.

So, to cast the "neighborhood school" concept in the form of an inflexible constitutional amendment which supersedes *Brown* is, in the South, to repudiate *Brown* itself. It is to make *Brown* a fifteen-year promise without substance; then, when substance comes near, to break the promise. It is to deal a terrible blow not only to our black citizens but also to the institutions of American government and the sincerity of our commitment through those institutions to preserve and protect the legitimate rights of all minority groups.

American government is based fundamentally upon the principle of majority rule with decent respect for minorities. That respect is partially assured by our constitutional guarantees of individual rights, including the right of racial equality, which no majority may abridge. Of course, the Constitution is amendable; those guarantees may be taken away in whole or in part; and so, if a minority is small enough, its rights are ultimately subject to the majority's will. But it is to America's credit—it is a source of America's unity, its strength, its relative freedom from agonizing dissention—that none of our constitutional guarantees of individual rights has throughout history been taken away, in whole or in part, by the amending process. This tradition of restraint in the use of the amending process is another large part of the constitutional heritage that expresses our decent respect for minorities. It is an indispensable part; for, without such restraint, only the rights of very large minorities would be safe for long.

To break with the tradition of restraint on this occasion, at this time, upon this issue, would be a national calamity. To amend the Constitution precipitously—in response to very recent judicial decisions whose boundaries the courts are still thrashing out and whose consequences we have plainly had insufficient time to consider maturely—would set the worst kind of precedent for the use of the amending process. And to achieve what worthy purpose? To put what all the world will see as an Apartheid Amendment on the Constitution of the United States. I devoutly hope not.

Yours sincerely,
ANTHONY G. AMSTERDAM,
*Professor of Law.*

---

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
*January 26, 1972.*

HON. EMANUEL CELLER,
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: I am pleased to respond to your letter requesting my comments on H.J. Res. 620. I write in my individual capacity, and not as a representative of the University of California.

This proposed constitutional amendment is described as "relative to neighborhood schools." Presumably the proposal is designed to require adherence by school districts to the neighborhood school principle. But the proposal does so only with respect to prohibiting assignment of children outside a neighborhood zone on grounds of "race, creed, or color." Any other departure from a neighborhood school principle is not prohibited by the proposed amendment. The proposal is, then, designed to preserve neighborhood schools only where neighborhood schools are threatened by efforts to ameliorate racial segregation. I am opposed to the proposal for several reasons.

(1) There may be cases where current racially segregated school populations are the product of present or past compulsory racial segregation by a school district. The proposed amendment would apparently prohibit assigning children to schools on the basis of race where such assignments would be an essential mechanism by which to undo "de jure" segregation. The amendment might, in such cases, make unavailable a necessary means to remedy a denial of equal protection of the laws under section one of the Fourteenth Amendment.

(2) The proposed amendment would establish a Constitutional principle on an issue which the United States Supreme Court has yet to decide: the scope of the obligation of school districts to take steps to ameliorate what is misleadingly referred to as "de facto" segregation. I believe that the Equal Protection Clause should be held to require that school districts make use of all means reasonably available to lessen such segregation. I shall not here develop my reasons for this conclusion. This issue has been litigated in a number of courts, and the Supreme Court will soon decide the issue. I, therefore, of course oppose a constitutional amendment which would produce the contrary result.

(3) The proposed amendment would not just establish that a school district does not have an obligation to lessen "de facto segregation"—it would go further, and prohibit school districts from deciding to take such action even though they were not constitutionally obligated to do so. I do not think it wise to prohibit such action by states and school districts. Even if there is no constitutional obligation to lessen "de facto" segregation, I believe that, as a minimum, state and local governments should be permitted to choose what their responses will be to this issue. It is, to say the least, not unreasonable for a school district to decide that, in order to provide equality of educational opportunity and to encourage the development of constructive race relations in a community, efforts should be made to lessen racial separation in the public schools. It is far from clear that there should be one single national principle on this question, prohibiting local determination and diversity.

For these reasons I believe that it would be contrary to the national interest to adopt the amendment proposed in H.J. Res. 620.

Sincerely,
HAROLD W. HOROWITZ,
*Professor of Law.*

---

DURHAM, N.C.,
*January 17, 1972.*

HON. EMANUEL CELLER,
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: In response to your request of January 6, 1972, I am submitting the following comments on H.J. Res. 620 which proposes to amend the Constitution by adding the following sections:

Section 1. No public school student shall, because of his race, creed, or color, be assigned to or required to attend a particular school.

Section 2. Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

As no hearings have yet been held, the intention and proper construction of this proposed amendment are necessarily uncertain. As I mean to indicate in detail, moreover, the language of the proposed amendment is readily susceptible to widely differing interpretations, any one of which might be finally rendered by the Supreme Court, with consequences very different from those imagined by some members of Congress

Nevertheless, as the proposed amendment has been introduced within a year of the Supreme Court's unanimous affirmance of *Swann* v. *Mecklenburg County,* and as it has been proposed in a time of considerable public unease regarding the judicial enforcement of equal protection derived from the Court's earlier unanimous Opinion in *Brown* v. *Board of Education,* its principal objective may be that of establishing a constitutional exception of the means which Federal courts have held to constitute an appropriate remedy to redress systematic racial discrimination by Government against the equal rights of Negro school children. Specifically, I suppose that it is meant to forbid Federal courts to consider the race or color of any student in fashioning a judicial order affecting school attendance, whether or not that order is otherwise determined by the court to be required as an essential means of assuring school children equal educational opportunities previously denied them in violation of the fourteenth amendment.

Respectfully, I believe that the proposed

amendment is uniquely ill-advised. First, its disingenuous coloration, *i.e.*, the manner in which it is worded, is systematically misleading. Second, and closely connected with the manner in which the proposal has been framed, its capacity for radically different kinds of judicial interpretation is so enormous as to leave utterly uncertain its ultimate practical consequences. For reasons more fully explained hereafter, moreover, the amendment as proposed is in fact exceedingly unlikely to have any effect upon the authority of a Federal court to require pupil assignments to schools other than those within their neighborhoods. In short, one of the least likely consequences of the amendment is that of insulating the assignment of children to neighborhood schools from judicial review and revision. My reasons for these conclusions are set forth in the three following sections.

I. PLAUSIBLE CONSTRUCTIONS OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS WHOLLY IN ACCORD WITH SWANN

From one point of view, the proposed amendment might well be interpreted as nothing more or less than the explicit constitutionalizing of federal court decisions previously derived from the more general provisions of the fourteenth amendment. Wholly consistent with its language, it can be construed to provide that no department of government, including of course a local school board, may structure any public educational system to achieve racial apartheid or to relate the assignment of students to any standard which would result in his attendance of a school racially segregated as the consequence of prior governmental racial discrimination involving that standard. The use of any standard compelling a student to attend a particular school, where the standard itself is one involving prior governmental discrimination based on race, would thus be declared invalid as a violation of this explicit amendment.

Far from prohibiting busing, and far from insulating neighborhood school assignments from judicial review and modification, however, the amendment as thus construed would have no effect on either of these other than to confirm their correctness. The only question in each such case would be for the court to determine whether a student has been assigned to a school according to some standard which reflects either current or past governmental racial discrimination, so that his attendance in that racially segregated school must in fact be seen as segregation "because of his race."

That this explicit provision in the Constitution, as thus construed, would not at all "constitutionalize" the neighborhood school basis for requiring attendance at a particular school can readily be seen. Indeed, that it would forbid such basis for assigning attendance is also apparent in every instance where the student's "choice" of neighborhood was itself dictated by governmental action based on race. That there has been such action which has had a continuing effect in many communities, North as well as South, is not difficult to establish.

To select only the most obvious and demonstrable examples, it is well known that government at all levels, federal as well as state and local, has in the past utilized its power to compel racial segregation by neighborhood. Such action includes the explicit policies of the VA, FHA, and FNMA which continued into the 1950s to limit the availability of federal insurance on home loans to persons of the same race as that which predominated in the neighborhood in which they sought to purchase a home. It includes as well the actions of state governments in enforcing racially-restrictive convenants limiting the choice of housing available to Negroes and excluding them from entire neighborhoods solely because of their race. It includes also the myriad decisions of local school boards and other departments of state government in school site selections, the particular selection having been made to maintain a deliberate racial predominance or exclusivity of students assignable to that school because of the location thus selected.

Against the background of these and other deliberate governmental actions, the subsequent assignment of students thus restricted to a given neighborhood because of their race could not be made to the neighborhood school. Consistent with the language of the proposed amendment, the courts would be called upon to enjoin any such assignment as one requiring attendance of the particular school "because of the race" of the student so assigned.

In suggesting this surprising construction of the proposed amendment, I should note in passing that it has ample precedent and analogy, as well as that it is of course the concrete constitutionalizing of *Swann* and subsequent decisions which have applied it generously. On the same kind of analysis exactly, the Supreme Court has already found that the use of an apparently nonracial standard is forbidden to government when in fact it is specifically identifiable to past governmental racial discrimination immediately related to that standard. Thus, in the *Gaston County* case, the Supreme Court quite properly found that persons otherwise eligible to register to vote could not be disqualified by the use of a literacy test which was not racially discriminatory on its face or in the manner of its administration. Rather, use of that standard was forbidden in a county with a prior history of racial discrimination in public education which itself significantly contributed to the lower incidence of literacy of those victimized by that discrimination. In this sense, the use of a literacy test contained within itself "built in" discrimination against Negroes which resulted in their inability to vote "because of race" as discriminatorily utilized by prior governmental action. Their disqualification attributable to that action was thus itself disqualification "because of their race" as employed by government. Identically, the assignment of Negro children to a racially segregated school which they are compelled to attend because of the combination of "neighborhood" assignment plus prior governmental action restricting them to that neighborhood because of their race, is forbidden.

The unexceptional nature of this construction and analysis is older still. Even in 1866, as the fourteenth amendment was then under formulation, the House Majority Leader recognized that as it would be racially discriminatory to disqualify a Negro from voting explicitly because of his race, so it would be equally racially discriminatory to disqualify him for lack of sufficient property *if, at the same time, governmental action barred him from acquiring property*:

> Mr. Farnsworth. Suppose the State of South Carolina should provide by law that no Negro should hold real estate.
>
> Mr. Stevens. Then the amendment operates.
>
> (Cong. Globe, 39th Cong., 1 Sess. p. 376.)

Exactly in the same manner, school assignments based on neighborhood, where government itself has previously assigned that neighborhood on the basis of race or where it has located schools to perpetuate neighborhoods on the basis of race, are clearly forbidden. To the extent that the proposed amendment would explicitly affirm this determination, I see little basis for taking exception to it. Given that construction of section 1, the compatible construction of section 2 of the proposed amendment would follow a similar course: to establish in Congress the authority to "enforce" this effect of section 1 by "appropriate" legislation, *i.e.*, to repose in Congress a useful authority to complement the judicial administration of section 1 by furnishing additional remedies (and, possibly, an even more generous affirmative scope of protection) to those remedies otherwise within the judicial power of the courts. Cf. *South Carolina* v. *Katzenbach*, 303 U.S. 301 (1966); *Katzenbach* v. *Morgan* 384 U.S. 641 (1966); *Bivens* v. *Six FBI Agents*, U.S. (1971).

II. THE PROBABLE IRRELEVANCE OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO EXISTING FEDERAL COURT ENFORCEMENT OF THE EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSE

I have not meant to be artful in setting forth the possible interpretation of H.J. Res. 620 that I have suggested in the preceding discussion. Rather, I have meant to show only how innocent, correct, and well-intentioned it can plausibly be construed by a Court in aid, rather than in derogation of its decision in *Brown* and *Swann*.

Even so, I do not take the proposal to be offered in this spirit of authenticating the obligation of our federal courts to grant relief to children required to attend segregated schools because of the discriminatory actions of government. It may, indeed, intend to accomplish nearly the opposite result: to forbid effective relief to persons captured in racially segregated neighborhood schools as a consequence of government's own complicity in related actions of racial discrimination. That it could conceivably be given this construction and this consequence can readily be seen, I suppose, even though it is difficult for me to imagine why any member of Congress would think it appropriate to enact such an appalling proposition into the fundamental law of this nation.

This possible consequence of the proposed amendment, so to perpetuate governmentally-imposed school segregation, can be seen by interpreting it to bar a federal court from issuing the only kind of order which may, in a given case, be indispensable to relieve Negro children from that racial segregation which government has imposed upon them through its combination of neighborhood school assignment plus prior racial discrimination in restricting neighborhoods and in locating its schools. In frankness, however, I do not think that this interpretation of the proposed amendment is truly supportable consistent with its current phrasing. The reasons that make this an implausible construction of its terms can best be understood by a brief review of the rationale of several busing cases.

We have already noted the several respects in which the rigid and unyielding assignment of students strictly on the basis of residential proximity to the closest school at hand may indefinitely perpetuate state-imposed racial segregation as clearly as though the state had physically confined Negroes to certain areas by a single statute, rather than by the wider combination of state and federal actions which were identically discriminatory: the enforcement of racially-restrictive covenants, the restriction of federal assistance to purchasers of property in racially homogeneous areas, the location of schools to assure racially homogeneous student bodies, etc. As the right to equal protection is personal, and as it is the duty of the federal courts to grant relief accordingly, *i.e.*, to each person thus discriminated against, it is not strange that the relief to be ordered in each such case necessarily must provide the plaintiff's child with effective access to a different school—a school not necessarily within the immediate neighborhood of where its family has been made to live.

That the child should merely be freed from attending the school erected in the immediate neighborhood is clearly inadequate in these circumstances to grant him *equal* protection: by itself, such an order makes no provisions for him to be admitted to any other school, or to overcome the governmentally-imposed greater expense that he must bear to reach that school. To the extent

that his family, because of its race, has been restricted by the prior actions of government to a residence farther from that other school than other children must travel at their own expense, it is very clear that government must now restore that equal access by furnishing the means of getting there with no more hazard or expense than other families are made to endure. Thus the provision for *busing*, the usual means for transporting students to school.

This, writ very small, is the essence of the unanimous decision in *Swann* and its subsequent application in other cases, North as well as South: judicially compelled relief from that denial of equal protection arising from deliberate government actions placing Negroes in particular neighborhoods because of their race, and placing schools in particular places because of race, necessarily requires that government must now provide effective access to other schools. Access which is effective on *equal* terms with that enjoyed by all other children required to attend that school is not assured, moreover, unless those entitled to such relief as a whole class are subjected to no greater inconvenience, delay, and hazards of transportation than all others within the district. Thus, buses may be made to move in *both* directions, assuring that Negro children need not travel farther than white children to attend a school free of that racial apartheid previously sponsored by government itself.

Even though it should now be clear that the resulting order of the court respecting school attendance is entered not "because of race," but rather because it is plainly required to assure the children of Negro plaintiffs that equal protection which the fourteenth amendment has been held to guarantee them, it may be that the purpose of the proposed amendment is to forbid our federal courts from granting that relief. If so, however, then that purpose and effect need to be more clearly stated in the proposed amendment because its current phrasing is simply inadequate to assure that end. Its inadequacy in this respect can be seen by comparing its wording with the actual manner in which the federal courts currently review school district plans.

What the amendment provides is that no public school student shall be required to attend a particular school "because of race." The rationale of a school attendance plan approved by a federal court as part of that relief to which the plaintiffs were found to be entitled, however, is not that any particular assignment is made because of the race of any particular student; rather, it is that the attendance plan reflects the school board's best determination of cost, convenience, efficiency, and safety in assigning students to various schools, *consistent with the constitutional right of the plaintiffs to be free from racial discrimination.* To put the matter differently, each student is assigned to a particular school because of considerations of cost, convenience, and educational policy as determined without respect to each student's race. To be sure, the alternative plans open to the school board on these bases, broad and numerous as they are, are appropriately limited by judicial decree to make certain that they do not operate directly or indirectly to impose unequal burdens upon Negro children because of *their* race. The proposed amendment does not on its face forbid such a limitation, however, and thus, given its present wording, it may in fact have no effect whatever upon this authority of the federal courts.

III. THE REAL DECISION BEFORE THE CONGRESS

What I have attempted to explain here is essentially that the proposed amendment is the victim of its own disingenuousness. Its ulterior objective has been so thoroughly disguised in the innocence of its language as to have been utterly compromised by that disguise. Indeed, the most that can be said of it in its current form is the suggestion I ventured at the beginning: its capacity for radically different kinds of judicial interpretation is so enormous as to leave utterly uncertain its ultimate practical consequences.

Nevertheless, there is of course a means by which that uncertainty can be eliminated, namely, to rephrase the proposed amendment so to make perfectly clear the real decision of the Congress. Specifically, uncertainty would be dispelled and the ulterior purpose made clear beyond peradventure of judicial mis-construction if the proposal were candidly reformulated as follows:

"The assignment of public school students to the particular school closest to their respective homes shall not be deemed to deny them any constitutional right whether or not that school is racially segregated and whether or not that racial segregation is the result of governmental action which has itself been based on race."

This amendment would, indeed, be adequate to accomplish its "purpose," *i.e.*, the plain and terrible determination to perpetuate racial apartheid in public education. It would freeze our courts from providing meaningful relief to those who have been denied equal protection, and it would signal that the promise of *Brown* v. *Board of Education* is a lie, a commitment we no longer mean to keep. Respectfully, however, it might be far better that Congress should most carefully consider whether it truly desires to do this.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM VAN ALSTYNE.

## IN MEMORY OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was one of the most dedicated, sincere fighters for the rights of all men of all colors. As a tribute to the memory of Dr. King, Miss Blanche Malankowski's sixth grade class at the Verde Elementary School in Richmond, Calif., read a story entitled "Our Feet Hurt." The story concerned Mrs. Rosa Parks' part in initiating the Montgomery bus boycott of 1956.

One of Miss Malankowski's students, Zelda Douglas, was inspired to write a charming and moving poetical narrative about the bus boycott. The poem was entered in the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., poetry contest sponsored by the Oakland, Calif., Black Caucus. It won first prize.

Mr. Speaker, I share Zelda Douglas' thoughts with my colleagues by printing the text of the poem as follows:

OUR FEET HURT

Dr. Martin Luther King,
He wanted to do his thing;
He wanted the black people to have the same
rights on the buses in the city,
But the white people had no pity.
So the black people began to walk,
And the white started to talk;
The buses began to slack,
Because there was no black;
So Dr. Martin Luther King
Did his thing.

## NEW, $50 MILLION PROGRAM TO SERVE THE POOR

### HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, when the OEO bill comes before the House I intend to offer an amendment authorizing an additional $50 million for new programs to serve the poor, particularly the elderly poor, who are being underserved by present OEO programs.

OEO was originally designed to break the cycle of poverty by targeting its resources only at the worst concentrations of poverty. This design has meant an emphasis on youth and on specific geographic target areas, with little attention given to the elderly poor who generally live in areas of less concentrated, but still significant, poverty. A long-intended expansion of OEO programs into these areas has not occurred.

The 1967 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act which directed OEO to assume a responsibility for the elderly poor have had little effect. While those 65 and older constitute 20 percent of all the poor and are progressively becoming a larger proportion of the total universe of poverty, OEO targets only $8 million from its $700 million budget specifically to programs for the aged. The National Council on the Aging has testified that proposed projects totaling at least $50 million should have been funded by OEO in this fiscal year, but were rejected due to a lack of funds and a lack of emphasis upon programs for the elderly.

My amendment would require OEO to bring its expertise in imaginative and innovative programing to bear upon the economic, social and health problems of the underserved poor, particularly the elderly, and help them to lead useful, productive lives. The White House Conference on the Aging called special attention to the crying need for such wide-ranging research and development in programs for the elderly, which is clearly OEO's primary responsibility.

When I announced a similar amendment in September of last year, telegrams and letters of support poured in from all over the country. I include a list of some of these at this point in my remarks:

Lawrence Barreras, Chaves Co. Comm. Action Prog., Roswell, N.M.

Richardsville Senior Citizens of the Tri Co. Senior Citizens, Dubuque, Iowa.

James M. Hughtes, S. E. Arkansas Comm. Action, Warren, Ark.

Harold P. Cooper, McDowell Co. CAP, Welch, W. Va.

Ernest Lopez, Scout Advisory Board, Watsonville, Calif.

Nelson Wurgler, Board of Directors, Hospitality House, Las Cruces, N.M.

L. Sharpe, Project Bravo Alameda Center, El Paso, Texas.

William Pothier, San Francisco Senior Center.

Len Hansmier, Waukon Senior Citizens, Waukon, Iowa.

William Medcalf, Lval Chapter, Amer. Assn. of Retired Persons, Las Cruces, N.M.

Foster Grandparents Program, Austin State School, Austin, Texas.

Facundo R. Rodriguez, Econ. Opportunity Board, Albuquerque, N.M.

Rudolph Cubiciotti, Contra Costa Co. Comm. on Aging, Martinez, Calif.

Bill Sanson, Comm. Action Prog. for Central Ark., Conway, Ark.

Hawaii County Econ. Opportunity Council, Hilo, Hawaii.

Mrs. Luetta Klosterman, Edgewood Iowa Senior Citizens Club, Dubuque.

W. P. McKinney, Sen. Citizens Activity, Boise Econ. Adv. Corp. Texarkana, Texas.

Carl Smith, Delta Community Action Assn. and I. Rosenzweig, Delta Senior Citizens Program.

Samuel L. Price, Harris Co. Community Action Prog., Houston, Texas.

Bill Joe Watson, Governing Board, SEA Community Action Corp., Warren, Ark.

Eugene Rodriquez Jr. Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp., San Antonio, Texas.

Marie Brooks, Seniors of Ohio, Inc., Cleveland.

Northern Arizona Dev. Council, OEO programs, Apache, Navajo, Coconino, Mohave and Yavapai Counties.

Senior Citizens Coalition of St. Paul, Minn.

Peter Vallot Jr., CAA for Acadia, St. Landry and Vermillion Parish, La.

Ulster Co. Senior Citizens Alliance Inc., Joseph Lorenzo and Elsie Lorenzo.

Philip D. Standley, CAA Director, Okfuskee Co. Community Action Foundation, Okemah, Okla.

David Joseph Cache, N.Y. State Wide Senior Action Council, Liberty, N.Y.

Rachel Kohlman, Senior Citizens Group, Inc., Waverly, Iowa.

Sageville Tri County Seniors, Dubuque, Iowa.

Leora Reinberger, Ames, Iowa.

Mrs. Faya Lane, Missouri Valley Iowa Senior Citizens Club.

Charles Stoen, Decorah Senior Citizens, Decorah, Iowa.

Bluff View Senior Center, Gering, Nebraska.

Morrill Manor Senior Center, Gering, Nebraska.

Minatare Senior Center, Minatare, Nebraska.

Bayard Senior Center, Bayard, Nebraska.

Kenneth Gordon, Mayor, Meriden, Iowa.

The Senior Citizens of Bridgeport, Nebraska.

Mrs. L. C. Mangler, Senior Citizens Club, Sabula, Iowa.

Francisco G. Zarate, Community Action Council of Star County, Rio Grande City, Texas.

Howard Borlan, Dundee, Iowa Senior Citizens, Manchester, Iowa.

Floyd Massy, Council of Econ. Opportunity, Hot Springs, Ark.

Albert Keebler, Ryan, Iowa Jolly Senior Citizens.

Ambrose Holtz, Manchester Iowa Senior Citizens Club.

Mrs. Naomi Mettler, Hopkintown Iowa Senior Citizens.

Nora Bricker, Senior Citizens, Tama, Iowa.

Henry C. Tomlinson, Senior Citizens Action Council of Missouri, Kansas City, Mo.

Jemroetta Toller, Aula McDonald and Mary Dahl, Over 60 Club of the Jane Boyd Community House, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

Mildred Jeffrey, Ann Huber and Cleo Dillon, Jolly 60 Club, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

Ray Lanning, Delhi Iowa Senior Citizens, Manchester, Iowa.

Agatha Funke, Tri County Senior Citizens Corp., Manchester, Iowa.

M. F. Brickler, Senior Citizens Center, Williamsburg, Iowa.

Angus Thompson, Community Action Corp., Wichita Falls, Texas.

Cornelius F. Ryan, Senior Action Council of Islip Bay, Plainview, N.Y.

The Senior Citizens Club of St. Charles, Va., Ella Burgin.

Greater Chester Movement, Frank Tyler, Chester, Pennsylvania.

W. B. Harrison, Mississippi Co., Ark. Econ. Opportunity Comm., Inc.

Margaret Staub, Mid Delta Co. OED, Helena, Ark.

Bobby J. Yopp, Crowley's Ridge Dev. Council, Inc. Jonesboro, Ark.

Earl Smith, Tri County, CAA, Center, Texas.

Bob Cannon, Comanche Co. Improvement Foundation, Lawton, Okla.

Mercer Co. Branch NAACP, Bluefield, W. Va.

Dan Reyna, CAP Agency, Cameron-Willacy Counties, Brownsville, Texas.

W. D. Goldsby EOA, Pulaski County, Little Rock, Ark.

EODC, Frio-La Salle-McMullen Counties, Cotulla, Texas.

D. W. Froe, Mercer Co. Senior Citizens Program, Bluefield, W. Va.

Mrs. Ellen Laun, Washington, Pennsylvania.

Harold Foulk, Council for Aging of Santa Clara Co., San Jose, Calif.

Rev. Horacio Rios, Phoenix, Arizona.

Community Action Agency of Dona Ana County, N.M. Las Cruces.

Henry V. Trujillo, Santa Fe Senior Citizens Center for Santa Fe Co., Delegate to White House Conf. on Aging.

Edward A. Gardner, Econ. Opportunity Council, San Juan Co., Farmington, N.M.

Maria M. Mendez, Las Cruces Neighborhood Assn. Las Cruces, N.M.

Mrs. Mary Ruth, Brabec Senior Citizen Outreach Aid, Blue Valley Community Action, Crete, Nebraska.

Wallace E. Smith, Northwest Arkansas EOA, Rogers, Ark.

Senior Citizens of Bluefield, W. Va.

Marjorie Hanson, Senior Citizen Supvr., Omaha, Nebraska.

Jessy Garza, Community Council Bee Co., West Corpus Christi, Texas.

Ada Bissell, Greeley Iowa Senior Citizens Club.

Sharon Flippen, Val Verde Community Action Agency, Del Rio, Texas.

Bob Adkison, ARVAC, Inc. County Community Action Agency, Dardanelle, Ark.

Margaret Sutton, Delaware Iowa Senior Citizens.

Gusta Thompkins, Senior Citizens of Colesburg, Iowa.

Mrs. Helen Felten, Maquoketa Iowa Senior Citizens Club.

Mrs. Earl Miller, Jolly Forty Nine'ers Senior Citizens Group, Lime Springs, Iowa.

John F. Bunn, Mayor, Marcus, Iowa.

Roy Nash, CAC of Victoria, Texas.

Jack D. Hays, Community Council of Southwest, Texas, Brackettville, Texas.

T. J. Graham, Mayor, City of Las Cruces, N.M.

Kent Collins, Director, Northeast Missouri Opportunities, Inc., Kirksville, Mo.

Service of the Aged, Maricopa County, Mesa, Arizona.

Fred Nebel, Earlville Iowa Senior Citizens.

Pioneers Recreation Center, Hebron, Nebraska.

Benton County, Missouri Senior Citizens Congress, Jessie Riffle.

Lawrence Barreras, Chavez County CAP, Roswell, N.M.

Velma S. Adkins, Washington, Pennsylvania.

Omaha Mayors Commission on Aging, Robt. Gibson, Nebraska.

Geniva Scott, Aging, Inc., Montgall-Kansas City, Mo.

Gonzalo Chapa, Jr., Kleberg Counties, Alice, Texas Community Action, Inc.

Sam Yuen, Self Help for the Elderly, San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. and Mrs. Paul Edwards, Washington Conference of the Aging, Washington, Pennsylvania.

Doris E. Adams, Scott County Senior Citizens Program, Top Gate City, Virginia.

Ida M. Wells, Project Saga and Model Cities Senior Citizens Center, Baltimore, Md.

Terry Bond and Jim Vermillion, Rural Action, Butler, Mo.

Effie Sutton, Bates Co., Mo., Senior Citizens.

Henry County Missouri Senior Citizens Congress, Allie McMahan, Butler, Missouri.

Eunice Sime, Johnson County, Missouri, Senior Citizens Congress, Butler, Mo.

Ethel McMiliam, Morgan County, Mo., Senior Citizens Congress, Versailles, Mo.

Goldie Jenkins, Vernon-Cedar County Missouri Senior Citizens.

Neomia Smith, Cass County, Mo., Senior Congress.

Harry Neptune, Senior Citizens Senate, Metz, Mo.

Enda Jairal, St. Clair Co., Mo., Senior Citizens.

M. B. Steltzmiller, Golden Circles Senior Citizens Club, Oelwin, Iowa.

Charles A. Tarsi, Progress on Wheels. Belvidere, N.J.

Danny Richardson, Jefferson Co. Econ. Opportunity Comm., Inc., Beaumont, Texas.

John B. Clark, East Central Arkansas Economic Opportunity Corp., Forest City, Ark.

Jules Eshner, Retirement Jobs, Inc., San Jose, Calif.

Bob Yokoyama, AK HEW, Kahului, Maui, Hawaii.

John Lydon, Santa Clara Co. Senior Adults Forum, San Jose, Calif.

Richard C. Mastbrook, Loaves and Fishes, Inc., Portland, Oregon.

A. E. Lamb, CAP, Central Texas Opportunities, Inc., Coleman, Texas.

Linda Schallmann, Neighborhood Service Center Specialists, Natchitoches Area Action Assn., Natchitoches, La.

Steve Zozaya, League of United Latin American Citizens in the State of Arizona, Phoenix, Arizona.

Kenneth R. Deckard, Community Action Program, Inc., Abilene, Texas.

Rev. William A. Von Arx, Econ. Opportunity Corp., Andrew Co., Savannah, Mo.

Cicel Davis, Green Hills Senior Citizens Council, Trenton, Mo.

Charles A. Johnson, Econ. Opportunity Agency, Fayetteville, Ark.

Louis Saegert, Community Council of South Central Texas, Braunfels, Texas.

South Central Community Action Authority, Camden, Ark.

Cy Phillips, Econ. Opportunity Commission of Naussau Co., Garden City, N.Y.

A. W. Brehme, Alliance of Southside Senior Citizens, St. Louis, Mo.

Library Group of Senior Citizens, Washington, Pennsylvania.

Fannie S. Jefferson, Senior Citizens of Washington Area Senior Citizen Center, Washington, Pennsylvania.

Council D. Lawrence Rose, Long Beach Housing Authority and Sol Scher of Long Beach Housing Auth., Long Beach, N.Y.

Lucy K. Lemmer, Services to Senior Citizens, County of Suffolk, Hauppauge, N.Y.

Tom Green, County Community Action Council, San Angelo, Texas.

R. J. Galles, Kingsley, Iowa.

Charles W. Doremus, Econom Opportunities, Waco, Texas.

Henry M. Britt, Hot Springs, Ark.

Guy E. Robins, Council of Econ. Opportunity, Garland Co., Hot Springs, Ark.

Diane Feinstein, Board of Supervisors, San Francisco City and County, Calif.

Abraham Ramirez, LULAC, Houston, Texas.

Conrado Cruz, Jr., Laredo Webb Co., Community Action Agency, Texas.

Dr. Jim Berryman, Central Ark. Dev. Council, Inc., Benton, Ark.

Fabens Catholic Church and Community, Fabens, Texas.

Joseph Maggiore, Jefferson Paris Community Action Agency, New Orleans, La.

Mrs. Mary Myers, Residents Club Ascension Seniors, Philadelphia, Pa.

ETNA Senior Citizens Center, William Conway, New York, N.Y.

Farley Epworth Senior Citizens Club, Dubuque, Iowa.

Argus A. Burnett, Texas Panhandle Community Action Corp., Amarillo, Texas.

F. G. Wittenburg, Jr., Hill Country Community Action Assn., San Saba, Texas.

Roy T. Nishida, C.I.D. Coordinator, Maui Econ. Opportunity, Inc., Kahului, Maui, Hawaii (petition).

Mr. Speaker, this is an important amendment. It is a chance for all of us to show that we are committed to providing real programs rather than rhetoric to deal with the problems of the elderly.

## IRAN AND THE PERSIAN GULF

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly apparent that Iran plans to play some policing role in the Persian Gulf and be a dominant force in that area's future. The United States close military and political relations with Iran mean that we must pay attention to what happens in this oil-rich area. John Cooley's recent series of three articles in the Christian Science Monitor—February 4, 7, and 16—describe Iran's new role in the Persian Gulf, and I would like to bring them to my colleagues' attention. The articles follow:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 4, 1972]

IRANIANS WATCH OVER PERSIAN GULF

(By John K. Cooley)

ABOARD THE MILANIAN.—Crack ships like this Texas-made Imperial Iranian Naval frigate have taken over the watch in the Persian Gulf, once kept by the British Navy.

"Since the Indo-Pakistani war, the Soviet Union and India may rate as the strongest sea powers in the Indian Ocean," said one high-ranking Iranian officer as we put to sea from the naval base at Kharg Island. "But the story is very different here."

Soviet warships make only occasional port calls in Iraq, while one or two American destroyers and auxiliary ships have berthing rights in Bahrain.

But, "Soviet merchantmen are everyday travelers in the gulf now," said the Milanian's Capt. Hushang Sepasi. He was watching one of his junior officers check out the registry of a passing oil tanker, a Soviet merchantman probably bound for Iraq.

The gulf's usually blue skies were screened by gray rain clouds as Kharg Island the largest marine oil terminal in the world, dropped behind in the mist.

ISLANDS OCCUPIED

Before the cruise began, Lt. (senior grade) Sharia Shafik, commanding officer at Kharg and nephew of Muhammad Reza Shah Pahlavi, briefed us on the Iranian Navy's ships, men, and missions.

The most publicized of these missions to date was the occupation at the end of November of three tiny but strategic gulf islands—Abu Musa—by agreement with the late ruler of the Arab Emirate of Sharjah, and Big and Little Tunb after a 15-minute skirmish on Big Tunb with forces of the ruler of another emirate, Ras al-Khaimah.

"There were no Arab warships anywhere around to challenge us," said one officer aboard the Milanian. He had sailed aboard the command ship of the task force, the ex-British destroyer Artemis, which joined the Iranian fleet as its flagship in July, 1970.

The Artemis carries both guns and surface-to-air missiles.

The Milanian, a trim litle ship carrying about 130 officers and men, was built especially for Iran by the Levingston Ship Company in Orange, Texas, and commissioned in 1968. Its armament includes a three-inch cannon, light guns, and hedge-hog-type antisubmarine charges.

The ship has participated in several maneuvers with British, American, and Pakistani ships in the Sea of Oman. It navigates both with British admiralty charts of the gulf and those produced by the Iranian Navy's own map and chart service.

Under the dim red lamps burning over the work tables on the Milanian's bridge at night, the charts show the gulf to be speckled with islands, shoals, and the offshore rigs and platforms of a dozen Western oil companies.

DATA TRANSMITTED

Stationary radar blips on the Milanian's new U.S.-made radar gear are compared with fixed objects on the charts. Moving ones are quickly identified as to type and nationality of ship or plane and the information, if not routine, is transmitted to Iranian naval headquarters.

Three old United States destroyers are being refitted for Iran. At least four new frigates are on order from Britain's Yarrow Shipbuilders Company of Scotland. These will carry British-made Sea Cat, short-range, antiaircraft missiles.

In the gulf, Iran also operates a squadron of coastal minesweepers and a group of patrol boats.

Its Kharg Island-based, aero-naval strike force includes three squadrons of helicopters, some of them armed as gunships; the largest force of British-made Wellington and SRN hovercraft used by any navy; marine commando and frogman units, and landing craft and supply ships.

One company each of the marine commandos are now stationed as permanent forces on Abu Musa and Big Tunb, where the Milanian was bound on a routine visit.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 7, 1972]

IRANIAN PORT GAINS STRATEGIC POWER POSITION

(By John K. Cooley)

BANDAR ABBAS, IRAN.—Big-power naval politics, in the wake of the Indo-Pakistani war and Britain's withdrawal from the Persian Gulf, have moved this subtropical port into the spotlight of strategy.

Iran's 15,000-man Navy—already the strongest in the gulf and now building a strike force of destroyers, frigates, and hovercraft—will shortly move its main headquarters here from Khorramshahr, 1,500 miles to the north on the Shatt al-Arab river boundary with Iraq.

Up to now these subordinate naval headquarters have kept watch on the gulf islands and on the area beyond in the Gulf of Oman, adjoining Pakistan.

The impending move of the main Iranian naval headquarters here from Khorramshahr, where it is within rifle shot of Iraqi territory, reflects more than just the perennial and recently sharpened Iraq-Iran tensions.

CLEARLY A SHIFT

It is clearly a shift in the entire center of gravity of Iranian Shah Muhammad Reza Pahlavi's defense effort southward toward the Strait of Hormuz—through which more than half the Western world's oil supplies must pass—and toward the Indian Ocean, where large American and Soviet fleets have been watching one another since December's Indo-Pakistani war.

Observers here believe the next Iranian port to be developed will be the excellent natural harbor of Shah Bahr on the Arabian Sea about a hundred miles from the Pakistan border.

Iranian officers in this booming city of 70,000—where Iran is using its huge oil revenues to build an air and naval base, low-cost housing for the growing labor force, and will soon begin a naval dockyard—are well aware of the new emphasis.

But there seems to be no feeling here of an impending Arab-Iranian clash or of any other emergency in the Persian Gulf area.

"We are not particularly worried just now about an enemy getting control of Oman," said one officer.

ISLANDS OCCUPIED

One reason for Iranian self-confidence is recent Iranian possession of the islands of Abu Musa and Big and Little Tunb, west of here. Iranian marines occupied Abu Musa and Big Tunb despite a wave of Arab protest and Iraqi diplomatic action.

"This," explained one senior Iranian official, "changes the whole navigation picture in the gulf. Formerly, our 12-mile territorial waters extended outward from our coastline and our inner gulf islands, such as Lavancma, Farur, and Hindarabi.

"Now, the channel between Qeshm Island and the outer islands, Abu Musa and the two Tunbs, has become indisputably Iranian territorial waters.

"Of course, the right of innocent passage by all ships through these waters is recognized. But this does not include warships, for which there have to be special clearances and arrangements."

STATEMENTS STUDIED

The Shah's government has been carefully studying U.S. and Bahraini statements about U.S. naval rights in Bahrain. In an exchange of letters, the Sheikh of Bahrain agreed with Washington to continue port facilities extended to U.S. naval units during the last 25 years, while Bahrain was under British protection. Bahrain denies that it granted the U.S. any new base rights since it became independent last year.

U.S. officials repeatedly have been assuring Iran and Arab governments that Washington has no wish to take over Britain's former senior naval and political role here.

These assurances were given formally by the U.S. deputy assistant secretary of State for the Near East and South Asia, Roger Davies, during a gulf tour in December, shortly after Iran's occupation of the three outer islands.

SETTLEMENT URGED

Diplomatic sources say he urged a discreet diplomatic settlement of the disputed three outer islands. U.S. overtures were made to Iran and, through Saudi Arabia, to the Emirate of Ras al-Khaimah, which claims the Tunb islands.

Washington also reportedly proposed its good offices in settling an old dispute over the Buraimi oasis area, which is partitioned between Oman and Abu Dhabi, but also claimed by Saudi Arabia.

Sultan Qabbus of Oman visited King Faisal of Saudi Arabia in late December. They announced agreement in principle on Buraimi. But the United States is reportedly replacing the British in representing Abu Dhabi in detailed talks to follow, to the annoyance of Saudi Arabia.

The senior U.S. diplomatic mission in the gulf area is the Embassy in Kuwait. A new Embassy in Bahrain is headed by U.S. chargé d'affaires John Tatch. The U.S. Embassy to the new six-state Federation of Arab Emirates will be in its capital, Abu Dhabi, and a consulate general is soon to be opened in Muscat, the capital city of Oman.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 16, 1972]

ABU MUSA: POWER KEY FOR IRAN

(By John K. Cooley)

ABU MUSA ISLAND, PERSIAN GULF.—This desert island of sand and red hummocks has become one of the keys to Iran's new power position in the Persian Gulf.

The island rose from the waterscape of the gulf like a startling mirage as the Iranian Navy frigate Milanian, one of the ships covering the original Iranian landing here, reenacted its approach of the night of last Nov. 30 and dropped anchor about a mile off shore.

We went ashore, first in an Arab dhow of the sort used to smuggle gold from the gulf ports to India, then in one of the Milanian's rubber boats propelled by an outboard motor.

A jeep of the Iranian Navy's Marine Commando Company stationed on Abu Musa bounced over the beach of pulverized white coral toward the Iranian camp at the island's hilly end.

CANDY MOUNTAIN

Jabal Halwa, or Candy Mountain—which British Admiralty sea pilot's guidebook to the Persian Gulf lists as a "prominent hill of light pinkish color 384 feet high"—looked more as though it belonged in the Sahara Desert.

The neat tent camp near its base was pitched behind parapets of pink Abu Musa earth and sandbags.

On the hill, topped by one light antiaircraft gun, waved Iran's red, white, and green flag.

We drove across a few miles of desert to Abu Musa Village, on the island's opposite end. The flag of Sharjah, a red square in a white field, flew over the municipal building—just a few feet higher than television aerials on the neat stone houses ranged in nearby rows.

VILLAGERS GATHER

A few of the 500 Arab villagers clustered around us, eager to talk. In the village general store, the shopkeeper and several Arabic-speaking strangers were delighted to chat with strangers.

Most of Abu Musa's villagers are fishermen. They are aware that Sharjah's ruler has made an agreement with Iran to receive an annual subsidy of about $3 million until nearby offshore oil-prospecting by Buttes Oil Company of the United States yields petroleum in commercial quantities.

## REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA

### HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, today, Americans of Lithuanian descent commemorate the 54th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania. This anniversary serves as a reminder of the priceless freedoms we have in the United States and of the tragedy that the people of Lithuania cannot share these freedoms.

Under forced Soviet rule since June 15, 1940, the Lithuanian people have continued to struggle against the oppression and have aspired to attain the basic rights of national self-determination, religious freedom and the rights of human dignity.

I know all people in the free world join with me and my colleagues in the sincere hope that Lithuania soon will again be free.

## SUPPORT FOR VETERANS DAY BILL CONTINUES TO GROW

### HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, support continues to grow for the joint resolution I introduced on November 11th to return the Nation's official commemoration of Veteran's Day to November 11th. I have received hundreds of letters from across the Nation from individual citizens and organizations that voice strong support of this legislation. They, too, want to have this historic commemorative holiday returned to its rightful place on the calendar, not moved around at random for the sake of another 3-day weekend.

Although November 11th was chosen by Congress over 50 years ago as the most appropriate day to honor all veterans whose great sacrifices over the years have made it possible for us to enjoy the freedoms we have today, the new Monday Holiday Act chose to disregard this tradition. Veterans Day is now celebrated arbitrarily on the third Monday in October making it simply the tail-end of a 3-day weekend.

One of the many organizations that expressed their support of my resolution was the Retired Officers Club in my home district of Clearwater, Fla. This organization is an affiliate of the Retired Officers Association and boasts a membership of over 450 officers. In an effort to show their support, they adopted a resolution concerning the changing of the date of Veterans Day. I feel the opinion of men such as these who have served our country so well merits the attention of my colleagues:

RESOLUTION OF RETIRED OFFICERS CLUB OF CLEARWATER

*Whereas,* historically and traditionally, November 11 is the date upon which the Armistice ending hostilities in World War I was signed, and,

*Whereas,* Memorial Day has traditionally been observed on May 30th each year, as a tribute to those who have died in the service of their country, and,

*Whereas,* these historically and traditionally established dates were eliminated by enactment of Section 6103 of Title 5 of the United States Code, as the dates for the observance of Veterans Day and Memorial Day, and,

*Whereas,* the observance of Veterans Day and Memorial Day on other than November 11 and May 30, respectively, lessens the significance to all citizens and particularly to Veterans themselves.

*Be it resolved that* the Retired Officers Club of Clearwater, Florida urges the Congress of the United States to amend Title 5 of the United State Code to provide for the designation of the 11th day of November each year as Veterans Day, and May 30th of each year as Memorial Day.

*Adopted* unaminously by the membership of the Retired Officers Club of Clearwater, Florida, in its regularly scheduled meeting on December 15, 1971.

## HONORS SUSAN B. ANTHONY—GREAT PATRIOT

### HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the anniversary of the birth of Susan B. Anthony, one of America's foremost leaders in the cause of freedom and equality.

Born on February 15, 1820, to Quaker parents in Adams, Mass., Susan B. Anthony was brought up in the Quaker tradition of speaking out against moral injustice. Miss Anthony first became interested in the fight for women's suffrage through participation in the abolition and temperance movements of her day. It was while she was attending a temperance convention in Syracuse, N.Y., in 1851, that she decided to visit Amelia Bloomer, an old friend, in Seneca Falls, N.Y. Elizabeth Cady Stanton had also taken that opportunity to visit Amelia Bloomer, and it was over tea in the Bloomer parlor that the lifetime friendship of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony began.

Mrs. Stanton, the foremost feminist of her day, was perhaps the strongest influence on Susan B. Anthony's life's work. The combined influence of Miss Anthony and Mrs. Stanton in the cause of women's rights is gratefully acknowledged today by all who have been involved in the continuing effort for this vital cause.

Progress has been made since the days when Susan Anthony was arrested, tried, and convicted for simply exercising a citizen's constitutional right to vote—and at that by a judge who refused to allow the jury to retire to deliberate a verdict.

Indeed, progress has been made since the days when Susan B. Anthony was considered audacious to rise and speak at a conference totally dominated by men, though the majority of those present were women. At one point during the meeting, Miss Anthony rose to answer a question and was told:

The sisters are not invited here to speak but to listen and learn.

It is a tragic footnote to history that Susan B. Anthony did not live to see her goal achieved. Not until 14 years after her death—in 1920—was the 19th amendment to the Constitution finally adopted giving American women the right to vote.

Women must today, as always, fully utilize their talents, whatever they may be, and continue Susan B. Anthony's struggle for the fullest possible participation in every area of American society. Susan B. Anthony was truly a great American and a great patriot. It is with pride that I salute the anniversary of her birth. In honoring her we honor all who contributed. All were brave.

## VIOLATIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN SOVIET-OCCUPIED LITHUANIA


### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES


*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 54th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania and the 721st anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state.

It is fitting that the Congress pauses at this time to commemorate this anniversary and point out again to the world the violations of human rights occurring in this Soviet-occupied territory and, in particular, the denial of self-determination to the Lithuanian people.

The case of Simas Kudirka, a Lithuanian seaman of a Soviet ship, is indicative of the denial of self-determination to the Lithuanian people and points out quite clearly the violations of human rights practiced by the Soviets to maintain their tyranny.

I insert related material from the publication "The Violations of Human Rights in Soviet Occupied Lithuania, prepared by the Lithuanian American Community, in the RECORD at this point, followed by House Joint Resolution 271, "to rename the United States Coast Guard cutter Vigilant the Simas Kudirka," and the text of my bill House Congressional Resolution 61, calling on the President "to place the question of human rights violations, including genocide, in the Soviet-occupied Lithuania on the agenda of the United Nations."

The case of Simas Kudirka, a Lithuanian seaman of a Soviet ship, is indicative of the denial of self-determination to the Lithuanian people. The motives for the attempted defection to the United States by Simas Kudirka, as they are revealed in the record of his trial, were discrimination and suppression of national rights.

On November 27, 1970, the U.S. Coast Guard Cutter *Vigilant* moored alongside the mothership of the Soviet fishing fleet in the Atlantic *Sovetskaya Litva,* for the purpose of holding a joint meeting between the representatives of fishing industries and the governments of the United States and the Soviet Union.[1] The conference involved the cooperation of the two countries in the solution of the depleting stocks of certain fish (yellow tail flounder) in the North Atlantic area. The ships were moored in U.S. territorial waters off Gay Head, Martha's Vineyard, Mass. While the conference on fishing problems was proceeding on the *Sovetskaya Litva,* Simas Kudirka jumped unto the *Vigilant* and asked for political asylum.

The United States has recognized the right of political asylum in its rich heritage of accepting the downtrodden of the world as well as in its constitutional guarantees of personal liberty and due process of law. In addition, the United States has signed the UN Covenant on the Status of Refugees and is obliged by its No. 33 to accept a refugee whose life or liberty might be threatened for racial, religious, national, or political reasons.

Regrettably, these commitments of the United States were not realized in the Kudirka case. The subsequent investigations of the case disclosed that clear instructions on handling cases of political asylum were lacking, that the Coast Guard officers involved failed to understand the situation and committed serious errors of command, and the State Department failed to take proper action to safeguard the rights of Kudirka. After complex communications among the various parties involved, the commanding officer of the *Vigilant* was ordered to surrender Simas Kudirka back to the Soviets, as was demanded by the captain of *Sovetskaya Litva.* Since Kudirka would not return to the Soviet ship voluntarily, six Soviet seamen were admitted unto the *Vigilant* to forcefully remove Kudirka. In the course of the action, Kudirka was cornered by the Soviet seamen and beaten to unconsciousness. Helpless, he was transferred back to *Sovetskaya Litva* on a U.S. Coast Guard lifeboat.

The tragedy of Kudirka was a shock to the American people. The President ordered an investigation and assured that the United States is not abandoning its policy of granting asylum to political refugees. Subsequently the State Department has issued improved instructions to all concerned agencies on dealing with such cases.

The significant aspect of the Kudirka case is not the circumstances of the unsuccessful attempt to seek political asylum nor the pangs of conscience experienced by the American people, but rather the conditions that explain why Simas Kudirka gambled with his life and endangered his wife and children in seeking freedom in the United States.

Simas Kudirka was brought back to Vilnius and was tried for treason (Article 62 of the Penal Code) on May 18 and 19, 1971, by the Supreme Court of the Lithuanian SSR. The trial was presided by Misiunas, the prosecutor was Petkevicius. The defense counsel assigned was Gauronskis, but Kudirka declined him on grounds that he could not defend him truthfully without jeopardizing his life and position. Kudirka was convicted to 10 years of labor in a strict regime camp and confiscation of personal property.

Excerpts from the proceedings were made available in the west by Kudirka's friends. Although the complete text was not available, the numerous citations from the proceedings of the trial reveal clearly the motivations of Kudirka in attempting to flee the Soviet state.

FROM A REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE TRIAL OF SIMAS KUDIRKA[2]

PARIS.—"I do not consider myself guilty since I did not betray my homeland, Lithuania. I do not consider Russia, called the Soviet Union today, as my homeland."

So spoke Simas Kudirka at his trial in May for attempting to defect from a Soviet ship to a US Coast Guard cutter off Massachusetts last fall. Kudirka was sentenced to 10 years at forced labor. A summary of his trial, prepared by friends in the Soviet Union, reached the West last week.

"The ordinary Americans received me very well," said Kudirka of the sailors aboard the Vigilant who were ordered to return him to the Soviet fishing trawler after eight hours.

"Seeing that I was cold, they gave me warm clothing, while the Russian sailors afterwards beat me until I was unconscious, and they crippled my knee when I lay in prison for several months. I don't consider (the Americans) turning me back as a great tragedy. By the decisions of the Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam conferences, whole nations found themselves in slavery. In the eyes of the American military administration, I, as a Lithuanian, was the legal property of Brezhnev, the heir to Stalin, and should be returned to him."

On May 18, during the cross-examination of the witnesses, sailors acknowledged that they had beaten Kudirka.

The chairman asked the second witness, who knew Kudirka well, why he had sought to flee the Soviet Union. When the witness answered that Kudirka was driven to it, the chairman immediately stopped him from continuing.

A political commissar of his ship; the Sovietskaya Litva, asked Kudirka whether he would have sought asylum in the United States if he had known that "you wouldn't find work there, and if you did, it would have been cleaning toilets?"

Kurdirka replied: "The job isn't important. There is no dishonorable work, and if I had cleaned toilets, it would have been with a clear conscience, which is not the way you carry out your work. Your party membership card is only a ration card."

In explaining why he attempted to defect, Kudirka spoke for more than four hours. He said he had grown up in a very poor family and was familiar with social injustice. In 1940, when the Red Army occupied Lithuania, Kudirka said, social injustice increased because national injustice was added to it.

He recalled that in June 1941 people were sent to Siberia, whom he considered the most conscious Lithuanians, including the majority of the nationalist teachers whom Soviet propaganda branded as "bourgeois."

In 1941, German occupation replaced Soviet rule. In 1944, before the return of the Red Army, Kudirka said, rumors began that the Soviet system had changed. But it hadn't.

He again saw how people he considered innocent were sent to Siberia. He also witnessed mass killings. Many of his comrades joined anti-Communist partisans: Almost all of them died. He didn't have the courage to follow their example, Kudirka told the court. He tried to continue his studies in Vilnius, finishing the 8th grade, and then decided to become a sailor.

"My grandfather was a sailor," Kudirka told the court, "and I've been drawn to faraway countries. There was the wish to see the world, and besides, I thought that at sea I would forget the tragedy of my people. I wanted to flee from the strange scene: Not a week went by that in various Lithuanian towns the disfigured bodies of Lithuanian partisans weren't stacked up in the marketplace. I wanted to flee the hunger which reigned in the Kolkhozes (collective farms) at that time, the total lack of rights . . . reminiscent of the serfdom in Lithuania 100 years ago.

It's a shame, but even in the fleet I found this kind of injustice and national discrimination.

In the (Soviet) press I read about the great Lithuanian fleet, but in reality there is no Lithuanian fleet: It's Lithuanian only in so far as the ordinary sailors are Lithuanian. Lithuanians command this fleet only in exceptional cases: The majority don't even know the Lithuanian language. The top leadership of the so-called Lithuanian fleet lives in Moscow and doesn't trust us Lithuanians. Permission to sail abroad and go ashore is, in general, not granted to Lithuanians . . ."

On May 19, the prosecution made his final plea, expressing indignation with Kudirka's treachery. He demanded as punishment 15 years in a strict regime labor camp as well as the confiscation of all personal belongings.

Kudrika spoke in his own defense, citing Herzen, Marx and Lenin to explain the difference between socialist theory and practice in Lithuania. In Kudrika's view, socialism does not exist in Lithuania, but there does exist an almost inexplicable type of "parody" of socialism.

"From the standpoint of international law," Kudrika said, "I am not a criminal. My decision to go abroad does not contradict the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights or even the Soviet constitution. Therefore I consider myself completely innocent. However, I know very well that my

Footnotes at end of article.

fate has already been decided by the security organs."

Kudirka described how Senior Lieutenant Urbonas, director of the investigatory section Kisman, KGB (secret police) Major General Petkevicius and many other secret police officials, some of whom had come especially from Moscow, had tried to re-educate him while he was in prison. They had suggested that he condemn "bourgeois nationalism" in Lithuania and abroad, which had ideologically prepared his treachery, hinting at a lighter sentence if he cooperated. But Kudirka stated that he was relinquishing his own personal freedom for the sake of his real homeland Lithuania. Six months in solitary confinement had given him sufficient time for deep reflection.

Kudirka continued: "I remember that when I studied in Vilnius, instead of the two prisons which were there under the Germans, there were seven under Soviet rule, in which there were about 20,000 prisoners. They were overfilled until 1955. Already in 1950, waves of Lithuanians with their young went to the concentration camps . . . the death of Stalin saved my people from physical extermination. However, the essence of the policy remained the same.

"Now," Kudirka said, "we are destined to die a much slower death—assimilation. However, we don't want to die. For 10 years our 'brothers in the woods' (the Lithuanian partisans) fought, believing that in the west our struggle was known and supported, even if only morally. Those who died in battle or in the concentration camps believed it as well. (Even the state security officials admit that 50,000 Lithuanian partisans died.) The Atlantic Charter, which promised the enslaved nations freedom, was an empty promise, costing my people 50,000 dead and 400,000 deported, of whom 150,000 found their graves in the earth of Siberia. . . .

"The bravest and most resolute patriots of Lithuania were physically annihilated. But a new young generation has grown up which intends to go the road of their fathers. When I refused to fulfill the wish of the state security organs, they threatened me with the death sentence. I believe that this promise will be fulfilled.

"I am a devout Catholic. Therefore, if the supreme court sentences me to death, I would request it to invite a priest to give me the last rites of the Catholic church."

At this point the chairman interrupted Kudirka and said: "I don't understand, what you are talking about."

Kudirka: "I ask the supreme court not to persecute my mother, my wife and my children. I ask you not to harm them."

Chairman: "Your own conduct brings hardship to your family." Kudirka: "Not me, but you. I hoped from America to help my family more than with the slave wages I receive here. Besides I hoped to bring them abroad."

The chairman read from a newspaper: "In the US a committee has been created for aiding the Kudirka family." From another newspaper: "The US intends to help the family of Kudirka, although many American families whose breadwinners have died in Vietnam are left to the mercy of fate."

Kudirka remarked: "Evidently this committee is in the hands of those who are on the side of peace."

Before sentencing on May 20, Kudirka said: "I have nothing to add to what I have already said, only one wish, more specifically, a request both to the supreme court and the government of the Soviet Union: I ask that you grant my homeland, Lithuania, independence."

Chairman: "How do you picture an independent Lithuania?"

Kudirka: "An independent Lithuania, in my opinion, has a sovereign government and is not occupied by any army. The government has a national administration, its own legal system, and a free democratic system of elections. The laws of other countries are not binding on this government, as the laws of Russia are here today. An independent Lithuania wouldn't be dominated by the Russian language as it is today. I would like there to be no more trials such as mine in Lithuania."

Chairman: "Are you perhaps saying that the present court was not democratic and was illegal?"

Kudirka: "Of course, inasmuch as it takes place behind carefully screened windows and closed doors with Russians on guard. In a democratic trial, anyone who wished would be permitted to attend. If I betrayed my homeland, then why are you afraid to show the public a traitor. Let the public itself judge me. Unfortunately, the courtroom is empty. Besides my wife and a few Chekists (security police), I see no one. There are also a few guards, but they don't know the Lithuanian language and don't know what we are arguing about."

After a short consultation, the chairman pronounced the sentence: "Ten years labor in a strict regime camp with confiscation of personal property."

When he heard the sentence, Kudirka couldn't conceal his pleasure. He had thought he would be shot.

Soon after the trial, state security employees took from his apartment a set of "Kaunas" furniture, a rug and a radio set, amounting in value to some 700 rubles ($770 at the official rate of exchange).

The compilers of the summary of Kudirka's trial conclude their report with the following postscript:

"To this day, Kudirka does not know that he had been living under the menace of internment in a psychiatric hospital. However, his relatives and acquaintances refused to yield to the threats of the Chekists (security police) and sign statements that he was psychologically abnormal. Doctors of the city of Vilnius, headed by the chief psychiatrist Gutman, also resisted Chekist pressure. They pronounced Simas Kudirka completely healthy."

Kudirka was sent to the Potma camp complex of the Mordvinian Republic, about 200 miles southeast of Moscow. However, his spirit of protest against a suppressive system has not been broken. He was one of the nine prisoners of the camp who signed an appeal to the International Red Cross to help improve the conditions in the camp.[3] The letter to the Red Cross disclosed not only the starvation diet and other beastialities of the camp, but also gave an account of a three day hunger strike by prisoners in protest of the conditions in the camp and the commemoration of Human Rights Day on December 10, 1971. The case of Kudirka, like those of many others who asserted the basic human rights, continues . . .

FOOTNOTES

[1] The Kudirka case has been widely reported in world press. A detailed record of the case will be found in the following publication: U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Operations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, *Hearings: Attempted Defection by Lithuanian Seaman Simas Kudirka*, 91st Cong., 2nd Ses., Washington, 1971.

[2] The report printed here is by Anatole Shub of the *Washington Post*, as published in *The Boston Globe*, August 7, 1971. A much briefer but similar account of the proceedings in Kudirka's trial is also published in *Khronika Tekushtshikh Sobytii*, No. 20, July 2, 1971.

[3] As reported by Theodore Shabad in the *New York Times*, December 31, 1971.

---

H.J. RES. 271

Joint resolution to rename the United States Coast Guard cutter Vigilant the Simas Kudirka

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the tragic lack of guidance and initiative surounding the forcible return of the Lithuanian sailor, Simas Kudirka, to a Soviet ship from the American Coast Guard cutter Vigilant on November 23, 1970, should serve as a perpetual reminder to all Americans of the need for an understanding of the obligations of liberty.

That static leadership, unclear authority, and a woeful absence of basic compassion resulted in Soviet naval personnel being permitted to board an American ship in American waters for the express purpose of capturing and subduing Simas Kudirka and denying him the sanctuary to which he was entitled.

That this tragedy and this man must not be forgotten by the free world.

That the Congress of the United States therefore urges the President to adopt the suggestion of the Lithuanian American Congress and rename the Coast Guard cutter Vigilant the Simas Kudirka in memory of the right of all men to individual liberty and as a constant reminder to all American ships at sea that this tragedy shall never be repeated.

---

H. CON. RES. 61

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President, acting through the United States Ambassador to the United Nations Organization, take such steps as may be necessary to place the question of human rights violations, including genocide, in the Soviet-occupied Lithuania on the agenda of the United Nations Organization.

---

## SOVIET INJUSTICE IN THE UKRAINE

---

### HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, recently we have all become more aware of the suppression of human rights within the Soviet Union, yet very little has been written about the persecution and repression of intellectuals in the Ukraine. Soviet domination of the Ukraine has tragically become a stark reality, yet writers and intellectuals reflecting Ukrainian ethnic individualism and nationalism are continually resisting political and cultural repression.

Valentyn Moroz, a young Ukrainian historian in November 1970 was given the harshest known sentence for political dissent in the Soviet Union since the Stalin era—14 years. The charge was unspecified, yet was generally covered by "anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation." In early September 1965, Ivan Dzyuba was detained in Kiev under the pretext of having sent to the West a diary of the deceased young poet, Vasyl Symonenka. Reportedly 100 individuals were arrested in Kiev and L'vov at that time and secretly brought to trial. Many were sentence to hard labor in Siberia for "their struggle against the Soviet state system."

The denial of justice and basic human rights as represented in these secret trials was criticized by a young journalist, V. M. Chornovil, who was subsequently brought to trial for subversive actions. The list of other young Ukrainian intellectuals arrested and sentenced on false charges is endless. Although the

Soviet Union boasts loudly of adhering to the spirit of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it has continued to respond to the challenge by extending police repression and its utilization of prison camps. It is clear that the oppression of Ukrainian intellectuals by Moscow is directed by the overall policy of the Kremlin to stifle all opposition in the Ukraine. However, these men are but speaking out against the forcible russification of the Ukraine and the continued destruction of its culture.

We, as members of a free society, must continue to speak out against these injustices and support the demands of these freedom-loving individuals in the hope that freedom and justice will once again become a reality for the people of the Ukraine.

## SILVER BAYONET AWARD TO WIN CURRIER

### HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, there are many fine newspapers and editors in my congressional district, and one of the best is Mr. Win Currier, editor of the San Leandro, Calif. Morning News.

His assistance to the Army in its recruiting program was recently recognized when Col. Philip S. Day, Jr. commanding officer, 6th U.S. Army Recruiting District, presented him with the Silver Bayonet Award.

The following article describes this occasion.

ARMY AWARD M–N EDITOR

SAN LEANDRO.—Recent recipient of the Silver Bayonet Award in ceremonies here was Win Currier, editor of the Morning News.

The presentation was made by Col. Philip S. Day Jr., commanding officer, Sixth U.S. Army Recruiting District, Presidio of San Francisco.

The Silver Bayonet, a rarely given award, has only been presented five times in one year in the 6th Army District, an area encompassing Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, Arizona, Utah, Idaho and Montana.

The award is presented if a recruiter achieves at least 100 per cent of his recruiting objective for one year.

The certificate accompanying the award states: "Mr. Win Currier has continuously rendered support to Army Recruiting far above that normally expected of the editor of a daily newspaper. As editor of the Morning News, San Leandro, California, a large circulation daily paper, Mr. Currier has been directly responsible for the publication of hundreds of column inches of Army Recruiting news releases concerning enlistment options and men and women enlisting in the Army. Virtually every release delivered to Mr. Currier has been printed promptly and usually in its entirety. He has cheerfully dispatched reporters and photographers to cover newsworthy events such as open houses at the Hayward and San Leandro recruiting stations whenever requested. Mr. Currier's continued and enthusiastic support has materially aided the Army Recruiting Service in its mission of establishing a Modern Volunteer Army." Signed; Philip S. Day Jr. Colonel, Infantry, Commanding.

## AMERICA HAS THE ANSWERS—LET'S START USING THEM

### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to bring to the attention of my distinguished colleagues a very good friend of mine and a hard-working, involved citizen, Mr. Sam Spizer.

Anyone who knows Sam knows what an active, interested, participating citizen he is. His retirement 4 years ago after a 39-year career as a physical education teacher in Philadelphia special schools, did not terminate his energetic involvement in bettering his community and the plight of his fellowman.

Sam, always eager to serve his community, has never hesitated to advise me concerning civic projects which would benefit the citizens of Philadelphia and our nation. I have always valued his counsel and continue to do so.

Now Sam Spizer is writing a very fine book entitled "America Has The Answers . . . Let's Start Using Them."

One particular chapter of this excellent book instantly drew my attention and admiration.

As we all know, abandoned housing has been growing at an astronomical rate—and it is a loss to everyone. Not only do the landlord and tenant incur a loss, but everyone in the city is denied the additional or improved services for which the property tax would pay.

In his book, Sam presents a well-thought-out and workable solution for reclaiming and renewing abandoned housing.

Since this is a nationwide problem and demands the special attention of all the members from large metropolitan areas, I take this opportunity to enter the chapter of his book which deals with abandoned housing into the RECORD:

Let's Change Thousands of Abandoned Houses Into Thousands of "Rays of Hope" in Philadelphia

(By Sam Spizer)

Poor Black people are demanding better housing!

Poor Black people are demanding better education!

Poor Black people are demanding better jobs!

Can we help them achieve these objectives, and do it soon?

Fortunately, there is a program in Rochester, New York, probably unknown to most Americans, which I believe can play an important part in making some progress toward all three objectives, not only for Blacks, but also for poor Whites, Puerto Ricans and other minority groups.

The program is of especial interest to those young adults, 16 to 20, who have either dropped out of High School, or who appear to have lost interest in school and are potential dropouts.

It is the kind of program that can help everybody in the community, directly or indirectly.

Because of this, it will pay all of us to become acquainted with it and to study it carefully.

* * * * *

"ROCHESTER TO USE PUPILS TO FIX UP HOUSES"

This heading, on a tiny 2½ inch story, hidden on the inside of the Philadelphia Bulletin, and dated September 25, 1970, attracted my attention.

The short story told us that Rochester, N.Y. high school pupils would rehabilitate 60 inner-city houses this year, under a federally funded program. About 100 pupils would work on this project, and get $1.85 an hour, for four hours, on the housing job. They also would go to high school for four hours a day in order to work for their diplomas.

If Rochester, New York, can do it, I thought, why can't Philadelphia and other cities in the United States? So, in order to learn more about it, I arranged to visit Rochester on October 21, 1970.

I was greatly encouraged by what I saw and learned. I now have the feeling that nearly every dilapidated, or deteriorating, abandoned house, anywhere in the United States, can be transformed from a sad and hopeless situation into a great opportunity.

It appears to me that we now have a wonderful chance to accomplish a number of good things, simultaneously. . . . in one project. We can motivate Young Adults into getting a more relevant and better education. . . . and at the same time help them pick up many work skills that can later be of use in getting them better jobs. By Rehabilitating Old Houses, that are decaying, we will give poor people better housing. And lastly, eliminating dilapidated houses can save whole neighborhoods from possible ruination and destruction. This helps everyone.

When I came home from my trip on October 25, 1970, I picked up the Sunday Philadelphia Inquirer, from my doorstep, and the first story my eyes fell on, had this headline across the whole top of the page. . . . 20,000 Abandoned Houses—and Problem's Growing.

In the long and well written article that followed, James B. Steele, Urban Affairs writer, tells us that "Abandoned housing is spreading like an incurable disease, infecting the good with the bad." In Philadelphia, he estimates, there are 20,000 abandoned houses. The same disease prevails in hundreds of cities in America.

Steele's discussions with numerous local and national leaders in housing doesn't seem to give a tiny bit of encouragement toward solving the problem. "Most people believe that abandonment will get worse, before it gets better," he writes.

Many people don't seem to realize it, but abandoned houses hurt everybody in a city. The first ones hit are the landlord and the tenant. The landlord loses every dollar he invested in the house. The tenant can't live long in a house that the landlord has abandoned, because in most cases it probably has many defects such as a broken heater, leaking plumbing or a leaking roof. So he is forced to look for another house, usually at a much higher rental, because rents are going up continuously. Lastly, the City loses millions of dollars in real estate taxes that stop coming in when owners abandon their houses. This loss of tax revenue affects everybody in the city.

The trouble doesn't stop here. Unfortunately, an abandoned house often becomes a hangout for alcoholics, dope addicts, sex parties, and vandals who start tearing away the plumbing, the electric fixtures, the wiring, the doors, the floor boards, window frames, shrubs and almost anything that can be torn apart and sold or used elsewhere.

Within a short time it is such a disgusting situation that people living on either side often move away. Before long, these two houses become abandoned also because no one will move into such dilapidated houses. This Housing Cancer sometimes goes on until

an entire block of houses are contaminated and ruined by abandonment. If unchecked, adjoining streets and neighborhoods become degraded and unfit for habitation. They often become cesspools for crime. Not only do people fear walking in these neighborhoods, but it costs double and triple to try to police them. Police, incidentally, are expensive. For every 100 extra policeman hired, Philadelphia taxpayers are paying $1,000,000 a year.

To make matters worse, Philadelphia, like most of the cities suffering with huge numbers of abandoned houses, is building less of new houses for the poor, than the number of houses being abandoned. This makes a tragic situation for poor people who need housing desperately.

Can this situation be reserved?

Is there a way out of this miserable situation?

I think there is!

Rochester, New York, showed me very plainly, that we can Rehabilitate Houses, and at the same time, Rehabilitate people and Neighborhoods.

Yes, we can actually change the 20,000 abandoned houses into 20,000 'Rays of Hope' in Philadelphia! The same can be done all over America!

All we need, is the will and determination to do it!

We also have to learn the skills of organizing the people or our nation, so that we will get effective action . . . at once!

* * * * *

Every good project requires someone to give it a push . . . a start. In Rochester, Eastman Kodak Company was looking for some project to help "Young Adults" who had either dropped out of High School or gave signs that they would become Dropouts.

One of their personnel assistants in the Engineering Construction Division, Robert Lee, 26, (and a co-worker, Dick Pignataro) came up with the idea for a Housing Renovation program. Lee, a very friendly fellow and an excellent leader, was put in charge.

Kodak started the housing project by pledging up to $110,000 early in 1970, underwriting a six-month program. They were assisted in starting the program by the School District of Rochester and the Metropolitan Rochester Foundation. The project was placed under the direction of Rochester Jobs Incorporated.

Kodak provided a training co-ordinator, several instructors on a full-time basis, drafting and architectural help, purchasing and technical consultation and tools and equipment.

To get things moving, Kodak purchased a run-down and dilapidated meat market, which was ready for demolition, and donated it to the program. Because of it's vandalized and broken down condition, it became a good Training Center from the very first day that the students appeared for the program. The first group of students, incidentally, were selected from seven High Schools in Rochester. They consisted of eight black, nine white, two Puerto Rican and one American Indian, students.

Supervisor Bob Lee, selects the youngsters by working with school vocational guidance personnel and with local job referral agencies.

Under this work-study program, the students attend regular school classes for half a day and spend the other half receiving training in industrial skills and applying these skills to the renovation of houses for eventual ownership by low-income families. Houses will sell mostly in the $8,000 to $12,000 price range.

The training stresses work procedures, emphasizes proper attitudes, work habits, attendance, safety, and care and maintenance of equipment and machinery.

The 'Young Adults' are paid $1.85 an hour for the 20 hours a week they are on the training program. By attending a half day in High School, they are encouraged to study for their graduation diplomas. Going to school half a day is a condition for being hired for the Housing Job.

* * * * *

As the program developed, more and more people became involved and soon it had broad community support. It is a good example of how expertise from a variety of community resources can be stitched together to efficiently reach a common goal.

For example:

A. Trainees are hired by Rochester Jobs Incorporated in co-operation with school guidance counsellors . . . the Youth Opportunity Center of the New York State Employment Service . . . and Various Job referral agencies.

B. Vocational and academic instruction is conducted under a subcontract to the City School District.

C. Local trade and craft unions are assigning full-time technical advisors to the training program.

D. Several Rochester industries have loaned personnel to the program, either on a part-time basis or for extended service as full-time experts in their field.

E. Many of the 90 firms supplying housing materials to the project are also providing training lectures in the proper use of their products. For example, the dealer supplying kitchen cabinets is training the trainees in the best method of hanging them on the kitchen walls.

F. The Real Estate Board of Rochester is assisting the Metropolitan Rochester Foundation in the purchases of old houses.

G. The Council of Social Agencies is handling the financial paperwork for prospective home buyers.

H. The member banks of the Rochester Clearinghouse Association is providing the mortgages under FHA guarantee programs.

I. Finally, Rochester Jobs, Incorporated, helps trainees find full-time career employment after their graduation.

All in all . . . it is a beautiful picture of various elements of a city . . . working together . . . for a common purpose . . . a better city.

* * * * *

The six-month Kodak developed Housing Project, which started in January 1970, quickly showed excellent possibilities. As a result, the United States Department of Labor gave Rochester a grant of $1,000,000 for training 350 youths in various work skills. About 100 will work on rehabilitating houses. The others will get training in various industries, including Kodak.

According to Robert Lee, Supervisor of the program, they expect to rebuild and rehabilitate 50 to 60 houses in one year.

When all expenses are added together, it is estimated that the costs will run from $8,000 to $12,000 per house, depending on size and facilities.

The houses are to be sold at cost, and are intended only for families in the low-income group.

* * * * *

Under the Rochester Housing Program, 100 Trainees are expected to renovate over 50 houses a year.

On this basis, 1,000 Trainees could hopefully renovate 500 houses a year.

And 4,000 Trainees could possibly renovate 2,000 houses a year.

2,000 houses happens to be the number of houses in Rochester that deteriorate annually.

Even at this early date (December 1970) in the Rochester Housing Demonstration Program, it seems to me that all of us, all over America, could start copying their method of operation. If we organize our programs properly, I believe that it would be a healthy start of a successful antidote to America's "abandoned" housing problem, which "is spreading like an incurable disease, infecting the good and the bad."

The experts have been saying that "abandonment will get worse before it gets better!"

This may be true if we just continue to drift along in our seemingly hypnotized and panic-stricken state of mind.

Rochester has given us proof that it does not have to be that way . . . in Rochester . . . or in any city of America.

Philadelphia, New York City, Detroit, Newark, Chester, Chicago, Boston and several hundred other cities can learn a lot from Rochester.

One of the nice things we learn from the Rochester program is that the program does not require continuous huge grants, year in and year out, from the Federal government. However, it does require a sufficient amount of 'seed money' for a few years, to get the program firmly established.

The 'seed money' actually becomes a revolving fund that keeps financing the project over and over again, continuously.

Let's see how the revolving fund works.

Let's say that the cost of renovating a house, runs an average of $10,000. Thus the management needs $10,000 to renovate the first house. When it is finished, they sell it at cost for $10,000 and thereby receive $10,000 that can be used to pay the expenses of a second house. When they sell it, they receive $10,000 which can be used to finance r novating a third house, etc.

The project thus becomes self-sustaining and can continue this way, taking care of renovating 50 houses a year, with very little financial help from the Federal government.

As a matter of fact, the Rochester people are already thinking that by August 1972, they may be financially able to manage the program without Federal aid. They hope that the techniques and program that they have developed by then, will fit into the regular school budget.

This sounds encouraging. However, there is one question I am raising. If the program can run on its own after a year or two of Federal 'seed money' help, why not expand the program to solve the whole problem of deteriorating houses in Rochester?

For example, if Rochester has an estimated 2,000 houses deteriorating annually, why not get enough 'seed money' to renovate 2,000 houses annually? The 'seed money' for this project would probably run about $10,000,000. This is less than the cost of one F–111 fighter-bomber. Incidentally, a news item in the New York Times dated December 19, 1970 tell us that a Senate unit calls the F–111 a Fiscal Blunder that will cost taxpayers almost 8 billion dollars.

Let's look at what renovating 2,000 houses in Rochester would do to the City. Let's look at what it would do to the people . . . to their hopes . . . their attitudes . . . their pride. Let's look at how much business would be generated in supplying materials and supplies for the building program. Let's look at what it would do to 4,000 potential dropouts and despairing dropouts in saving them from a life of anger, welfarism and possible crime, and at the same time motivating them to get their High School Diplomas.

Look at all the taxes these Trainees would start paying both to the City, State and Federal government. And the real-estate taxes the new home owners would start paying on houses that previously paid nothing as abandoned houses.

Rochester would take on a new lease on life . . . and so would its people.

The Federal investment of $10,000,000 in 'seed money' for Rochester would be a beautiful investment . . . for it would bring beauty to the city . . . and beauty to its people.

And at the same time, it would act as a beacon of hope and optimism to assure all Americans that the housing renovation problem can be licked successfully and completely.

* * * * *

Now, let's see how the project works and how the 'Young Adults' fit into the program.

As we mentioned earlier, the Trainees are fellows who dropped out of school, but are willing to go back to the schoolwork program (half day at school and half day at work) and try to get their diplomas.

Trainees also include students in the High Schools who have little interest in school and who are potential dropouts. Trainees are between 16 and 20 years of age.

50 of them attend the Housing Program in the morning and then go back to school for the afternoon. Another 50 attend school in the morning and work on Housing in the afternoon, 1 to 5 P.M.

It is a 2 year program. During the first year, several months are spent learning such things as proper attitudes toward work, proper attitudes toward their fellow Trainees, proper handling and care of materials and tools, and proper safety measures in such activities as climbing ladders, fixing roofs, fixing windows and dozens of other jobs in the Housing Construction industry.

During the first year, each trainee is exposed to a number of crafts such as carpentry, masonry, painting, sheet metal, electrical, plumbing, roofing, cementing, landscape gardening and other skills that may come up in rebuilding a house.

By exposure, I don't mean that a Trainee merely looks at a craftsman working. He actually assists or does the real work. In my visits to four places, I saw Trainees working in all of them.

In his 2nd year, the Trainee will have a chance to specialize in the trade of his choice.

The Young Adults work together on one house, in units of 10 fellows, plus a Team Leader. Leaders are generally experienced craftsmen in the building trade who act as instructors and leaders of their teams. A leader is selected first for his ability to understand and work with 'Young Adults.' Without this special ability to lead, he would not be appointed regardless of his building skills. It is important that he has 'rapport' with the Trainees and can act as a Counsellor to them, whenever necessary.

The 'trainee' receives his pay weekly. He gets $1.85 an hour for 20 hours a week. From his pay is deducted all the taxes that the average adult worker would pay, who is employed in industry. He is encouraged to have a small amount deducted for his savings account. In addition, one dollar a week is deducted to pay for his tool chest, until he has paid $40.000, which is payment in full for all his tools.

Having his own tool chest gives the 'Trainee' a feeling of importance, that he really is a mechanic. It also makes him take better care of his tools, not to break them or lose them. He is told that this is the way he will be treated in industry, so he may as well get used to it now.

If the Trainee's work is satisfactory and his attendance and teamwork is good, he will get a pay raise of 10c an hour ($2.00 a week) every six months.

If he becomes an assistant team-leader, his pay will go up to $2.50 an hour. This goes to Trainees who are extra good.

The houses that 'Trainees' are helping to renovate are selected by the Rochester Real Estate Board. I got the impression that at the present they select individual run-down or dilapidated houses on the 'fringe' of a slum area. Their philosophy seems to be that if one house in a block becomes abandoned, the best policy is to renovate that house and thus encourage the neighbors to remain in that Block. Fixing up the abandoned house, also has been a stimulant to motivate next door neighbors, to paint and fix-up their houses too.

* * * * *

Now let's get back to the 'Young Adults' on the job.

I was quite lucky to have Robert Lee, the Supervisor of the entire Rochester Housing Project, take me around to the various housing projects. It was easy to see that this young and interested 26 year old fellow is excited about his job. I also like his philosophy of trying to run the project just as it would be run by a private construction company.

It was a real thrill coming to one job, where six of the fellows were nailing shingles on the slanting roof. The other four were working on the first floor, fixing windows, and doing some siding on the walls of the house.

As I looked up, I noticed that the fellows on the roof had built a platform on which their feet rested. Their bodies were almost lying flat on the sloping roof as they banged nails into the shingles. Everyone of these fellows was serious and industrious. There was 'no fooling around' and very little talking, if any.

While looking at them, I mentioned to Robert Lee that this made a beautiful picture. Look at the young men seriously working, trying to 'build a new roof' for a renovated house. Without this program some of these dropouts or potential dropouts might be tearing houses apart . . . instead of putting together. Robert Lee agreed. I gently ribbed him about not taking pictures of this scene. Incidentally, talking about pictures, Lee had told me earlier that Look Magazine had taken a great many pictures of the Housing Project and were planning to show some of them in a story they were planning to run in a future issue. This story came through in the December 29, 1970, issue of Look.

"Incidentally, Bob," I asked, "Are you able to get insurance on these Trainees?" He answered that in New York State youth over 16 can get insurance on these work-study programs and that all Trainees in the project are covered with insurance.

"How about the Unions? Do you have any problem there?" Lee told me that they have two full-time Union Consultants on the job and discuss all work with them in order to try to avoid misunderstandings. Considering how all elements of Rochester are working together on this Housing Renovation Project, it appears to me that this type of project should be grabbed up by every city in America that has the problem of 'Abandonment.'

* * * * *

When people usually talk about Training or Vocational Centers or Schools, they generally thing of huge buildings costing millions of dollars and expensive in their upkeep.

It was different in this project.

As I recall, the broken-down meat store that Kodak bought and donated to the project was about the size of three ordinary houses. Yet, it didn't have to be larger, because there are only 50 Trainees in the A.M. session and 50 in the P.M. session, with most of the Trainees sent out on renovation jobs throughout the city after putting in their two months training period in the Training Center.

Incidentially, from the very first moment that the first group of Trainees walked into the dirty and broken-down store, it became a valuable Training Center for them.

During the first week or two the students learned a very important skill . . . how to clean up a vandalized place . . . removing all the scrap and debris . . . so that renovation could start. Then under supervision of master craftsmen, they learned how to help in reinforcing sagging floors . . . how to fix doors taken off the hinges . . . fix broken windows and window frames . . . how to patch up holes in plaster . . . fix holes in the brick walls . . . make new closets . . . make accoustical ceilings . . . fix the roof . . . hang new electric fixtures . . . install new bathrooms . . . and paint inside and out.

They learned how to rip out the old equipment and how to help in the fixing of the heating system . . . the plumbing system . . . the electrical system . . . and other systems necessary to make this formerly worthless and decaying eyesore of a store . . . to become a well constructed and pleasant building which, beside uplifting the morale and spirit of neighbors, now has very pleasant and efficient offices for the administration and their employees . . . and also a workshop and classroom where Trainees can learn new techniques.

When I walked into the Training Center, they were in the process of building locker and shower rooms for use by the students, and also a Recreation room for them.

They were turning this building into a fine Training Center and Headquarters for the Administration.

It is now a fine asset to a fine program! Why can't we do the same all over America?

* * * * *

In going to Rochester, one of my main objectives was to learn how they changed the mental outlook of the Trainees from their previous "defeatist" attitude of Dropping Out . . . to one of serious interest and confidence in their ability to rehabilitate broken-down houses.

How did they talk to the Trainees . . . what did they say . . . and what procedures did they use in tackling the work on the job?

This, after all, is important in a project where "Young Adults" are asked to rehabilitate broken-down houses and at the same time be encouraged and guided in rehabilitating themselves.

To get help on this question I asked many questions of Bob Lee, the program Director, the Team-Leaders, and the Trainees. And, here is the general picture I got of their procedure when they started actual work on the houses.

The Team-Leader would get his 10 Trainees together in the dilapidated house and say something like this:

"Fellows, I realize that some of you are wondering how a broken-down and filthy and vandalized house like this can be fixed up properly so someone will decide to buy it and live in it.

"If you have such doubts, let me show you this picture of a beautiful house at 39 Day Place. It's not far from here. If you wish, you can see it on your way home.

"This house was fixed recently and when we started working on it, it didn't look any better than this place, right here. So, you know it can be done, and I feel confident that you fellows can do it.

"Now here is our Plan. Come over here, a little closer, and watch this pointer on the blueprint. Over here, we will build a bathroom. Over here, we will put in a closet. Here we will tear out this wall and enlarge the kitchen.

"We will have to repair this torn-up floor, and fix the electric wiring. We might have to rip out the old wiring and put in new. We may have to do the same with the plumbing and heating. You see those breaks in the ceiling and the walls? Well, we will fix them with plaster. On the outside, we will put on new siding on the walls, and it looks like we may have to put new shingles on the slanting roof.

"After that, comes installing new kitchen fixtures and electric fixtures, and after that we will paint the whole house, inside and out.

"The last job will be repairing the cement work in the basement . . . . repairing of sidewalks and driveway . . . . landscaping and planting flowers and bushes . . . . and then a nice clean-up of the house, inside and out.

"Any questions?" After they are answered, the Team Leader may ask Trainees if anyone knows what will be the first job. Someone yells, 'clean the place up.' Right.

"Now fellows, if you were working for a private company, there would be a schedule of work. We too have a schedule.

"Here it is:

"A. We expect to have this place cleaned up in one week.

"B. We expect to have the place completely renovated in eight weeks. At that time, if it is completely finished, the Federal Housing Authority (FHA) will send a man down to appraise the house. That means, he will decide how much the house can be sold for, and then he will recommend the size of a loan (a mortgage) to the person buying the house.

"When we get to that point, I know you fellows will be very proud of yourselves and your work. Every time you pass this house you will feel real good, because you helped create it. And, people in the neighborhood, and your family, will be proud of you.

"In fact, since the Look Magazine wrote a story and showed pictures of our work here in Rochester, millions of its readers all over America, are undoubtedly proud of us and our housing renovation job in Rochester.

"So fellows, let's get started on Schedule #1, the Cleanup.

"OK? Let's go!"

* * * * *

As soon as the cleaning job has been finished, work starts on fixing the house.

The ten Trainees are exposed to every type of work all over the house. Besides watching and helping the Team Leader, they get extra valuable training and advice from many of the 90 companies that supply materials for the house.

For example, the firm that sells Kitchen Cabinets sends an expert down to explain and demonstrate in detail how to properly hang cabinets on the wall. Doing it exactly right is very important. In addition to the cabinet's own weight, several hundred pounds of dishes, pots and pans may be put into the cabinets by the family that moves into this house.

If the cabinets are not firmly and properly attached to the wall, the weight could cause the cabinets to topple down and seriously hurt someone standing nearby.

This specialized help from the Kitchen Cabinet Suppliers, is repeated over and over again by many of the other suppliers. Thus, the Trainees, and perhaps the Team Leaders too, get a lot of specialized help that could take many years to learn, if they did not have such assistance from their suppliers.

This is nice teamwork. Incidentally the "Young Adults" are coached on ways of helping each other on the job. If anyone needs help, Trainees are advised to offer their help at once. This can build friendships. It can also often prevent accidents.

This very beautiful teamwork, by suppliers, by local agencies, and by the Trainees, helping each other, is helping to build beautiful homes that are not only bringing joy to those buying them, but also is helping to ease the city's chronic housing shortage.

Why not copy it all over America?

* * * * *

Sometimes, the spontaneous remarks or reactions of people connected directly or indirectly with a local project over a project of many months, often describe or portray the project much sharper and clearer than an outsider, like myself, who spent such a very short time in Rochester.

So let's hear some of their reactions.

One Trainee said, "My first reaction on the first day I walked into the dilapidated Training Center was 'What a dope I am. What was I getting myself into.' " Now, after the renovation job was completed, he said, "I can't believe it. I never thought we could do it. For the first time in my life I've been involved in something worthwhile."

A second Trainee who lived around the corner from one of the renovated houses said, "Before that place was fixed up, I hated that house. It was a real eyesore. But now this place is something special. The whole neighborhood is looking up to us Trainees now."

A third Trainee, who told his family about his delight and joy of accomplishment in putting in a new linoleum floor in the kitchen of one of the houses, said "When I got done explaining how we did the work, my mother asked me if I would do the same for our kitchen. She explained that she couldn't afford to hire anyone to do it. Naturally, I was glad to do it. Now, I'm going to do a lot of painting, fixing and gardening around my house in my spare time."

A fourth Trainee said, "When I came home one day, I found that the kitchen sink needed repairs. Luckily, I had just learned how to fix kitchen sinks on the renovation job."

A fifth Trainee said, "I would have been out of school by now. Probably working in a car wash and maybe working there for the rest of my life. Now, I've got a chance to be somebody. That's what this program did for me."

A neighbor said to Supervisor Bob Lee, "You're not going to show me up," and started fixing up his house and grounds, and even planted grass seed.

A second neighbor said, "I guess I've got some pride. With this renovated house so pretty. I'm going to paint my house and I haven't done it in twelve years.

A steady stream of neighbors come visiting as the house is being renovated. "There's no doubt," Bob Lee says, "that the program has had an uplifting effect on every neighborhood in which we've been renovating houses."

"The Trainees," Bob says, "look upon the Training Center as their second home. They've told us so and we guess it is because of all the hard work they put into it."

Dr. Louis K. Eilers, Kodak Chairman of the Board, said, "This program will improve the opportunities for young people, who, by failing to do well in school, might have been at a disadvantage for the rest of their lives. The program will give then education, training, money in their pockets, and an understanding of what is required of them in the world of work.

"It is doubly encouraging that the training involves housing rehabilitation. The pride of these Trainees who have gained meaningful work experience and of those people who live in or near the rehabilitated houses should help change our city for the better.

"Further, it is another example of Rochester's broad based, community-wide approach to the solution of its problems as well as an example of how business and the schools can work together on behalf of the community."

Herman R. Goldberg, Superintendent of the Rochester Schools, said, "This program has important direction for students who may not feel that school has meaning for whatever aspirations they may have, and who might be challenged to advance themselves in a school setting and learning opportunity other than our present program."

John A. Dale, President, Metropolitan Rochester Foundation, said, "This program adds a new dimension to our continuing efforts to supply critically needed housing in our city. And, it is all the more important because it has the added benefit of providing needed training to some of the city's young people."

Edward S. Croft, Executive Director, Rochester Jobs Incorporated, said, "This is a great opportunity for students to learn firsthand what an employer expects from an employee without having to leave school to do it. Thanks to the co-operation of industry, labor and school officials, we have a very exciting program package that should help to provide new educational ideas, techniques and approaches for those young people we are attempting to reach."

And lastly, a mother has said, "I honestly didn't believe he had it in him," when she saw the beautiful house her son had helped to create. She was bubbling over with pride over her son, who only a year ago, had given her much sadness, when he had dropped out of high school.

* * * * *

It's a beautiful feeling, isn't it?

Why can't this happen all over America . . . . starting tomorrow morning?

* * * * *

It would make a nice ending to the Rochester Housing Renovation story, to say . . . they found the solution to their problems . . . and they lived happily ever after.

Unfortunately, we can't use this Fairyland ending to our story . . . . because the story is a much bigger one and is not ended merely by fixing 50 houses a year.

The big story is that in Rochester, 2000 houses become deteriorated every year. If you fix 50 houses a year, can you catch up with 2000?

It will take approximately $10,000,000 a year (mostly seed-money) to tackle 2000 deteriorating houses a year, for a few years, in Rochestser.

In Philadelphia, the Inquirer newspaper (October 25, 1970) said there may be more than 20,000 abandoned dwelling units. Several months later (December 1970) I saw new figures from the city's new data processing system showing 28,000 abandoned houses and 15,000 abandoned lots. To get things moving would take around $100,000,000 a year (in seed-money) for several years, in Philadelphia.

The same condition, more or less, is true in several hundred cities throughout the country. In New York City, for example, the condition appears to be greater and uglier. It is estimated that 200,000 apartment units have been abandoned in the last 10 years. Recently, it is getting worse. Latest estimates are that 40,000 housing units are being abandoned annually.

It will take Billions to save American Cities!

The only place that has this kind of money is the Federal government!

With a Gross National Product of One Trillion Dollars a year (reached on December 15, 1970), the Federal government can afford to invest 10 or 20 Billion dollars a year, in seed-money, to help stop the cancer of abandoned housing units and the cancer of crime, fear, and hopelessness, which follow abandoned houses, all over America!

Let's Wake Up Out Of Our Stupor! And Get Into Some Real Fast Action!

America Has The Answers! Let's Start Using Them!

---

## EASTERN MARKET IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

---

### HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia budget approved by Congress in the last session did not include a capital improvement item for the Eastern Market a few blocks from here—an unfortunate omission from the standpoint of persons interested in preserving some of the old delights of urban life.

My colleagues and their families might enjoy seeing this market and trying some of the delightful foods, some of which may bring back memories of family kitchens and shopping trips in

the days before the domination of supermarkets.

As background for such a visit—and for support of the market's renovation—here is some material developed at the time the market was given a plaque marking the 100th anniversary last April of the acquisition of the property on which it was built:

Eastern Market is a rectangular structure located in Southeast Washington bounded by North Carolina Avenue on the north, Seventh Street on the east and C Street on the south. It was completed in 1873. An addition to the north part of the Market was built in 1908.

Initially there were 85 stalls which rented for $3.75 a month each. In later years, the addition was closed and the space used for storage by the D.C. Department of Highways and Traffic.

In 1963, occupancy of the Market changed when fifteen merchants, forced to relocate from the Center City Fish Market at Fifth and K Streets, N.W., formed the Cen-East Cooperative and moved to Eastern Market. Now almost all available space in the Market has been leased with the exception of about 2,000 square feet which is used for storage purposes.

Historic Eastern Market stall owners on April 27, 1971, participated in a plaquing ceremony sponsored by the Capitol Hill Restoration Society on the 100th anniversary of the acquisition of the land on which Eastern Market was erected in 1873.

Making remarks were Mayor-Commissioner Walter Washington, who has bought meat and vegetables at the Market for years; Rep. Gilbert Gude, R-Md., whose father and uncle had sold flowers there years ago; Richard Westbrook, Landmark Coordinator, National Capital Planning Commission with introductions by Lawrence A. Monaco, Jr., President of the CHRS, Robert Cantrell, Executive Assistant to Mayor Washington, and Jessie Stearns Buscher, Chairman of the historic event who strived for years to preserve the Market.

The U.S. Marine Band provided the music.

A framed paper plaque was hung near Mrs. Boone's famous lunch room at the north end of the Market. A bronze plaque will be placed in the outside wall when renovation takes place.

The wording:

THE EASTERN MARKET

In Commemoration of the One Hundredth Anniversary of the Acquisition of the Land on which The Market was erected And the Continued Use of the Market As a building serving and benefiting Capitol Hill and the Washington, D.C. Metropolitan Area. Capitol Hill Restoration Society, April 27, 1971.

## PRESIDENT ANDREW JACKSON INITIATED REVENUE SHARING—OF SURPLUS, NOT DEFICIT

### HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, with revenue sharing a prime topic of conversation and consideration these days, it is interesting to note in the current isue of the Hermitage, published by the Ladies Hermitage Association, Hermitage, Tenn., that President Andrew Jackson initiated revenue sharing more than a century ago.

In this connection the Hermitage article commented:

Jackson became President with the following set of principles:

"The Federal Government must be obeyed, states rights preserved, our national debt must be paid, direct taxes and loans avoided, and the Federal Union preserved. These are the objects I have in view, and regardless of all consequences will carry into effect."

These policies Jackson proceeded to carry out. He did pay off the national debt, and the national government accumulated a surplus of $35,000,000 during the last years of his administration. This surplus was distributed to the various states, giving Andrew Jackson a record of fiscal achievement unparalleled in the history of the United States.

It is important to note, Mr. Speaker, that President Jackson distributed Federal revenues from a substantial surplus—and did not borrow funds to finance a "deficit-sharing" program.

While I favor the principle of revenue sharing and have cosponsored a revenue-sharing bill, I am concerned that any such revenue sharing will result in further deficit financing.

The estimated total deficit for fiscal 1970–73 is more than $90 billion for the 4-year period—including an estimated deficit this year of more than $38 billion. This is the highest period of peacetime deficits in history.

Our esteemed colleague, Chairman WILBUR MILLS of the Committee on Ways and Means, in a recent speech with reference to the deficit for the past 3 years said:

We are on a collision course with chaos.

Chairman MILLS said that his bill for providing States with additional revenues, soon to be considered in the House, provides for $5.3 billion in new Federal aid to the States.

With the national debt in excess of $450 billion it is interesting to review the example of President Andrew Jackson on revenue sharing—which he implemented when the Government had a surplus of funds rather than a huge deficit.

## AMERICA MUST NOT BETRAY LAOS

### HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, we have all been hearing a great deal these past few years from those who heatedly object to any course of action which might lead to a decisive American victory against the Communists in Southeast Asia. A year ago this month, shortly after the South Vietnamese counterattack into Laos, I stated that the South Vietnamese thrust into areas of Laos under Communist control was one of the major breakthroughs in the allied effort to halt North Vietnamese aggression. I pointed out that we had finally realized that limiting active opposition to enemy advances to just those areas in which the enemy preferred to fight, while also allowing him a privileged sanctuary in those areas he must control to prolong the war, were not sound military methods of coping with an enemy invasion.

It has long been obvious that the North Vietnamese Communists, heavily supplied by the U.S.S.R. and Red China, could have been stopped in their protracted campaign to capture and control all of Southeast Asia by merely cutting the enemy's lines of supply in Laos. This, the South Vietnamese have attempted to do while the United States has attempted to use diplomatic channels to deny the North Vietnamese staging areas and resupply routes in Laos. Those diplomatic approaches to the problem, calling on help from Soviet Premier Kosygin and Prime Minister Wilson of Great Britain, as cochairmen of the 1962 Geneva accords which guaranteed the neutrality of Laos, have predictably failed. And the North Vietnamese have continued to violate these accords, as they have since 1954, not only using Laotian territory as a base and conduit for operations against their neighbors in South Vietnam and Cambodia, but also by mounting military campaigns against the neutralist government of Laos.

Today, this Communist attack on Laos continues, as does the attack on South Vietnam by the Vietcong even though a 4-day "cease-fire" has been proclaimed by the aggressors in observance of the Tet, the principal Vietnamese holiday. Indeed, the Communists, as in the past, broke the cease-fire within hours of their proclamation by assassinating a hamlet chief and a soldier in South Vietnam. Tuesday morning, the joint United States-South Vietnamese command had tallied at least 35 "enemy-initiated incidents," in which eight Vietnamese were killed, most of them in a Communist attack along the coast of Binhdinh province. By the end of this year's "cease-fire" there will undoubtedly be many other deaths added to the grim toll of South Vietnamese, Laotians, Cambodians, and Americans killed by the Communists during the past decade.

I insert at this point in the RECORD an article which appeared in the February 24, 1971 issue of the Review of The News entitled "America Must Not Betray Laos." Written a year ago as an eyewitness account of the Communist aggression in Laos by former Green Beret R. D. Patrick Mahoney, the information in that article is still timely and of great importance:

AMERICA MUST NOT BETRAY LAOS

(By R. D. Patrick Mahoney)

The project was classified Top Secret. But when the first contingent of United States Special Forces advisors arrived in Laos, Land of a Million Elephants, the first broadcast any of them heard was Radio Hanoi blaring: *"Les Americains sont arrivés dans Laos pour commençer la guerre"*—the Americans have arrived in Laos to begin the war. It would not be the last time that the clandestine American military operation in Laos was compromised from Stateside.

Your correspondent was serving with our Armed Forces in Southeast Asia in 1968 when he first began noticing Top Secret code words, correctly relating to Top Secret operations, appearing in *Newsweek* magazine. I was not surprised when at a Special Forces camp in Saigon I learned that a *Newsweek* reporter, of French citizenship, was in the

camp as a guest of the Special Forces Group commander. That commander was responsible for all routine and clandestine personnel involved in Special Forces Operations in Southeast Asia. His Sergeant-Major sold watches; what the commander sold, if anything, can only be a matter of conjecture. What is not conjecture is that his successor, Green Beret Colonel Robert H. Rheault, was relieved for daring to *protect* our clandestine operations in Southeast Asia. Today Rheault's predecessor is a brigadier general; Colonel Rheault was brutalized in the "Liberal" press, relieved of command, and retired into oblivion.

Such ugly lessons are not lost on Vietnam commanders. Top Secret operations continued to be betrayed in the American press. Consider. *Newsweek* for March 23, 1970, declared of the week's casualty figures:

"The figures were imprecise. And they did not take into account the many Americans who have met death in Laos while on secret missions across the border from either Thailand or South Vietnam . . . . Most, if not all, of these incursions are run by the U.S. Studies and Observation Group (SOG), which has its headquarters in a heavily guarded and rarely visited building in downtown Saigon . . . . Reporters are strictly non grata, and *Newsweek* correspondents were sternly warned last week that detailed reporting on U.S. operations across the border into Laos would be in contravention of 'Ground Rule 5.' . . . This military regulation forbids the press to report on specific 'intelligence activities, methods of operations or specific locations.' "

It read like an enemy intelligence report. And, a sentence or two later in the same *Newsweek* article, Senators Mansfield and Fulbright were cited as confirming the report by declaring: "We are up to our necks in Laos."

The leaking of classified information in such journals as *Newsweek*, coupled with the accompanying confirmation from the U.S. Senate, produced precisely the effect the enemy must have desired. Little wonder that our cross-border operations were so often caught in murderous crossfire. Little wonder that casualties mounted so fast. How fast is attested to by the long rows of brass plates now to be seen in every Special Forces headquarters . . . hundreds of them . . . marked "Killed In Action—Classified."

Such Long Range Recon operations had been maintained in secret to find out what kind of a force the enemy might be planning to send against American and South Vietnamese conventional forces back across the border in South Vietnam. For Senator Fulbright and his Senate Vietcong now to deny knowledge of these operations, when a year ago they imposed restrictions on them *by public decree*, is the ugliest sort of hypocrisy. For them now to attack the outcome of operations in Laos, which they personally betrayed over a year ago, plumbs new depths of depravity.

Senators Fulbright and Mansfield know very well that those hammer-and-sickle murderers who maintain terror in South Vietnamese villages by publicly disemboweling mothers, fathers, and infant children—and worse—*don't* come across the Demilitarized Zone. When the tongue of a man who teaches the word of God is cut from his mouth so he can never speak of the Savior again; and when bamboo stakes are driven through the ear drums of eleven children to whom he cited passages from the Bible, so they can never hear the word of God again—when these things happen—they are not done by the South Vietnamese. These are the acts of Communist terrorists, of political cadres, brought down from North Vietnam through the Mughia, Ban Nape, and Ban Karai passes—*through southern Laos!*

As I write, South Vietnamese troops are heading from Khe Sanh via Route 9 to Tcepone in southern Laos to cut the Ho chi Minh Trail by which these invaders continue to come. Since the Lon Nol Government took over in Cambodia, the port of Sihanoukville (now Kompong Cham) has been closed to Communist ships. That leaves only the Ho chi Minh Trail to act as the invasion and supply route for *all* Communist forces in Cambodia, Laos, and South Vietnam. Plans for the incursion into Laos to cut off the Ho chi Minh Trail should therefore have been one of the major secrets of the war. They were not. For days before the operation began the American press kept up a steady warning to the enemy that the South Vietnamese were coming.*

The fact is that there has long been a war going on in Laos. The hawks know it and the doves know it. And every time it looks like North Vietnamese aggression there might be checked, Moscow screams to Tokyo, it is heard in Washington, and the seance in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee begins again. In the meantime, the American press starts leaking troop movements, the enemy starts evacuating, and by the time the seance is over the green light goes on and the South Vietnamese are sent into some vacated area to skirmish over a few bags of rice. This time it was a major operation. But a thousand-man bugle corps playing *Charge* non-stop for a month in advance couldn't have provided a better warning.

Why bother even to go through the motions? Father Matthew Menger of San Antonio knows why. Having spent fourteen years in Laos he told *Pacific Stars And Stripes* for March 29, 1970:

"North Vietnamese troops are camped in the jungle throughout Laos and can take Vientiane, its capital, whenever they choose. The only thing holding them back is fear of U.S. bombings and fear of the Thai Army. Thai troops are tigers, and they could defeat the Communists in Laos if they were not held back by American fears of escalating the war. And Thailand cannot be saved if Laos is lost."

So much for why Mr. Nixon let the South Vietnamese move into southern Laos. They are there because, if he hadn't let them go, the Thais might have gone in—with or without our approval. And the Thais might not be so easily thwarted from Washington.

Up in northern Laos it is a different war. Yet the enemy there also gets advance warning. On April 13, 1970, *Newsweek* announced: "CIA agents in Saigon are actively recruiting both American and non-American civilians there—construction men, U.S. Government employees, men who have left the Army but can't quite bring themselves to leave the war—to lead raiding parties of Meo tribesmen against the North Vietnamese in Laos." On March 9, 1970, *Time* reported that one of its stringers (Timothy Allman), a *Life* correspondent, and a French reporter had paid an unauthorized visit to northern Laos. *Time* said they had successfully reached a Top Secret Royal Laotian operating base at Long Tieng, the Meo base under the command of Major General Vang Pao. What Allman found at Long Tieng is not germaine. What is germaine is the fact that Allman is Senator Fulbright's eyes and ears in Southeast Asia. And, as such, he was reporting details in *Time* magazine of vital interest to the enemy.

You see, there is another pass on the Ho chi Minh Trail in northern Laos. This pass, at Barthelemy in the heartland of the Meo tribesmen, is the Communist invasion route into northern Laos. The operations of the anti-Communist Meos there are a major threat to this route. Those who know of the success our Special Forces have had with the Montagnards, the Chinese Nungs, and the Khemir Seri Cambodians, will have an inkling of the fidelity, bravery, and integrity of our Meo allies. These people are all of that, multiplied by ten. There is no major crime, no corruption, and almost no trafficking in opium among them. Led by Major General Vang Pao, they are the most dedicated Asian allies imaginable. It is their base which Senator Fulbright's man betrayed in *Time*.

The situation in this part of Laos developed just as it did in South Vietnam. In late 1966, the Vietcong's National Liberation Front was finished. Had we not allowed Ho to send 375,000 North Vietnamese down the Trial, the war of insurgency in South Vietnam would have been over. The same is true of Laos. The Meo heartland used to extend all the way to the border with North Vietnam at Sam Neua. No more. Sam Neua is now the Laotian headquarters of the North Vietnamese, with a sprinkling of Communist Pathet Lao to keep the stronghold "off limits" to Laotian and American bombers. It happened suddenly. On February 16, 1965, the wire services reported that "Hua Muong, 30 miles northwest of the town of Sam Neua, fell Sunday to a strong Communist force. . . . The government forces, consisting mainly of Meo tribesmen, have withdrawn to the surrounding hills." The North Vietnamese had invaded. The Pathet Lao had not captured Sam Neua, mind you; it was the North Vietnamese. Like the Vietcong, the Pathet Lao were and are nothing.

One month later, on March 25, 1965, the New York Times tried to salve the situation, announcing: "The Meos, a freedom-loving group of tribes, have long resisted Communist inroads. Today they are better equipped to do so than in the past. Instead of ancient flintlocks and World War I rifles, they carry modern U.S. carbines. Many also have camouflage army uniforms." It was a dispatch designed to ease mounting concern about the North Vietnamese invasion. Contrast it with a report from Dr. Charles T. Weldon, a Louisiana country doctor, who with his doctor wife has spent years living and working with the Meos:

"They aren't fighting for us, they aren't fighting for the free world or any of that stuff. They're fighting for themselves and their survival. The bad guys didn't like this. In 1965, the North Vietnamese Army decided to wrap up the mountain areas in one enclave. We had 5,000 [Meo] people guarded by 250 [Meo] soldiers. The NVA (North Vietnamese Army) hit with three battalions. The bulk of the people fled. They kept walking because they knew the enemy intended to destroy them. They walked for four days, and finally they stopped on a mountain top to rest. The bad guys surrounded them and opened up with mortars and automatic weapons. The people panicked and started running. The bad guys thought they could stop them because they had all the escape routes covered. But the people kept going. The bad guys kept after them. They picked up babies and bashed their heads in against the rocks. . . . But still the people kept going. . . . They walked 12 days before it was over. When they finally stopped the Communists had killed 1,200 of them."

But what of that *New York Times* report that the Meos carry modern U.S. carbines. Edgar "Pop" Buell has spent ten years working with the Meos. Everyone who knows Laos, where this former Hoosier farmer is a living legend, knows and respects "Pop" Buell. Here he talks of witnessing 1,000 Meo refugees pour into Sam Thong from the Sam Neua province:

*If this long-overdue operation is being run by Americans behind the scene, we have much to fear. It will be another fiasco like Mr. Nixon's 21.6-mile propaganda drive into Cambodia. Our press tipped off the enemy then, too, and President Nixon gave him a timetable. Three days before the operation began the enemy pulled back beyond the specified 21.6 miles, taking along all American and South Vietnamese Prisoners of War in the area.

"They were fleeing advancing North Vietnamese Communists who have systematically wiped out every remaining Meo enclave in Sam Neua. The fiercely independent Meos have waged relentless guerrilla warfare against the Communists for the last six years. Now the North Vietnamese are having their revenge. They have sent 50 battalions of disciplined, well armed regulars into Northern Laos to wage what amounts to a war of extermination against the Meos. . . . We organized them. We gave them a bunch of surplus World War II weapons. Now they're up against people armed with a whole new family of weapons: AK–47 machine guns, bazookas, rockets and artillery. People tell me we're staging 250 strikes a day against the Ho chi Minh Trail, but do you think we can get an air strike for our people? Hell, No."

Meanwhile, Senator Kennedy was holding Hearings on this "refugee problem," raising the roof that "the Meos have been moved eighteen times." On September 26, 1970, he concluded: "They are lost to us: Let's leave them alone and not trigger actions that will worsen their lot and/or have them added to our refugee problem." The Hero of Chappaquiddick made no mention of a North Vietnamese invasion, nor of the Communist efforts to liquidate systematically an entire people on their own land. No, said Senator Kennedy, who has never been there: *"Let's leave them alone."* Perhaps the Senator is the sort of man who can walk off and leave the helpless to sink or swim. But General Vang Pao and his brave Meo people will not die quietly, and without attention. If Senator Kennedy leads *their* abandonment, there will not be enough public relations experts in all America to clean the mud and bilge from his name.

Meanwhile, General Vang Pao watches with a hope beyond hope as his people and the Royal Kingdom of Laos are every day further reduced by America's failure to commit firmly to their rescue. Recently added to the North Vietnamese arsenal were Russian-made PT–76 tanks, which overran one of Vang Pao's key garrisons at Muong Soui on February 3, 1971. His back is to the wall, yet still he has faith in America.

The courageous little Meo General wears that faith like a shield, and burnishes it with valor. It was almost a year and a half ago that Vang Pao was leading a major offensive in northeastern Laos. Because he lacked the necessary equipment to prevent it, he was forced to watch one day as two F–105 Thunderchiefs supporting his troops were shot from the sky, killing their American pilots. Vang Pao took it personally. It was not long afterward that his brave little Meo soldiers captured the 37-millimeter gun which had downed those American aircraft. Within hours that gun was enroute to Takhli Air Base in Thailand at the direction of General Vang Pao. It was a gift to honor his fallen American comrades—to be displayed in front of the 355th Tactical Fighter Wing Headquarters at Takhli. Van Pao's right arm, that Fighter Wing has since been withdrawn from Thailand on orders from President Nixon.

As the situation continues to deteriorate, General Vang Pao looks to the west, to the city of Luang Prabang. There is the home of his beloved King, Sri Savang Vatthana. The imperial capital is being assaulted daily by the enemy, and the survival of the Monarch of the Lao people is in grave doubt. Above Luang Prabang, the General knows, is the road that comes in from Dien Bien Phu in North Vietnam, through Muong Sai, where it is met by a road out of Meng La in China's Yunnan Province. At Muong Sai these roads join to extend southward along an old French logging trail running all the way to Pak Beng—to within five kilometers of the mighty Mekong River. This is an all-weather road, guarded by wall-to-wall guns. It is, in fact, the Chinese invasion route to Thailand.

Vang Pao knows all about it. And he knows of the Chinese soldiers who now foray into Lao villages along that road, murdering and pillaging. He knows, too, that to the south in Vientiane the Prime Minister, Prince Souvanna Phouma, is doing his best to rally support to halt the Communist advance. The Prince has warned again and again that "North Vietnam bears principal responsibility for the war in Laos." He has for years been begging for help from the United States. It has come in dribs and drabs—always too little, too late. American pilots die for the Laotians, and then their Fighter Wing is pulled out of Thailand. Or, after a thousand or two of Vang Pao's Meos have been killed as a result of inferior arms, we send up a few crates of M–16s. *Now* he can have an automatic weapon or two—to use against tanks. Too little, too late.

Each morning, before the haze has lifted at Long Tieng, the solitary figure of Vang Pao walks the roof of his simple home. His bronze body is covered with scars from wounds suffered at the hands of the Communists over many years. He is a small man, with more honor and courage and manhood in his little finger than the myth-makers of the Underground Press could manufacture for a hundred Senator Fulbrights. He knows all about our Fulbrights, yet he believes America will not betray him!

There is a motto displayed at General Vang Pao's headquarters at Long Tieng. It is there by his choice, and it reads: "To be born a free man is an accident; to live one, a responsibility; to die one, an obligation." He bears daily witness to the terrible price of what freedom remains in northern Laos. His people are being killed—butchered—by both the Chinese and North Vietnamese. Yet he knows his enemies have the backing of our Fulbrights and Kennedys, who provide the excuse for our Nixons and Kissingers to withhold the arms and tactical air strikes his people need just to survive genocide. The little General gives what armed support he can to the evacuation of refugees. He occasionally renders a superb counter-attack and sets the enemy off balance, saving northern Laos for another month, and another. How long he can continue, God only knows.

Time is running out for Vang Pao, and for his brave Meo people. He knows it. But he will fight another day, another and another, knowing that he is out-flanked and out-numbered and out-gunned. The word *surrender* is not in the Meo vocabulary.

How could this happen? How could we abandon Vang Pao and his valiant Meos, fighting as they are for the very survival of their race? Father Matthew Menger knows the score in Laos. He knows the people. And he knows how Laos has been betrayed. Here are his words:

"All of the Asian members of S.E.A.T.O. have wanted to send troops into Laos to fight the Communists. As you recall in 1954–55 when S.E.A.T.O. was established, Laos was not a member nation of S.E.A.T.O. But they said, 'We will put Laos under the protection of the umbrella. . . . ' If the Communists attack Laos, although Laos is not a member, they will come to its rescue. We made one mistake. When the Communists attacked Laos, we forgot to open the umbrella . . . .

"All of the Asian members namely Thailand, Vietnam, Philippines, New Zealand, and France did not. The Asian nations said, 'Okay, we don't need England and France, but we do need a few officers from the United States military forces.' They said, 'Let us Asians fight the Asian Communists. We will stop them; all we need are a few leaders, American leaders,' and the United States said No. They would not even let the Asians fight."

The Reverend Matt Menger, missionary and former parish priest to the late Tom Dooley, has spent years in Laos. He knows what betrayal like this means. Anybody who has ever read Tom Dooley's books about Southeast Asia, or talked to "Pop" Buell or Father Menger or Vang Pao—anybody who has ever seen the Communists in action—must know that betrayal of these brave people amounts to a sin against God and everything for which America has ever stood as a nation. If Long Tieng and the Bolovens Plateau fall to the Communists the betrayal will be complete.

Whatever happens, General Vang Pao and his people will fight on and on. If that means a long and deadly march to Thailand to help neutralize Communist tribesmen in the Thai northwest, I suspect he will try it. The Thais, like Vang Pao, know the Communists and what they are doing. And they know the betrayers from Vientiane to Saigon and Washington. Certainly the Thai Ambassador to Laos knows the score. It was he who remarked to *American Opinion* correspondent Hilaire du Berrier in late 1970: "I was offered Madrid, but I asked the Foreign Minister to send me to Vientiane, because the fate of Thailand is going to be decided in Laos."

Developments seem to point to a repeat in Laos of the Lattimore solution to China: Let them fall, but let's not make it look as if they were pushed. The invaders are now pressing at Long Tieng. Vang Pao has been to Bangkok and to Vientiane to plead for his people. He has been turned down, flat, by the American State Department. And, in the meantime, a Soviet Ambassador has visited Luang Prabang to tell the King that "Laos is in great danger because of South Vietnam's invasion of the Ho chi Minh Trail." Something reeks to high heaven, and it isn't mackerel.

It is becoming all too obvious what is happening. The price of President Nixon's de-escalation in Vietnam will be the loss of northern Laos and a guarantee of the security of the Chinese road to Thailand. Whether Mr. Nixon will pay that price remains to be seen. But let there be no doubt: the Communists are already on the move toward Thailand. And all that is in their way is Vang Pao, the little Meo general who until this week never even considered the possibility that America would betray him.

It is the sixteenth of February now at Long Tieng. The man who has fought for the whole northern tier of Laos has been refused the major air strike he needs to prevent his stronghold from becoming another Dien Bien Phu. Only token assistance is sent—and, when it is, an F–4 Phantom drops a cluster of bombs on the fortress at Long Tieng. It is called an accident. Vang Pao must wonder. He knows his F–105s out of Thailand have been withdrawn on orders of President Nixon. They could help him now. Their pilots knew the love and trust Vang Pao had for America. Had *they* made the strike there would have been no "accident."

What air support the little General gets is too little, too late! And in the wind is the repeated whisper of Owen Lattimore's message: Let them fall, but let's not make it look as if they were pushed.

Tonight Vang Pao returns to his headquarters at Long Tieng. Our government, which used him to tie up fifty Communist battalions in northern Laos so they couldn't be sent to kill Americans in South Vietnam, has deserted him. More of the enemy's strength is now being used to attack his stronghold than is being sent against all the other areas of Laos combined. Yet still he will not waver; still, in his heart, he believes that America will not betray him.

Vang Pao will stop this day, as always, and visit the hospitals and the refugee camps. He will talk to the American who donated his entire year's salary to help build a hospital at Long Tieng. He will visit the relatives of those who gave their lives today, that the Meo people might have another day of freedom.

As he walks to his quarters, two A-1 Skyraiders, en route home, will swoop low over his headquarters and tip their wings in

salute. And Vang Pao will remember the countless times that his Meo soldiers rushed to surround and hold off the enemy while just such an American pilot was rescued from just such a plane. *Surely* America will not betray him! He eats a quiet dinner, and retires early. He knows, as MacArthur did at Corregidor in another Asian war, that the enemy is knocking at the gates. And Vang Pao knows also that he will never surrender.

Across the globe this evening, those of us who have known and loved this man and his people, who have helped him in that silent war in Laos, are thinking of the motto we adopted from "The Raven" to suit our mood at Long Tieng. Solemnly we raise our glasses in toast: "Never . . . More," someone says, "Until Tomorrow." As my own glass touches my lips I look down at my hand—at Vang Pao's ring, bearing his personal crest, still where he put it as a pledge of comradeship from one soldier to another. Since World War II, I think to myself, I have fought proudly for my country wherever she has sent me. Never before have I felt *shame* for America. There is no reason to hide the fact that there are tears in my eyes.

## RECIPE FOR CARROT CAKE

### HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, the scope and talents of Connecticut cookery reflects not only the colonial tradition of the region but the variety and richness of a myriad of cultures that have added spice and flavor to our culinary fare.

The dilemma of choosing from among such an abundance of riches acquired new significance when as Representative from the Sixth District of Connecticut I was invited by the U.S. Bi-Centennial Cookbook Committee to submit a favorite recipe for the Bi-Centennial Commemorative Cookbook.

The choice from among the recipes borrowed and tried through the years was not easy, but since I was limited to a single item, it was my pleasure to submit a recipe for Carrot Cake—a special favorite of booths at the wonderful country fairs of my district as well as a popular item at the constant cake sales by which we raise money for a variety of worthy causes.

I was tempted to call it the Harwinton Fair Cake because of happy memories of a chilly Sunday afternoon made bright by a visit to the fair, and an armful of goodies, as well as the warmth of the greeting at this annual event. But to single out Harwinton would be unfair to the outstanding contributions on other town greens and fairgrounds. Accordingly, the recipe has been labeled Country Fair Carrot Cake and it is submitted with special pride for a most worthy endeavor:

COUNTRY FAIR CARROT CAKE

3 cups of grated carrots
4 eggs
1¼ cups of liquid vegetable oil
2 cups of sugar
2 cups of self-rising flour
1 cup black walnuts, chopped
1 tsp. of vanilla
¼ tsp. of black walnut extract
1 tsp. cinnamon (scant)

Place all ingredients in a bowl. Blend well. Pour mixture into 10 inch greased tube pan. Bake 1½ hours in a 350° oven. Remove from oven and glaze cake while still hot.

BUTTERMILK GLAZE

½ cup buttermilk
1 cup of sugar
½ tsp. baking soda
1 tbsp. white corn syrup

Place ingredients in bowl. Blend well. Pour over top of hot cake. Let cake cool before removing from tube pan.

## FORGED RX'S ARE PASSPORTS TO PERILOUS DRUGS

### HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of this body to a problem that has reached critical proportions. This is the sale of dangerous drugs on the basis of forged, illegal prescriptions.

The New York Daily News of February 14 vividly points out the ease with which one can obtain such dangerous drugs as benzedrine, nembutal, and desbutal. With the cooperation of the Manhattan District Attorney's Office, investigative reporters for this newspaper were not only able to obtain 1,000 prescription blanks under false pretenses, but also used them to buy amphetamine and barbiturate drugs.

The drug traffic which is ransacking our streets today will never be wholly eliminated unless such practices as those outlined in this article are brought to a halt. I would like to submit this valuable article for the RECORD and in doing so, commend the New York Daily News for its attitude of public concern and its exposition of an area which is sorely in need of tighter regulation.

The article follows:

FORGED RX'S ARE PASSPORT TO PERILOUS DRUGS

(By Richard Oliver)

The system for dispensing dangerous drugs to the public is so loose, so shoddy that anyone with a little knowledge, a lot of nerve and a ball point pen can buy amphetamines and barbiturates through forged prescriptions.

The News demonstrated this on a single day last week when reporters from this newspaper presented bogus prescriptions and purchased dangerous, supposedly controlled, drugs with no difficulty at 16 pharmacies in various parts of Manhattan.

The investigation was conducted with the permission and active cooperation of Manhattan District Attorney Frank Hogan. State Attorney General Louis Lefkowitz also was apprised of the probe.

ALL TURNED OVER

All the drugs and receipts, along with nearly 1,000 unused prescription blanks, were turned over to Hogan's office for investigation into possible violations of federal and state laws.

This inquiry is being conducted with the cooperation also of Sal Rubino, president of the State Pharmaceutical Society, who met with Hogan's aides last week.

To the credit of the profession, it should be noted that a substantial number of pharmacists would not or could not fill the phony prescriptions. Thirty-two said they did not have the requested drug in stock, while 14 demanded a federal narcotics registry number, which purposely was omitted from all the phony prescriptions.

MANY HAVE SUSPECTED

As Rubino said it is quite possible that some of those who said they were out of the drugs did so because of the missing number or because they suspected the prescriptions were bogus.

Nevertheless, the investigation did show conclusively that it was not difficult to find pharmacies that will fill authentic-looking prescriptions for dangerous drugs even if the required federal number is missing.

Drug abuse experts regard the forged prescription problem as epidemic. Dr. Richard Koeppel of the city's Addiction Services Agency described as "frequent" the use of stolen prescriptions, and said that in many cases youths print or have printed prescription blanks, purchase "ups" or "downs" over the counter and then peddle them on the streets to youthful drug abusers at fantastic profits.

PROMPTED BY TIP

In fact, The News investigation was prompted by a tip from an anonymous letter writer who actually enclosed a phony prescription blank. Hogan's office subsequently approved the newspaper's probe.

Two weeks ago, a reporter opened the Yellow Pages and chose a professional printer at random. Using an assumed name, that of a physician, the reporter ordered 1,000 prescription blanks.

The first printer apparently smelled a rat and demanded the physician's federal narcotics registry number. A second printer, again chosen at random from the telephone book, took the order, no questions asked.

A typewritten sample was sent to the printer on Jan. 31 by a youthful messenger who left a $5 deposit. Four days later, another messenger picked up the blanks. Total cost: $13.38.

BOGUS M.D.

The blanks bore the name of a "doctor" D. M. Sugob, which, spelled backward, reads Bogus M.D. The address on the blanks was 36 W. 34th St., which is the office of the Federation Against Drug Addiction, Inc. A telephone number was established as a control to determine whether pharmacists called to check up on Dr. Sugob.

With the advice of Chief Assistant District Attorney Alfred Scotti and Assistant DA John Fine, five dangerous drugs popular with drug abusers were selected for the survey:

Bamadex (Lederle), a dextroamphetamine; used for obesity, as a short-term regimen of weight reduction; improperly used, the drug has produced extreme psychological dependence. On the streets and in schoolyards it is known as an up.

Desbutal (Abbott), methamphetamine hydrochloride and sodium pentobarbital, which, according to, the manufacturer, "should be used with extreme caution and only foi limited periods of time in weight reduction programs." This is an up.

ANOTHER UP

Benzedrine (Smith Kline & French), amphetamine sulfate, a powerful drug which, incidentally, many druggists refuse to stock to be used "only for limited periods" in weight reduction. An up.

Nembutal (Abbott), sodium pentobarbital; produces sedation or hypnosis; may be habit forming. Known as a down.

Seconal Sodium (Lilly), sodium secobarbital, a quick and short-acting sedative and hypnotic; may be habit forming. A down.

Under federal law in effect since October, prescriptions calling for controlled drugs, including the above, are required to carry a special number issued to physicians by the

U.S. Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. Without the number these drugs may not be legally sold.

IT'S A SAFEGUARD

A spokesman for the bureau here said the regulation was put into effect in part to attack the forged prescription problem. "Prescription pads are not tightly controlled," he said. "This is an additional safeguard to assure that the prescription is proper."

In THE NEWS investigation, by design, no such numbers appeared on the prescriptions and no such numbers were given out to those pharmacists who took the trouble to reach Dr. Sugob, whose answering service reported him "out of the office" when anyone called.

A total of 25 prescriptions were made out by a reporter, a relatively easy process since anyone can obtain Rx signs and symbols in most dictionaries and almanacs.

For instance, this information appears at page 1670 of the "Random House Dictionary of the English Language" (unabridged, ed., 1971), and, for that matter, on page 55 of "The World Almanac and Book of Facts 1971."

Five reporters, each with five Rx's, went to different sections of Manhattan, where pharmacies were selected at random. The results:

Jean Perry, who covered Harlem and northern Manhattan, purchased four drugs. In all, she visited 13 pharmacies, eight which were out or said they were out of the particular drug requested, and one which demanded the missing federal number.

Preston Layton, who covered the upper West Side, returned with all five prescriptions filled. He visited 10 stores, five of which said they did not have the requested drugs.

Meriemil Rodriguez, who was assigned to the upper East Side, had three prescriptions filled. She went to 15 pharmacies, eight which said they didn't have the drug called for, and four which demanded numbers.

Fred Loetterle, who covered lower Manhattan, came back with two drugs. He visited 15 pharmacies, nine which said they did not have the drugs requested, and four which demanded numbers.

Another reporter, who covered midtown, had two of five prescriptions filled of a total of nine stores visited. Five requested numbers, two said they didn't have the drug.

An interesting sidelight to the probe came as a result of a serious medical mistake made by the reporter, alias Dr. Sugob, in filling out the Rx's calling for Bamadex, a strong stimulant that should be taken in the morning, according to the manufacturer.

By accident, the prescriptions were made out to call for one at bedtime—an absurd direction, akin to say, taking sleeping pills upon awakening—which an alert pharmacist should have spotted easily.

Four of five Bamadex prescriptions were filled. Of the four, one pharmacist marked the label "one capsule as directed," and told the customer to check with his doctor; two caught the error but filled the Rx's anyway; one made no mention of it.

## CHEAP HANDGUNS

### HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, Congress should be responsive to the needs of citizens and businessmen for greater safety from punks who become killers because of the easy availability of cheap handguns.

A recent letter to me from Peter H. Plamondon, group vice president of the Marriott Corp. at 5161 River Road, Bethesda, Md., illustrated the problem. Here is a pertinent section of that letter:

Our business has been plagued by the so-called "90 lb. punk who becomes a giant with a gun" almost on a monthly basis. One of our assistant managers very nearly lost his life because of one of these characters just a few months ago. In addition, we have lost thousands of dollars through robberies of our individual operating units this past year. Every one of these incidents has involved a firearm.

Our employees, young men and women, are extremely concerned for their safety and it would appear to us that a concentrated effort by the legislature must be undertaken to properly thwart the efforts of well organized, well financed, proponents of "no gun control."

## INDEPENDENCE OF UKRAINE—54th ANNIVERSARY

### HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that 1917 was an important year in world history. However, often forgotten among the many events of that third year of World War I, is the fact that the Ukrainian State was reborn against the background of great social revolution in Russia.

As the tsarist regime crumbled and Russia was torn by internal forces, the non-Russian areas of the empire such as Ukraine were afire with a struggle not only to attain social freedom but national independence as well.

Amid the complex events of the day the Ukrainian masses created a powerful movement which led to the emergence of the Ukrainian National Republic.

Seizing on the opportunity to escape long suppression by foreign powers the Ukrainian press reappeared to meet the demand for Ukrainian books. Educational committees were organized to put together textbooks in the Ukrainian language. In Kiev and the provinces courses for retraining teachers were set up and intensive educational reorganization took place.

An All-Ukrainian National Congress elected the Central Rada as the standing Ukrainian representative assembly. And then, on November 20, 1917, the Central Rada announced the creation of the Ukrains'ka Narodnia Respublika—Ukrainian National Republic.

The new government soon proclaimed democratic principles, among them were: The freedoms of speech, press, religion, assembly; the freedom for unions to organize; the security of the individual and his property; the right of non-Ukrainians to use their own language in relations with state institutions. Other principles declared included the abolition of the death penalty, new and proper administration of the courts, an 8-hour working day, and the right of national minorities to manage their national and cultural affairs by means of their own representative and administrative institutions.

These principles were then developed and enacted into laws, and the authority of years of suppression was abrogated.

However, as the new nation was hard at work establishing itself, its freedoms and independence were snatched away. In 1922, the Bolsheviks disregarded boundaries and seized Ukraine, clamping despotism over this nation of beauty, vast resources, and 50 million people.

Although Ukrainian independence was short it remains a symbol to Ukrainians everywhere. It serves as a sign of hope for a people who have suffered oppression for centuries.

That the culture and heritage of Ukraine lives on is a tribute to determination of a strong-willed people. They have lived by the words of their great poet and national hero Taras Shevchenko:

Wretched is the fettered captive,
Dying, and a slave;
But more wretch he that, living,
Sleeps, as in a grave,
Till he falls asleep for ever,
Leaving not a sign
That there faded into darkness
Something once divine.

I salute all Ukrainians on the 54th anniversary of the Independence of Ukraine.

## YOUTH FOR UNDERSTANDING EXCHANGE PROGRAM

### HON. JOHN Y. McCOLLISTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 2, 1972*

Mr. McCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in saluting the Youth for Understanding teenage exchange program for more than 20 years of contributions to the cause of friendship among young people of the United States, Europe, and South America.

The expansion of this program from a local project in Michigan to a nationwide effort has given thousands of high school students the opportunity to live and travel in a foreign country with a host family. In addition, it has provided a family situation for foreign students coming to the United States.

More than 250 Nebraska homes have welcomed young people from other nations through YFU, and as the program has grown, more than 100 teenagers from my State have gone abroad as ambassadors for the Midwest. Their glowing reports of new friends and broadened understanding of world problems have inspired many others to apply. Support in local communities for sponsoring these students has grown tremendously in the last few years.

I congratulate the officials of YFU for their competent management and enthusiastic promotion of this worthwhile program and wish them continued success in furthering world understanding.

## WHEN GOVERNMENT LIES

**HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, one of the saddest facts of life we Americans have learned in recent years is that our Government cannot always be trusted to tell us the truth.

Sometimes we are misled by what is not said, other times because we are given only partial information and on occasion we are deliberately lied to.

It takes courage to expose the lies, especially during those periods when an administration with precious little respect for the truth would subvert the intent of the first amendment to its own political ambitions.

The revelation of the Pentagon Papers and the Anderson Papers were acts of great courage and patriotism. These documents have revealed how the making of great decisions and national policy have been concealed from the American public and how the people were misled and lied to in the process.

We have seen the Government vehemently object to the publication of these documents—not because the papers were inaccurate but because they were too accurate.

There are those in Government who, rubberstamp in hand, are of the belief that all information is born classified and must be concealed from the public. Few things could be more dangerous to the existence of a free society than such an attitude.

The latest issue of Parade magazine makes a very cogent observation:

When a government consistently conceals its true motives from the people, it risks their mounting skepticism. It is regrettable but true that neither the Johnson Administration nor the Nixon Administration has inspired the American public with trust and faith in their government.

After eight years of mounting doubt there is a great danger that the people's confidence in their government's credibility will eventually vanish.

I am inserting in the RECORD at this point the article from which this statement was taken plus another article from the same magazine written by Jack Anderson, "Why I Blew the Whistle":

### THE DANGER OF LYING

(By Lloyd Shearer)

When the U.S. Government decides to withhold information from the people, it employs two main methods (1) it declares all the documents pertaining to the information, top secret, secret-sensitive, or confidential, or (2) it simply lies to the people.

The Pentagon Papers is an example of the first method, the government's explanation of why it sent the Enterprise and a destroyer escort into the Bay of Bengal during the India-Pakistani war is an example of the second.

The case of the Pentagon Papers in which some 48 volumes were needlessly overclassified is too well-known to bear repetition.

The announcement covering the Enterprise is less well-known. The reason given to the public last December for ordering a portion of the U.S. Seventh Fleet to the Bay of Bengal was to evacuate U.S. citizens from Dacca in East Pakistan.

That was a most unimaginative cover story. Following the evacuation of 114 Americans from Dacca by British RAF transport planes, there were at the time, according to the Indian government, only 47 Americans remaining in Dacca—17 U.S. Officials and the other 30 mostly missionaries. All 47 could have been flown out in one plane. They did not need to be rescued by a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier.

The true reasons for ordering the Enterprise and its destroyer escort from Vietnamese waters into the Bay of Bengal were:

(1) A show of force against the Soviet navy also cruising the Indian Ocean.

(2) The diversion of Indian aircraft from the Pakistan fronts.

(3) Possible diversion of the Indian aircraft carrier Vikrani from blockade and air strike missions against East Pakistan.

(4) Possible evacuation of Pakistani troops from the port of Chittagong.

(5) A demonstration of solidarity with the People's Republic of China which also sided with Pakistan against India.

Why the U.S. Government felt that the people should not be told these truths is difficult to determine. Perhaps the Administration felt that a war-weary public ought not be informed of a possible confrontation of U.S. and Soviet naval forces in the Indian Ocean.

When a government consistently conceals its true motives from the people, it risks their mounting skepticism. It is regrettable but true that neither the Johnson Administration nor the Nixon Administration has inspired the American public with trust and faith in their government.

After eight years of mounting doubt there is a great danger that the people's confidence in their government's credibility will eventually vanish.

Surely, in the past eight years the public has been more generously informed by its press than by its government.

### WHY I BLEW THE WHISTLE

(By Jack Anderson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Do you feel as an American citizen that you have the right to know about an impending war?

This question is pointed up by the secret documents I got out of the White House. They tell a chilling story. While Americans sang of peace on earth last December, grim men sat in guarded rooms in Washington, Moscow and Peking making life-and-death decisions. The world might have awakened on Christmas morning, not to jingle bells, but to the roar of nuclear warfare.

When I became aware of the developing confrontation, I was determined to inform the American people. The only way this could be accomplished was to rip the secrecy labels off the details. For the dangerous drift toward Armageddon, during the second week of December 1971, was classified top secret.

Two third-class powers, India and Pakistan, were fighting over the fate of East Pakistan. Just offstage, the world's three great powers—China, Russia and the United States—began making moves in a far more dangerous game.

On Dec. 7—30 years to the day after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor—a message was received in the situation room in the basement of the White House. It was stamped "Top Secret Umbra." Umbra means the darkest part of a shadow. In U.S. intelligence circles, it is the symbol for the darkest of secrets.

This cable warned that three Soviet ships—a destroyer armed with missiles, a seagoing minesweeper and a tanker—had passed eastward through the Strait of Malacca to join other Soviet warships in the Bay of Bengal.

#### CHINA RUMBLINGS

Intelligence reports brought into the White House other evidence that the Soviets were supporting the Indian thrust into East Pakistan. There were simultaneous rumblings out of China that the Chinese might intervene on the side of Pakistan.

It was a situation that the U.S. was better equipped to observe than to alter.

On Dec. 8, Henry Kissinger, the President's foreign policy czar, told a strategy meeting grimly: "We may be witnessing a state [India], backed by the Soviet Union, turning half of Pakistan into an impotent state and the other half into a vassal." He warned the assembled policymakers that they must consider the long-range consequences.

They began planning at once to counteract the Soviet ploy. On Dec. 10, a decision was made to send an American flotilla, led by the carrier Enterprise, into the Bay of Bengal. The ships, called Task Force 74, were to make "a show of force." It was suggested the flotilla would divert Indian ships and planes from the war with Pakistan and, thereby, relieve the pressure on President Yahya Khan's beleaguered forces.

#### FORCES ALERTED

The risks were apparent. On Dec. 10, the commander of the Seventh Fleet flashed the secret word that the "primary air threat would be from IAF (Indian Air Forces) aircraft . . ." The next day, Washington warned Task Force 74 that it "must be alert to the possibility of provocative and irrational acts by hostile forces."

Adm. John McCain, the Pacific commander, asked for and received permission to maintain aerial surveillance of the Russian squadron.

Not long afterward, a new Soviet squadron, including two guided-missile destroyers and a pair of submarines, set sail from Vladivostok for the troubled waters.

The scene was set for another Gulf of Tonkin incident. In the secret documents, the parallels are frequent and frightening.

Meanwhile, other moves were taking place on the ground. The White House situation room learned the Chinese were gathering weather reports along the China-India border, an unusual move indicative of military interest.

The Chinese were a worry to the Russians. In remote Kathmandu, Nepal, in the Himalayas, the Soviet military attaché warned the Chinese attaché that Chinese intervention to aid Pakistan would be met with massive Russian force.

The same day, U.S. intelligence reported: "According to a reliable clandestine source, President Yahya Khan claimed . . . today that the Chinese Ambassador in Islamabad had assured him that within 72 hours the Chinese army will move towards the [Indian] border."

#### CIA HEARS MRS. GANDHI

Back in New Delhi, the Central Intelligence Agency picked up a remark by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi "that she had some indications that the Chinese intend to intervene along India's northern border . . ."

Soviet forces, meanwhile, had been massed for months on the border of China's remote Sinkiang Province, where the nuclear test range is located. The Soviets might welcome an excuse to drive into Sinkiang and destroy China's nuclear works.

There was a hint of this in an ominous, secret intelligence cable from New Delhi on Dec. 13. The Russian Ambassador to India, Nikolai M. Pegov, was quoted as assuring Indian officials "that a Soviet fleet is now in the Indian Ocean and that the Soviet Union will not allow the U.S. Seventh Fleet to intervene. If China should decide to intervene, said Pegov, the Soviet Union would open a diversionary action in Sinkiang."

As it happened, the Pakistan army crumbled, and the brief war came to an end. But for a few days, the world stood on the edge of another world war and the American people were never told about it.

Through my sources, I had followed the developments. I felt someone should blow a warning whistle. So I sought documentary evidence, available only in secret papers, of what was going on. It seemed a matter of peace or war, of life and death. Certainly, the public had a right to know.

Too often in the past, the price of secrecy has been bloodshed. Lyndon Johnson campaigned on a peace platform in 1964, saying he did not intend "to send American boys to do what Asian boys should be doing." Not until seven years later did we learn from the Pentagon Papers that Johnson had been making opposite plans in secret.

PUBLIC MISLED

We also learned seven years too late that the public was misled about the Gulf of Tonkin incident. Johnson's announcement that North Vietnamese torpedo boats had staged an unprovoked attack upon a U.S. destroyer led to a Senate resolution which was repeatedly cited, thereafter, as legal authorization for prosecuting the Vietnam war. The truth remained classified.

In 1961, *The New York Times* learned of the preparations for the Bay of Pigs invasion, but the story was suppressed in the name of national security. Later, a bitter President Kennedy realized that the press could have saved him a major disaster. "I wish you had run everything on Cuba," he told the paper's late publisher Orville Dryfoos.

WARNINGS HIDDEN

During the Korean War, the people weren't told of repeated Chinese warnings that China would intervene if U.S. troops crossed the 38th Parallel. There was no public opinion, therefore, to restrain Gen. Douglas MacArthur from sending his troops to the Yalu. This brought Chinese volunteers flooding across the river into Korea.

The American people, whose sons must do the dying when the government's policies lead to war, are entitled to know all the dangers. Certainly, the government has the right to classify information that might jeopardize the national security. But the government has badly abused this right.

The classification system gives the executive branch the absolute authority to make whatever it pleases a state secret. Neither Congress nor the courts can declassify documents. Our leaders use this power to control the flow of news to the people. Thanks to freedom of the press, they can't stop newspapers from publishing the news. So they try to cut off undesirable news at the source. The classification system is used, in short, as a censorship system.

There are more than 20 million documents locked away in government file cases under a variety of secrecy labels. Only a tiny portion—perhaps one percent—directly relate to national security. The rest are classified to protect the bureaucrats and safeguard our leaders from public scrutiny.

Many citizens were appalled at the spectacle of their governments' secret papers being spread across the pages of newspapers. What right did I have, many have demanded, to declassify papers?

Under the license granted the press by the First Amendment, I have the right, and probably the duty, to expose government secrets.

RISKS ARE SMALL

For all the risks in a Constitution that gives freedom of the press priority over the government's secrets, the newspapers' handling of both the Pentagon Papers and my revelations indicate that the risks are minimal.

The gravest breach of security the government could find in the Pentagon Papers was the account of "Operation Marigold." This was a confidential peace initiative in 1966 in which the U.S. communicated with Hanoi through a Polish diplomat. Yet this information was spelled out at length in President Johnson's memoirs.

As for the so-called Anderson Papers, no government official has even claimed there was a significant breach of security. I took the utmost care in releasing classified information in my possession. References to the government's intelligence sources and other military details remain tightly guarded.

For about 25 years I have tried to break down the walls of secrecy in Washington. But today the walls are thicker than ever. More and more our policymakers hide behind those walls.

FREE PRESS VITAL

Only the press can stand as a true bulwark against an executive branch with a monopoly on foreign policy information. It has all the authority it needs in the First Amendment. As the late Justice Hugo Black put it so eloquently in his last opinion:

"The government's power to censor the press was abolished so that the press would remain forever free to censure the government. The press was protected so that it could bare the secrets of government and inform the people. Only a free and unrestrained press can effectively expose deception in government. And paramount among responsibilities of a free press is the duty to prevent any part of the government from deceiving the people and sending them off to distant lands to die of foreign fevers and foreign shot and shell."



## LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE ANNIVERSARY

### HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to note that today, February 16, is the 54th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania and the 721st anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state.

Lithuania was occupied by Soviet troops on June 15, 1940, and for more than 3 decades has been subjected to alien and suppressive rule, which has violated many of the universally recognized rights of men and nations, such as the right to self-determination and fundamental freedoms of religious worship and conscience, nationality, and opinion.

The events of this past year again indicate the deep aspirations of the Lithuanian people for freedom and independence. The case of Simas Kudirka is a good example of the denial of self-determination to the Lithuanian people. Mr. Kudirka, a seaman aboard a Soviet ship, attempted to defect to the United States on November 27, 1970. His motives were discrimination and suppression of national rights imposed upon him and his people. Mr. Kudirka was later sentenced to 10 years hard labor and stripped of all personal property for treason by a Lithuanian SSR court.

Abuse of Soviet power and violation of religious rights is illustrated by the case of Rev. Juozas Zdebskis who was arrested on August 26, 1971, for allegedly, systematically teaching catechism to children. A court found him guilty and sentenced him to 1 year in prison. These are just a few of many such cases of the current suffering and suppression of citizens of Lithuania.

The Lithuanian people in my own congressional district in the Bronx, N.Y., Mr. Speaker, are upstanding individuals who contribute greatly to the community and I am sure they join me in commemorating this anniversary.

## CONGRESSMAN WHALEN COMMEMORATES LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with compassion and admiration that I join with Members of the House of Representatives today to commemorate the two most significant events in the history of the Lithuanian people.

This date marks the 54th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania and the 721st anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian State. Once again we contemplate with great sadness the continuation of the tragedy which began with the occupation of Lithuania by Russian force of arms in 1940. Yet we cannot be other than inspired by the unending desire for freedom and self-determination manifested by Lithuanians trapped within the Soviet Union and by their countrymen living in other free countries around the world.

While the material aspects of life seem to have improved gradually in this little Baltic Nation—they hardly could have become much worse—the repression of the freedoms we take for granted in the United States persists. Yet the tenacity which the Lithuanians exhibit in working for the ultimate reestablishment of the free Lithuanian Nation is truly a marvel. The Russians quite clearly must recognize the tremendous depth of this yearning. In 31 years they have been unable to quench it despite the various devices they have employed with such great futility. The result has been an intensification rather than diminution of resolve on the shores of the Baltic.

Our remarks here today, Mr. Speaker, are appropriate because they signify the consistent awareness of the United States of the deprivation and hope of a once-free people. I consider it to be our responsibility to signal the Republic of Lithuania that she has not been forgotten by the people of America.

ROUTE 76 PROJECT

## HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a powerful force is gathering momentum in rural America. The force is young people—young men and women who are vitally concerned with the complexities of the future—young men and women who are organizing their strength and applying their vigor to make towns and cities attractive—to encourage expansion of opportunity for jobs and good living.

This nationwide movement is being catalyzed by the Future Farmers of America—FFA—and their Building Our American Communities—BOAC—program. I am elated to learn that the Winterset, Iowa FFA is implementing a long range "Route 76" project to be completed by 1976 the bicentennial year of the American Revolution.

"The project idea" according to Kevin Bishop, 17, president of the Winterset FFA chapter, is to:

Clean-up deteriorated buildings and dead trees throughout the county, to plant new trees and flowers, to speed up soil and water conservation work, to stimulate a face-lifting of business districts in Madison County communities, and to use these things to find paying jobs for the youths of the Winterset area.

I want to call the attention of my colleagues to an important aspect of this Winterset FFA—BOAC project. It is countywide and the Winterset FFA has invited two other Madison County FFA chapters—Earlham and Truro—to join in the project. This has great meaning for the future. Rural development requires multicommunity, county and area cooperation on a national scale.

The National FFA should encourage interchapter activities and cooperation. Air, water and land pollution are not local problems, neither are they respectors of county or community lines. Employment opportunities in rural areas can be more easily developed and industry attracted by several communities pooling their resources, labor and finances to obtain the necessary technical assistance. Health resources can be mobilized to better advantage if communities work together. The combination, attractive communities with employment opportunities, health and recreation, will provide a good life for more people and stop the out-migration from rural to urban areas.

I commend the Winterset FFA and their adviser, John Bishop, in their effort and compliment them for taking the initiative and involving local citizens, civic leaders, businessmen, county officials and government agencies in their project.

A story entitled "Route 76" Clean-Up written by Don Muhm, the Des Moines Register's farm editor, appeared in that paper January 17. I insert this story in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the National FFA has taken a significant step forward with the Build Our American Communities—(BOAC)—program. It has great portent for the future of rural Americans and the Nation. Many of the young people who have been forced to migrate to urban areas from rural communities would not have left had there been opportunity at home. If we develop opportunity in rural areas, future migration will be slowed, thus helping to prevent the concentration of our population in urban areas. For this reason my urban colleagues should have a vested interest in rural development.

All of us from rural areas know that a strong agriculture earning its equitable share of the national income is the economic base of rural communities. This base can provide the amenities, including education, for millions of young people, thus broadening their opportunities.

In addition to agriculture, rural areas need a strong industrial economy built around the existing rural towns, villages and cities. We still expect about 100 million new people by the year 2000 and development of rural areas is vital to help in a more even distribution of our population.

The national policy of developing a rural-urban balance will require knowledgeable leadership. The FFA is an integral part of the system of agricultural education and it has been instrumental in developing agribusiness and technical leaders in many fields over the 40-odd years of its existence. Long range rural development begins in the schools.

The BOAC program is a study-action program. Vocational agriculture provides the classroom, and the community is the laboratory to develop knowledgeable leaders.

The local projects now begging to emerge demonstrate how young people, industry and educators can work together to accomplish specific community objectives.

BOAC was initiated as a joint effort between the Farmers Home Administration and the National FFA and is being sponsored by Lilly Endowment, Inc., of Indianapolis, Ind. James V. Smith, a former colleague of ours, and now Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, who is always looking for ways to strengthen rural areas says:

The BOAC program implemented by the power and vigor of youth, is one of the most promising ideas we have for creating a rural-urban balance.

Robert Pim, Iowa State Director of the Farmers Home Administration, is enthusiastic about the program and is "encouraging FHA County Supervisors and local FFA Advisors to work together to assure this program's success." He and Gerald Barton, the Iowa State FFA Advisor have been cooperating at the State and local level.

I commend the BOAC concept to your attention. It is a sound one. More than that, I challenge the leaders and teacher trainers of our universities to examine it carefully. In-service training and new teacher education in the fundamentals of community development are needed to fully implement the BOAC concept.

We here in Congress should be sensitive to the needs of this program as it develops.

The article follows:

TRAVELING "ROUTE 76"

(By Don Muhm)

Three Winterset Future Farmers of American (FFA) chapter leaders are shown in front of a dilapidated hog house that is one of the "targets" in a four-year Madison County "clean-up" campaign that will terminate by 1976—the American Revolution bicentennial year. Their completion date is the source of their campaign slogan "Route 76." From left are Chapter President Kevin Bishop, 17, of Winterset; and David Stout, 16, of Lorimor; and Roy Foley, 16, of Peru.

WINTERSET, IOWA.—An ambitious, four-year "clean-up" project encompassing Madison County is being organized by the members of the Winterset Future Farmers of America (FFA) chapter.

They call this long-range work program, which is designed to be completed by 1976—the bicentennial year of the American Revolution, "Route 76."

Kevin Bishop, 17, of Winterset, the FFA chapter president, described the project this way:

"Our idea is to clean-up deteriorated building and dead trees throughout the county, to plant new trees and flowers, to speed up soil and water conservation work, to stimulate a face-lifting of business districts in Madison County communities and to use these things to find paying jobs for the youths of the Winterset area."

Bishop stressed that the "clean-up" project isn't to be a matter of FFA youths and other young people donating their time and efforts for the good of Madison County.

"We want to encourage projects that will help provide summer jobs for 200 to 300 young people who we have available in the Winterset area and part-time jobs during the school year," the lad explained.

"While we have done some volunteer work so far, this isn't what we have as a goal."

The FFA members got the idea for the county-wide "clean-up" project from a Georgia FFA chapter which conducted a similar project in their community. . . .

"Our 'clean-up' project is different from what the FHA boys did in Georgia in that ours will last four years, and will terminate in 1976 when we observe the American Revolution Bicentennial," Bishop added.

He is the son of John Bishop of Winterset, who is now in his twentieth year as vocational agriculture instructor in that community and who is also the Winterset FFA chapter advisor.

The FFA youths have sought approval of Madison County officials in their four-years "clean-up" project. They explained their objectives to the county board of supervisors, the local soil conservation district officials, the Winterset City Council, chamber of commerce, and other groups or individuals.

In addition, the Winterset FFA has invited two other Madison County FFA chapters—located at Earlham and Truro—to join in the four-year "county clean-up."

"One county official estimated that we probably had 500 abandoned farm homes in Madison County which should be torn down," the elder Bishop explained. "And we have thousands of dead elm trees that should be removed.

PROF. ROBERT LEKACHMAN SPEAKS OUT IN FAVOR OF PUBLIC SERVICE JOBS

## HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most pressing problems facing the coun-

try is unemployment, which the President's vaunted new economic policy has not solved. The unemployment rate for January 1972 was 5.9 percent, not significantly lower than it was all last year. And this figure masks the fact that certain groups within the population bear a disproportionate amount of the unemployment burden. The unemployment rate for teenagers is 17.5 percent; for black and other minority adults the rate is 10.3 percent; and in the inner cities, for black teenagers it is astronomical.

One of the soundest ideas advanced for dealing with this problem is to create a program of public service jobs, and I have joined in cosponsoring H.R. 12011, initiated by Congressman REUSS, which would create 500,000 federally financed public service jobs by amending and expanding the Emergency Employment Act of 1971.

The concept of public service employment has received support from a wide range of economists. One of the most cogent analyses of the concept of public service jobs was set forth recently by Prof. Robert Lekachman, professor of economics, State University of New York at Stony Brook, before the Select Subcommittee on Labor of the House Education and Labor Committee. In his testimony on January 26, 1972, he observed:

> Public service employment is an idea whose time has come. It represents the best available means of coping simultaneously with the persistent unemployment and unfilled public sector needs.

I commend Professor Lekachman's testimony to the attention of my colleagues.

My testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT LEKACHMAN, PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS, STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT STONY BROOK TO THE HOUSE LABOR COMMITTEE, JANUARY 26, 1972

Public service employment is an idea whose time has come. It represents the best available means of coping simultaneously with persistent unemployment and unfilled public sector needs.

As long ago as 1959, John Kenneth Galbraith used *The Affluent Society* as the occasion eloquently to decry private waste in the midst of public squalor. Since then scholars who have studied the situation as well as ordinary citizens exasperated and endangered by the deficiencies of public services have time and again identified pervasive shortages of personnel which cripple libraries, parks, hospitals, and departments of police and fire protection. In 1965 President Johnson's Commission on Technology and Social Change (the Automation Commission) estimated that at the current levels of staffing more than five million vacant positions existed in community provision for health, education, environmental protection, welfare and home care, public safety, sanitation, and urban renewal. No urban resident is likely to believe that conditions have improved since the Automation Commission delivered its report.

Indeed in 1968 Dr. Harold Sheppard of the Upjohn Institute conducted a survey of 130 cities, each with a population in excess of 100,000, which disclosed that these cities could readily have put to useful work 279,415 persons in activities which ranged from antipollution enforcement, through public safety, to sanitation and welfare—if only the funds were available. Most of these positions required little skill or skills that could readily be taught in short training programs. In the light of the budgetary crises which have afflicted states and municipalities since 1968, Sheppard's figure must in 1972 be substantially larger than at the earlier date.

The changing geography of the labor market attests to the rising significance of public employment. Those who professionally must guess about such matters estimate that between 1966 and 1975 growth of public sector jobs is likely to approximate 4 million. By comparison, private and nonprofit service positions may increase by 8.5 million and private goods-producing employment by a mere 2 million. As many have concluded, the United States is in a post-industrial era, characterized by increasing emphasis upon the production and consumption of human services. And of these services, many of the crucial are largely or completely in the public sector—preservation of the environment, protection of persons and property, education, hospital care, and mass transportation among others. To an extent possibly still unrealized by a great many Americans, the quality of their lives is a direct function of the character of public services.

Thus the quality and quantity of public services represent one escalating national problem. Unemployment is a second. Even the professional optimists who issue this Administration's economic forecasts do not anticipate in 1972 significant reductions in the 6.1 percent measured rate of unemployment. a figure which for a variety of reasons underestimates the scope of the problem. While I do not share Secretary John Connolly's oddly Marxist view that the United States can expect full employment only in time of major war, I do note the continued presence of structural unemployment as an apparently permanent characteristic of our labor markets. The decline in unemployment to 3.3 per cent just before Mr. Nixon entered the White House raised some false hopes among economists that aggregate demand remedies would suffice to wipe out unemployment above some frictional minimum. Even that 3.3 per cent figure masked the quantity of concentrated unemployment in inner cities, rural backwaters, and depressed areas, and among minorities and teen-agers. The exceedingly modest employment goals of this Administration implicitly register the conviction of its economists that structural unemployment is a long-term problem about which little can or ought to be done.

But something can and ought to be done. The crucial decision before Congress and the nation is not, I am convinced, a choice of expansion or contraction of the public sector. The shape of consumer demand and the trend of goods-producing technology practically mandate an expanding public sector. The real choice of national policy is different. It concerns the kind of public services Americans want and the conditions of employment under which they will be supplied. The choice is nothing less crucial than between public service jobs as a mode of social punishment of men and women who lack private employment and public employment as an honorable alternative to private employment.

I devote the remainder of this testimony to a discussion of the implications of these policy alternatives.

THE NEW MALIGNITY

In the last decade Administration and Congressional policy toward public job creation has violently fluctuated. In its more enlightened moods, Congress has proved itself entirely capable of handling government employment as a rational path of social and vocational mobility for poor people. In their days of glory, Office of Economic Opportunity Community Action Programs opened a variety of managerial, clerical, and semiprofessional positions to urban blacks and Puerto Ricans. CAP vocational favoritism to members of indigenous populations is of course nothing new in the American experience. OEO policy simply continued and applied to the latest group of newcomers to the American celebration, traditional patterns of entry by new and aggressive ethnic groups into one or another of the government services. In my own New York City it is history not accident or coincidence that Italians dominate sanitation, Irishmen police and fire protection, and Jews public school teaching and administration.

A commendable feature of Great Society urban legislation was emphasis upon the promise of public employment as an entry point into the vocational structure, preferably with full civil service status. Thus Section 103(a) of the 1966 Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act mandated ". . . maximum opportunities for employment of residents of the area in all phases of the program." Regrettably the statute stopped short of granting civil service coverage to new employees after suitable probationary experience. Understandably if not especially commendably, local civil service groups and public employees unions have successfully resisted certification of Model Cities workers. Parallel occupational structures accordingly have been erected. It is to the credit of Secretary Romney that since November 1970 HUD regulations insist that "In the case of public employment generated in components of the comprehensive city demonstration program, financed in whole or in part by supplemental or other HUD funds, such jobs will be incorporated into the community's regular civil service system within a reasonable period of time not to exceed two years from the point that the positions were filled."

Sadly there is much in the current national climate that turns Mr. Romney into something of an honorable exception, for this is a period when a good many legislators, Congressmen, state governors, and the President himself are sponsoring a swing to the opposite pole of national policy. The poor, black, urban, unskilled, and unemployed are no longer benignly perceived in Great Society terms as individuals enmeshed in various kinds of personal and social misfortunes from which they can be rescued by encouragement, training, social therapy, income maintenance—and specially designed public jobs. The new brutalism of the Nixon Administration nurtures emphasis upon the personal shortcomings of the poor and a corresponding inclination to convert public service employment into urban chain gangs. Leaders like Ronald Reagan and Nelson Rockefeller in his latest political role profess to discover in the poor a reprehensible preference of welfare to work, hustling to regular employment. There are social scientists whose theories bolster such revelations. If Edward Banfield is right, the poor perpetuate their own condition by an inability to defer gratification after the manner of the prudent middle class. Or, a hampering matriarchal family structure, Daniel P. Moynihan's incendiary explanation, better interprets the plight of poor urban blacks than mere shortages of jobs, suitable housing, supportive services, and public transportation.

I adduce three contemporary examples of this new malignity. Take first President Nixon's Family Assistance Program. Although socially concerned men and women have endorsed FAP as a breakthrough to general income maintenance, others, myself decidedly among them, are convinced that the repressive features which accompany and vitiate this innovation amount to evils larger than the promised benefits. For FAP defines public service jobs less as vocational opportunities and escape routes from poverty and unemployment than as sheer punishment for personal failure. The emphasis is upon coercing the mothers of young children into leaving them, on pain of benefit denial, in day-care

centers of which far too few in any event exist.

These women are to be compelled to accept whatever employment is provided quite probably at rates which are exempted from minimum-wage standards. In Skinnerian terms, people are "encouraged" to work by negative reinforcement—the presence of the fear of punishment.

Similar ungenerous conceptions of the motivation and the consequently desirable treatment of the poor were blatantly evident in New York State's abortive experimental program of welfare benefits which in its original form was too much for the stomach even of this Administration's HEW reviewers. This so-called "Incentives for Independence" scheme began by reducing welfare benefits for families of four from $313 to $200 per month. The State then offered the family the "opportunity" to return to its old level of financial maintenance (but not to improve upon that level) by adopting certain approved behaviors and refraining from certain other disapproved ones. A complex point system awarded the parents of school-age boys and girls $12.50 for each two weeks of school attendance with good behavior for each child. An adult could amass additional points for locating a deserting sexual partner, establishing a child's paternity, attending a self-improvement course, enrolling a son in the Boy Scouts, and so on. Such were the carrots—the positive reinforcers.

The negative reinforcers focused upon work. A family could lose as much as one-third of its *reduced* scale benefits, declining from $200 to $133, should one of its adults refuse a job. An individual might be required to work without pay in a public service job, should a shortage of private sector opportunity exist. New York State proposed to test this benign device on 27,000 persons grouped in 7,000 family units located in three counties—rural Franklin, suburban Rockland, and a portion of black and Puerto Rican Manhattan. Of this plan, the New York State Department of Social Services solemnly averred, it endeavors to "provide for the needs of the poor while encouraging a speedy return to independence and self-sufficiency." Rather more aptly the Columbia University Center for Social Policy and Law judged the proposal "a primitive form of coercion", designed "to compel a parent to take certain actions by the manipulation of her child's basic means of survival—the welfare grant."

The suspicious, sour public temper stimulated by the President and his helpers is, finally, and regrettably epitomized by some of the rhetoric and important limitations of the Emergency Employment Act of 1971, Public Law 92-54. Congress, recalling that Mr. Nixon had already vetoed a somewhat superior measure, understandably tailored the new statute to the President's taste. What a mean taste it is! Confronted by high and continuing unemployment, the Act supplied as therapy perhaps 130,000 new jobs for the 7 million or more unemployed or underemployed. Why so little, so late? The statutory language is instructive: throughout the stress is upon the relationship of the new jobs to periods of unusually high unemployment. As the Preamble phrased the position, the Act aims "To provide during times of high unemployment programs of public service employment for unemployed persons to assist States and local communities in providing needed public services, and for other purposes." Section 2 plays variations on the same theme: "times of high unemployment severely limit the work opportunities available to the general population, especially low-income persons and migrants, persons of limited English-speaking ability, and others from socio-economic backgrounds generally associated with substantial unemployment and underemployment." And "in times of high unemployment, many low-income persons are unable to secure or to retain employment." These wise words recall Calvin Coolidge's insight that when people are out of work, unemployment results.

Repeatedly the language of the statute reassures readers that the occasion of the program is unpermanent. All the employment to be financed is only "transitional." The tongue here is that of the business-cycle analyst: "providing resources for transitional public service employment . . . during an economic slowdown can help as an economic stabilizer both to ease the impact of unemployment for the affected individuals and to reduce the pressures which tend to generate further unemployment." And, yet again, "It is . . . the purpose of this Act to provide unemployed and underemployed persons with transitional employment in jobs providing needed public services during times of high unemployment, and wherever feasible, related training and manpower services to enable such persons to move into employment or training not supported under this Act."

Possibly a bandaid was all that Congress could persuade the President to accept. What is needed is a public jobs program of appropriate scale, at least 500,000 new jobs as a start, conceived after a fashion which unifys rather than divides our nation. I turn finally to a sketch of such a national design.

HUMANE PUBLIC SECTOR JOBS

One can very nearly write the headings for more humane and more realistic public job creation by taking the direct opposites of major Nixon-Reagan-Rockefeller attitudes to the poor and the unemployed. Out of considerations of this Committee's time, I shall be exceedingly brief.

STRUCTURAL UNEMPLOYMENT IS ALIVE AND WELL

Its causes are well known: lingering racial and sexual prejudice, mismatches of skills and available jobs, unavailability of cheap and efficient transportation from inner cities to suburban factories, shortages of low-cost housing near outlying plants, deficiencies of education and personal mobility among the unemployed, and so on.

PUBLIC SERVICE JOB PROGRAM SHOULD BE PERMANENT

This is the clear implication of the character of structural unemployment. A 4.5 per cent or any other unemployment trigger as in the current Act, generates uncertainty of tenure among the holders of new positions, weakens the at best difficult process of placing them in civil service categories, and stigmatizes the people who do get new jobs as inferior employees. Temporary or transitional programs ignore the rising needs of the public sector and the endemic understaffing of public services even during spells of relative fiscal ease.

PERMANENT JOBS MERIT STATUS AND CAREER LADDERS

Whether in the long-run civil service associations and public service unions resist or accept public service job creation depends upon the scale of their funding, the training facilities provided, the sincerity of official efforts to equip recruits with realistic credentials (not necessarily the ones currently in vogue), and the promotion opportunities for old as well as new workers. Large-scale programs which enlarge vocational opportunities for all public employees are the most promising. Meager temporary initiatives simply encourage existing resistance to decent status for new workers, fatally damage efforts to convert existing credentials requirements into sensible job qualifications, and facilitate the unseemingly scrambling among communities and states for fiscal crums which has characterized the administration of the Emergency Employment Act.

PUBLIC SERVICES SHOULD BE HIGH-QUALITY SERVICES

Involved here are the self-respect of new and old public servants and the desperate need at all times to improve the quality of public sector output. In the long-run, Americans will not enjoy a decent society until they come to value as highly the work of the public as the private sector.

MINIMUM WAGE LAW SHOULD BE OBSERVED

The temptation to breach the rules is a corollary of the use of public work as punishment and social discipline. Once the attitude changes, the temptation will disappear.

COMMUNITY ACCOUNTABILITY IS DESIRABLE

At their best, public service job programs are vehicles for the rehabilitation of neighborhoods and entire communities. Mechanisms for the responsible participation of community residents accelerate a potentially benign process.

CONCLUSION

In the next few years as a nation we shall almost certainly choose between job creation strategies which punish the unemployed and those designed to integrate them into the productive community. I urge upon this Committee the kind of action which will move the nation toward the only policies which are consistent with our best instincts, a policy which emphasizes human potentiality, not human failure.

## LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, the significance of our Independence Day is clear to all Americans—it is a time of great celebration and joy. We are truly fortunate to be able to enjoy our Independence Day in freedom and contentment.

It is tragic, indeed, that so many people throughout the world are forced to mark their independence day while under the heavy yoke of tyranny and oppression—and the day becomes a memorial to a shattered dream.

At this time we again commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day. Our commemoration marks two anniversaries: First, the 721st anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian State when Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251; and second, the 54th anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918. Most unfortunately, the brave and freedom-loving Lithuanian people must still endure the suppression of the Soviet regime. However, these noble people have persisted in strong faith. They have frustrated Soviet rule by occupation at every conceivable turn. The recent valiant attempts of courageous Lithuanians to escape from national imprisonment—such as Pranas and Algirdas Brazinskas, Vytautas Simokaitis and Simas Kudirka—bear witness to the soul of a people that yearns to be free.

Lithuanians and the people of the other two Baltic nations—Estonia and Latvia—must be free again. It is my hope that the Congress will renew the pledge contained in its 1966 Resolution calling for freedom for all the Baltic nations, and that the President will bring this grave matter to the immediate attention of the United Nations.

## LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 of this year, Americans of Lithuanian descent together with Lithuanians throughout the world will observe the 54th Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. It is significant and sad that in Lithuania itself the people will not be permitted to commemorate the occasion, for this country of proud, brave and freedom-loving people has been enslaved by Russian communism for the last 30 years.

The Lithuanian State was formed over 700 years ago in 1251 on the shores of the Baltic Sea by Mindaugas the Great. During several centuries the Lithuanians fought for and maintained their freedom and identity until in the late 18th century they were forcibly annexed to Czarist Russia. For 100 years after that the Lithuanian people were subjugated by the Russian Empire, managing throughout, however, to maintain their separate cultural identity and dignity.

On February 16, 1918, Lithuania was one of the first nations to take advantage of the overthrow of the czar, assert the right of self-determination, and declare its independence. For the next 22 years the Lithuanians rebuilt their war-ravaged nation—homeland under a free and democratic form of government. They lived in peace, worked hard, and were accepted as a member of the League of Nations.

In 1940 they were again subjected to Russian occupation. This time, through Communist controlled elections conducted under the guns of the Russian Army, Lithuania was again annexed to the Soviet Empire. Thus began one of the most brutal, inhumane occupations of all time. Nearly one-sixth of the population has been packed in trains and shipped to distant regions of the Soviet Union. Religious freedom has been suppressed. Self-rule is unknown. But Lithuanians continue to seek freedom. Over 50,000 patriots lost their lives fighting for it between 1945 and 1953, and since that time many more have risked their lives to escape Soviet totalitarianism. Who can forget the tragic November 1970 escape attempt in our own territorial waters, of Simas Kudirka, a Lithuanian seaman? This was truly a day of infamy.

On this anniversary of Lithuanian Independence, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following copy of House Concurrent Resolution 416, unanimously adopted by the 89th Congress, calling for the liberation of Lithuania and her two Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia. The American people pray for the freeing of the Baltic people from Russian tyranny and reaffirm our commitment to the ultimate liberation of all captive nations. I urge the President to bring the question of Baltic independence before the United Nations and also before the Soviet leadership during his upcoming trip to Moscow.

H. CON. RES. 416

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

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.

Passed the House of Representatives June 21, 1965.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS, *Clerk.*

## AFDC MOTHER WANTS A JOB

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, as the Senate prepares to vote on H.R. 1, the President's family assistance plan, I would like to share a letter I recently received from a constituent, an AFDC recipient. Her letter shows she does not lack the desire to work. Rather, the problem is lack of a job that would give her a decent living wage.

Her letter follows:

FEBRUARY 8, 1972.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRASER: I understand that on July 1, 1972, President Nixon's "Family Assistance Plan" goes into effect.

This plan affects me, because I am a welfare recipient (AFDC) with two children, ages 10 and 12 years old.

Why I have written to you, is to ask you for advice and information?

July 10, 1969, I took the Post Office examination for clerk-carrier and passed with a low score of 72.3.

I have waited and called the Post Office to find out when I can be hired! I can't get any information from them or I get contradictory information! This has been going on for 2½ years!!

I think after 2½ years, I definitely want to know where I stand in this matter.

Mr. Fraser, you constantly hear about welfare people not wanting to work, just sitting around collecting the taxpayer's money!

If I could have been hired in 1969 by the Post Office, I would have been off 2½ years ago but, I want to work at a job that gives me a decent living wage. The Post Office could do this, and I have met their requirements!!

Would you help me get this job, or, put me in contact with someone, who would look into this matter for me?

President Nixon wants people off welfare, but yet, the Federal Post Office has let my name sit dormant on this list for 2½ years. "I can't believe this!"

Maybe, this should be brought to President Nixon's attention?

Please, would you help me?

## THE 54TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA

### HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Americans are somewhat inclined to take for granted freedoms of conscience, religion, speech and press. Americans, in fact, sometimes forget the uniqueness of a country where dissent is welcomed and a free exchange of ideas encouraged.

It is good for Americans to recognize today the 54th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania and the 721st anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state. It is good for us to note that Lithuanians, though free in spirit, remain shackled physically.

Oppression of the masses is not a new thing. Irish Catholics and Soviet Jewry are arbitrarily detained and illegally held; Vietnamese men, women and children face the ravages of war every day of their lives; East Bengalis who have survived the devastation of a civil war now must fear death by starvation or disease. We must not forget, however, the plight of an entire nation, Lithuania, even though the oppression suffered by this nation does not reach the front pages of our newspapers daily.

We mark this anniversary rather than celebrate it, looking forward to the day when celebration will be in order. We must not shirk our responsibility as a moral force in the world. We must agitate for the self-determination of the Baltic States and the restoration of the freedoms we Americans have come to cherish.

## PRESIDENT NIXON—DEDICATED AMERICAN

### HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation should not forget, in this time of Democratic attacks on President Richard Nixon, that in 1960 when the President—the then Republican nominee for President—was campaigning against Jack Kennedy, there was a television debate between the two. This debate occurred shortly after a period of hospitalization for Mr. Nixon who did not appear to advantage physically.

More significant in its effect on the election that November, however, was the fact that on that TV program Jack Kennedy sounded like a hawk on Cuba and Nixon reserved even to the point of seeming reticence. Small wonder, for now we know that Nixon then knew of the arms buildup in this planning for an invasion designed to kick the Communist Castro out of that island so close to our shores but candidate Nixon kept the confidence.

Had Nixon, the candidate then, disclosed what he then knew the Republican administration under General Eisenhower was doing, he would have pulled the props right out from Jack Kennedy. In retrospect, it is almost unquestionable that the subsequent election would not have been lost to Kennedy by a whisker as it was had Nixon used this information for political advantage.

Last Sunday, the Boston Herald Traveler had an interesting editorial concerning critics of President Nixon. A main point of the editorial and what I sincerely hope all Americans understand about President Richard Nixon is as the Herald Traveler says:

Whether in or out of office, he placed the Nation's interest ahead of his own or his party's ambitions.

The article follows:

THE PRESIDENT AND HIS CRITICS

Twice in the past week, in his State of the World report to Congress and in his impromptu press conference President Nixon has urged his political adversaries to examine their statements on Vietnam and other critical foreign policy matters with special care.

Candidates for the presidency, he said, have as much right to criticize him as anyone else, but he added they have "a higher responsibility than the ordinary critic."

Why is that? Well, it should be obvious. If one of the "ordinary critics"—a columnist or editorial writer, say—suggests that the administration isn't trying hard enough to reach an accommodation with the North Vietnamese, that won't displease the gentlemen in Hanoi. But it doesn't provide them with much encouragement either, since they know the critic is in no position to implement his suggestion.

But when a serious presidential candidate suggests, as Sen. Edmund Muskie and George McGovern certainly have, they would offer Hanoi a better deal to end the war than the Nixon administration has, is it unreasonable to assume that the North Vietnamese may conclude that it is in their interest to postpone serious bargaining with the U.S. until after the November election, on the theory that they can get the same deal from Mr. Nixon if he wins and a better one if he loses?

This, of course, is exactly what the President had in mind, when he cautioned his political adversaries not to "give the enemy an incentive to prolong the war" on two occasions last week. But his remarks, and those of several other members of the administration, have stirred up a hornet's nest of indignation to the effect that the President is trying to muzzle the opposition and silence all his critics.

That's utter nonsense. Mr. Nixon is a much decorated and scarred veteran of the political battles of the past quarter century. He knows that partisan politics can't always stop at the water's edge, and that it is healthy and useful to have vigorous debate and dissent by the opposition, as long as it is constructive, responsible and loyal. Over the years he's spent a good bit of his own time and effort engaging in that sort of thing.

But the one thing he has never done is to allow his personal or partisan interests to outweigh or interfere with the national interest. His handling of the Vietnam issue during the 1968 campaign is a good example. Sure, he criticized the Johnson administration for its conduct of the war, and he said that he had a plan to end it. But he muted his criticism and offered his cooperation at critical junctures so as not to jeopardize Mr. Johnson's efforts to negotiate a settlement with Hanoi.

Or go back, if you will, to the 1960 campaign, when two of the key issues were Cuba and the so-called "missile gap." If Mr. Nixon had been able to tell the American people that the Eisenhower administration had a plan already in motion to "do" something about Castro and that Mr. Kennedy's "missile gap" charge was absolutely false, he would have scored more points with the voters and might have won the election (one of the closest in U.S. history).

As Vice President and a member of the National Security Council, he had access to plenty of secrets such as these which might have been very helpful in rebutting his opponent's arguments. And, of course, he didn't have to reveal them personally; it would have been easy enough to arrange to have such information "leaked" to a friendly editor or columnist.

But he didn't do that. He listened to arguments he could easily have refuted in silence, rather than jeopardize the nation's interests for personal or partisan gain. John F. Kennedy went on to win the election, and soon after he entered the White House he executed the Eisenhower administration's plans for the overthrow of Castro and also discovered that the "missile gap" had been a myth.

For the past three years, Mr. Nixon has likewise suffered in silence a great deal of criticism he could have refuted easily concerning his efforts to negotiate an agreement with Hanoi. For 30 months, while Henry Kissinger was meeting secretly in Paris with representatives from North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front, offering one plan after another to end the war, the President listened to his critics and adversaries complain incessantly that he wasn't trying hard enough and demanding to know why he wasn't doing precisely what he was doing. But he refused to defend himself by revealing what was going on behind closed doors in Paris as long as there was a chance the secret negotiations might be productive.

No doubt Mr. Nixon's credibility and political stock went down over these many months. But, as he has always done over the years, whether in or out of office, he placed the nation's interest ahead of his own or his party's ambitions.

Would that some of his critics and political adversaries could learn to do the same.

## COOLEY'S ANEMIA—A HEREDITARY DISEASE

### HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, a private medical foundation recently made me aware of a hereditary disease called Cooley's anemia. Medically termed Thalassemia Major and sometimes called Mediterranean disease, Cooley's anemia was discovered by Dr. Thomas B. Cooley, an American, in 1925. Presently, there are more than 100,000 Americans, mostly children, suffering from this incurable stigma. Initially, it was prevalent only among persons of Mediterranean descent, primarily Greeks and Italians. Today, however, America's Mediterranean population has intermarried in many cases and the disease is now found not only among Americans of Italian or Greek origin but also among Americans of Jewish, Scandinavian, or even oriental origins. Rarely does a victim of this disease live beyond 20, and from early life on victims must undergo blood transfusions almost daily in order to maintain a blood count sufficient for survival.

The Cooley's Anemia Blood and Research Foundation for Children, a private organization based in New York City with branches in other cities, remains the only national source for extensive funding of research and training toward possible cure of the disease. For fiscal year 1971, the Federal sector provided only $630,000. This major reliance on the private sector unfortunately has made the projection of long-term programs difficult. Meanwhile, more and more American children are discovered with the terminal disease. It is estimated that one-quarter of all children born of a marriage of two individuals with even a mere trait will have a severe form of the disease, and an additional 50 percent will be carriers.

Before Cooley's anemia grows worse, and to initiate a long-term program of research and training, the Federal sector must intervene with financial assistance.

COOLEY'S ANEMIA

(By Herbert C. Lichtman, M.D.)

Cooley's Anemia is the name commonly used to describe the severe form of a hereditary disease of the blood. It was Dr. Thomas B. Cooley, an American physician, who described this as a separate and specific type of blood disease about 1925.

This disorder occurs most commonly in individuals whose ancestors were natives of the countries surrounding the Mediterranean Sea. In the United States therefore, most of the patients are of Italian descent. Those of Greek, Turkish, Southern French, and North African origins are also more susceptible. There are sporadic cases found in individuals of other origins, especially among the Chinese and Israeli.

The disease, also called Mediterranean Anemia or Thalassemia, is inherited according to Mendelian laws, and it is currently believed that the severe form (Thalassemia Major) occurs in a child born of parents both of whom must be carriers of the trait.

According to this most widely accepted concept, approximately one quarter of all children born of a marriage of two individuals with the trait, will have the severe form of the disease. Another twenty-five per cent of the offspring will be perfectly normal, and fifty per cent will be carriers themselves. Any such hereditary situation, of course, is valid in a statistical sense only, and may not be referable to one family where instances are known of only one affected (anemic) child out of ten, or the reverse, where three out of three children may be affected.

Because individuals with the trait or minor form of the disease are not in any significant way handicapped physically, and in whom the only manifestation may be detectable changes in the size and shape of the red blood cells, it is of great importance to distinguish between Thalassemia major and Thalassemia minor. Individuals with Thalassemia minor have a normal life span and enjoy normal health, whereas individuals with Thalassemia major may succumb to the disease in a matter of one or two decades. The trait never increases in severity or converts to the severe form of Cooley's Anemia.

Thalassemia major usually becomes manifest during the first year of life. Both sexes are equally affected. The earliest signs may be pallor, listlessness, loss of appetite, and irritability. Examination of the patient, by a physician, usually reveals an enlargement of the spleen and liver to some degree, pallor of the skin and mucous membranes, and sometimes a slight degree jaundice (yellow coloration) of the whites of the eyes. Blood examination will usually show typical changes in the shape, numbers of the erythrocytes (red blood cells), and a variety of alterations from the normal in special properties of the blood cells, in addition to a severe anemia.

There are probably several defects which lead to the anemia, for example, there undoubtedly is a reduction in the rate at which red blood cells are formed in the bone marrow and released to the blood vessels. Those cells that are produced are defective in that they do not survive in the blood vessels for more than ⅓ to ½ of the normal life span of red cells, which should be about 90 to 120 days. There are complications which develop in certain individuals which further reduce the rate of blood cell production and survival time of the formed cells. In these patients the greatly enlarged spleen may be the cause of this additional hindrance.

As a result of the chronic state of anemia the children with this disease are greatly handicapped. Bone growth is poor—they are therefore usually small for their age. Because of abnormalities of the bone marrow there are alterations of the skull and other bones, so that a characteristic facial expression is found, which give many of these children the appearance of being related. The bones are more fragile than normal, and fractures occuring almost spontaneously are quite common. The anemia causes easy fatigability, and a lack of pep and energy. Frequent nose bleeds is a common finding in many patients. When anemia is severe, low grade fever may be noted. There is no particular increase in susceptibility to infections.

At present the only effective treatment is the proper administration of blood transfusions to alleviate the constantly recurring anemia. There are other specific treatments for various complications of the basic disease.

Specific food substances or vitamins other than required for a normal balanced diet do not in any way affect beneficially the basic disease.

There seems to be a continuous spectrum in the degree of severity of the disease from those children who require blood transfusions as often as once a week to those who rarely need transfusions. Some children die within a few years and others are known who are alive in their twenties. There is no known cure.

Basic research on the problems of blood formation and destruction offers the only hope available to the sufferers.

---

## JUDGE ZERFACE'S JUVENILE PLAN

---

## HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 25, 1969, an editorial from the March 7, 1969, issue of the Indianapolis News. The editorial explains how Judge Maurice J. Zerface has succeeded in reducing juvenile crime in White County, Ind. As I pointed out at that time.

It shows that greater firmness and imaginativeness on the part of our courts and judges can significantly reduce criminal offenses, particularly among the young.

I wish to again insert that editorial along with a front page news article from the January 31, 1972, Monticello Herald Journal. Not only is Judge Zerface's program reducing juvenile delinquency, but it is also saving the taxpayers money.

The editorial and article follow:

CUTTING CRIME

White County has a three-man team which has reduced juvenile crime by 80 per cent in a single year.

Youngsters who get in trouble there face Judge Maurice J. Zerface. Under his "get tough" policy, juvenile offenders often find themselves confronting a jail term as well. Zerface and Monticello City Court Judge Edwin W. Malmquist agree that "once a youngster has lived inside a jail cell, he never wants to go back." Neither judge has had youth appear a second time since the policy was initiated in July 1967.

Judge Zerface says parents are responsible for the conduct of their offspring and orders them to appear in court when their youngsters get in trouble. He makes the parents assume the burden of disciplining their children by holding them in contempt if they do not. "When we place the onus on the parents," he says, "we find they're usually tickled to death to find they can control their children after all.

The third member of the team is Charles E. Smithburn county probation officer, who aligns himself with the general views of the two judges. Smithburn works with the schools and various civic organizations to head off potential youthful crime, but he also believes offenders should be adequately punished.

In the common-sense opinion of the two judges, a person capable of stealing a car is no longer a juvenile and should be tried in adult courts. This is in sharp contrast to the attitude of Marion County juvenile court which seldom waives jurisdiction on youthful cases, regardless of the severity of the offense. Judge Harold N. Fields says he used the waiver in 80 cases in 1968 out of a total of over 3,000 cases.

The soft approach hasn't worked. Juvenile crime in Indianapolis increased from 6,573 in 1967 to 7,080 in 1968—a 7.7 per cent hike. In 1967 youthful crime rose 17 percent over the previous year.

Judge Zerface takes the view that the first job of any court is to protect the public from the offenders and that rehabilitation is an outgrowth of proper punishment. Zerface believes that the names of juvenile delinquents should be published because the public has a right to know who the lawbreakers are.

The difference in results in the two counties is graphic. While White County has reduced its juvenile offenses, Marion County experiences a steady rise in youthful crime. It would seem that a dose of common sense also might work in juvenile crime prevention in Marion County.

---

[From the Monticello Herald Journal, Jan. 31, 1972]

JUDGE ZERFACE'S JUVENILE PLAN REDUCES WHITE COUNTY WELFARE BUDGET BY $15,000 PER YEAR

In 1967 Judge Maurice P. Zerface as Judge of the Juvenile Court initiated a juvenile program referred to as the Juvenile DCP program. The theory of the program was to detect the child who was apparently tending to become a delinquent child, to ascertain the cause of the child's behavior and provide necessary remedy to prevent such delinquency, present and future.

The Judge secured close cooperation from all law enforcement bodies, the churches, Women's church organizations, Civic organizations and lodges, school administrations, and interested businessmen and citizens of the community.

Within two years the Juvenile delinquency rate in White County was reduced 80% and the record of the Juvenile Court of Judge Zerface had received wide publicity.

March 6th, 1969 The Indianapolis Star carried a picture of Judge Zerface and Charles E. Smithburn, Probation Officer, setting out the results he had obtained due to this juvenile program. The White County Juvenile Court immediately received state and national recognition and on March 25th, 1969, Earl J. Landgrebe, U.S. Congressman from the 2nd Congressional District of Indiana introduced a resolution in the U.S. Congress making the record of Judge Zerface and his Juvenile program a matter of Congressional Record in the U.S. Congress in Washington, D.C. and he recommended that all Juvenile Courts adopt such a program.

On this same day the Governor of Indiana called Judge Zerface and invited him to participate in a seminar of Criminal Justice Planning held in Indianapolis April 1st, and 2nd, 1969. Other speakers at the seminar included Wilbur Brantley, Law Enforcement Specialist in the U.S. Department of Justice and Arthur K. Ratz, Director of Indiana Criminal Justice Planning Agency. At this time the Judge explained in detail his program of 'Detection', 'Correction' and 'Prevention' of Juvenile Delinquency. The Criminal Justice Planning agency is a Federal Agency operating nationwide and has incorporated within its planning a "Youth Service Bureau" identical to the White County program as initiated by the Judge of the White County Circuit and Juvenile Court.

A TOTAL OF 1,320 CASES IN 1967

Since Judge Zerface originated his program in 1967 there has been 1,058 juvenile and 262 adult, referrals processed through his office as Judge, for a total of 1,320 cases. It has been necessary to commit just 2 boys and 2 girls to the State institutions and the recidivism rate has dropped from 9.2% to 4.8 per cent.

The court instituted recreational programs and placed the responsibility for these programs in the hands of the Probation Officer of the White Circuit Court. Marshall Waggoner, Probation Officer, now deceased started the recreational program and was followed by Charles E. Smith, burn, Probation Officer, now deceased. The program is now under the direction of Bruce Bramlage, Probation Officer.

These programs include all juveniles, male and female, and their parents and include,

baseball, football, basketball, soft ball, track, swimming and other activities. No child is denied participation due to lack of finances, transportation or other conditions. In 1971 there were more than 150 girls in soft ball, basketball and track with most of their parents also participating.

This program also includes a Job Placement Service whereby employment is secured for the youngsters wishing work after school, on week ends and during vacation periods, this being supervised by Bruce Bramlage.

Inadequate clothing, home furnishing and necessities were realized and a Used clothing and Furniture program is in its second year and more than 100 persons and families were given aid in 1971.

The Judge's program has grown to such an extent that it is county wide and of necessity is too great for Mr. Bramlage to direct alone. Mr. and Mrs. Maynard Boze are supervising the girls and parents recreational programs. They are also supervising the clothing and furniture program and have donated the use of two buildings, rent free for this program.

This is a County wide community project, the Women's County Church Organization, the Churches, Lodges, Civic and Fraternal Organizations, Businessmen and many individuals are cooperating in every manner 100%.

This program has also resulted in restitution being paid to businessmen and citizens for losses suffered of a sum of more $7500.00, collected and paid by Bruce Bramlage, Probation Officer.

All of this emanates from the 3rd floor of the Court House, the Judge's Chambers and Office of the Probation Officer with the aid and support of every segment of the Community of White County and without even the cost of one small penny to the taxpayer.

This is the reason John Troncin, Director of the White County Department of Public Welfare has been able to reduce his Juvenile budget $15,000.00 a year. Parents are now responsible for their children, not the Welfare Department.

The door to the Juvenile Conference Room on the 3rd floor of the Court house is always open to juveniles and parents for counseling, solving their many problems, personal and otherwise and all of this is in strict confidence.

The Criminal Justice Planning Agency of the Federal Government is spending vast sums of money in its various endeavors, including the Youth Service Bureau. Office rentals, office expense, costly equipment and high salaried employees but it can not perform the service or take the place of the program now in operation in White County at a saving to the taxpayers of $15,000, a year and at no cost.

The Youth Service Bureau has not jurisdiction, legal or otherwise, over any juvenile or adult. It is not a part of or in any manner connected with the White County Juvenile Court nor the Probation Officer, Bruce Bramlage and will not participate in any respect with the present program instituted in 1967 by the Judge of the Juvenile Court, Maurice P. Zerface.

Considering the success of Judge Zerface's program in reducing crime in White County, Ind., let up hope that it will soon be adopted in other areas of the country.

## DICKINSON REPORTS

### HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, most everyone has a favorite story to tell about Government bureaucracies to illustrate their shortcomings and failures. I am no exception to that rule. I would therefore like to share with my colleagues in the House a recent episode which I believe you will find quite interesting:

WEEKLY COLUMN FROM CONGRESSMAN BILL DICKINSON, SECOND DISTRICT, ALABAMA

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Mason Lustig lives in a cramped one-room dwelling and subsists mainly on cheap chopped meat. When winter comes, he goes barefoot in the snow. Still he doesn't look like a welfare case. Mason is healthy, very healthy, *but* with a little help from his friends, he has just enrolled in Medicaid, the health care program for the poor.

Mason Lustig has become a source of embarrassment to the city of New York for Kolyer's Mason von Lustig is a registered Harlequin Great Dane. Mason holds Medicaid identification card No. 5463603–1 because of a little scheme his master dreamed up to dramatize alleged administrative laxities in the New York program.

In order to bring reform to the New York Department of Social Services, the dog's owner, Mrs. Evelyn Lustig, applied in the name of one Mason Lustig for all those benefits her dog is now entitled to—visits to a doctor or dentist, false teeth if necessary, prescription drugs, eyeglasses and money for transportation, for example.

Mrs. Lustig listed Mason's age as 32 (he's really a middle-aged 5½), identified Bovine and Quinyce as his son and daughter (they aren't) and asked for benefits for them, too. She added an urgent appeal: "Please rush. Children need dentist work for school."

"I gave answers that any five-year-old should have caught," Mrs. Lustig says. However, neither Mrs. Lustig nor Mason were required to give any answers under oath or in the presence of a notary and many answers were supplied with only a slight exaggeration of the truth. No welfare worker ever came to call, and no one wondered whether Mason's dependents were indeed attending school. But Mason did receive an acknowledgement from the Department of Social Services with a warning that approval would not be automatic.

In the end, though, the department processed Mason's application and, in due course, the yellow "medical identification card" arrived by mail. His ID card merely lists his name, address and the type of coverage—A1, or "all available benefits"—he and the two "children" can receive. The card doesn't describe his appearance, giving neither age, weight (250 pounds) nor height (39 inches to the shoulder). So, his owner asks, what's to stop Mason from putting the bite on taxpayers by lending his card to someone else?

Furthermore, the Medicaiders have informed Mason that his low income ($6 to $19 a week from odd jobs, his application said) qualifies him not only for free health care but for cash grants, too. Accordingly, they wrote "may we suggest that you apply to the office indicated below, where your eligibility for a public assistance grant will be determined fully."

"What? A dog? I can't believe it," exclaims Esta Bloomfield, New York's director of medical services.

This episode reminds me of a welfare family who recently left Indiana in a huff—or rather in a $10,000 air-conditioned mobile home. The family had four TV sets, a deep freeze, a vibrating reclining chair, two $248 red velvet chairs and other new furniture. The family poodle got $10 haircuts. The family packed up and headed for California declaring that Indiana was a "lousy" welfare State.

What? I can't believe it either!

WEEKLY COLUMN FROM CONGRESSMAN BILL DICKINSON, SECOND DISTRICT, ALABAMA

WASHINGTON, D.C.—About two months ago in this column, I reported to you what seemed at the time to be an unbelievable story detailing how one Mason von Lustig, a dog from New York City, applied for and received a Medicaid card from the New York Department of Social Services. As was explained then, Mason von Lustig is a registered Harlequin Great Dane and Mason's owner dreamed up the little scheme to dramatize alleged administrative laxities in the New York program.

It seemed that Mason's master, Mrs. Evelyn Lustig, did succeed in instituting one major change. Effective November 1971, the State of New York made face-to-face interviews mandatory for persons seeking to be certified for Medicaid. That ruling, it was thought, should put a stop to the registration of dogs, who are, incidentally, not qualified to receive benefits from the health care program for the poor.

Apparently, however, someone forgot to notify the computer for it went ahead, having a compassional and social conscience, I presume, and issued a second card to Mason extending his benefits. The re-issued card was sent to Mason in December of last year—a full month after the new ruling became effective.

This is not the end of the story of our friend Mason. The latest episode finds his owner facing criminal prosecution for fraud. New York officials have investigated the case and as a result of their findings have referred the case to the New York district attorney for criminal prosecution.

I don't know what the final results of this bizarre case will be. In the end, the department will probably issue Mason additional medical identification cards. His ID merely lists his name, address and type of coverage—A1, or "all available benefits"—he and his two "children" can receive. The card doesn't describe his appearance, giving neither age (5½ years), weight (250 pounds) nor height (39 inches to the shoulder). So, in the event Mason is unable to personally take advantage of his card, he could put the bite on taxpayers by lending his card to someone else. After all, there just aren't that many dogs who have the cash or insurance needed to obtain proper medical treatment.

Who knows, perhaps Mason, or someone who can help him with his application, will turn his owner's legal difficulties over to a card-issuing legal service. No one wants a registered Harlequin Great Dane to add to the problems of overcrowding our prisons already suffer from, and everyone knows a fine—no matter how stiff—is not going to rehabilitate a 5½ year old "friend of man."

## DEERFIELD OBSERVANCE

### HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, there are many ancient and historic towns in my Congressional District, but one of the most famous of these is the town of Deerfield. This town was the site of the legendary Deerfield Massacre in 1704, in which frontier Indians in league with the French razed the village and carried off its inhabitants to Canada. The settlement was restored, however, and its carefully preserved buildings can still be seen in the well-known historic landmark of Old Deerfield.

This town will celebrate its Tercentenary next year. Preparations for the official observances have already begun with the sale of commemorative spoons manufactured by Lunt Silversmiths of Greenfield. I include an article from the Greenfield Recorder, reporting on the plans of the Deerfield Tercentenary Committee:

[From the Greenfield (Mass.) Recorder, Jan. 27, 1972]

DEERFIELD OPENS 300TH OBSERVANCE

(By Walentyna Pomasko)

DEERFIELD.—The Deerfield Tercentenary Committee will start off the town's 300th anniversary program Saturday with the sale of commemorative spoons.

Chr. George Melnik announced the small silver spoons, designed by the late Frederick H. Larrabee, will be on sale at Cleary's Jewelers in Greenfield, Frontier Pharmacy in South Deerfield and Hall Tavern in Old Deerfield. The spoon was manufactured by Lunt Silversmiths of Greenfield and will cost $9 plus tax.

A folder, entitled "Hold History . . . In Your Hand", accompanies the silver demi-spoon explaining it "embodies the grace of early American silversmithing" and reflects moments in Deerfield history. A replica of the Bloody Brook Memorial is engraved on the handle, the Old Indian House is etched into the bowl and the tomahawk symbol on the back of the handle is the "mark" of Deerfield's tercentenary. The tomahawk is significant because "it epitomizes the town's intimate exposure to the perils of frontier life . . . while striving to achieve man's age-old hope of peace with liberty", the brochure says.

Sale of this spoon is the first event in an ambitious and long awaited event, being planned by the tercentenary committee for more than a year.

The committee this week informed selectmen and the Finance Committee about $125,000 may be needed to make all the plans a reality. Chr. Melanik explained that although funds are needed from the town to back up the committee's plans, the event will be self-supporting. Income derived from sale of commemorative pieces, the town history books and social events will cover costs incurred by the celebration, Melnik explained. The celebration will not be a profit-making event and all funds allocated by the town should be returned, he said.

Selectmen will recommend $30,000 allocated to the committee to start off the numerous expenditures needed.

A revised history is being planned. It will include chapters written by various interested townspeople. Melnik has stated his committee would like to have the two-volume set available for sale at the time of the celebration during the summer of 1973.

A beef barbecue, a specially written play and youth day are just some of the events in the works. The executive committee and the many subcommittees are meeting every week to work out details and enlist townspeople to help.

From now on, the committee and the town will be in full gear, moving toward a grand celebration next year.

## KOSCIUSZKO HOME DESERVES RECOGNITION AS NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

### HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of my colleagues an article written by Alan Prince, travel editor for the Miami Herald, regarding the proposal to designate the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home located in Philadelphia as a National Historic Site. Mr. Prince's article appeared in the January 2 edition of the Herald.

Thus far, favorable consideration has not been extended to the proposal to designate the Kosciuszko Home as a National Historic Site because Kosciuszko lived at his house after the Revolutionary War—and not during the war. Mr. Prince points out that Kosciuszko is being faulted for being a soldier and spending his days in helping to fight and win the Revolutionary War rather than spending lazy days in Philadelphia during the war. I disagree with the view that Kosciuszko should be posthumously ignored simply because he went where duty called and put his best efforts forth in behalf of the cause of American freedom, rather than simply spending unproductive days living at his Philadelphia house.

The fact remains that Kosciuszko did indeed live in this house during the winter of 1797–98, and as far as the records show, no other structure in the United States associated with Kosciuszko has survived. According to the Herald article:

Philadelphia interests say that the house could be restored with colonial period furnishings and presented to the American people absolutely free.

Under these circumstances, I feel that anything less than prompt designation of the Kosciuszko home in Philadelphia would amount to disrespect and disparagement of the Kosciuszko contribution to American independence, and indeed, of the outstanding contribution made by the Polish American community to the growth and development of America.

Mr. Speaker, the article which appeared in the January 2 edition of the Miami Herald follows:

[From the Miami Herald, Jan. 2, 1972]

YOU LIKE POLISH JOKES? HERE IS ONE YOU WONT

(By Alan Prince)

Polish jokes have circulated in this country for many years. One, for instance, poses the question: "What is the capital of Poland?" The answer: "Thirty-seven cents."

Then there is the really sick variety, such as the joke about the Polish family which painted its garbage-can covers orange so the children would think they were eating at Howard Johnson's.

We are neither that prudish nor hypocritical to deny that we think there is humor in some of the Polish jokes. What is objectionable is that the target is of an ethnic nature.

Now, let us tell you the latest Polish joke.

It concerns a house at 301 Pine St., Philadelphia, commonly called the Thaddeus Kosciusko House. The Advisory Board of the National Park Service has turned down suggestions that the Kosciusko House be declared a national historic site. As such, it would be more than a tourist attraction; it would be a protected shrine to which Americans and foreigners alike could always go to learn more about the shaping of this nation and to receive knowledge and inspiration from it.

Just who was Thaddeus Kosciusko? He was a Polish general who came to this land to help the colonists in their quest for freedom. He used his own money in that effort.

He is most remembered for his engineering skill in erecting the fortifications at West Point during the early battles. George Washington felt that the British surely would have been able to move south from Canada through the Hudson Valley, split the colonies in half and win the Revolutionary War had it not been for Kosciusko's work. In other words, Kosciusko helped to save the life of the emerging nation.

Other contributions by the general have led some military historians to call him the father of American artillery. He also distinguished himself as a cavalry officer in the Carolina campaign.

LOPSIDED LOGIC BY UNITED STATES

The Philadelphia House in which Kosciusko lived does not qualify as a national historic site, however, because Kosciusko lived there after—and not during—the Revolutionary War which he helped to win. That is what the government has decided.

In other words, Kosciusko posthumously is being faulted for being a soldier and for living the life of a soldier. He did not spend lazy days in Philadelphia during the war; he went where duty called. Only after the war was he able to live in the house for some time. But the fact is that he did live in the house, and that is why the federal government ought to help to preserve it.

We do not think that everything that is old should be preserved simply because it is old. However, houses like the Kosciusko House bring to mind a concept explaining land value as articulated once by a real estate man: "There is no more of it." Similarly, there are no more houses in which the nation's heroes have lived than the ones that now exist, and those that still stand should be preserved.

There is a financial irony to the Advisory Board's rejection of the Kosciusko House. Philadelphia interests say that the house could be restored with colonial period furnishings and presented to the American people absolutely free. Yet this offer was turned down by the same board which approved construction of the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, a project which originally was supposed to be financed entirely from private resources but which has resulted in a tab of many millions of dollars for the taxpayers.

The Advisory Board's action is, in its lopsided logic, perhaps the cruelest of all Polish jokes. It not only is an insult to millions of Americans of Polish descent. It is an insult to all Americans.

## COMMEMORATION OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join many of my colleagues in commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day. This year marks the 721st anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian State, when Mindaugas the Great succeeded in unifying the Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251.

Unfortunately, since that time, the Lithuanian nation—and all Baltic peoples—have suffered from the accident of geography. Although related ethnically neither to the Germans nor the Russians, the Baltic peoples have been subjected to invasions and occupations from both sides throughout the centuries. Currently, the Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia are "incorporated" into the Union of Soviet

Socialist Republics. Since 1940 when the Soviets first took this action, each American President has reiterated this country's policy of nonrecognition of the Soviet occupation of these nations.

It is only because of the remarkable spiritual and ethnic strength of the peoples of these Baltic nations that they were able to survive the intense pressures brought to bear on them throughout their history. It is this spirit and strength that I wish to commemorate today. And in so doing, I insert in the RECORD the text of House Concurrent Resolution 416—passed unanimously in the 89th Congress by both the House and Senate—at the conclusion of my remarks as a fitting tribute, on this 54th anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania, to the courage and fortitude of all the Baltic peoples:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 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.

## A VOTE AGAINST AN INCREASE IN THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

### HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, February 9, 1972, I joined a considerable number of my colleagues in voting "no" on H.R. 12910, legislation providing a temporary increase in the public debt limit.

This legislation, requested by the Nixon administration, added an additional temporary debt increase of $20 billion to the already outstanding temporary debt ceiling of $30 billion, both of these added to the total permanent debt ceiling of $400 billion. This means that through June 30, 1972, the Federal Government now has a total authorized public debt of $450 billion.

I had two major reasons for voting against this increase. The first was to protest the past and anticipated future deficits in the Federal budget, and the second was to help emphasize the urgent need for meaningful tax reform legislation to raise additional revenue for the Federal Government and at the same time distribute the burden of our tax system more equitably.

In regard to my first reason, it is with concern approaching alarm that I view the estimated Federal deficit of $44.7 billion for the current fiscal year. When this figure is combined with the projected deficit of $36.2 billion for the coming fiscal year of 1973 it reaches a frightening level. The Congress should keep foremost in its collective mind the need for fiscal responsibility in Federal spending. This type of excessive spending may have a beneficial short-run effect. At the same time, in my opinion it is clearly not in the best long-run interests of our Nation. While defeat of this proposal would have called for early consideration of some alternative legislation in order to keep solid the credit of the Government, it would have been a most effective method of attracting public attention to the deficit and to the issue of tax reform.

My second reason for opposition to this measure was to attempt to force the Congress to undertake meaningful tax reform legislation. For if we were to limit the public debt, then the Congress would be required to review its present sources of revenue to determine whether it was reasonable and proper to increase tax revenues one way or another.

At the present time, the basic income tax schedules are stated to run from 14 to 70 percent. But recent data shows that under present law the effective rate in the $10,000 income bracket averages about 9 percent; for the $25,000 bracket about 14.5 percent; and at the $1 million mark, only 32.1 percent.

These rates are brought down, particularly in the upper brackets, by such factors as: Lower rates on capital gains, no taxation on local bond interest, the oil depletion allowance, deductions of property taxes and mortgage interest by homeowners, and special treatment for dividends. Each of these special exemptions and deductions should be carefully reexamined. It appears clear that until the Congress moves further than it has to date to reform our present tax system, the Federal Government will not maximize its tax resources, and the present gigantic gap between receipts and expenditures will continue.

In conclusion, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to examine both the present Federal taxation and the present Federal expenditure situations, and ask themselves if it is not absolutely imperative that we accomplish meaningful immediate reform in both areas.

## REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA

### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the story of the recent decades of the 20th century has, in some respects, been a story of the decline of colonialism, of the desire of the world to implement the principle of self-determination for all peoples. In this regard, we have seen the withdrawal of the European powers from their previous positions of influence and authority in Asia and in Africa.

Yet, if the retreat from colonialism is part of the story of this period, an equally important part is that of the rise of a new, more brutal, and oppressive colonialism and imperialism; namely that of the Soviet Union.

While Western European countries such as England, Holland, France, and Belgium are retreating to their own national boundaries and are pursuing policies meant to improve the standard of living and quality of life of their own people, the Soviet Union continues to expand and extend its influence, using force and violence as its major methodology.

The world observed this force and violence in Hungary and in Czechoslovakia, and witnessed its formulation into a rule with the announcement of the Brehznev doctrine. Still, despite these facts, many argue that somehow communism has "changed," that somehow the Soviet Union no longer harbors aggressive designs upon its neighbors. Were this to be true, evidence could surely be presented. Instead, the colonialism and the imperialism of the Soviet Union remains unchanged.

Today Americans of Lithuanian descent commemorate the 54th anniversary of the etsablishment of the Republic of Lithuania and the 721st anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state. In 1251 Mindaugas the Great unified the Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom. For the better part of their history, the Lithuanians have been subjected to brutal attacks, from the Teutonic Knights in the West and from the Russians in the East. It has taken remarkable spiritual and ethnic strength to survive these pressures.

Many Americans have forgotten the history even of our own era. After the Nazis and Soviets smashed Poland in September 1939, the Kremlin moved troops into the Baltic republics and annexed them in June 1940. Thus, the independence of Lithuania was terminated on June 15, 1940, when the Soviet Union sent an army of occupation of 140,000 men into that country. With the support of the occupying force, the Soviets staged mock elections, in which only one slate of Moscow-sponsored candidates was allowed, and through this subversion of the will of the people, formally annexed Lithuania.

The Lithuanian people have shown their hostility to Soviet rule, and have paid a heavy price for such opposition. On June 22, 1941, the Lithuanian people revolted against the Soviet occupation

and control and proclaimed the reestablishment of an independent state. This effort cost the Lithuanians almost 12,000 casualties. The Provisional Government, proclaimed by the leaders of the revolt, was disbanded as Lithuania was occupied by the German Armies on the march into the Soviet Union.

From 1945, when the Soviet Union reimposed its rule, until approximately 1953 an armed patriotic resistance movement waged a war against the Communists with approximately 50,000 Lithuanian patriots losing their lives. The Soviet leaders, in an effort to eliminate the national resistance, deported about every sixth Lithuanian to the distant parts of the Soviet Union or to concentration camps, where a large number of them died from the harsh conditions, starvation, and executions. Trials of partisans were held as late as 1955.

Lithuania, together with the other Baltic republics, Latvia and Estonia, represent a special example of Soviet colonialism. They have been physically annexed by the Soviet Union and forcibly incorporated into its group of "Socialist Republics." As far as the Communists are concerned, these three countries have ceased to exist as separate entities entitled to their own national identity and independence.

During his trial Simas Kudirka, the Lithuanian seaman turned back to the Russians by the U.S. Coast Guard in a shocking reversal of America's humane treatment to all those seeking freedom, declared that—

> 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.

As we commemorate these important anniversaries today, this too should be our request: That Lithuania be granted independence. It is a request which all Americans should share, particularly those who are most vehement in their denunciations of colonialism and imperialism when they think that those committing such acts are fascistic. All those who deny man's freedom and dignity, and the right of peoples to self-determination, whether they be tyrannies of the right or of the left, should be equally condemned. It is the Soviet Union which has perpetrated this new colonialism across the face of Eastern Europe.

Lithuanian independence and freedom, as well as the independence and freedom of the other subjected nations and peoples, must remain an important goal for all of those in our own country who seek a world at peace. The only peace which will advance mankind is a peace based upon the respect for each man and nation to have an identity and a life of its own. The kind of peace based upon subjugation and surrender to tyranny is one which honorable men can endorse only at the price of their own integrity.

During the 89th Congress both the House and Senate unanimously passed a resolution calling for freedom for Lithuania and the other two Baltic states. It is my hope that the administration will seek to implement this legislation by bringing the Baltic states question before the United Nations. It is high time that our society did more than pay lipservice to the concept of freedom for the peoples of Eastern Europe. We have an obligation, to ourselves and to our friends, to translate noble words into meaningful deeds.

---

## METHADONE SERIES SUGGESTS NEED FOR FURTHER DRUG RESEARCH

### HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, the problem of drug addiction continues to plague our Nation and our citizens. We must continue to strive to develop means to remove addicts from drug dependency.

It was this search that led many to tout the effectiveness of methadone as a substitute drug for heroin addicts. Proponents of methadone argue that methadone eliminates dependency by ending the craving for heroin without inducing a stupor after the "high" associated with heroin.

In a recent series of articles in the Hartford Times, Lee Hickling, an industrious investigative reporter for Gannett News Service, illuminates the problems being experienced with methadone treatment. It is a highly informative series of articles and reinforces my support for legislation which calls for more research money to find drug substitutes that effectively block the affects of addictive drugs.

I commend these articles to my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD:

METHADONE—I

(By Lee Hickling)

WASHINGTON.—In 1941, while Nazi Germany was cut off from the rest of the world, its scientists invented a synthetic narcotic to replace the morphine Germany could no longer import. In Adolf Hitler's honor, they named it dolophine.

Now, renamed methadone (it rhymes with "ron," not "roan"), dolophine is being given legally to more than 50,000 of the estimated 315,000 heroin addicts in the United States. By the end of this year, from 100,000 to 200,000 may be getting it at government-licensed and financed clinics.

Among politicians, some physicians and the public there is a widespread belief that methadone blocks the craving for heroin, produces no euphoria or "high" itself, and makes it possible for an addict to live a nearly-normal life.

Evidence is piling up that this belief is wrong in every respect. But public officials, in despair at the failure of other efforts to turn the rising tide of hard-drug addiction, with its resulting crime and misery, are either unaware of or ignore that evidence at city, State and Federal levels, they are moving to put an ever-large share of their slim resources for drug abuse control into methadone maintenance programs.

The Federal Food and Drug Administration has given about 300 organizations or individuals licenses to experiment with methadone, which is classified as an "investigational new drug" at the moment. (As dolophine, it is already accepted for use as a pain-killer, a cough suppressant and to treat opiate addicts undergoing drug withdrawal.)

Few if any of the licensed "experimenters" are actually experimenting with the drug. What they are doing is running clinics where addicts come in, usually daily, to swallow a dose of methadone in a glass of orange drink. The synthetic orange-flavored drink "Tang" (cap T) is the favorite medium for disguising the unpleasant taste of the drug.

A husband and wife team of doctors at Beth Israel Medical Center in New York City, Vincent P. Dole and Marie E. Nyswander, first experimented with giving dolophine or methadone in large daily doses to heroin addicts.

They have a theory not generally held by other leaders in the drug addiction field, that addiction is basically a medical, not a psychological or social problem. Dole and Nyswander do not believe social, emotional or personality problems are the root cause of addiction. They think "some metabolic quirk" causes one person to become an addict while another does not.

It follows that the problem should be treated with medicine, by a doctor, and not with counseling, psychotherapy or social work.

Dolophine, or methadone, is a cheap, legal drug. It can be given by mouth. It is as addictive as heroin. But it does not have to be injected into a vein, and its effects are longer-lasting—24 hours instead of four or five.

From 1964 through March, 1968 (when the first national conference on methadone treatment was held in New York City, Dole and Nyswander took in 871 patients at their clinic and kept 752—rejecting most of the others because they judged them psychopathic or because they used other drugs, including alcohol.

Their conclusion, first given widespread publicity in 1966, was that methadone, properly given, acts as an anti-narcotic agent, blocking the action of heroin and other opiate drugs without in itself producing sedation or euphoria.

All their patients had long records of addiction. All had failed with other methods of treatment. Most had been arrested many times. Only 28 per cent of them held any kind of job when they started treatment.

After five months in the program, 45 per cent were either working or back in school; after 11 months, 61 per cent, and after 24 months, 85 per cent.

Most startling of all, Dole and Nyswander said none of the patients who stayed in the program became re-addicted to heroin. Some did turn to other drugs—about 11 per cent used amphetamines or barbiturates, and about 5 per cent abused alcohol.

But the results were astonishingly successful, compared to any other approach to addiction ever tried. There was widespread disbelief. Other researchers repeated the experiment and reported results paralleling Dole and Nyswander's. Methadone appeared to block their patients' craving for heroin.

The addicts treated by William F. Wieland of the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia, he wrote, "Look well, feel well and behave normally under the influence of methadone."

"Furthermore," he went on in a report to the first national conference on methadone treatment, "from the public health point of view methadone maintenance is a relatively inexpensive form of treatment, since it does not require prolonged residential confinement nor extensive psychiatric intervention . . .

"In modern parlance, the cost effectiveness of methadone maintenance is superior to

other current modes of treatment . . . a factor that must be weighed by governmental agencies charged with treatment or control of narcotic addiction on a large scale."

Methadone's promise of a solution on the cheap for the heroin problem makes it all but irresistible. At Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore, officials of a drug abuse center struggling to keep its financial support gave figures:

The average addict in Baltimore steals $43,000 to $57,000 worth of merchandise a year to support his habit. There are 5,000 to 10,000 addicts in the city. That means they take $15 million to $500 million a year, mostly by shoplifting and burglary. It costs about $2,000 a year for each patient in a methadone maintenance clinic, which works out to 2 to 4 per cent of the property losses that would be caused if the patient remained an addict on the street.

"It is difficult to see," summed up psychiatrist Herzl Spiro, "How the city, the state or the Federal government can say they cannot afford a drug abuse program."

---

METHADONE—II

(By Lee Hickling)

WASHINGTON.—"The addicts in the street know the difference between changing your life and just fooling with another drug. If one just wants to play around, the methadone program is where he goes."

The speaker is Ron Clark, a counselor at RAP (CAPS) Inc., a drug-free, live-in home for 85 young ex-addicts, located in three big old houses just north of Dupont Circle in the District of Columbia.

Ron is biased against methadone and in favor of the encounter-group, therapeutic-community style of help for addicts that RAP (standing for regional addiction prevention) tries to give. His bias is based on years of experience, as an addict on the street and as a worker in a methadone maintenance clinic in the Bedford-Stuyvesant Neighborhood of Brooklyn.

Ron, out of his street wisdom, and a growing number of doctors and researchers, based on their studies, dispute nearly every claim made for the synthetic narcotic methadone as a treatment for heroin addiction.

In their purest form, as made by Drs. Vincent P. Dole and Marie E. Nyswander, the original experimenters with the drug in New York City, these are those claims:

—Given at the proper dosage level, it blocks the effect of other opiate-like narcotics. An addict on methadone will get no "high" from shooting heroin, so he stops using it.

—Methadone itself, given at the proper dosage, does not produce euphoria or sleepiness in an individual who has developed a tolerance for the drug. He looks normal, feels normal and functions normally.

—Patients in a well-run methadone maintenance program rarely become readdicted to heroin or any other hard drug. Their craving for narcotics satisfied by methadone, they are not driven to shoplifting, burglary, robbery and prostitution for money to buy heroin.

Dole, Nyswander and other advocates of methadone maintenance as the most effective approach yet to the drug problem—including President Nixon's special advisor on drug abuse, Dr. Jerome Jaffe—are not disturbed that methadone is as highly addictive as heroin or morphine.

Replacing one addiction with another is not an ideal way to fight the rising incidence of heroin use, they admit. But the people who are being addicted to methadone were already addicted to a more dangerous, illegal drug, they argue—and besides, what else do we have?

The best solution might be to find a way of persuading people to no longer want to abuse drugs. Since nobody really knows why they do, nobody has yet succeeded, on a large scale, in making them decide to stop.

Second-best might be a chemical that would block the effect of the narcotics. Research is being done on such drug "antagonists" and one or two look good. None is proved yet and ready for large-scale use.

Meanwhile, misery and crime caused by drugs are blighting whole city neighborhoods and spreading into suburbs and small towns. Hardly a resident of a large city is free from the fear that he will be held up, going home at night, by a youth who needs money for his habit. Pressure on government to act—to do something, anything—is intense.

"Methadone is certainly not a cure-all or panacea for the treatment of heroin addiction," Food and Drug Commissioner Charles C. Edwards told a congressional committee recently. But, he went on, "At the moment . . . we know of no drug that has been demonstrated to be as safe and effective as methadone for combating heroin addiction."

Government—from the White House down—is moving to expand methadone programs. There are 300 programs now treating 50,000 addicts. Applications to start new ones are coming in from cities, States and private organizations at the rate of one a day. Dr. Jaffe, the President's advisor, expects the number of clinics to increase from 50 to 100 per cent by the end of this year.

That would mean, perhaps, more than 100,000 of the country's 315,000 addicts under treatment. Would they be "blocked" or dissuaded, by having their drug need satisfied, from using heroin, and from committing crimes to get the money to buy it?

"I don't know too many people on methadone who don't use drugs on the side," Ron Clark said. "In Brooklyn, our people were out still hustling heroin. They were out learning how to become better burglars. Why should they take a 40-hour job for $90 a week when they can hustle $90 in one day on the street?"

Dr. William Dobbs, who ran a methadone clinic at the District of Columbia General Hospital, quit more than a year ago after disagreements with the city narcotics treatment administration (CAPS N T A). He was suspicious of the effects of methadone and the results of the program.

Dobbs did a study of 100 patients. He found that three-fourths of those who had been given heavy, daily doses of methadone (averaging 100 milligrams) for four to six months were still using heroin, as proved by urinalysis. That was a slightly higher rate than that for patients just admitted to the clinic—69 percent of whose urine tested positive for heroin.

Two doctors, Russell Taylor and Carl Chambers, checked on Philadelphia's methadone maintenance program. They found that 59 percent of the time, patients' urine showed they were using one or more illegal drugs, on top of methadone.

They said this attacks the whole philosophical basis for dosing addicts with methadone. The Philadelphia patients were not staying away from heroin. Even the ones on high doses of methadone—which by the Dole-Nyswander Doctrine should "blockade" an effect from heroin—were using it.

Chambers and Taylor concluded that methadone in daily doses may prevent addicts' getting high on small doses of illegal drugs, but not from large ones. "The high rate of abuse among the patients who had been on maintenance for at least one year," they said, "indicates that drug craving most certainly had neither been extinguished nor significantly diminished."

Ron Clark also disputes the official line that patients on methadone look and act normal. "You can see in their faces when they're on it," he said. "They're all slowed down. You can see it right away when you know what to look for. They're only functioning marginally."

METHADONE—III

(By Lee Hickling)

WASHINGTON.—A great irony is involved in the current rush to set up vast programs to give the synthetic narcotic methadone to heroin addicts.

Unable to solve the problem, society is trying to alleviate it—by giving the victims a drug. Such an approach is exactly why the addicts are in their unhappy condition. Unable to deal realistically with their personal problems, they chose to alleviate them with drugs.

When methadone first became known to the general public in the late 1960s, there was created a lasting impression that it is a miracle cure for addiction which keeps addicts from using heroin and lets them return to normal lives.

Professionals in the drug addiction field know this is not so. But there have been very few newspaper and magazine stories setting the record straight.

Even many physicians, unless they subscribe to medical journals such as the British "Lancet" and the New England Journal of Medicine, where both sides of the issue have been aired, are likely to be misinformed. Until recently, most articles in the widely-read journal of the American Medical Association have promoted and defended the methadone maintenance approach to treating drug addict.

Public overoptimism based on misinformation worries many persons in the field of addiction, including President Nixon's special advisor, Dr. Jerome Jaffe. He advocates methadone maintenance—but only as one method among many, and only as a step toward the ultimate goal of complete freedom from drugs.

Even though methadone is highly addictive itself, even though it is widely misused, even if it does not keep patients who are on it from using other drugs, there are many professionals who think it has a place.

It is widely used for detoxification—bringing heroin addicts back to physical normal by giving them ever-decreasing doses over a period of three weeks to three months. But methadone maintenance is different from detoxification; maintenance means putting patients on a "stabilized" daily dosage and keeping them on it indefinitely.

Asked how long patients could be expected to stay on methadone, pioneer experimenter Vincent P. Dole once answered, "Forever." Dole has since started experimenting with withdrawal, and says he is having success.

Dr. Robert Dupont, who runs a city drug control program in the District of Columbia that now has 3,500 persons on methadone, claims he has had great success in transferring patients from maintenance to drug-free treatment and eventually out of his program altogether. But Dupont's narcotics treatment administration (NTA) stresses methadone maintenance over any other method. At any given time, at least 60 per cent of NTA's patients are on methadone.

Long-time junkies who want to get out of the drug life but cannot do it unaided seem to be the best prospects for methadone maintenance. A large share of Dole's original experimental group answered this description, and many experts attribute their success to a careful selection of just those patients who were likeliest to benefit.

Younger persons in their teens and early 20s—who make up the larger part of the addict population—do not seem to be helped. Two doctors, Carl Chambers and Russell Taylor, in a critical report on Philadelphia's methadone maintenance clinics, described the way they respond:

"Methadone does not eliminate the patient's desires for and pursuit of a 'high,' their attachment to and involvement with the needle, nor their enjoyment with and acceptance of the street life. A relatively

common practice among maintenance patients is to trade a portion of their take-home medication for drugs from which to receive a high. They, therefore, have the best of both lives."

Methadone, under its original name of dolophine, has always been available on the street and has had a steady sale to addicts who could not get heroin or who wanted dolophine to taper off or kick their habits. But, fed largely by supplies stolen or fraudulently obtained from legal clinics, the street market for methadone is booming now.

Some addicts, particularly younger, white suburban ones, have bypassed heroin and gone straight to methadone addiction because it is cheap, available and clean—the drug is pure and no needle is needed to take it.

In Fairfax County, near Washington, Commonwealth Attorney Robert Horan is extremely upset about the menace. In the last two years, Fairfax has had only one death from heroin but ten from methadone, three of the victims under 16.

The Philadelphia study by Chambers and Taylor found methadone maintenance was not all bad, in spite of its defects. Many of the patients, even though they kept on using illegal drugs, seemed to be leading more stable lives. Half were maintaining intact marriages. Nearly half were holding jobs. Overall, there were fewer arrests.

Being able to get methadone may have reduced their need to be on a continual prowl for money and freed them of their fear of going into withdrawal sickness, according to one interpretation.

The harshest critics of methadone maintenance programs are those professionals who run drug-free, therapeutic communities for addicts, all modeled more or less freely on the original Synanon community in California. They think using methadone is going in exactly the opposite direction from the right one.

"When you're talking about kicking drugs, you're talking about looking at your whole life," says Psychologist Ron Grognet, director of such a community, RAP Inc., in the District of Columbia. "It means you have to work through some really heavy emotional problems. If you're anesthetized, you're not going to do that."

Grognet disdains the prevailing American view of the drug problem and what to do about it. "They don't choose to relate to 25,000 traffic fatalities a year because of alcohol, not to mention the brain damage, the liver damage and the social damage it causes," he says. "They pick one drug out of all the rest and call it 'our drug problem' and they take aim at it and call that 'our campaign against drugs.' "

RAP, Synanon and a host of other colorfully-named residential drug programs aim at helping addicts find a way to live the rest of their lives free of all drugs, including alcohol and everything except perhaps caffeine. Coffee is drunk at such centers from morning to night.

Not only drug-free, encounter therapy programs but less radical ones based on gradual withdrawal, psychological counseling and job training are facing cutbacks or extinction as more and more of the limited amount of public money for addiction control is put into methadone maintenance clinics.

None of the other methods has proved to be the whole answer, but it can be argued that experience so far shows there is no single answer. To pinch out other programs in order to push methadone therapy, in the face of evidence casting strong doubt on its value for most addicts, would be reckless.

That, however, is what is being done. In New York City recently, three residential programs were shut down and the methadone program expanded. New York State is doing the same thing, cutting back on residential centers and programs in prisons and mental hospitals, and opening more methadone clinics. A year ago there were 8,500 addicts on methadone in public or private clinics in New York. Now there are more than 19,000, and the number is to be increased.

---

## LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, a note of irony is present in this commemoration of the 54th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania since 1972 also marks 31 years of totalitarian Soviet rule.

For three decades the freedom-loving people of Lithuania have suffered violations of human rights unimaginable to the average American. The same holds true of all the captive nations and is the reason that today, as on other occasions when the House has paid its respects to nations held in unwilling bondage by the Kremlin, I urge that we give more than lipservice to our concern.

I would hope that at long last the Committee on Foreign Affairs will give its approval to House Concurrent Resolution 49, requiring the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations to request that the U.N. insist on fulfillment of its charter provisions based on self-determination of all people, and that the Soviet Union be asked to abide by its U.N. obligations concerning colonialism and interference with the sovereignty of other nations.

To that end I insert at this point in the RECORD the complete text of my resolution, and with it, my hopes that the House will take realistic and significant steps toward alleviating the condition of the captive nations through its passage:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 49

Whereas the United States of America was founded upon and long cherished the principles of self-determination and freedom; and

Whereas these principles, expressed in the sovereign quality of nations, are the very reason for the existence of the United Nations, as set forth in the charter of that world organization; and

Whereas the United States and all other members of the United Nations have solemnly pledged themselves to make these principles universal and to extend their benefits to all peoples; and

Whereas, on December 10, 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations passed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which was accepted both by the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, defining said rights as relating to citizens of all member states; and

Whereas, since 1918 Soviet communism has, through the most brutal aggression and force, deprived millions of formerly free peoples of their right to self-determination; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has unanimously expressed in Public Law 86-90, approved July 17, 1959, its revulsion at the continued enslavement of the peoples of Eastern and East Central Europe who were described by the said public law as captive nations; and

Whereas the Hungarian, Polish, Czech, Slovak, Carpatho-Ruthenian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Estonian, East German, Rumanian, Bulgarian, Albanian, Ukrainian, and White Ruthenian peoples may only look to the United States and the United Nations for the restoration of their national self-determination and political independence; and

Whereas the member nations of the United Nations have failed to bring before the General Assembly for successful discussion the problem of self-determination and political independence of the peoples of Eastern Europe; and

Whereas, despite the numerous resolutions passed by the United Nations General Assembly, Russian occupation troops are still maintained in Hungary and the issue of their removal has not come up for discussion in the Assembly since 1962; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States and to the perpetuation of free civilization that the nations of the world act in concert through the forum of the United Nations in demanding national self-determination and political independence for the peoples enslaved by Communist governments; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States of America, in article II, section 2, vests in the President of the United States the power, by and with the advice of the Senate, to make treaties and to appoint Ambassadors: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to instruct the United States Ambassador to the United Nations to request at the 1968 session, that (1) the United Nations insist upon the fulfillment of its charter provisions based on self-determination of all peoples in the form of the sovereign equality of states and condemnation of colonial rule; and (2) the Soviet Union be asked to abide by its United Nations membership obligations concerning colonialism and interference with the sovereignty of other nations through the withdrawal of all Soviet Russia troops and agents from other nations now under Communist rule and through returning to their respective homelands all political prisoners now in prison and labor camps; be it further

*Resolved*, That the President of the United States is further authorized and requested to use all diplomatic, treaty-making, and appointive powers vested in him by the Constitution of the United States to augment and support actions taken by the United States Ambassador to the United Nations in the interest of self-determination and political independence of these nations.

---

## LITHUANIA CELEBRATES 54TH ANNIVERSARY

### HON. JAMES D. (MIKE) McKEVITT

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 54th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania and the 721st anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state.

Unfortunately, Lithuania itself will not be able to commemorate this occasion because of continuing subjugation and oppression by the Soviet Union.

Since World II, we have seen many nations emerge. We in the free world

have hailed the formation of these new republics. But how tragic that the principle of self-determination is not honored in Eastern Europe and that Lithuania remains a captive nation.

The continuing Soviet oppression of Lithuania and the denial of basic human rights to the people of Lithuania is a tragedy of the first order.

The Lithuanian American Community, Inc., recently issued a report on the Violations of Human Rights in Soviet Occupied Lithuania. This document bears bitter witness to the tragedy and is compelling reading for Americans. It helps remind us of the many freedoms we enjoy in our great Nation—freedoms we often take for granted.

All of us can be proud of the roles that citizens of Lithuanian descent play in the lives of our communities. Their continuing contributions to America mirror a proud and meaningful heritage.

## LITHUANIANS KEEP ALIVE ASPIRATIONS FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

### HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we are taking time to celebrate the 54th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Lithuania and the attainment of a long cherished dream of freedom from foreign domination. On February 16, 1918, before the end of World War I, a few million people courageously overcame generations of despotic rule and, at the same time, inspired the hearts of freedom-loving people all over the world.

Our celebration of the freedom won by the Lithuanian people is clouded, however, by the knowledge that these people are again in captivity. In the tragic events which preceded our entry into World War II, two decades of independence ended abruptly with the Soviet occupation of Lithuania in 1939. Along with the other Baltic Republics, Estonia and Latvia, Lithuania was drawn by the force of the Red Army into subjugation by the Soviet Union.

There was the pretense of free elections during the occupation, but the very presence of Soviet force made it dramatically clear that those elections were only a mockery. The need for such force, furthermore, demonstrated that the Kremlin had not completely defeated the desire for liberty by the valiant Lithuanian people.

Today, Americans of Lithuanian descent are continuing to keep alive the many aspects of Lithuanian tradition and culture which have enriched our country. They also nourish the hope that national independence may be restored and under a regime which truly seeks social and political justice.

All Americans, I know, share with me the earnest hope that Lithuanians will again enjoy the God-given rights of freedom and liberty. I join the other Members of the House in expressing sympathy and friendship to a brave people. We pray that for them the future bring independence to their homeland and the right to pursue in peace their own national destiny.

## REVENUE SHARING WITH ISRAEL AND RUSSIA

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, on the same day our Government announced a $50 million guaranteed loan to build 11,000 homes in Israel, our Government announced approval of $367.1 million worth of export licenses for the Kama River trucking plant in the Soviet Union.

It is small wonder that the American people are so frustrated and confused today. The many tentacles of the bureaucracy do not keep the command post advised of their activities, or the command post cannot make up its mind who are friends or enemies; or when it comes to giving away the taxpayers dollars, the administration loves everybody.

I think that the American people feel that there are many fellow Americans who could use their Government's financial support right here in our own U.S. backyard. Related newsclippings and a document on "The Problem of Government Censorship in Regard to Our Assistance to the Soviet Military Structure," by Mr. Anthony C. Sutton of the Hoover Institution of Stanford, Calif., follow:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 17, 1972]

A $50 MILLION LOAN SET FOR ISRAEL HOUSING

(By Stephen Klaidman)

The United States yesterday guaranteed a $50 million loan to build 11,000 homes in Israel primarily for Jewish immigrants from the Soviet Union.

The guarantee, the largest to date under the Agency for International Development's housing guarantee program, follows separate and broader legislative proposals by Sens. Edmund S. Muskie (D., Maine) and Henry M. Jackson (D., Wash.) for the United States to help resettle Soviet Jews who emigrate.

It also follows closely the sale of Phantom and other combat aircraft to Israel and a hint by President Nixon that he might raise the issue of Jewish emigration during his May visit to the Soviet Union.

In response to questions State Department spokesman Charles Bray emphasized the ongoing nature of U.S. support to Soviet Jews who wish to emigrate, and of aid to Israel.

The contract signed yesterday by AID Director John A. Hannah and Pinhas Sapir, Israel's finance minister, guarantees repayment of the loan to private U.S. savings and loan associations.

The Muskie bill calls for $85 million over a year to help resettle Soviet Jews. The Jackson bill would provide $250 million over two years for the resettlement of Soviet Jews in "Israel or the country of their choice."

Bray said yesterday that the administration was still considering its position to the proposed legislation.

Israeli officials contend that this is a matter for the U.S. Congress and that they are taking no stand on either bill, except to indicate that they favor the principle of support for the immigrants.

The houses to be built with the AID loan will serve Soviet and other immigrants, Arab and other minority groups, recently formed families and occupants of overcrowded or substandard housing. Current immigration to Israel is mostly from the Soviet Union and at the present pace Soviet newcomers exceed 35,000 this year.

Selling prices of the houses cannot exceed $16,000 and they must all be built within "Israel's pre-June 1967 boundaries."

The loan is repayable to the U.S. home loan institutions in dollars over a period of 25 years with annual interest at 7½ per cent. The purchasers of the houses paid AID a guarantee fee of ½ per cent annually on the outstanding amount of their loans.

The AID program in more than ten years has guaranteed $350 million in loans for housing in 30 countries.

The program does not use any government-appropriated funds. The loan funds come from private investors, and costs of administering the program are paid from the fees charged to the homeowners.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 17, 1972]

APPROVAL GIVEN MORE EXPORTS TO SOVIET UNION

The U.S. government yesterday approved $367.1 million worth of export licenses to the Soviet Union involving possible sales of machinery for a large trucking plant on the Kama River.

Previously, the government had already approved more than $1 billion worth of licenses for the Kama project. However, these figures do not indicate value of actual exports to the Soviet Union; the licenses will enable American firms to compete against foreign companies—or each other—for firm orders.

Nevertheless, the gain in export licenses reflects the dramatic reversal of government trading policy towards the Soviet Union; in 1971, total U.S. exports to the U.S.S.R. are estimated at about $150 million.

THE PROBLEM OF GOVERNMENT CENSORSHIP IN REGARD TO OUR ASSISTANCE TO THE SOVIET MILITARY STRUCTURE

(By Antony C. Sutton)

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

This brief paper is based upon my three volume study "Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development" published by the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, California. (For complete bibliography see Attachment One).

This published study details the fundamental contribution made by Western—mainly U.S. origin—technology to Soviet economic development and its dependent military structure. This technical assistance is the prime factor in Soviet economic and military development and has been traced in precise technical detail from 1918 down to the present time. For the period before 1950 I utilized U.S. State Department and the captured WW II German documents. For the period after 1950, as a result of U.S. Government restrictions, I was forced to use indirect sources. Fortunately, the Soviets, in their own engineering literature, have been reasonably open about technologies used in the USSR. Through private sources, and largely at my own expense, I was able to obtain a considerable quantity of such Soviet technical material.

I have no hesitation in stating, on the basis of my research findings, that the ability of the Soviets to present any credible threat

at all to the United States to push its influence into the Mediterranean, the Caribbean and the Indian Ocean is only possible because of our past and present technical assistance. While this statement has been supported with precise technical detail in my work, the fundamental and critical nature of our assistance has not been made known by successive Administrations to the Congress and to the American public. Indeed, all Administration public statements have been to the contrary—i.e. to the effect that we do not provide assistance to the Soviet military-industrial complex.

Two examples may clarify the general nature of my findings in the context of Government censorship of the relevant data.

*Example One: The origin of the main propulsion systems of the 96 Soviet ships used on the Haiphong supply run.*

For most of the period since 1949 the Battle Act and the Export Control Act have prohibited export to the USSR of transportation technology for military purposes. However, the determinations made by State, Commerce and CoCom within the framework of these laws are classified and it is impossible for an independent reseacher to obtain free and complete access to the relevant decision papers in order to examine the manner in which the intent of Congress has been administered. We do know however that any member of the CoCom group of nations has veto power and that no shipment has ever been made to the Soviet Union without unanimous approval of all members. Thus for example, transfer of Danish marine diesel technology in the 1950's had implicit or explicit U.S. approval.

Some years ago my research strongly suggested that the Soviets had no indigenous military transport technology: either motor vehicles or marine diesel engines. However the bulk of the weapons and supplies for the North Vietnamese in the present war came from the Soviet Union and the greater part of these Soviet supplies and weapons went to Vietnam by sea, and along the Ho Chi Minh trail by Soviet built trucks. Therefore I applied some effort to this apparent contradiction and specifically to identify and make an analysis of the main propulsion units of the Soviet supply ships. While such information is readily available in Government files, it is classified and not available to Congress (by virtue of "executive privilege") and certainly not to individual citizens.

By using Russian origin data I was able to make an accurate analysis. I determined that all main propulsion systems (diesel and steam turbine) of the 96 Soviet ships used on the Haiphong supply run and which could be identified (i.e. 84 out of the 96) originated in design or construction outside the USSR. (See Cong. Record, Oct. 21, 1971, vol. 117, pt. 28, page 37385). By applying the export control laws and some initiative in CoCom the State Department could have prohibited the export of the greater part of this military technology to the USSR. However, without access to the CoCom anl State papers I do not known whether we have a problem of culpable negligence, abysmal inefficiency or a basic inability to examine all sides of a problem. We *do* know that if the U.S. State and Commerce Departments had consistently enforced the 1949 legislation passed by Congress, then the Soviets would not have had the ability to supply the Vietnamese War—and 50,000 more Americans would be alive today.

The names of the 96 Soviet ships used on the Haiphong run were gleaned from *Morskoi Flot* and similar Russian maritime publications. The specifications of engines in these ships were obtained from *Registrovaya Kniga Morskikh Sudov Soyuza SSR* and in the course of my three volume study I had already compiled a list of 42 of 44 types of marine diesels used by the Soviets, together with their non-Soviet origins.

In brief, while all the information came from censored Soviet sources, the same information is only available in the West in classified Government files; it is therefore totally censored to the Western independent researcher and to Congress. Fortunately in this case Soviet censorship was less restrictive than that of the United States.

U.S. classification also conceals another fundamental problem—that illegal or inefficient administration of the export control laws in the 1950's gave the Soviets the ability to supply the North Vietnamese in the 1960's.

*Example Two: The Kama Truck plant.*

The Soviets have no indigenous truck manufacturing technology. The Soviet trucks on the Ho Chi Minh trail are from Western built plants. Kama is projected to build 150,000 multi axle heavy trucks per year i.e. more than all U.S. manufacturers combined. An interagency committee of the U.S. Government has concluded that such a multi axle truck is essential for war. I queried Department of Commerce to determine if the findings of this interagency committee were accepted, and the reply was to the effect that the findings were acceptable. (See Attachment Three for exchange of letters).

The Administration therefore apparently accepts my argument that Kama will be a weapons production system. The Administration has issued almost $1 billion in licenses for the Kama truck plant but details of these licenses are censored and not available to researchers outside the Executive branch. It is not possible then for independent researchers to determine to what extent the plant will be U.S. built, its capacity, its precise technology and therefore its exact military production capabilities. There is no way at this time in which I can fully document the Kama case (unlike Example One: the origins of the Soviet ships on the Haiphong run).

Finally, while there is little question in my mind that a great deal of other material of direct military application—particularly computer technology—is currently being exported from the United States to the Soviet Union, I cannot completely detail this conclusion without open access to Government files and in particular without detailed knowledge of current applications for export licenses.

My published work suggests the following conclusions (among others):

(a) that the Departments of State and Commerce have, possibly over a period of 50 years and certainly since the early 1930's, assisted the export of military goods and related technologies to the Soviet Union,

(b) both the Korean and Vietnamese wars were fueled on both sides by Western—mainly U.S. origin—technology, and

(c) there have been continuing and largely successful attempts to conceal information concerning this technical transfer and its subsequent utilization by the Soviets.

The problem for the future is whether we will continue to hide critical information from outside examination, and so perpetuate ineffective administration of Congressional intent.

In general this writer now requires two types of information from Government files in order to take the argument to its next stage:

(a) details of current shipments and licenses for exports to the Soviet Union. These are not available to anyone outside the Executive branch. The reason given is "business confidence." However on non-Soviet shipments the same firms are willing—indeed often anxious—to provide such information. I therefore suggest in the light of my past work that a more accurate reason in the Soviet case is an unwillingness to allow public access to the nature of our support to the Soviet military structure.

(b) access to current files (i.e. since 1950), to determine the influences on export control decisions. For example, how did CoCom and the State Department arrive at the decision not to veto export of marine diesel technology in 1959 on the assumption that it was non-strategic—yet this same Danish technology turns up in one third of the Soviet marine propulsion units in the Vietnamese War?

Until independent researchers can gain full freedom of access to Government files on a more or less current basis I see no way in which this tragic process can be halted, and the present artificial information environment replaced with arguments and conclusions based on facts.

ANTONY C. SUTTON.

STANFORD, CALIF., January 17, 1972.

---

ATTACHMENT 1

ANTONY C. SUTTON BIBLIOGRAPHY, SEPTEMBER 1971

BOOKS

Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development, 1917 to 1930, (Vol. I) (Stanford: Hoover Institution, 1968)

Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development, 1930 to 1945, (Vol. II) (Stanford: Hoover Institution, 1971)

Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development, 1945 to 1965, (Vol. III) (Stanford: Hoover Institution, forthcoming 1972)

Wars and revolutions: a comprehensive list of conflicts, with fatalities, (Part I, 1820–1900), (Stanford: Hoover Institution, 1971)

ARTICLES

"Are we in a Pavlovian Box?", *National Review*, July 1969

"Soviet Export Strategy", *Ordnance*, Nov–Dec 1969

"Some Aspects of Trade, Western Technology and Soviet Military Capability", in Export Expansion and Regulation: Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Finance of the Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, Ninety first Congress, 1st Session, 1969.

"Soviet Merchant Marine", U.S. Naval Institute, Proceedings, January 1970

"The Western Origins of Soviet Marine Diesel Engines", U.S. Naval Institute, Proceedings, January 1970

REVIEWS OF THE WESTERN TECHNOLOGY SERIES (AT SEPTEMBER, 1971)

The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, September 1969.

Economisch en Sociaal Tijdschrift, October 17, 1969.

America's Future, December 12, 1969.

Journal of Economic History, December 1969.

Tijdschrift Udor Economic, 1969.

Osteuropa, December 1969.

Journal of Developing Areas, 1969.

The Russian Review, January 1970.

The Objectivist, January 1970.

International Review of Social History, January 1970.

Barrons, February 9, 1970.

The Engineering Economist, April 13, 1970.

Journal of Economic Literature, April 1970.

Arizona Republic, April 28, 1970.

International Affairs, April 1970.

Slavic Review, June 1970.

The Slavonic & East European Review, January 1971.

Economic Journal, June 1971.

American Opinion, September 1971.

---

ATTACHMENT 3

HOOVER INSTITUTION
ON WAR, REVOLUTION AND PEACE,
*Stanford, Calif., October 27, 1971.*

Mr. KENNETH N. DAVIS, Jr.
*Assistant Secretary for Domestic and International Business, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. DAVIS: May I request the assistance of the Department on a problem relating to trade with the Soviet Union?

I am the author of a multi volume series entitled "Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development" published by the Hoover Institution at Stanford University. Two volumes are currently available and the third is about to go to press.

In the third volume I would like to include an analysis of possible American equipment and technical assistance for the proposed Kama truck plant. Kama is of course distinguished by its considerable strategic and economic implications. In particular, as the Soviets have no indigenous truck manufacturing technology (except for "freaks" such as the YAG 12) and there is a long record of use of Western equipment for production of military items, the 'Kama deal' is of considerable current importance for the conclusions of my study.

I understand from press sources that both Swindell-Dressler of Pittsburgh and Giffels Associates of Detroit have been granted licenses by the Department. However, neither company will confirm or deny for publication that this is indeed the case.

Given the extraordinary strategic implication of Kama, may I then pose three questions to the Department?

1. can the names of applicants for licenses to cover equipment for Kama be released for publication?

2. if not, can the Department confirm that the policy of the Administration is in principle to grant licenses for equipment to be used in the Kama Plant?

3. the Report of the Interagency Committee prepared under the coordination of the Foreign Economic Administration stated that 'the Committee is unanimous in its opinion that an established automotive industry is an asset to a country for war-making purposes' (TIDC No. 13 p. 2) and describes multi axle trucks as 'essential for war' (p. 6). Are these conclusions acceptable to the Department of Commerce.

I apologize for taking your time but the Kama project is a crucial piece of the puzzle to which I have devoted many years of work.

With best wishes,

Very truly,

ANTONY C. SUTTON,
*Research Fellow.*

---

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE,
*Washington, D.C., November 12, 1972.*

Mr. ANTHONY C. SUTTON,
*Research Fellow, Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford, Calif.*

DEAR MR. SUTTON: Your letter of October 27 posed three questions about the possible involvement of U.S. firms in construction of the Kama River truck plant in the Soviet Union.

In regard to your first question, Section 7(c) of the Export Administration Act of 1969 prohibits publication or disclosure of information contained in applications for export licenses, unless the Secretary of Commerce determines that withholding the information would be contrary to the national interest. This policy of treating as confidential the names or firms receiving export licenses is both in the public interest and in accord with the intent of Congress as expressed in the Export Administration Act and in Subsection e(3) of the Freedom on Information Act.

Next, you asked whether it is the policy of the Administration, in principle, to issue licenses for Kama River. Applications for such licenses are carefully reviewed on their merits on a case-by-case basis, with the national security and commercial aspects of each given full consideration. To date, the applications on which we have made decisions have been approved. Other applications are under consideration.

Finally, the contribution an established automotive industry can make to the military potential of a country is recognized by the Department. This factor, along with other considerations, enters into the decision whether or not to issue any licenses authorizing exports of equipment to a plant such as Kama. In addition, the fact that such equipment is essentially available abroad (a factor we are obligated to take into account by the Export Administration Act), the overall foreign policy objectives of the United States, and the current health of our economy are all considered in judging whether it is in our national interest to permit U.S. industry to participate in the Kama River project.

Sincerely,

RAUER H. MEYER,
*Director, Office of Export Control.*

---

## VALUE-ADDED TAX

### HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, a recent newspaper article by Columnist Charles Bartlett should be of great interest to anyone concerned with school finance. Discussing the feasibility of a value-added tax to raise funds for education, Bartlett challenges the arguments of several critics of the proposed new tax. I insert this article in the RECORD, so that my colleagues can have the benefit of reading it:

APPEAL OF VALUE-ADDED TAX GROWS

(By Charles Bartlett)

The Nixon value-added tax is being shaped in the White House as a more appealing package and a better response to the looming gap in school finances than any Democratic alternative.

Sen. Edmund Muskie will certainly have trouble maintaining that he has found an adequate substitute for what the President has in mind. He wants a $1 billion federal subsidy to lighten the property tax burden on the elderly and a reform of local poperty taxes to secure more equitable assessments.

The clever virtue of the plan President Nixon is about to unveil is that it goes further in every direction. It proposes to cut citizens' property taxes in half by furnishing federal funds to cover the costs of education now met by these taxes. This is a crucial response to the almost inevitable prospect that the Supreme Court will uphold rulings by lower courts that it is unconstitutional to finance school systems with the property tax.

Washington will need approximately $13 billion to make this switch and Nixon is expected to propose a 4-percent tax on consumer spending. It will apply to all items across the board but those with incomes below $10,000 will be shielded from the tax by their entitlement to claim an income tax rebate for whatever they have paid.

This means the American value-added tax will not be regressive, as its opponents claim. It will in fact be mildly progressive because lower incomes will get tax relief—a halving of property taxes and no share of the burden of value-added tax. Since many are paying less, some will have to pay more.

The Nixon plan contemplates that persons with incomes around $12,500 will come out about even but for those who are wealthier, the property tax cut will not compensate the cost of the tax on their expenditures.

Critics of the value-added tax maintain the government cannot raise money it needs with a non-regressive tax. But Treasury computer runs show that even when all consumers with incomes of $10,000 or less are excluded, the value-added tax yields $3.4 billion per percentage point. Since the real estate property tax now supplies $13 billion to schools across the nation, a 4 percent tax will cover the need.

Liberals dislike sales taxes because of their obvious inequities, and it is interesting to find, in a study by the Office of Economic Cooperation and Development, that the United States derives less of its tax revenues from this source than any Western industrial nation except Japan. Consumer taxes account for 39 percent of total taxes in all the industrial nations, but this country relies on them for only 30 percent of its total tax revenues.

Since Hawaii is the only state now meeting its school costs without reliance on property taxes, some 49 governors are going to find comfort in the Nixon plan. The Supreme Court decision on the constitutionality of financing schools with property taxes could come as early as this fall. Moreover the McElroy Commission on School Finances will make its report in April and it is ready to propose a nationwide shift to a system of state financing.

Against this background the Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations, of which Muskie is a member, will have less than five months to make its judgment on the Nixon plan. Apprehensions that Nixon's value-added tax will interfere with state and local sales taxes will prove to be groundless because it is buried in retail prices. It will in fact increase the sales tax take by raising the price base.

The Democrats cannot confront the immediate issue by arguing for the elimination of tax loopholes. Their own record in this field of reform leaves little hope that the states could meet court deadlines and rising impatience with the property tax by counting on Congress to tighten the tax codes. Someday tax loopholes will go down with other injustices but this is not an immediate prospect.

Nixon will take his plan to the country just as the political contest is gaining momentum. It may well become a key issue if the Democrats can find objections more substantial than any they have proposed to date.

---

## THE 54TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in the observance of the 54th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. It is very fitting that the Congress of the United States devote time to commend the Lithuanian people and to remind the world that Lithuania and its people will continue to fight for the reestablishment of complete independence and self-government.

On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian nation declared its independence. This was a goal for which the Lithuanian people had been striving throughout a long period of Russian domination. After only two decades of independence, Lithuania again fell under Russian domination when it was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. on August 3, 1940. Then, following the German attack on the Soviet Union 10 months later, Lithuania was in Nazi hands until reoccupied

by the Soviet Army in 1944. Since that time Lithuania has been considered by the Soviet Union as a component republic. Propaganda from the U.S.S.R. would try to assure the West that the Lithuanian people are delighted with their satellite status and the Soviet methods of farming and industrial techniques have brought about economic growth never dreamed of in Lithuanian history. The citizens of the free world know that this is a sham. We know that the people of this proud land are struggling in bondage, yearning to be free. The spirit of Lithuanian independence is not dead, nor does it even lie dormant. It exists as an indestructible flame in the hearts of its people. Today we honor and salute these brave people, with the hope that they will again know the joy of human liberty.

## KENNETH D. LARSON

### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to call to my colleague's attention a man most worthy of their commendation. I present to you the record of a man, Kenneth D. Larson, who has worked diligently and unceasingly for the improvement of and protection of firefighters' wages, working conditions, and political rights.

Mr. Larson has a distinguished record of service to the International Association of Fire Fighters, AFL–CIO, both in active service and in the capacity of a legislative representative for the Federated Fire Fighters of California. Mr. Larson served 21 years on the Los Angeles County Fire Department, retiring with the rank of Fire Captain which he held for 11 years. A graduate of USC, his varied educational background in business administration, prelaw, general accounting and cost accounting, as well as his work experience, highly qualified him for the position he now holds as legislative representative for the Federated Fire Fighters of California, AFL–CIO.

It is here, in his capacity as legislative representative that Mr. Larson has truly shown his concern for the welfare of the firefighter. He was responsible for the first public employees' "right to organize" legislation which was passed in 1959. He assisted in the writing and passage of the George Brown Act in 1961. He has caused to be introduced numerous pieces of legislation, among these: The first reciprocity provisions for PERS and County Retirement Acts; political freedom legislation; the elimination of the "earnings test" for PERS and county retirement; the age 50, 25-year retirement under the 1937 County Retirement Act; the 25-year retirement at any age with reduced benefits, under the 1937 C.E.R. Act. This is merely a sampling of the vast amount of legislation that Mr. Larson has actively been involved in introducing during the past 14 years.

Mr. Larson is extremely active in organizations which enable him to keep apprised of the needs of California firefighters. He is a member of the California Labor Federation Labor University Education Committee; the California Fire Training Commission; the California Committee on Staffing Standards and Ratios. In addition, he served for many years as an executive board member of the Los Angeles County Fire Fighters Local, as a delegate to the Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, and as Vice President of the California Labor Federation of Labor, AFL–CIO. In this office he distinguished himself as the first public employee to be elected to the executive council of the C.L.F.

Mr. Speaker, as you can see, the list of achievements of Mr. Larson is seemingly endless, and it serves to reinforce his reputation as a man devoted to the service of his fellow firefighters. I offer my sincere admiration and great appreciation for Mr. Larson's efforts on behalf of the labor movement and extend my best wishes for his continued success. With men of Mr. Larson's caliber, it is not difficult to understand the great success the labor movement in the United States has realized in providing and safeguarding benefits for their members.

## ON THE ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

### HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918, Lithuanian patriots declared the independence of the Lithuanian State. This was the culmination of years of planning and hoping, as well as years of agitation and struggle. The Lithuanian Declaration of Independence set the fires of self-determination in the hearts of Lithuanians everywhere.

For over three decades the Lithuanian people have been subjected to an alien Russian rule, which has violated many of the universally recognized rights of men and nations.

Lithuanian-Americans have contributed much to the progress and freedom of the land from which they and their forefathers came. In the Cleveland area, Lithuanians have long been community leaders who have added immeasurably to the cultural, economic, and political life of Northeastern Ohio.

In the hearts of Lithuanians in our community this anniversary not only represents the spirit of their homeland but also their commitment to the Cleveland community.

Today the courageous and brave people of Lithuania still cling to the hope and idea of freedom and independence. I am glad to join the loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent in the celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day, and with them, hope for the freedom of the Lithuanian people and their homeland.

## THE NEED TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO FEDERAL POLICYMAKING OFFICIALS IN MATTERS INVOLVING DATA PROCESSING TECHNOLOGY

### HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the United States is the world's leader in computer technology and use. Broad segments of our economy and most of the Nation's defense systems rely upon computers. Advanced data processing techniques offer vast potential in the solution of many of the extremely difficult social problems confronting the Nation.

If the United States loses its leadership in computer technology—if we become a second-rate computer power—we will become at the very same time a second-rate Nation, both economically and militarily.

In the quarter century since World War II, the United States has gained a significant lead over other nations in computer technology and development. But, our leadership can be lost. Other nations will continue to challenge us. The productive genius of Japan in the field of electronics is being applied to computers. Nor can we discount the inherent capability of the Russians, the Chinese, and other nations in the field of computer technology.

The supremacy of the United States requires that we maintain a strong momentum of accomplishment, as reflected in the development of electronic data processing techniques during the past three decades. We must challenge the state of the art and translate the advances that we make into practical computer technology.

To maintain our leadership, Federal policymaking officials in matters affecting computers must have the most sophisticated and the highest quality information the computer community can provide. We cannot endanger the Nation's economic and military leadership by faulty policies. In such areas as East-West trade in computers, the patenting of computer software, and matters involving individual privacy and data security, and in other areas in which the Government has specific policymaking responsibility, the officials formulating the policies and making the decisions must have the best information and advice they can get.

The legislation I introduce today (H.R. 13200) would provide limited funding to the Computer Board of the National Academy of Sciences to allow the board, at the request of Federal officials, to study and evaluate critical problems relating to computer technology requiring the Board's unique level of expertise. I believe the legislation will provide a practical means of providing for the informational needs of Government policymakers as they relate to computer technology from the highest level of expertise in the Nation's computer community.

In addition, H.R. 13200 would authorize Federal expenditures of $100 million annually for basic research and computer technology. The major portion of research responsibility must continue to be borne by the computer industry. The Department of Defense must also continue to support a significant computer-oriented research program. But, private industry and Defense Department programs are not sufficient. If computer technology is to be fully exploited in the years to come throughout the social sciences with the fullest benefit to society, there must be a basic research and development program in computer technology that is not compromised by the restraints inherent in these other programs. Poorer nations have larger research programs than the United States at this time.

A third section of my proposal amends the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to lease computers, computer components, and to acquire other related services under contracts of up to 5 years.

Both the Comptroller General and the Administrator of General Services have recommended in recent months that longer term lease and rental agreements be authorized in view of the obvious savings that would accrue to the Government.

The proposal I introduce today (H.R. 13200) relates to matters that require legislative sanction. The development of an effective computer standards program, the streamlining of our procurement procedures, and the development of effective computer performance measurement criteria are but a few of the more pressing problems that must be solved administratively. Under Public Law 89–306 that Congress approved in October 1965, the executive branch has been able to avoid expenditures that otherwise would have accrued in a sum substantially in excess of $1 billion. But, the improvements that we have made in the management of Government computers are simply the beginning of a long-range program aimed at protecting the taxpayers' interests. We must continue to push forward, seeking solutions to the problems that remain with us and exploiting new opportunities as they arise.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this legislation by all Members. I believe it will be another significant step in protecting the Nation's leadership in computer technology and making the computer, which is one of the Nation's most valuable resources, more adaptable in meeting the social needs of the people.

The text of H.R. 13200 follows:

H.R. 13200

A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to improve the quality of information available to Federal policymaking officials in matters involving data processing technology, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) section 111(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 759(d)) is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(d)", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) The Administrator shall reimburse the Computer Board of the National Academy of Sciences from the fund, in an amount not to exceed $3,500,000 during any fiscal year, for costs incurred by the Computer Board (other than any compensation paid to panel members) in conducting studies or evaluations, and in performing other services, which the Computer Board may undertake from time to time at the request or on behalf of a Federal agency, and which, in the judgment of the Computer Board, require the Board's unique capabilities and qualifications and could not be performed in an equally satisfactory manner by a Federal agency or an educational institution, or under Government contract. The recommendations and conclusions of the Computer Board shall be developed and submitted to appropriate Federal officials in such manner and form as to optimize their informational value but shall not be binding upon, or limit the responsibility or the authority of, any Federal official. With regard to studies, evaluations, and other services subject to reimbursement under this paragraph, it is the sense of the Congress that the National Academy of Sciences should select members to serve on the Computer Board and on the Board's panels on the basis of recognized capability and expertise in the relevant areas, with proper provision made for the reasonable development of conflicting philosophies, opinions, or points of view."

(b) Section 111(d)(1) of such Act (as redesignated by subsection (a) of this section) is amended by striking out "(1) advances" and inserting in lieu thereof "(A) advances" and by striking out "(2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(B)".

SEC. 2. Section 111(f) of such Act (40 U.S.C. 759(f)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "There is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the sum of $100,000,000 to be expended under the guidance and direction of the Director of the National Bureau of Standards to support basic research in data processing technology."

SEC. 3. Section 111 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) The Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts for periods not exceeding five years for the rental of computers, computer components, and related services which he is authorized to acquire for use of the Government under provisions of this section."

## LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. PAUL S. SARBANES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, it was on February 16, 1918, that the Lithuanian people realized a dream nurtured through over a century of foreign domination; on that date, 54 years ago, Lithuania reestablished its independence. For over two decades the gallant Lithuanian people flourished as they enjoyed their new found freedom. Then, as the world was caught up in World War II, that freedom was snuffed out when this proud nation was occupied by the Red Army. The subjugation which that invasion began continues to this day. Therefore this anniversary of that historic day in 1918 is a cause for both pride and sorrow among all men and women who cherish freedom.

Lithuania's heroic reassertion of its independence reaffirmed an ancient tradition of national identification stretching back to 1253 when a delegate of Pope Innocent IV crowned Mindaugas King of a united Lithuania. During the Middle Ages the Lithuanians created a powerful independent state which protected Europe against the Mongols and Tartars. One scholar has noted that the Lithuanian rulers of that period "blessed their subjects with more human freedoms than in the neighboring countries, and they played their part in the general development of European civilization." In 1386 the marriage of Queen Jadwiga of Poland with Jagiello, Grand Duke of Lithuania, created a personal union between these two proud nations which two centuries later was transformed into a legal bond which lasted until 1795. Always threatened by its powerful neighbors, Lithuania finally fell under foreign control in 1795, but its independent spirit remained.

In the years following Lithuania's loss of independence countless efforts to gain freedom were made. Repressive measures were taken to destroy the Lithuanian language and culture, but none succeeded as the gallant Lithuanian people remained faithful to their religion, language and traditions.

World War I intensified Lithuania's suffering as the Russian and German armies passed through that unfortunate land. But the war did weaken foreign control and resulted in 1917 in a Congress of Lithuanian delegates which elected the 20-member council that proclaimed an independent Lithuania based on democratic principles on February 16, 1918. Lithuanian independence however had to be won with the blood of Lithuanian patriots, for shortly after independence was declared the Red Army invaded. By 1920, however, the Polish-Lithuanian army led by Marshal Joseph Pilsudski had driven the Communists out.

Under its first president, Antanas Smetona, a permanent constitution was adopted in 1922 which awarded freedom of speech, assembly, religion, and communication. The country prospered in its freedom and Lithuanian literature flourished. Suffering quickly returned, however, when an occupied Lithuania was incorporated into the Soviet Union in 1940. After World War II Lithuania patriots rebelled against Soviet rule but were unfortunately not successful.

The heroic commitment to freedom which gave rise to Lithuania's proclamation of independence continues to inspire the Lithuanian people. That commitment was vividly demonstrated in November of 1970 when Simas Kudirka jumped from the Soviet ship *Sovetskaya Litva* onto the U.S. Coast Guard Cutter *Vigilant* seeking political asylum. It is tragic and shameful that the U.S. Coast Guard forced this brave young sailor to return to the Soviet ship. Kudirka was returned to Vilnius, Lithuania, and tried for his attempted defection. Convicted and sentenced to 10 years of hard labor

in a Soviet concentration camp, Simas Kudirka symbolizes the courage and spirit of the Lithuanian people. On this anniversary of Lithuania's proclamation of independence I would remind the Congress of Simas Kudirka's words as he awaited sentencing:

I have . . . only one wish . . . a request both to the supreme court and the government of the Soviet Union: I ask that you grant my homeland, Lithuania, independence.

With heroic young men and women like Simas Kudirka to keep its traditions alive, who can doubt that one day this proud land will know freedom once again.

## CHILD CARE TAX DEDUCTION

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, each day our offices receive thoughtful letters from constituents. Many of these deserve wider attention. The personal experiences related often provide deep insights into our society and the laws that govern it.

Of course, it is impossible to place each of these letters in the RECORD. But a letter I received Tuesday from a wife who supported her husband while he attended medical school is especially insightful. There is something wrong, as my constituent writes, when a tax deduction for child care is not allowed while entertainment for business purposes is deductible. Here is another instance where a reordering of priorities is in order.

The letter follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
*Wednesday, February 2, 1972.*

Representative DONALD FRASER,
*U.S. House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FRASER: I have just completed my family's federal income tax return for 1971.

I have also recently completed 4½ years of full time employment to put my husband through his last semester of college and 4 years of medical school. During this time I provided him with food, clothing, shelter, transportation, household goods, and insurance, as well as understanding and encouragement. During his junior year of medical school we were pleased to become the parents of the child which we had planned for.

How is my 1971 tax return related to my role as the former breadwinner for a family of three? I am extremely proud to have supported my husband while he studied to become a doctor. I am extremely proud to be the mother of a wonderful child. But I am extremely ashamed of a country whose tax laws will not allow me to deduct from my taxes any of the $884 required for child care while I continued to be the sole support of my family at a gross salary of $7600. According to the present law, a family whose income is over $6000 is assumed to be able to afford child care as a luxury item. To my knowledge, however, there is no upper limit on incomes beyond which the deduction of entertainment for business purposes is assumed to be an affordable luxury item. Furthermore, the present law contains the highly discriminatory stipulation that a married woman can deduct child care only if her husband is mentally or physically incapable of supporting himself. Do legislators seriously believe that a medical student—working at least 60–80 hours per week for no pay and bearing great responsibilities for the care of human lives—is at the same time capable of supporting himself?

I would certainly appreciate hearing your views on the reasonableness and equity of the present child care deduction rules.

Sincerely,

## CONGRESSMAN CHARLES B. RANGEL TESTIFIES ON PRISON REFORM

### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, on February 11, I testified before the Select Committee on Correctional Institutions and Programs of the New York State Legislature. At that time I discussed several of their recommendations on the future thrust of corrections in my State.

I insert my testimony in the RECORD at this point:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES B. RANGEL

I appreciate having this opportunity to testify before the New York State Select Committee on Correctional Institutions and Programs. The report which you submitted to the Governor includes many recommendations which we should have adopted many, many years ago, but which we must immediately enact if we expect our prison system to be anything more than a network of laboratories for the brutalization of our fellow citizens.

Today I would like to focus on five of your recommendations. I speak from the perspective of a former Assistant United States Attorney, a member of the Select Committee on Crime of the House of Representatives, and a member of the House Bi-Partisan Task Force on Prison Reform.

I also speak to you today as a Member of Congress who receives letters every day from inmates in local, State and Federal prisons. They are messages of anguish and despair. As one addict in the Tombs wrote to me not long ago:

"I'll be very frank with you, Mr. Rangel. I am now 30 years old and have been in and out of jail since 1956. The better part of my life lies in a heap of waste always staring in my face."

I have been to Attica, the Tombs and other so-called "correctional" institutions across New York State. I have spoken to inmates, guards, prison officials, medical staff and relatives of prisoners. One inmate at a facility in New York told me:

"I cannot live under the present arrangement here. My problem is not mine alone, but is the problem of the majority here. We are subjected to mental harassment, mental intimidations, slurs, unjustness and mistreatments."

I will now address myself to five of your recommendations, four of which I wholeheartedly support—work release and furloughs; restoration of civil rights; Spanish-speaking staff; unrestricted correspondence rights—and one which I oppose—the death penalty for those responsible for homicides inside a prison. There certainly are other recommendations which you have made worthy of comment, but due to the time limitation, I will concentrate on these.

WORK RELEASE AND FURLOUGHS

Our society has long regarded prisoners as unworthy of human dignity. They have been stereotyped as unfit for interrelationship or communication with the community. As a result, we have kept them locked up, subjected them to physical and psychological abuse, denied them meaningful contact with their families and friends, isolated them in predominately rural parts of our State, and then expected them to return to their homes and fit into their communities as if they had simply been on vacation.

The results are inevitable. Without adequate preparation for jobs on the outside, without interrelationships with non-criminals and without a society willing to go out of its way to assist them upon release, a return to crime is the easiest road to travel.

The racial discrimination inherent in a system that disproportionately punishes black inmates is magnified when it comes to the present limited work release and furlough programs. Blacks more often than whites are found guilty when tried for the same offense. The *Washington Post* recently reported:

"A study in Stamford, Connecticut, for example, found that guilty findings per 100,000 ethnic inhabitants was eight times higher for black defendants than white.

"Of nine Americans found guilty in a court, fewer than four actually serve time in a prison. Here, too, whites more often get probation or suspended sentences. In the Stamford study, the rate of commitment to prison per capita for each racial group was ten times more for guilty blacks than for guilty whites.

"Once in prison, blacks stay there longer, partly because they get longer sentences and partly because they get from 10 per cent to 14 per cent fewer paroles."

The work release, education release and furlough system we do have works in the same discriminatory way. The programs are, first of all, too limited in number and scope.

Not only does the inmate have a great deal to gain by participating in a work release program, the State finds that the income earned by the prisoner contributes substantially to the expense of housing, feeding and clothing him.

In testimony before the Select Committee on Crime, William D. Leeke, Director of South Carolina's prisons, explained how his work release program benefits both the inmate and the State:

"These (work release) centers are located in downtown areas or on the outskirts of towns and work release participants commute daily to regular jobs in the community . . . Work release participants pay to the State of South Carolina $3.50 per day. They pay city taxes, (and) Federal taxes, and as a result of this they end up being assets to the State rather than liabilities.

"For the period January 1968 to November 1, 1971 . . . the total earnings of inmates participating in the community-based programs amounted to $2,210,913.18. They paid taxes in the amount of $326,477.53. Breaking that down: Federal taxes of $211,756.95; Social Security $83,680.69; State taxes of $31,039.89; and they paid to the South Carolina Department of Corrections at the rate of $3.50 per day room, board and transportation, $560,424.39; and also paid to their dependents $338,937.72."

The Federal Bureau of Prisons has also put work release programs in the picture of an inmate's immediate fiscal problems when he is released. They are an effective way for an inmate "to accumulate savings for release, to make restitution and to pay legitimate debts, especially when such payments will free an inmate from overwhelming financial burden on the day of release."

The furlough, work release and educational release program is a dynamic and practical

way of acclimating the community to receiving the prisoner back into its midst, to reduce the mistrust and antagonisms that might otherwise cause him to become a social outcast upon release.

Leeke detailed the effect of South Carolina's program on the repeater rate for crimes by participants in work release:

"Since 1968, when we began the series of community-based prerelease centers, less than 10 per cent of the people who have successfully completed work release have returned to the South Carolina Department of Corrections for parole violations or new offenses; consequently, our work release program appears to be effective as a deterrent to crime . . . Based on these figures, the recidivism rate is extremely low. We are very pleased with it. . ."

Finally, programs of this type can prepare an inmate for occupational, social and educational experiences in a much more realistic and relevant way than do in-prison training and educational programs.

RESTORATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS

We have created a hypocritical system of perpetual punishment by barring ex-offenders from certain jobs and from voting.

An integral part of the duties of citizenship in the United States is the responsibility to help select our lawmakers. Civics classes, citizenship education programs, voter registration drives, the mass media—all exhort us to register and vote for the candidates of our choice. Unfortunately, rhetoric overshadows reality in the electoral process. Instead of knocking down barriers that lock these citizens out of the voting booth, we have silently accepted a system which unfairly denies these men and women their right to vote.

We who profess to believe in the importance of the ballot box deny the fundamental right to vote to those who have been convicted of a crime and have fulfilled the sentence of the court. At the present time, only a minority of States—Colorado is one—permit these individuals to be automatically reenfranchised after satisfying the legal obligations imposed by the courts. This means that tens of thousands of law-abiding citizens continue to be punished for offenses of the past by the abridgment of certain basic rights of citizenship. The State legislature should take prompt action to end this injustice.

Furthermore, in New York State, individuals imprisoned awaiting trial—even those who have never been convicted of a felony—cannot under present law vote by absentee ballot in a primary election in New York State. This is, of course, in direct contradiction with our historic belief that a person is innocent until proven guilty. If we do not want this traditional tenet of our democratic system to become an empty illusion, it is imperative that we guarantee these prisoners their right to vote.

In the area of employment, New York's statutes barring former felons from certain occupations lock them out of some of the best paying jobs that our economic system provides for men and women of limited education.

It seems unreasonable and unjust to deny a former convict the right to work in a bank, a place selling alcoholic beverages, or an insurance adjuster's office, as just three examples. It is inequitable to bar a former felon from certain Civil Service examinations when the entire thrust of a civil service system is to hire the individuals who are most qualified. It is absurd to say that a former felon cannot be licensed as an auctioneer, a junk dealer, a pharmacist, an undertaker, a check collector, or any one of more than a dozen other jobs. At a time we have a drastic shortage of medical personnel, what sense does it make to prevent an ex-offender from becoming a physiotherapist or dental hygienist?

I cannot understand why some inmates are trained as barbers when they are prevented by State law from practicing that profession upon their release.

We have established a vicious cycle—a criminal act, followed by punishment and release, then the alternatives of welfare, dead-end employment or crime, and back to prison again. That makes no sense at all.

SPANISH-SPEAKING STAFF

I would wholeheartedly concur in your recommendation that Spanish-speaking staff be provided in all State prisons.

On November 5, I introduced in the House of Representatives the Prisoner Treatment Act of 1971. This legislation would establish a National Prisons Standards Administration to set standards modeled largely on the United Nations Minimum Standards Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners. This bill has been cosponsored by 23 of my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans.

One important provision in the bill requires that among the prison personnel must be individuals "who speak and understand the language best understood by those prisoners" who have not mastered English. In prison, life and death decisions are made every day involving inmates who cannot speak English and, thus unable to comprehend disciplinary proceedings, medical examinations, and parole interviews. They can participate in educational programs only with great difficulty. They have difficulty writing to their elected representatives in the State and Federal legislatures and in communicating with the courts.

The effects are obvious. Alienation. Injustice. Lack of opportunity.

UNRESTRICTED CORRESPONDENCE RIGHTS

I enthusiastically welcome your recommendation that there "be no restrictions on outgoing mail for inmates, and incoming mail should be inspected only for contraband."

Censorship should no longer be part of the of the legacy of injustice in America. There is no reason why a prisoner should be unable to write to whom he wants, including to the press.

During the Select Committee on Crime's investigations into the events at Attica, Warden Vincent Mancusi said several times that he believed the disorders originated through a conspiracy of inmates with attorneys and public officials, a conspiracy made possible, he claims, by the State's liberalized correspondence regulations which permit court officials, elected representatives and attorneys to receive uncensored mail. That fallacious reasoning is in itself an excellent argument for ending censorship—to allow the full and undistorted truth to be available.

Imprisonment has a serious detrimental effect in most cases on the inmate's personal relationships. His family and friends are cut off from him physically and, at the present time, their ties through the mails and through restricted visiting rights are sharply limited. This hinders his reorientation to society without adding significantly to prison "security."

Furthermore, there are in my mind important Constitutional questions as to the legality of prohibiting inmates from exercising their First Amendment guarantees by limiting the amount of mail they may send or receive and the number of authorized correspondents with whom they may keep in touch. The Constitutional difficulties also involve cutting off this large group of citizens from corresponding with the mass media. This imposes unjustly on both the rights of the inmates and the freedom of the press.

DEATH PENALTY FOR HOMICIDAL ACTS WITHIN A PRISON

The Committee's endorsement of the death penalty for any inmate responsible for a homicidal act is another example of how our historic approach to corrections has brutalized our entire society.

Not only does the death penalty fail to act as a deterrent to capital offenses inside or outside of the prison, it also constitutes an admission that even in the last part of the Twentieth Century we do not have either the interest in or the capability of helping someone whom society and our penal system has failed. Prison riots are evidence that we have not succeeded in our duty of preparing inmates for their return to the community. They make it obvious that retribution, not rehabilitation, is the rule of the day in those institutions which are disrupted. They prove that even caged men and women have sensitivities and feelings, that they can be degraded and tortured only to a point before they explode with anger and despair.

Capital punishment will not solve these problems, only worsen them. The death penalty is the ultimate sign of failure. It is not an answer, only an expedient excuse for disposing of an uncomfortable situation. The conditions that lead to riots will not be changed by executing a human being. If vocational and educational programs do not meet the inmates' needs, if guards are allowed to vocally and physically harass and intimidate prisoners, if institutional disciplinary proceedings are devoid of due process protections, if inmates are cut off from contact with their families and friends, if they are kept caged up and without decent recreational facilities in isolated rural Upstate towns—then we should not be surprised when another prison erupts with the death of inmates and guards.

It is appropriate to point out at this time how the death penalty has historically discriminated against black Americans. In the period 1930–1966, more than half of the 3,857 men and women executed—53.5 percent—were black. That figure represents approximately 5 times the proportion of blacks in our total population.

Equally terrifying in its impact was the decision earlier this week by New Jersey State Supreme Court Justice John J. Francis that 113 executions in that State since 1917 had been unconstitutional because of unequal protection of the laws in the case of suspects who chose their Constitutional option of a jury trial. To mandate the death penalty for homicidal acts within the prisons, as you recommend, would be to run the very real and unconscionable risk of taking the life of another human being unjustly, immorally and senselessly.

We are all aware of the stakes in prison reform. We know what inaction will lead to, and we know that action—not rhetoric—is needed.

These words of an inmate at Great Meadow Correctional Facility articulately express how low this society has fallen in treatment of our prisoners:

"I've been down almost nine years, what I mean is that is the time I spent behind these walls and have never seen such condemnation. Not only is this a breeding place of iniquity, but an infectious, stagnant pool from which tomorrow's citizens drink."

I hope that we will soon see the response in Albany for which we have waited so long.

## POST-STANDARD WOMEN OF ACHIEVEMENT DAY

### HON. JOHN H. TERRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, in the past few years, the just demand for equal opportunity for women has gained great significance. Today in the city of Syracuse in my congressional district, 12

women, who have demonstrated their capacity to contribute in a significant fashion in a variety of fields, are being honored by the Syracuse Post-Standard at a luncheon. The 12 women will receive engraved silver bowls and citations reflecting the area in which they have made such outstanding achievements.

The 12 women and their fields of endeavor are:

Miss Marjorie Smith, all-time.

Mrs. Marcelle Levy, all-time.

Miss Patricia Coolican, career.

Mrs. Harry Thompson, citizenship.

Mrs. J. Frederic Hillegas, communications.

Mrs. John T. Schenck, community service.

Mrs. George Nesbitt, cultural development.

Mrs. J. Cassin McHale, good neighbor.

Dr. Marguerite Fisher, international friendship.

Dr. Miriam Swift, medicine.

Mrs. Bernice Dumas, science.

Mrs. Henry Washington, social service.

Mrs. Lois Vosburgh, women's editor of the Post-Standard, is coordinator of the luncheon. The Post-Standard, Mrs. Vosburgh, and the 12 women honored are to be congratulated for their contributions to not only the central New York areas, but also to New York State and the Nation.

## TAXATION WITHOUT TRANSPORTATION

### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the burdens of taxation are heavy enough on the average wage earner that he should not have to bear the additional load of taxes levied for the enhancement of someone else's property or the easing of someone else's commute.

But, Mr. Speaker, such is "overburdening" the case in areas of Contra Costa, Alameda, and San Francisco Counties in California.

For thousands of homeowners and taxpayers the cost of paying for a rapid transit system in those three counties is being shouldered without any hope of having service in the near future or enhancement of their property by that service.

On top of that, the rapid transit district itself envisions expansion outside of the district itself which, if anything, will delay service to those taxpayers who have been paying property and sales taxes for more than 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, recently the Antioch Ledger ran a news story on this issue that showed how each taxpayer in eastern Contra Costa County was being taxed by the Bay Area Rapid Transit district.

I would, at this time, like to place this article in the RECORD.

BART'S NONSERVICE EAST CC TAB TOPS $180

MARTINEZ.—Figuring conservatively, homeowners in the East County cities have paid $3,474,959 into the Bay Area Rapid Transit District and gotten nothing in return.

Assuming a person owns a $20,000 home, he's paid $181.30 so far in BART property taxes in 12 years.

And that's not counting what a family may have paid since an extra half-cent sales tax was levied in April 1970 to bail BART out of a financial crisis.

The extra sales tax, providing a family spends at least $3,000 a year on taxable goods, comes to $15 a year or $30 for the past two years.

The figures do not include taxes paid by business and industry.

BART's current tax rate is 65.7 cents per $100 assessed valuation. The tax has been steadily climbing.

A rundown of BART's tax rates for the past 12 years are as follows:—1970–71, 52.7 cents;—1969–70, 55.5 cents;—1968–69, 47.2 cents;—1967–68, 36.9 cents;—1966–67, 41.7 cents;—1965–66, 30.8 cents;—1964–65, 17 cents;—1963–64, 8.4 cents;—1962–63, 0.4 cents;—1961–62, 2 cents;—1960–61, 1.7 cents;—1959–60, 3.9 cents;—1958–59, 1.7 cents.

Anyone can figure the total amount paid to BART by adding the figures included on their tax bills or dividing the total value of their property by four and multiplying that figure, times the tax rate for each year. Rising property values during the years should be considered.

The statistics on the total amount the East County has paid to BART so far are based on Antioch, Pittsburg and Brentwood chamber of commerce figures of 16,469 single family homes with an average value of $20,000 in the area.

The total amount collected from the county for BART is $51,579,036, reports the county tax collectors office. That figure includes the central, east and west parts of the county, plus business and industry.

In the Central County, where there are an estimated 75,000 homes with an average value of $32,000, the amount paid for BART is a whopping $24,150,000.

But for that $24.1 million, Central County residents have BART tracks stretching from the Caldecott Tunnel to Concord, stations nearly complete at Orinda, Lafayette, Walnut Creek and Pleasant Hill, plus a Concord terminal under construction.

But the East County has nothing but a study committee, the chairman of which is worried an extension to Antioch might be aced out by San Mateo County.

BART is apparently becoming an increasingly sore point with East County residents.

The city of Brentwood has plans for its own BART facility—a hitching post.

Although there is the special committee set up to study the feasibility of extending BART to Antioch, its chairman, BART Director Nello Bianco, is worried the system will go to San Mateo County first.

A study to string BART from Daly City to San Francisco Airport has already been completed and a study of an extension from the airport to Menlo Park is in the works.

Bianco is fearful the Antioch study won't be completed by 1973 when the Metropolitan Transportation Commission is to have finished a regional transportation plan for the bay area.

BART, Bianco contends, would have to abide by that plan.

And some commissioners have frankly said chances of building BART to the East County are nil until the system is extended through San Mateo and around the bay through San Jose.

Perhaps the most cutting blow of all is the possibility San Mateo County taxpayers, should they decide to build BART, may not face an increase in property tax.

BART could be built to the airport or Menlo Park using money from either a special sales tax or money from an auto "in lieu" tax.

Keith Bernard, San Mateo study project director, emphasized that project should not affect any East County extensions.

He added an extension to Antioch is more important than building BART around the bay through Santa Clara County.

The East county is a growing area, he said, "and whatever's built won't be ready to roll for 10 years from the day it's designed."

Bernard said even if plans for an East County extension were ready today, BART would still have to go through MTC.

Bianco's fear of the MTC coming to full power in 1973 is somewhat late because that agency is already reviewing transportation plans, Bernard added.

The San Mateo airport extension study itself notes any counties planning to annex to BART must abide by a BART directors' resolution giving top priority to rail extensions to Antioch and Livermore.

The airport study also stresses San Mateo County would have to pay its "full share" of the total cost of the entire rapid transit system.

That amounts, Bernard said, would have to be negotiated between BART and San Mateo. The state law creating BART specifies any counties annexing to the system must pay their fair share of the total cost.

The San Mateo study, Bernard added, emphasizes additional money from San Mateo joining the three-county district could be put into extensions to Antioch and Livermore while still building a line to the airport or Menlo Park at a cost of $700 million.

## TRIBUTE TO FRANK B. RAUCH

### HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in all of our districts there are certain men who stand as giants in their civic contributions to our communities and our Nation. Such a man was Frank B. Rauch, Sr., of St. Charles, Mo., whose lifework is described in the following article:

FRANK RAUCH DIES

ST. JOSEPH'S HOSPITAL.—A City father, in the literal and historic sense of the word, died Monday night in St. Joseph's. Francis B. Rauch Sr., died at the age of 76 after an illness, and with his passing, St. Charles and the Catholic Church have lost a man who since 1916 has been a bright and guiding community light.

Mr. Rauch was born and raised in St. Charles, attended the old Borromeo School, and attended high school in St. Mary's, Kansas. When Mr. Rauch was named "Man of the Years" in 1959, it was said, "Sometime after that, the school was disbanded." When he returned home, he worked for a time in East St. Louis.

Mr. Rauch was 16 when he first went to work. One of his duties was to each morning accompany the firm's treasurer to the bank, carrying a length of lead pipe. He returned to St. Charles in 1916 when he and his father bought the Moore wholesale produce company here. So in 1916, his service to St. Charles began, and did not fail until his death.

The honors bestowed upon him have been many. Perhaps the greatest civic honor granted by St. Charles is the "Man of the Years," an award by the Chamber of Commerce citing one man for more than 20 years of service. But in addition to that, one of the highest awards granted by the Catholic

Church is the Order of Knight of St. Gregory. In 1968, this was granted directly by the Pope to Mr. Rauch.

But Mr. Rauch could transcend these public honors, because he did not seek them. "He was never short with his charity. Not organized charity, but individual charity when a person needed something. I know of some efforts of his nobody knows about, never did he turn it down," Sol Wolfe, a friend of Mr. Rauch's for 41 years, says.

Wolfe is speaking specifically (at least) of the depression when Mr. Rauch and two other men were members of the City Relief Committee in 1931, and provided office space. "When people needed shoes or coal, he became one of the first people to put up the money until organized relief could get there," Wolfe remembers.

It was not only charity which made Mr. Rauch noble and great. When St. Charles needed a man of his caliber, he was there. In 1937, the highway department wanted to close the St. Charles bridge for repairs, and Mr. Rauch helped keep it open. In 1948, Mr. Rauch helped bring industry into the City. In 1958, he "gave immeasurable help in securing passage of the sewer bond issue which (was) so vital to the future development of St. Charles," a salute read.

His civic achievements, all of which are not listed here, were matched by his service to his Church. In 1957, he was chairman of the Borromeo Parish committee to raise funds for Central Catholic High School, later to be known as Duchesne High School, and he was, at the same time, active in the drive to raise funds for the expansion of St. Joseph's Hospital.

The passing of Francis Rauch is not only the passing of a monumental human being, but the passing of one of the early and strong foundations of this City; foundations which received the care of his own hands. "He was an outstanding citizen of St. Charles," former mayor Henry Vogt says.

## SENATOR CARL HAYDEN

### HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, the death of former Senator Carl Hayden caused deep grief among Arizonans. Many tributes were paid to this great statesman. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tribute written by Fred H. Rosenberg, of Phoenix, and mailed to my office.

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

THE LORD SAID

Welcome, Carl, to Paradise.

You have filled your mission on earth and accomplished your task;

You have led the Congress and Senate well, gave your all for these United States and the State of Arizona you loved so much; in wisdom and direction to achieve peace and good will on earth.

You gained the respect of the peoples of the entire world.

You have served your country for 57 long years.

You have smiled often and loved your fellow man, you looked for the best in others and gave the best you had to all.

You never expected others to accept whatever was distasteful and hateful to you; Carl you left behind the true meaning of Brotherhood.

Your humility and compassion for others must have been quite rewarding and pleased me much.

You saw beauty in all I created, In Arizona, its unbelievable magnificence and never failed to express it in your prayers.

Your prayers and concern about Arizona were always acceptable, for you lived by the Ten Commandments and the Bible as you were taught.

You have left the world better than you found it.

Welcome home, Carl!

## MARIE ANTOINETTE COMES TO WASHINGTON

### HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's Capital is about to be graced, symbolically, by the presence of a great lady. As contemplated by many of the cozy and the well-off, a living symbol of her famous quip, "Let them eat cake," will soon preside over Mount Vernon Square—as an undying testament to the fact that the poor will be moved so that the rich can go to conventions in this, the most democratic nation on earth. Mr. Speaker, I refer in this ironic manner to the proposed convention center-sports arena complex. I have read of it and thought hard about it. There is a long report prepared for the House Committee on Public Works by GSA with the cooperation of Booz-Allen & Hamilton, architects. This lays out the reasons for—or at least the propaganda for—having such a complex as is planned immediately south of Mount Vernon Square in Washington, D.C.

It is important for all in this Chamber to be aware at this time that separate legislation is not necessary to build this complex. Under the Public Buildings Act of 1959, approval by both Public Works Committees of the House and the Senate is tantamount to setting in motion a project of this nature.

If the project is to be stopped, the full displeasure of many Members must be given a loud and open airing, and that, I must admit, is what I am attempting to encourage here today. For, if this complex is allowed to be built with such minimal consent, based on an act passed in a long-ago time when our Nation's Capital did not have the sort of unholy congestion that it now has, then the floodgates will stand fully open to boondoggles that are unproductive, unfair, and unwise, built only to contend for tourists' money in this town.

I understand, according to an article in last Sunday's Washington Post, that my esteemed colleague from Illinois (Mr. GRAY) was recently moved to reconsider his opinion on the wisdom of putting such a complex in Mount Vernon Square. Indeed, this past Thursday, he reportedly discovered so much open opposition that he went so far as to hold an open forum on the subject, at the Greater New Hope Baptist Church. I feel that he should be strongly commended by us all for his concern for the feelings of the people of the District, as well as his conviction about their right to express their views on topics which directly affect them. Not only the site for this complex should be reconsidered, but also that such site should be reconsidered in the face of what I believe to be the patent wisdom of further crowding this already overcrowded colonial zoo of Washington, D.C., with any more federally funded white elephants.

Such construction, particularly in the present case of the proposed convention center-sports arena complex, is too often a case of small-scale versus large-scale economics. It certainly is so now. Representing the large-scale view, we have Mark Evans, a former chairman of the city's Bicentennial Commission and a director of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade. In the Washington Post article to which I have already referred, he is quoted as saying that the project "represents the future of the city. The facts are unless you refurbish the economic base of the city, it will continue to deteriorate."

Apparently what Mr. Evans and those of a similar disposition envision is a complex which would add $112 million a year to the city's economy and create 1,500 new jobs, with a payroll of $26 million a year. The complex would bring in approximately $96 million in tourist trade, they feel, and would attract some 4,135,000 persons annually to its sporting events. Based on these projections, which are nothing but the guesses of so-called experts—the likes of which have produced many another white elephant in our fair city, Mr. Evans and his friends assert that not erecting such a complex with the tourism trade we have is like a city committing suicide. Shifting his metaphor, Mr. Evans argues:

It's like being in Oklahoma and having an oil well in your back yard and not tapping it.

Yet only guesstimates assure us that oil is here to be found—or that a pot of gold lies at the end of the proverbial Federal rainbow. According to the GSA report to which I have already referred, the projected top cost for the construction of this complex would be $101.705 million. Yet, anyone with just a little cynicism, bred of remembering what we were promised about the Federal Bureau of Investigation Building, the Rayburn Building, about Dulles Airport, about the Kennedy Center, would at least double these costs. The Kennedy Center is at present being forced to approach Congress, hat-in-hand, for a measly $1.5 million annual appropriation to support its nonperforming functions. Yet we are told, in the GSA report, that the convention center-sports arena complex will require, when completed, all of $3 million annually from the comparatively impoverished and dependent city government to subsidize its performing functions. This is not much of an assurance that Washington, D.C., stands to be rescued economically by the construction of this complex. But finally, will the complex, by itself, really manage to attract as much money as is projected from tourists? I find this to be doubtful. Once the tourists get here, they go to the

Washington Monument, they go to the Kennedy Center, they go everywhere—but do they come here to see only one building? This seems scarcely likely at all.

Locally, the GSA report boasts of 4 million people in the "Washington area" who are reachable through the televised broadcasting of sports events. So what? Does that mean they will thus be attracted to such events? I rather imagine just the reverse would be true. Television and attendance do not complement; they oppose.

So the thinking, the dreaming, and the projections on the large-scale economics end of the question seem neither very clear nor very persuasive.

On the small-scale end, however, the facts are tragically clear and persuasive. What is, is. The place is deteriorating, but people are there, as are churches and places of business. The African Methodist Episcopal Church bought its building for $100,000 20 years ago; in 1965 it held a mortgage-burning ceremony after years of dedication and sacrifice. This would be wiped out, along with the Greater New Hope Baptist Church, according to the GSA report on the proposed complex.

The area to be demolished is a furniture center. Harry Hahn of House and Hoffman is quoted in the Washington Post article of last Sunday that trade in the area comes to $20 million annually and that his payroll alone amounts to $521,000 per year. The Chinese section of Washington would be obliterated. As William Yee, the owner of the China Inn Restaurant, says:

> The Chinese home owners here worked 17, sometimes 20 hours a day to buy their homes and raise their families. It would be a disaster to move them out.

In the debate between large-scale versus small-scale economics, it really comes down to what you mean by "disaster." If you belong to the Washington Board of Trade, if you wrap your economic hopes up in the patriotic symbolism of the Bicentennial Celebration, perhaps you mean the possibility of attaining great wealth not realized. If you are poor and Chinese, perhaps you mean the impossibility of ever going home again to a house for which you have sacrificed for many years that home ownership and self-respect might become personal realities. It is finally therefore a question of values. And I can only go with the Chinese on this one. To go the other way would be, like Marie Antoinette, to take away the natives' bread so that the convention-goers might eat cake.

I am sorry that pressing business kept me from attending the meeting last night at the Greater New Hope Baptist Church, along with other Members of the House Public Works Committee, although I did send an aide to represent me. I can only once again commend Chairman GRAY for his foresight and fine democratic spirit in arranging for such an airing of public opinion by the aggrieved themselves. I can only pray that the meeting itself served to stave off the projected disaster of a convention center-sports arena complex on this or any other local site.

## BE OF GOOD CHEER

## HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, seldom does anyone say anything really relevant to today's youth. Recently such a man spoke to a convocation of students at Redlands University, Redlands, Calif., and I would like to share his remarks with my colleagues.

The speaker was Jenkins Lloyd Jones, editor and publisher of the Tulsa Tribune, Tulsa, Okla. The title of his speech is "Be of Good Cheer." It was given originally at Brigham Young University forum in Provo, Utah, on December 9, 1971.

BE OF GOOD CHEER

(By Jenkins Lloyd Jones)

Ladies and gentlemen:

This speech is not going to be directed to everybody in this room. There may be among you a very few who are so talented and so filled with self-confidence that you will not need the homilies you are about to hear.

There will be among you a few who are so egotistical, who are so cocky regardless of your lack of talent that a speech like this would do you no good.

But this speech is directed to the uptight majority. It is directed to the nervous normals. It is directed to the overwhelming bulk of you who, however much you may present to the world an insouciant and carefree face, are in reality in large measure suffering from a number of fears.

You may have the fear of not measuring up. You may have the fear of not being able to get with it, perhaps of having no real place in the future.

Many of you are advanced hypochondriacs. You arise in the morning with incipient cancer and you go to bed with the beginnings of emphysema. You have cold sweats. You fear imminent insanity or at least a brain tumor. You have a dread of losing the guy or the gal, or, perhaps worse yet, you have the fear of never getting far enough in the love business to even lose the guy or the gal.

You fear the quite obvious complexity of this world growing more complex in leaps. And some of you, perhaps all of you at one time or another, have had the mad impulse to drop out and get back in the box and hide.

Ladies and gentlemen, I come to bring you good news.

The overwhelming majority of you are going to make it. That is, you will be useful to society and because you will be useful, you will be reasonably well rewarded in this life. You will accomplish things more difficult than you presently think you can accomplish. You will make a reasonable score in the love business. You may not marry a Raquel Welch or Robert Goulet but the chances are you aren't Apollo or Helen of Troy either.

There will be unlucky ones. A small minority of you in this room at this moment are going to die early, before your potential has been proved. A small minority in this room are going to suffer from chronic ill health, which will dim your hopes. You can take comfort in the fact that this will be a smaller minority than in any generation that ever lived. Thank the Lord for that. But those few of you, if you have this big bad luck, will have to be written off from what I am about to say, because big bad luck can't be overcome.

Still, the sufferers from big bad luck are going to be balanced off by a few of you who are going to have big good luck.

You are going to be in the college play, remembering all your lines, when a Hollywood scout is out in the audience. Miraculously a door that you never thought would open suddenly swings wide. Or your dad who has been hopelessly scratching at 40 acres of hard pan is going to discover that there is an oil pool underneath.

Or you are going to say the right thing at the right time at the right meeting and presto! the whole course of your life will be changed. An almost unknown prairie lawyer by the name of Abraham Lincoln went to the Cooper Union meeting in New York and made a speech that most of the nation was crying to hear. He had big good luck.

Big good luck like big bad luck is rare and it will not affect the overwhelming majority of you.

What I wish to talk about this morning is the fact that most of you are going to spend your lives in a milieu of little good luck, little bad luck. How you bend that luck, how you seize the little good luck and intensify it, how you overcome the little bad luck and perhaps even turn it to your advantage, is going to govern the way in which you will live. It will create your life score.

Most bitter, disappointing lives are curable. Only a few of us are overwhelmed by forces beyond our control.

I wasn't very long in the newspaper business as a young police reporter before a great truth began to dawn on me, and that is that pure evil is a rare force in this world. There are few people who are purely bad. There is, of course, a mental phenomenon which can only be classified as moral and ethical imbecility. You don't find many so afflicted.

Most of the misery, most of the tragedy in this world is caused by people of good intentions and great capacities for self-justification who are suffering from arrested development.

The real problem with this world is that it has an exportable surplus of big babies and no place to export them.

Some of you have seen problems with your parents. Only in very rare instances do parents not love their children, but there are those among you have had your childhoods blighted because your parents reacted to conditions as big babies would react.

Some of them were unable to come to conclusions, difficult conclusions which are the mark of the adult person, and thus were wishy-washy personalities which left you adrift.

Or they were martinets and in an unheeding and unthinking way they attempted to overcontrol your lives, and you were distressed.

You cannot do anything about that.

But you can do something about yourselves. You, too, will be parents. You do not have a right to bring human beings into the world if you are going to mistreat them, even with the best intentions. If you have seen errors in your upbringing you do not have the right to repeat those errors. If you are not determined to be the finest kind of parents, I hope you are barren.

Most of you, if you are thrown, will throw yourselves. Some of you know judo, which is the Japanese art of making your opponent throw himself. The reason why the little man who knows the art can conquer the big man is because the big man, by the unwise use of muscle, goes sprawling. If you get in trouble in this life, it will probably be because you have committed self-judo.

When I was learning how to fly an airplane I went out my first day all excited and fluttery. We took off and my instructor turned the controls over to me. My knuckles were white on the stick and my feet were sawing the rudder pedals. The plane was going all over the sky—wing down, tail up—yawing and pitching—and I was perspiring buckets.

Finally he said, Jones, let go—let go of everything".

Then he put his little finger on the stick

and he guided that plane smoothly through the sky.

He said, I want to tell you one thing and I want you never to forget it—the light touch is the touch of the expert".

All through life you are going to see people overcontrolling, people with white knuckles, people sawing at the rudder pedals, people going all over the sky because they have never learned the light touch.

I was talking to a college dean last month in New York State. And he said, "The thing that I can't get over is that many of these young people don't smile. When I say. 'Why don't you smile?' they reply, 'How can we smile with an atom bomb? How can we smile with millions starving to death?' "

Well, our ancestors smiled even while their children were dying of smallpox and diphtheria. Mark Twain smiled even while people were being sold into human slavery.

If we do not learn to smile, if we cannot laugh, then we will not solve problems either. Because we will overcontrol. We will not have learned to put the little finger on the thing to make it fly.

This does not mean that there are not occasions for high dudgeon. This does not mean that righteous indignation does not have a place in the integrated personality.

But it does mean that if you are going to be a professional militant you've got to be mad all the time. You cannot afford gratitude because gratitude is the antithesis of dudgeon. If you are going to be in a high dudgeon all the time, eventually you will suffer a distortion of reality, and you will create a credibility gap that will defeat your hopes.

The light touch. The touch of the expert. Or as one psychiatrist has advised persons suffering from distressing neuroses, "Give it a little judicious neglect".

You hear a lot of talk about doing your own thing. That's great. I'm in favor of people doing their own thing as long as it is a decent thing, as long as it does not intrude upon the liberties and the rights of others, and as long as the world sees enough value in it so that it will be happy to keep feeding you while you are doing it.

I have no quarrel with the son of the banker who doesn't like the banking business then decides to start a small marina. He has a right. It is his life, however much papa may be disappointed. It is a lot better to have a good marina operator than a bum banker.

But if you are going to do your own thing, just be sure that it is so expert that you don't have to spend the rest of your life trying to convince people it's good.

Last year I was out in a hippy pad in California. I was in there out of curiosity. I was very friendly and they were quite friendly to me.

They were all slopping around, barefooted, and attired in necklaces and beads, and they had been daubing at the walls. They gathered around rather wistfully and they explained the great thoughts behind these splashes and blobs, even though the room looked as though a chimpanzee had gotten loose in a navy paint locker.

But you see, they were upright because they had to try to explain to me why this thing they were doing was so splendid. They were defensive, and it's not good to spend your life on the defensive.

If you know four chords on a guitar, and that's the acme of your accomplishment, you are going to have to devote a lot of time trying to convince people that those who know four chords on a guitar are musicians. But if you can play the guitar like Segovia, then you've got no problem because the world will understand that your thing is both difficult and excellent.

So when you talk about doing your thing, ask yourself this question: "Am I going to have to spend my days trying to sell it, lousy as it is, or is my thing going to speak for itself?"

You hear a lot about identity crisis. You hear about young people asking themselves, "Who am I?"

The moment you can do some decent thing that is difficult, and do it well, your identity crisis is going to begin to evaporate. You won't worry about who you are, because who you are will be self-evident.

We've all heard a lot about the new morality. Of course there's nothing new about it. Primitive man probably started out with barnyard morality. No doubt he moved casually from ape-woman to ape-woman and now some so-called advanced thinkers want to get us back into the barnyard. One sage up in Spokane, Washington, said not long ago, "Many people think they are emancipated when they are only unbuttoned."

But what about morality, what about morals? Are these merely capricious and arbitrary rules that whitebearded old characters keep dragging down from mountains on graven tablets to bug the general public? You know, the funny thing is, every great religion is in agreement on the basis of morality, and why is that?

Because Man has learned painfully over the many centuries that some things make a workable society and some things make a chaotic society, and morality is absolutely nothing except a system of guidelines that spell the difference between a workable and an unworkable society. Long before Moses, Man learned that he couldn't live well if people killed, if people stole, if people coveted, if people committed adultery. Because then human associations would fly apart.

These are not senseless taboos. These are the basic formulae for an orderly community. But you hear it said that times change. What harm for example, does a little promiscuity do now that we've got the pill, now that people can sleep around without so much chance of embarrassing consequences? I'll tell you what it does. Promiscuity produces a very interesting paradox—it tends to emasculate the male.

You see, the Man male is in the human context, not in the Hereford context. He is more than a stud. He is the teacher, the protector, the provider for those who are coming behind him. And when the male just wanders up and down the street getting into a different bed every night, he ceases to be the teacher, the protector, the provider and he goes right on back to the Hereford level. He is only a piece of a man.

Then what you get is a matriarchy in which the mother is the stronger of the two. She sticks around. She's stuck with the kid. But history is devoid of a single instance in which a matriarchy has produced a powerful and productive society. One of the great troubles we get in our slum and ghetto societies now is the fact that you find too often a matriarchy—no father-figure and an unproductive social organization. So even if you say that you're not going to pay any attention to those commandments on the graven tablets, you had better pay attention to the way the human animal reacts or you're heading straight into quicksand.

No system of marriage works too well, for man is a confusing mixture of the animal and the spiritual, and he get himself all fouled up with these conflicting natures. So, as all Mormons know, there has been a lot of heated argument through the ages about monogamy and polygamy, and some tribes have even tried polyandry—one wife with multiple husbands.

But the important thing to remember is that all systems of marriage require responsibility. Detractors of old-time Mormonism who came to Salt Lake expecting to find a city of sin went away considerably shaken when they found the high degree of family affection and stability.

Then there's the matter of common honesty. Recently, Abbie Hoffman, the Yippie leader, wrote a book, entitled, paradoxically, "Steal This Book". It was a manual of methods for cheating the telephone company, fixing electric meters, jimmying coin boxes, etc., on the theory that this would wreck the hated capitalist system and bring about whatever fuzzy socialist paradise Hoffman has in mind.

But, oddly enough, one of Abbie's collaborators on the book has recently accused him of unethical practice in the distribution of its royalties. In short, there is an argument over the honest way to divide the proceeds of a book advocating theft.

This illustrates a truism. No human association can get along without rules of fairness. Prisons have "right guys" and "wrong guys" and even thieves sometimes holler for the cops.

Cash is a convenience that can't survive counterfeiting. A credit card civilization can only exist if most of us are honest. If we ever have to go back to biting coins and toting our own scales into the shops then the speed of commerce, which is the essence of our prosperity, will vanish. Without the general assumption of ethical behavior our country would be poor.

So remember this, morality enriches and decomplicates life. Immorality impoverishes and complicates it.

If you tell the truth you don't have to remember what you said. If you lie as a general rule, you'd better keep elaborate notes.

The crooked man leads a complicated life, and he's endlessly surrounded by thieves and cheaters, for he sees his own face in the faces of all men.

If you are going to err, ladies and gentlemen, err on the side of trust.

That doesn't mean you have to be naive. Governor Leon Phillips of Oklahoma had a sign up in his office which quoted an old Indian chief as saying, "Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice, shame on me!" You don't have to be a patsy.

But if you are absolutely uncheatable, it means that you have your guard up so high you will be forced to be distant from your fellow man. It is better, occasionally, to be victimized than to be over-suspicious. Err a little on the side of belief in human beings. You won't get lines in your faces so quickly.

Another decomplicator is courage. You've heard the saying that the coward dies a thousand deaths, the brave but one. I remember at the beginning of World War II reading of the farm kid over in Arkansas who committed suicide. He was about to be drafted and was afraid he would be killed in the war.

There is nothing like the plain old-fashioned ability to meet a difficult issue. Trouble is like an angry dog. If you face it fearlessly, it will probably retreat from you. If you try to run away from it, it will grab you by the pants.

Another great decomplicator is the business of keeping an eraser handy.

What's an eraser? It is a device for rubbing out a mistake. Don't stagger through life under a load of futile regret.

You are going to do things of which you will not be proud. We all have done things of which we are not proud. We should ask ourselves three questions:

1. Have I learned my lesson?
2. Am I resolved never to do this stupid thing again?
3. If I have injured someone, have I made every effort at restitution?

If the answer to those three questions is Yes, put your remorse in the garbage can. Don't carry around the chains that weighed down Marley's ghost.

Someone once asked Ben Hogan, the great golfer, how he felt after he had made a bad shot. "I always think," said Hogan, "that the next one will be the big one."

The fourth decomplicator is faith. I don't mean the kind of faith that puts a furtive man with a 30-30 in a Belfast window, waiting for a Catholic dog or a Protestant pig.

We had a lot of that kind of faith during the incredibly vicious religious wars of the Middle Ages.

Nor do I mean the frenetic religious fanaticism which you sometimes see, and which may not be faith at all but some neurotic manifestation of a tortured soul trying to rid itself of internal devils.

Nor do I define faith as a prissy display of holiness by those who are sure they are already elected to Heaven, and who can hardly wait for the damnation of their neighbors.

I mean capital F faith, the faith that bespeaks inner peace.

On New Year's Eve of 1940, when Britain was on its knees and a rampaging Hitler was threatening to send his hordes across the Channel, King George VI got on the BBC to give a ray of hope to his people. I don't know who he quoted, but I clearly remember the words:

"I said to a man who stood at the Gate of the Year, 'Give me a light, that I may tread safely into the unknown.'

"And he said to me, 'Go forth, and put your hand into the hand of God. That shall be better than a light, and safer than a known way.'"

Ladies and gentlemen, it's not going to be so tough for you, unless you make it tough for you.

Barring the big bad luck victims and the big good luck recipients, who won't follow the normal rules, most of you can and most of you will build a good life just as you build a brick wall. A brick wall is nothing but small pieces of dried mud, gradually—slowly accumulated into a formidable thing of great strength.

Every wise thing you say, every decent thing you do, every hour of purposeful and intelligent work, every demonstration of unselfish love will produce a brick. And with the accumulation of good works, good things, little things, you get a wall. Then you'll find it's very hard to miss a substantial realization of your hopes. "Cast thy bread upon the waters, and thou shalt find it after many days."

I don't wish to insult you with idle flattery. The capacity for mental exercise is about the same in one generation as it was in the preceding one. A great number of you will find a comfortable rut, slip your minds in neutral, and turn on the TV. As one of my cynical friends has said, "The only trouble with children is that they grow up to be people."

There are those among you who are drifting through this university because you were sent. Young women may be casually making the minimum grade average because they haven't yet found a likely candidate for a husband, and young men may be turning up with straight C's because they don't want to be sent home and have to get into the plumbing business.

These are the un-eager beavers. They don't understand what this opportunity is all about. They may be plain lazy, or they could be deeply insecure. They may be writing themselves down.

But I have some good news. Some of these apparent sluggards are going to make a marvelous disovery in the next few years. They will catch fire.

Late bloomers are common. Many of the distinguished alumni who are honored by universities later in life were never heard of on the campus during their undergraduate days. I sometimes think that college is wasted on the young. It is a sort of pearls-before-piglets proposition.

But many of you slow starters are going to discover, about the time you get to be 30, that learning can be fun, that challenge is exciting.

Many of the open doors that you are slouching by in your undergraduate days, when you have this marvelous chance to get with it, are going to become intriguing. You may find yourselves in airport waiting rooms, not leafing through sex novels, but picking out treatises on astronomy and chemistry and space science and even accounting. Because many of you who are now just getting by will some day, and perhaps some day soon, begin wondering about what you've been missing.

You who will be late bloomers will be pleased as punch when you find out how much capacity you really have. You will be capable of grasping that which now seems too formidable, of mastering that which presently seems impossible.

There is nothing so complicated that it cannot be reduced to component parts and conquered in pieces.

And so, ladies and gentlemen, life is probably not going to conquer you.

If you are going to fail, you'll have to be self-flunkers.

You can throw yourselves with immature attitudes, and produce disgusted employers, tense households, miserable mates and fouled-up children.

You can throw yourselves with liquor and embark on that downward spiral of the drunk to feel big, the hangover that makes you feel smaller, the drunk to make you feel better, the hangover that makes you feel smaller still, and so on and so on into tragedy.

You can throw yourselves with drugs in an effort to float above problems in narcotic euphoria, instead of facing and resolving them. Even if you discount the physical tortures of addiction, which can hardly be exaggerated, the atrophy of your ability to solve problems can point only one way.

Someone has said that most lives are predestined to be neither triumphant nor tragic. They are predestined to present an endless series of predicaments. Your capacity to resolve predicaments will be the whole answer to your future.

Your salvation will be the daily exercise of common sense. And what is common sense? It is the not-common-enough ability to recognize the obvious.

If you exercise the art of buildup, instead of the grossly overpracticed art of the put-down, you will not lack friends. That's obvious.

If you study and observe you cannot escape acquiring expertise, which will gain for you respect. That's obvious.

If people don't have to watch you, they will trust you. And trust is the surest road to promotion and recognition. That's obvious.

If you indulge in lies you will eventually be utterly disbelieved. That's obvious.

You can hand out only so many wooden nickels before you are out of business. That's obvious.

People who develop alley cat morals will not possess the glue that will cause them to stick during illness and misfortune and advancing age. That's obvious. And then what will they live for—a government pension and a lonely croquet game at St. Petersburg?

Life is a struggle to think well of yourself. And if you do not develop those ingredients of character that bring self-esteem you've lost the struggle.

Life is a search for inner peace. And when you hold to the simple precepts of common sense you'll find the competition not so tough, and the terrors of the night will vanish.

Paul, in his letters to the Corinthians, the Galations and the Ephesians, keeps winding up on one note:

"Finally, my bretheren, be of good cheer."

Well, my brethren and sistern, be of good cheer. Unless you destroy yourselves, you'll probably run up a pretty good score.

As Carl Sandburg wrote in his little poem, "Caboose Thoughts":

"It's going to come out all right, do you know?
The sun, the birds, the grass, they know.
They get along, and we'll get along."



## REALIZING THE POTENTIAL OF THE BLACK MEDIA—CURTIS SHAW

### HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the city of Cleveland is fortunate to have serving her one of the finest broadcasters in the country. Curtis Shaw is a young man whose devotion to the public welfare has been demonstrated on innumerable occasions. I feel that Mr. Shaw's work is an example of the good that can be done by a concerned individual in the communications industry.

Curt Shaw was born on August 13, 1946. In the intervening 25 years, he attended Cleveland's Glenville High School, Cleveland State University, and the University of Iowa. At present he serves as operations manager of WABQ Radio in Cleveland. In 1971, he was elected to a 2-year term as president of the National Association of Television and Radio Announcers, and in 1972 he became chairman of the board of the Association of Black Broadcasters.

Through his work at WABQ, Curt Shaw has created a promising alternative to white analysis and presentation of the news. I am hopeful that efforts such as Mr. Shaw's will not only encourage other talented black broadcasters, but will spur the white media toward greater awareness and responsiveness to the needs of all of the people.

On January 15, 1972, the Cleveland Call and Post featured an article on Mr. Shaw. I commend it to my colleagues as informative reading:

SMOOTH TALKING CURTIS SHAW IS FREELANCE PHILOSOPHER AT WABQ

(By Tom Ehrbar)

Over the Station WABQ, which is promoted as Tiger Radio, suave and witty Curtis Shaw is top tiger. He is manager, announcer, freelance philosopher there.

Anyway, Shaw was rapping about a recent media gathering in Chicago, and right away I could tell he was a radio person—expressing himself just so, with nice even phrases, a molasses timbre, and a command of language. Not glib, though. When I asked Shaw a question he thought it through, then answered frankly, straight out.

So Shaw was rapping about some of the hassles and tussles of black radio. "It's tough for blacks in this business, tougher than it seems," Shaw said. "We don't get the same treatment in regards to pay, in regards to working conditions, in regards to fringe benefits, in regards to anything."

Shaw was particularly miffed at those supposedly neutral guardians of fact, the rating services. These are the people that always knock on the door when Dagwood Bumstead is taking a bath and he comes down with a towel rapped around him and leaves the water running and they ask him what radio station he's listening to.

But like Dagwood Bumstead these services are white, and do not, Shaw asserts, always get an accurate reply from blacks who are distrustful and wary of what they might be consenting to.

Shaw is not super-fond of the white dominance over black radio either. He says "Of

our 300 some stations, only 15 have black owners, and only 40 have black managers. This is not a happy situation."

He is certain there is an abundance of black talent, but that their access to radio is unfairly stymied. "And as usual," he says, "the whites have the money and we don't."

At this point, without missing a single breath, Shaw moved spontaneously into a brief dissertation on "a responsible black broadcasting facility." He obviously felt that WABQ aptly qualified, and said:

"a) There must be educational information on the black experience. We have been providing this for six years, long before it became popular to do so.

"b) The station must be available when your people need you. When Martin Luther King was assassinated we went on the air even though we had no license to and let anyone say whatever he wanted to. We became the voice of our community, and I think we prevented what could have been an intensely violent situation.

"c) The news must show the other side, the black side, when necessary.

"d) There must be in-depth surveys to find out what kinds of entertainments our listeners want."

Shaw was also convinced that radio, because of its nature of immediacy, was of special use to the disadvantaged, the illiterate, those who don't have time to watch television.

"We can always at least talk to and listen to one another." he said.

And so saying, and myself listening, Shaw smoothly plugged himself into the musical scene. He said "Black music will never die, it will always continue to expand, to modernize, to spin off into new sounds."

He was also sure that American pop and progressive music are rooted in the black experience. "In the days of slavery," he said, "the blacks in the fields weren't allowed to talk to one another. Their only form of communication was song. The blues was born with a frustrated people, locked in bondage."

Today, rhythem and blues, soul music, or whatever you call it, accounts for about 35 per cent of record sales in the U.S., Shaw says.

Gospel music and jazz too reflect this outpouring of emotion and feeling. And both according to Shaw "are moving in novel and interesting directions."

A watchword with Shaw is "progressive" music, but what exactly it means even he can't define. "It can include jazz-rock sounds, like Chicago, or sweet searching sounds like Carole King. The Fifth Dimension is progressive. James Brown is not. Lead Zeppelin, the Jimmy Hendrix Experience, and Melvin Van Peebles may be called progressive. They're all going places we haven't been before."

Shaw has particular praise for Isaac Hayes, "He's been around for a long time writing songs in Memphis. People never knew about him until he started singing his own stuff. Now finally the recognition is coming."

As a final comment, Shaw mused about one full minute, then said, "I hope black radio can be as meaningful to black people, and as a result to people in general; as black music has been meaningful to music in general.

So saying in perfect cadence, Curtis Shaw, radio man extraordinaire, left me dangling on that hope.

## LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, once again we pause to join Americans of Lithuanian origin and descent in marking several anniversaries which occur within a few days of each other.

There is the 721st anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state when Mindaugas the Great unified all principalities into one kingdom in 1251.

There also is the 54th anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918.

We are fortunate here in America to be able freely to observe these anniversaries. In Lithuania itself, regrettably, such observances are not possible because of the continuing subjugation and oppression by the Soviet Union.

For a relatively too brief period, the Lithuanians were able to exercise the independence they prize and seek. But, since June 1940, they have been under illegal Soviet occupation and annexation and denied their religious freedom and human rights.

The effort must be continued in every forum possible to seek a restoration of basic human rights to the peoples of the Baltic States, including Lithuania.

## ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

### HON. JOHN Y. McCOLLISTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. McCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the Lithuanian American community of Omaha in commemorating the 54th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania. The organization's secretary, Mr. Joseph Navakas, has informed me that approximately 800 members will be celebrating independence day and the 721st anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state in 1251. These occasions are cause for festivities.

Yet, I share in the continued sorrow brought on by Russian occupation and oppression during so many of these years. Lithuania's pursuit of freedom became a short-lived reality on February 16, 1918. For 22 years the nation grew and prospered before it was overrun again and engulfed by the Communist empire during World War II. Since that time the population has declined greatly despite several hundred thousand Soviet colonists brought in after World War II.

All Americans can appreciate the never-ending struggle waged by the remaining 3 million Lithuanians to break away from Soviet control. The revolts go on, as does the tyranny. In addition, we applaud the efforts of people of Lithuanian descent in the United States who have kept alive the cause of liberty for their countrymen at home since 1940.

Those of us fortunate enough to live in a free nation must strive to maintain it as a source of hope and inspiration to the enslaved peoples of the world. We honor Lithuanians everywhere on their day of independence and hope that those who remain in the homeland soon will have reason to celebrate renewed independence.

## PRESIDENT NIXON SACRIFICES THE CONSUMER AND TAXPAYER TO THE "FARM PROBLEM"

### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, a recent article by Mr. Joseph Alsop raises the possibility that the Nixon administration under the guidance of Dr. Earl Butz, Secretary of Agriculture, may be responding to political disaffection in the Midwest by trying to appease farmers through subsidies and by increased consumer prices on food products.

At a time when the President finds it necessary to veto appropriations for health and education; to forestall attempts to develop plans for the eradication of hunger; it is disturbing to realize that the administration might foresake its opposition to increased spending in order to win the votes it could not win in the last election.

The farmers might be "conned" by this political largesse but I doubt the consumer who will pay the price of President Nixon's political generosity to the farmer will be equally enchanted by the high prices he will pay.

If the President were honestly trying to solve farm problems through these decisions, there would be no danger. But, if Mr. Alsop is right, I fear this is not the case.

I would like to place Mr. Alsop's article in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Feb. 4, 1972]

MILLIONS AND BILLIONS FOR THE FARM BELT

(By Joseph Alsop)

One day, an extra $1 billion of government-guaranteed "rural developments credits"; the next day, another $100 million for the corn farmers for not planting corn (with a nice soy bean sweetener)—that, roughly speaking, is the way Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz has been shoveling it out since taking office.

It is a fascinating spectacle. It seems to have passed wholly unnoticed by the Democrats, who keep assuring one another, with rich complacency, that "President Nixon is in bad trouble in the farm belt." Maybe they are partly right today, but the real question is whether the President will still be in trouble in the farm belt next November.

Without plunging too far into the hideous and costly intricacies of the federal agricultural programs, a partial list of costs of the new Secretary of Agriculture's recent decision may be worth offering. To begin with, there was the decision to keep no less than 37 million acres of land out of production under the feed grain program in 1972.

The bill for that one alone will be around $2 billion, or about $600 million more than last year's payments to the feed grain growers for the same purpose.

Then the so-called environmental conservation payments to farmers, cut back last year to $145 million, have been raised again to $200 million. Another $100 million of money for rural electrification loans, long impounded by the Bureau of the Budget, has already been released.

Some $2 million extra for "wheat research" (whatever that may be); another $10 million for a special purchasing program to stimulate the market price of corn—these are mere trifles!

But another deep dig of the shovel of generosity is at least worth mentioning. It is a pretty good bet, in fact, that come April or May, the support price for corn, and maybe for wheat as well, will be raised by 8 or 10 per cent.

The whole thing should be a lesson to the Democrats, who seem to have a limitless capacity for misjudging the President. The choice of Secretary Butz caused every Democrat to crow with delight.

Initially, there is no doubt that the choice of Earl Butz was anything but popular in the farm belt. But what in fact did the President do, when he exchanged Clifford M. Hardin for Butz?

He got rid of a fairly timid and doctrinaire Secretary of Agriculture, and he acquired, instead, a very tough and able operator, with a strong political bent. President Nixon made this exchange, of course, because there was real discontent among the farmers.

Earl Butz is shovelling it out with both hands; and he will surely go on shovelling it out. This year's total increase in federal farm spending can easily go well above $2 billion, if credits are included. The Democrats are always unwise, in sum, because they always under-estimate the President's foresight and political realism.

---

## WHAT IS GOOD FOR SANTA BARBARA IS GOOD FOR THE EAST COAST

---

**HON. FRANK J. BRASCO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, periodically a proposal is put forth that is either laughable or such a grotesque caricature of reality that it commands significant attention. Drilling for oil off the eastern coast of this country is one such attempt at translating fantasy into ugly reality.

Ordinarily intelligent citizens would greet such a proposal with the derision it so rightly deserves. In this case, however, the proposal must be taken seriously, because of the peculiar circumstances surrounding the way it has emerged as a serious proposition.

Most intelligent Americans are at least generally aware that the domestic oil industry of this country is a coddled, privileged operation, enjoying a series of tax benefits that are the envy of every set of industrial buccaneers in the Republic. Depletion allowances, drilling writeoffs, carveouts, and the like allow the oil industry to reap profits that stagger the imagination. During the 1950's, the artificial walls of oil import quotas were constructed by Presidential Executive order, allowing the Nation to become a captive, profitable sanctuary for the major oil corporations. We pay what they see fit to charge, and that is twice the going world rate for oil. A barrel of crude oil from abroad coming ashore in the New York-Philadelphia-New Jersey refinery complex costs approximately $2,000. When it moves inland to the domestic market, the quotas double its price to the consumer, who of course pays and pays and pays. Such is the unhappy state of affairs today, as the oil moguls gleefully count their massive profits, while paying Federal taxes of around 8 percent annually.

In such a climate of privilege, an arrogant attitude has been spawned in the minds of the people dominating the oil industry decisionmaking process at the top. They feel they can literally get away with anything. Years of such unchallenged dominance have led them to such thinking. As a result, their tankers feel free to despoil our offshore waters and beaches. Their promotion games, based on elementary fraud, are jammed down the throats of the average gasoline station operator, and once again, the consumer pays and pays.

The list is as sad as it is endless. But in recent months a new twist has been added to this particular chain of circumstances. An endless expectation of ever mounting profits has been a permanent part of the oil industry philosophy for some time. Previously, they have been able to raise prices on their products with a fine disregard for the sensibilities or pocketbooks of the average citizen. The cow had always allowed itself to be milked in the past. Why should it rebel this time?

Unfortunately for them, resistance has been rising, and from the Congress on down the line, a constantly mounting outcry has been raised against their depredations. A new gimmick was required. So the "energy crisis" came into being.

Roughly, the argument goes as follows. Because the Government has shaved our tax privileges an infinitesimal amount, we no longer have the financial incentive to develop new domestic sources of oil and natural gas. Until new price hikes are allowed by the Federal Power Commission and other Government agencies, we will have to make do with existing sources here at home. And this certainly may mean that the industrial centers and population concentrations of the Northern United States may be confronted with shortages of oil and gas at critical times during the year, perhaps even during the winter.

Of course an outcry ensued in those same centers. In the process, the Federal Power Commission, which regulates natural gas prices for this fuel when it moves interstate, saw the opportunity it sought, and has begun to grant selective price increases. In turn, this opened up a brand new opportunity to the pirates of this freebooting industry. Why not drill for oil off the east coast of the United States? Why not, indeed.

It was a plausible thought, indeed. If they have been allowed to trample across the sensitivities and wallets of the entire Nation in a dozen different ways; if the tax laws have been written by and for the oil industry; if they have been allowed to inflict one set of prices upon American consumers that is twice that they are able to charge worldwide; why not drill for oil off the east coast of the Nation? Why not allow them to utilize the family toothbrush as well?

Fortunately, the blessings of offshore oil and gas drilling have been revealed to the American public in all their flaming, gaudy glory in recent years. The Santa Barbara Channel oil spill disaster has not faded from memory that fast.

When an oil drilling rig is implanted in an offshore area, it has one purpose: to drill as many producing wells as possible. A common sight is such a rig, complete with as many as two or three dozen sets of pipes leading off it into the water. Each pipe may represent a potential producing well which has been drilled, capped and awaits exploitation. Such was the case in the Santa Barbara Channel. Of course, while all this exists, other wells are in the process of being drilled as well.

In the California case, there was a rupture due to an accident, and the entire channel resort area found itself with an oil spill of catastrophic proportions. Most Americans remember with distaste the sight of oil and gas bubbling to the surface of that lovely body of water with monotonous regularity. All the efforts society and industry were able to mount were unavailing for many days before the spill was brought under some control. The damage to the environment was significant, with results still being tabulated, several years after the event.

The Gulf of Mexico oil drilling rigs have been the source of several holocausts due to similar happenings. It has taken several weeks to bring some of these pyres under some kind of control. Now the oil industry seeks the same blessings for the Atlantic coast of the Nation, right off the shores of the most heavily populated areas of the country.

Their response has been, "the energy crisis," or, "the needs of the Nation must be served." Other times it has been, "technology will prevent any trouble." Of course, no one has believed these fairy tale assurances for an instant.

Yet in the face of the vehement and vigorous opposition of virtually all the Members of Congress from the potentially affected States, the Department of the Interior began to make noises indicating that leases for drilling in these Continental Shelf areas would be made commercially available to the industry.

In spite of all the evidence that showed that an oil spill was an ever-present danger, this sign was given and announced to the media. In spite of the certainty of residual oil spills due to drilling that were a certainty, this action was contemplated. It is to the credit of the people, the media, and the Members of Congress from the affected States that their combined outcry stifled the plan, for the immediate future. Assurances have been given. Delays have been promised and soothing statements have been forthcoming. However, what the large print giveth, the fine print taketh away. Even though we have heard more promises than a drunkard's wife, there is no intention on the part of this Member of the House, at least, to relax any vigilance. The environment of the Continental Shelf area and the Atlantic Coast States come before added profits for the oil industry.

They have been successful in the past in exploiting energy resources in a variety of sparsely populated places, and the environment or people be damned. This time they are not going to get away with it. Notice can and must be constantly served upon these freebooters that the American consumer is turning on them just as their foreign friends are. The cow's milk has turned sour. The cow has sharp horns. And she will use them. The

oil industry had better take heed of this particular alarm. They have gone too far.

## PHILADELPHIA'S FINANCIAL CRISIS

### HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on February 4 and 5 the Committee of 70, Philadelphia's unique nonpartisan civic watchdog organization held a conference on the city's impending financial crisis.

This seminar was just one of the many special activities of the committee. Included in its regular activities are underwriting graduate fellowships, assisting Temple University and the city of Philadelphia in presenting a graduate-level political science course in municipal administration, investigating complaints concerning the conduct of elections and assisting the Philadelphia city commissioners in the training of election officers.

The basis for the conference was a prediction by the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia that the combined deficit in 1975 for the city and the Philadelphia school district would be $500 million.

My distinguished colleague from Philadelphia, JOSHUA EILBERG, spoke to the conference about the possibility for Federal aid to the big cities and urban school districts. He gave the business and civic leaders at the meeting a clear picture of what our cities and schools can expect from Washington in the near future.

At this time I enter into the RECORD the text of Congressman EILBERG'S remarks, the agenda of the 2-day seminar, and the summarizing remarks of the executive secretary of the Committee of Seventy, Michael von Moschzisker:

PHILADELPHIA'S FINANCIAL CRISIS

(An assembly sponsored by the Committee of 70 in cooperation with Temple University)

"$500 million annual deficit in combined operating budget."

Will this be the fate of the City of Philadelphia? It may be, said the Federal Reserve Bank, concluding a comprehensive study of City finances.

To avert such disaster, Philadelphians must be alerted, informed and encouraged to take constructive action. This is the objective of the Assembly.

The Assembly will be held at the Sugar Loaf Conference Center of Temple University, 9230 Germantown Avenue (at Bell's Mill Road), Chestnut Hill:

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1972

5:30 p.m.: Registration and Reception (cash bar)

6:30: First General Session: "Philadelphia's Impending Financial Crisis" David Eastburn, president, Mrs. Anita Summers and Mr. Richard Epps, Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia

7:30: Dinner (Assembly participants may bring guests at $8 per person)

Speaker: Representative Joshua Eilberg, U.S. Congress, 4th Pennsylvania District, "Federal Financial Aid to Cities"

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 5

9:00 a.m.: Second General Session: "Philadelphia's Financial Needs and Resources" Lennox Moak, finance director, City of Philadelphia.

10:00: Workshops—

1. Schools' Needs.
2. Municipal Services' Needs.
3. Financial Resources—Local, General.
4. Financial Resources—Local, Business and Industry.
5. Financial Resources—State Government.
6. Financial Resources—Federal Government.

12:30: Luncheon.

2:00: Third General Session—

Workshop Reports.

Commentary by Panel representing Schools, City, State and Federal Government, Business and Industry.

Discussion: Alternatives for Ongoing Action.

Assembly Summary: Michael von Moschzisker, Executive Secretary, 70.

4:30: Adjournment.

FEDERAL AID TO CITIES SPEECH BEFORE THE COMMITTEE OF 70

Urban fiscal crisis—the term has become so pervasive in the media, so familiar from appeals by mayors, so automatic in the reports of commissions and task forces that it may have lost its force and entered the realm of sheer rhetoric.

But it is very real to the urban citizens who feel the effect of urban decay. It is real to mayors who are forced to cut back budgets, drop programs and fire employees—all in the face of increased demands for public services.

It is real to school administrators who are unable to even hold the line and maintain basic programs, let alone develop the new approaches required to meet the special needs of the city pupils.

And, it is real to the man who pays—the taxpayer!

So serious is the situation that the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations recently began work on a project to develop an orderly plan for dealing with local governments confronted with a financial emergency. It is popularly known as the Municipal Bankruptcy Report.

If we are to avoid the chaos that would ensue were our cities to reach a stage of complete financial collapse, policy makers at all levels of government must join in a concerted effort to realign the allocation of public responsibilities and resources.

Our cities are national assets. They both need, and are entitled, to receive financial assistance to be given by *all* the people in the country.

Few doubt that his country has the *total* resources available to provide essential government services and schooling.

The real problem is that the distribution of responsibility for poviding public services among the three levels of government does not correspond with their respective tax-raising capabilities.

This is particularly true in our older central cities, which are faced with a deadly combination of dwindling tax bases coupled with increased demands for services.

The situation in Philadelphia, which has been so ably described by David Eastburn, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, is typical.

In his predictions, Mr. Eastburn recognizes our rising demands and expectations.

Because the problem is national in scope, a national response is required. Consider, for example, dislocations in the local economy which are the result of an unhealthy national economy.

The rising salaries and prices which confront local governments, the lower revenue collections due to unemployment, and the unprecedented rise in the cost of borrowing all reflect national economic conditions, and require national remedies.

Andrew Brimmer, member of the Board of Governors of our Federal Reserve System, notes that for all general expenditures combined—state and local—between 1955 and 1969, inflation accounted for well over two-fifths of the total increase in outlays, one-quarter was due to increased workload, while less than one-third was accounted for by changes in scope or quality of services.

Higher prices had the most noticeable effect on the growth of expenditures on local schools—52 percent—and basic urban services—51 percent.

Rising wages and salaries are due partly to the need to offset increases in the cost of living, partly to the need to bring public salaries into better alignment with the private sector, and partly to union militancy. The results of these pressures may be seen in the growth of teacher's salaries in the past 7 years in Philadelphia.

In 1965, before the first teachers' union contract was negotiated, a teacher, on the average, made about $7,200 a year. By 1971, the average salary was $12,500. Teacher wage increases over the past 2 years alone came close to $60 million.

No one can argue that these increases were not justified. In fact, they were long overdue.

The rising cost of debt financing is illustrated in Philadelphia by the figures for school debt service: Between 1962 and 1970, the annual payment on the outstanding debt jumped from $9 million to over $28 million—an increase of 300 percent.

Because of rising interest rates, states and localities are subject to extra costs in maintaining a given volume of debt.

If the average interest rate paid in 1955 had prevailed in 1969, interest payments nationally would have been $2.5 billion, rather than the $3.7 billion actually paid—a saving of $1.2 billion, or 48 percent.

Local governments are facing these rising costs at a time of recession and high unemployment. This slows the expansion of total revenues and places increased demands on local services: Welfare, unemployment compensation, public hospitals and public universities.

It has been estimated that State and local governments would have obtained about $3.5 billion more in revenue in calendar year 1970 if the economy had been at the full employment level.

The Federal government can help alleviate the impact of national economic conditions in several ways. Last year, Congress enacted the Emergency Employment Act of 1971, which is designed to provide approximately 150,000 jobs in the public service.

This legislation authorizes $750 million for fiscal year 1972 and $1 billion for fiscal year 1973. It authorizes these funds to be released when the national unemployment rate reaches 4.5 percent for three consecutive months.

It also authorizes $250 million for fiscal 1972 and $250 million for fiscal 1973 for a special employment assistance program for local areas where the unemployment rate is 6 percent or higher, regardless of the national rate.

This measure is helping to relieve local unemployment and welfare burdens, providing a new source for filling local government personnel needs, and converting 150,000 tax consumers into taxpayers.

A proposal currently being considered by Congress, The National Development Bank, is designed to assist local governments with the problem of meeting the need for public works facilities at a time of rising debt costs.

The Bank would make long-term loans at reasonable interest rates to:

State and local governments for public works facilities,

Individuals and corporations to establish new businesses and commercial institutions, and

Public agencies and private non-profit and limited-dividend corporations for the construction of low and moderate income housing.

Like the Emergency Employment Act, this

proposal is tied to the unemployment rate, and serves as an employment measure as well as an aid to capital facility financing.

This measure was introduced last summer. Its chances are not considered good.

Yet, this program remains a possibility because of its distinguished co-sponsors, Senator John Sparkman, chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and Representative Wright Patman, chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

Another proposal for alleviating the effects of national cyclical movements in the economy has been put forth by Joseph Pechman of the Brookings Institution. This program would add to the Federal grant system a cyclical grant for general operating purposes which would be activated when the national unemployment rate exceeds 4 percent for three months in a row.

If this supplement were set at $2.5 billion for every percentage point in excess of a national unemployment rate above 4 percent, it would amount to a total of $5 billion under the current unemployment rate of 6 percent.

There are three grounds on which such a program could be justified. First, the Federal Government is responsible for maintaining stable growth. Failure to do this should not increase the burdens on State and local governments.

Secondly, the essential expenditures of State and local governments should not be dependent upon fluctuations in business activity.

Finally, such a supplement to the Federal grant system would be an excellent countercyclical device, allowing State and local governments to plan their expenditures on the basis of revenues at full employment, regardless of the actual flow of receipts.

Unfortunately, at this time, the chances of adoption for this plan are dim.

Of course, the Federal government must, as a first priority, restore and then maintain full employment, full production, and optimum economic growth. That in itself would do a great deal to move us toward the solution of other economic and social problems in our cities.

I have been asked: What if the Federal Reserve Bank's predictions come true?

Will Uncle Sam bail us out with $500 million in 1975, should that figure be the deficit?

First, I think figures such as that are very "iffy" and do not reflect the present determination of the new city administration to prevent such a disaster.

Secondly, the U.S. could do it. Considering the kind of money we spend on trips to the moon and space shuttles, Lockheed and Penn Central loans, C–5A's, etc., and, although $500 million dollars adds up to the salary of all Congressmen and Senators for 22 years, this sized expenditure does not shock us anymore.

Thirdly, I do not believe things will get that bad before help comes.

Our mechanism of government in Washington is sometimes creaky, but I have been there long enough to know it responds to emergencies.

A particularly crucial element in any program to save our cities is the desperate need to improve city schools.

Until these schools become institutions to be proud of, rather than to flee from, the cycle of blight, abandonment, and decline will continue to run in our central cities—a cycle that threatens the very fabric of our society.

Local resources are simply not adequate to meet the need. It is imperative that the Federal government take action.

As I said when I co-sponsored the Quality School Assistance Act of 1972, "The young minds that will make America greater in the years ahead are, at the same time, our finest resource and surest defense. Let us insure by our commitment and action in this body that the best a great nation possesses is assured to our young."

The Federal government currently provides 7 percent of the nation's expenditure for education. The Federal role has been essentially a supplementary one, attempting to plug holes in the fiscal structure of our educational system.

Despite Federal aid, however, the system is creaking, malnourished and unable to maintain on-going programs. This critical situation, plus recent court decisions in several states regarding the current system of financing education, has given impetus to a search for new Federal approaches to the problem.

One approach is embodied in the Quality School Assistance Act. This proposal would provide a greatly expanded form of general, non-earmarked aid to local educatioanl agencies, with special provisions for those districts with large concentrations of students from low-income families.

It includes funds for construction and extends the impact-aid program. Philadelphia would gain almost $90 million in the first year of this program's operation if there are no changes in the original plan.

Because the funds are not earmarked, this program will help to alleviate the problems of educators who claim Federal aid is helping them to meet special needs, but it does little to help them keep the basic enterprise running. They want general, unrestricted operating funds.

The formula takes into account the special needs of low-income children. Therefore the proposal ensures that the areas of greatest need will receive the greatest assistance.

This bill is too new in the hopper to evaluate its chances. We cannot be optimistic in view of the amount of money involved.

Right now, there is growing support in Washington for the idea of Federal assistance for basic operating programs in the local schools.

This favorable climate will probably be strengthened by the report of the President's Commission on School Finance which will be released in the next few weeks.

The Commission is expected to recommend a major overhaul in the nation's educational finance methods. This will include a State-directed tax effort equalization program and more Federal assistance to be given in the form of general, non-earmarked funds with special emphasis given to the needs of urban schools.

Unfortunately, I have come to take a dim view of Commission reports. After submission, they tend to gather dust unless they agree with the prior views of the Administration.

A second approach to greater Federal participation in education is to provide incentives to the States to assume the whole cost of financing public elementary and secondary education as a State function, and gradually relieve the local government of this burden.

This method has been recommended by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and the National Educational Finance Project, and is incorporated in a bill introduced by Representative John Dow of New York.

As the state increases its support, under this approach, the burden borne by the local property tax—which has now reached unmanageable levels in many districts—would be correspondingly reduced.

The States might meet the additional costs of such a program by a State-wide property tax and/or greater reliance on sales and income taxes.

The Federal government can assist the States in these efforts by adjusting Federal services and taxes to reflect the increase in State taxes.

For example, it could increase Federal income tax deductions or credits for taxes paid to the States.

Reports I have received in Washington, however, indicate no great hopes for this idea.

There is substantial feeling in the House that the present patchwork of Federal aid to local education must be converted into an across-the-board system of helping the nation's schools.

The purpose is to raise the present level of Federal spending for education from 7 percent of the total expenditures to 33 and one-third percent.

The increase in spending would be accompanied by a change in policy from funding specialized programs to authorizations for general operating funds.

It is doubtful that any such significant changes will materialize this year, but Chairman Carl Perkins and other key leaders are determined to bring a general aid bill to the floor sometime this session.

The need for Federal assistance to local governments for programs other than education has been widely documented.

There is growing sentiment in Washington for the idea that the Federal Government must commit itself to a new approach to urban problems, based on a total city strategy rather than piecemeal programs that apply band-aids to one neighborhood or service while others are collapsing.

This strategy would entail some form of Federal funding which would provide for equal services to all citizens and would retain some elements of local control.

It seeks to reconcile the need for applying National resources to local needs, while retaining the traditional concept of local determination as the best way to solve local problems.

The basic case for general Federal aid, as stated by Professor George Break, at Berkeley, rests on the "Proposition that State and local governments are presently unable, for reasons beyond their control, to provide the level of local and regional public service benefits that their residents really would like to purchase, or that today's societies regard as an absolute minimum."

Because I support the basic idea of general aid for local governments, I have co-sponsored several measures which take varying approaches to the solution of the problem.

Perhaps the most significant of the proposals is the Intergovernmental Fiscal Coordination Act, H.R. 11950, introduced by Wilbur Mills, the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

This bill has three basic elements:

Direct payments to county and local governments, amounting to $3.5 billion a year for five years.

Direct payments to State governments, in the form of incentive payments geared to the level of State individual income taxes, amounting to $1.8 billion a year for five years, and

Optional Federal collection of State income taxes.

We expect to come to the floor of the House in March with the bill.

In its present form this legislation would provide $36 million to Philadelphia in automatic pass-through funds. It is possible that as we try to improve the aid formula, based on municipal overburden, we may do better.

These funds, which could not be used for education or welfare costs, are restricted to expenditures for public safety, health services, environmental protection, public transportation, youth recreation and fiscal administration. These funds could also be used for the capital cost of providing public works facilities.

Another approach to aiding State and local governments is embodied in legislation introduced by Representative Henry Reuss of Wisconsin, which I am also co-sponsoring. This bill would link Federal financial aid to

State and local government reform efforts by giving incentives to the States to reform their own and their local governments.

In order to qualify for shared revenues in the second and subsequent years of a revenue sharing program, the Governor of a State must come forward with a modernization plan for his State and local governments.

States that do not have an income tax are given an incentive to adopt such a tax. This legislation is designed to support moves in the direction of modernized, fiscally equitable, and humanized local government.

In addition to general aid proposals, other attempts are underway to restructure Federal aid to cities so that local officials will be able to develop a total approach to the problems of their communities.

Both the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs and the House Subcommittee on Housing are scheduled to work this month on major bills aimed at revising central city renewal and metropolitan development programs.

Essentially, these proposals would consolidate existing fragmented programs for community renewal and development into a single package, cutting down on the red tape and delays that result from the current multi-program approach.

Both the House and Senate Bills would authorize three-year funding for the programs, subject to annual review for performance and modification of funding commitments of local programs. It is expected that legislation along these lines will be enacted in this session.

Finally, there is interest in alleviating State and local financial burdens by having the Federal Government assume the full costs of welfare and medicaid.

You will recall that Representative Mills' Federal aid proposal would prohibit use of funds provided under that program for welfare costs.

The Mills' proposal has this provision because H.R. 1, which has passed the House, provides for Federal assumption of welfare costs. Hearings on H.R. 1 are underway in the Senate Finance Committee.

Yesterday in Washington we learned that an agreement for welfare reform had been worked out between top Nixon Administration officials and Senator Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut, whereby there will be a major pilot project before welfare reform goes into effect, possibly on January 1, 1974.

Incidentally, an amendment to H.R. 1, pending in the Finance Committee, would provide immediate fiscal relief to the States in the form of $2 billion in emergency payments in the next two years.

Numerous proposals for reforming the nation's system of financing health care are under consideration in the Congess. These bills range from variations of continued reliance on private health insurance to a comprehensive government-supported health care program.

Essentially, health finance reform involving greater Federal participation would relieve the States of the expenses involved in participation in medicaid and other programs, thereby releasing the money for other areas. The House Ways and Means Committee is scheduled to begin hearings on this question in the spring.

Realistically, we shall not legislate in this area this year, except perhaps in the direction of alleviating our citizens of the enormous expense of catastrophic illnesses.

I have tried to give you an assessment of the current thinking in Washington regarding financial relief for local governments. I think we can safely say there is growing support for the idea that cities and their schools must have greater access to Federal funds for maintaining and enriching their services.

We see support for the idea that the Federal Government must recognize the impact of national economic conditions on State and local pocketbooks.

We see support for the development of a coordinated, long-range approach to providing Federal aid.

Whether, in view of the current Federal budget, any immediate relief is in sight I cannot say, except for the very high probability of passage of the Mills' bill.

The big-city mayors, in their review of the President's 1973 budget, asserted that it would reduce major urban programs by $765 million in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1972.

Mayor Henry W. Maier, of Milwaukee, noted "We're gearing up for a space shuttle by adding $250 million to the earth orbital program, while we are cutting back substantally on funds for low-income housing."

I cannot end my remarks without urging you to be in touch with us more.

There are some 100 Congressmen from the large cities, 240 from metropolitan areas. If you help us and make us do our job better, we will improve the prospects for our cities in the legislative area.

In any event, increased Federal aid will not do much good if we do not work for a better end product here.

We must spend productively. What good are our schools if the kids getting out can't read?

Our cities deserve a better fate than a cutback in services. I agree with Arthur Naftalin, former mayor of Minneapolis, that "The most urgent need today is for a definition of priorities, of what this nation ought to be doing. That definition cannot emerge from 50 states and countless localities.

"It is a study in illogic to devolve responsibility for making national policy upon units of government incapable of doing that. To follow that approach would be to run away from responsibility."

I believe that the Federal government must, in the near future will, accept that responsibility.

There has been a great deal of speculation about conditions in our great cities and that perhaps they are worn out.

These comments are usually made by suburbanites on their way home to their crab grass and martinis.

But, I prefer to go along with the opinion of Simon John McPherson, a Presbyterian minister, who said:

"The city has always been the decisive battleground of civilization . . . It intensifies all the natural tendencies of man.

"From its fomented energies, as well as from its greater weight of numbers the city controls.

"Ancient civilizations rose and fell with their leading cities. In modern times, it is hardly too much to say, as goes the city so goes the world."

Thank you.

---

## Financial Plight of Philadelphia and Its School District

(Remarks delivered on February 5, 1972 by Michael von Moschzisker, executive secretary of the Committee of Seventy, Room 910, 1420 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa., summarizing the assembly, sponsored by the Committee of Seventy)

I brought the idea of this Assembly before what I think to be one of the most remarkable groups that Philadelphia has had in my adult lifetime—the Board of the Committee of Seventy—and the Board and successive Chairmen have pushed it hard.

If I may be forgiven a word of personal appreciation, it is wonderful to see you men and women here, men and women who have done their homework. I am going to mention United States Senator Hugh M. Scott. He would have been with us except that he is a trustee of the University of Virginia, and the Trustees are meeting just while we're here—the same two days. That's a direct responsibility that Senator Scott has had for some years and only it kept him from being here. Fortunately, you have already had his special message to this Assembly.

We've learned much. It has interested me to learn that the term "good old days" is a reference to the administration of Bernard G. Samuel. We first heard from David Eastburn, President of the Philadelphia Federal Reserve Bank, who called for an action program. Later this Assembly adopted Mr. I. M. Scott's Resolution. Not a substitute for action, not designed to lull us into non-accomplishment, the Scott Resolution gives us a means, if you choose to use it, to go on to further action and accomplishment. Mr. Eastburn requested that his call for action be responded to at once. I believe that the men and women here have done their best so far. We next heard from Mr. Epps of the Federal Reserve Bank. He showed us wonderful charts on the wall that I am now facing. That is to say the purple and blue bars showing income were wonderful; the orange bars, showing expenses, are another matter altogether.

Mr. Epps spoke of the impact upon the Philadelphia budget of increased services and of inflation. Wages in the public sector in Philadelphia, he noted, have grown more rapidly than in the private sector, and more rapidly than in the public sector in other cities. He spoke in terms of a possible operating budget deficit for city and school district combined of more than $800 million by July, 1974—not correcting the March, 1971 Federal Reserve Bank Report, but simply noting the evidence brought forward, as more water has flower under the bridge.

Mrs. Anita Summers then spoke about what might be done. Power flows to the political unit that can best raise money, Mrs. Summers noted. She reminded us that there are short run problems that perhaps can be responded to with band-aids, but there are long run problems too—and by analogy to physical health you might say that they can be responded to better by adequate, nourishing, balance fiscal fare. Overburdened expenses are different than the problem raised by disappointing revenues, Mrs. Summers noted, and I believe that she communicated to us little hope that we succeed in curtailing our expenditures. She reminded us of inadequacies in the real estate assessment system. She reminded us that the real estate tax relief is regressive, and with that the shade of our late host, Mr. Greenfield, appeared in the corner. The communities surrounding Philadelphia are served by Philadelphia, Mrs. Summers noted, and she admonished us to consider how the people of these communities might pay a more proper share of the cost of the services they are able to receive from Philadelphia. She spoke too of the possibility of increased efficiency through modern electronic techniques, such as those used by the New York Fire Department to spot the areas where fires are apt to occur at certain hours. She mentioned revenue sharing, with strings, without strings—so-called tied and untied revenue sharing. She reminded us of the threat to our federal system that may be implicit in revenue sharing. I did not understand her to mean, and I don't mean to imply, that we should back off from revenue sharing because it might be a threat to our traditional federal system. Echoing Mr. Eastburn, Mrs. Summers enunciated a plea that this group's responsibility not be discharged at 4:30 p.m. today—which is approximately the time it will not be discharged. I believe.

Congressman Eilberg then addressed us. He too spoke of ongoing responsibility on our part. He expressed it in terms of responsibility to communicate with the members of legislative bodies, letting them know our needs and our wishes. Mr. Eilberg also spoke of the bill introduced by Representative Mills for the revenue sharing. He spoke of the value

added tax, and in effect said that he regarded it as a glorified sales tax, regressive in nature. Most interestingly, Congressman Eilberg predicted, at least twice I believe, that Mr. Moak, when he appeared this morning would in important respects contradict the Federal Reserve Bank Report. Almost everybody in this room heard Mr. Moak, the city's Finance Director, and can judge whether or not his remarks impaired the validity of what was said by the Federal Reserve Bank.

Mr. Moak came before us this morning. We learned many things. I learned that the eighteen month budget I've criticized Mayor Tate for so many times was, according to Mr. Moak, modeled on an eighteen-month budget device that Mr. Dilworth put through as school board president.

Mr. Moak acknowledged that he was speaking in terms of gloom and doom. He too spoke of the expansion of government activities and expenditures. He observed that they challenge our capacity to govern ourselves, that is to say our capacity to sustain our constitutional republic, our representative democracy. He spoke of the impact of loss of jobs in a city that's largely dependent upon the wage tax. He spoke of what he termed—and who am I to contradict him?—undue generosity to city employees, most notably with regard to pensions, as well as other misdesignated fringe benefits. He told us that on July 3, 1972, not only can we look forward to a holiday the next day, but also we may read that a loan has to be negotiated by the city in the amount of $40 million to meet debt service obligations. Mr. Moak spoke of an $83 million city deficit by July, 1973, even before you throw in the coming wage raises under the contracts to be negotiated. Meanwhile, he noted, our tax rates have accelerated more substantially than those of other cities, although other cities are in a jam similar to Philadelphia's. Mr. Moak mentioned plans to improve the tax climate of the business community—not as something to be done for business, but for us all, because it will mean more jobs and fewer jobs lost. He noted a tendency to rely less upon our municipality as a source of financing, and of course a tendency to look more to Washington and Harrisburg—and to the latter city particularly for the expenses of our courts and our prisons and for care of our dependent children. He mentioned the Act of 1968 which provides for binding arbitration for wage and fringe benefit negotiations for fire fighters and policemen, a remarkable piece of legislation incidentally because it takes away from City Council and places in the hands of arbitrators the power to fix a large part of our city budget. Perhaps it would be unconstitutional, but while we all slept lobbyists for the fire fighters' and policemen's unions included in the new Constitution of Pennsylvania a provision authorizing the Act of 1968. So it's hard now to argue that it's unconstitutional, although there is some suggestion that a sort of daring, original-minded attack on the constitutionality of those provisions under the Federal Constitution might possibly be launched. Mr. Moak spoke of the city's operating budget as one that will embrace $573 million to which you have to add not only the pay raises that will be negotiated but the expenses of new judges and their retinues as well. And he spoke of an annual $343 million operating budget for our schools.

At lunch we were honored to hear from the Chairman of the City Planning Commission, Bernard G. Meltzer. He spoke of crisis because of an imbalance in our concept of planning, mentioning the three legs of a metaphorical stool: first, human resources; second, the environmental factor; and third the economic feasibility of plans. Mr. Meltzer explained that planners helped to create the imbalanced situation in Philadelphia, saying that before World War I, our planners heeded only the concept of economic feasibility; then the focus shifted to human needs; and then to the environmental factor, at which time economic feasibility was all but ignored. He spoke of the need for alternative studies, promising that such studies will now take place. He almost told us that this means that a certain area of land is not to be used for low cost public housing as promised, but, if I heard Mr. Meltzer correctly, he stopped short of telling us that this has been decided. He assured us that there will be no more sugar pills—a prediction with which I find myself in accord after listening carefully to what was said in a recent campaign for Mayor. He noted that if we will have libraries and so forth, we must be prepared to pay for them and that there may have to be severe curtailment in the length of the first leg of his metaphorical stool, which was money spent on human needs and resources, as well as in the second leg, which involved consideration of the environment.

Many projects of negative economic feasibility will have to be delayed or shelved, the Chairman of the City Planning Commission advised us. It is no criticism of him, indeed it is wonderful that he came here and told us what's going on. All thanks to him, no criticism whatsoever, if I say that some of us in listening must have wondered if it is proposed that we return to the Dark Ages, and we wondered whether this nation cannot really afford to have a stool with three adequate legs, as I think Dr. Haakenson indicated we can.

I only have one feeling of disappointment about the conference. I tried to listen carefully, I may have missed it, but I remember no adequate discussion of whether more funds might become available for urban areas and for Philadelphia itself, if we rethink our national priorities and especially rethink the wisdom of spending as much as we do spend on what should be only an effort to retain a respectable defensive posture militarily, but which many of us think has become a great deal more than that—and some of us think unwisely so.

In the workshop reports, Mr. Burton dealt with educational needs. The workshop had become emotional, he reported. Certainly that's understandable—they had spoken of pre-school deprivation and the new generation whose needs are not being met. Of what might be done in training parents too, in regard to Get-Set, and to having more teachers per child, avoiding very delicately the controversial question of whether to have fewer children per teacher. Mr. Burton's workshop had spoken also of the necessity that skills relevant to students' environments be acquired by the youngsters. Education ought to be regarded as a capital investment, he reported—echoing, I believe, many people, including Governor Shapp. The year-round school, split-shift schools, the involvement of parents and para-professionals in schools—all these too were considered by the workshop on Educational Needs.

The workshop on Municipal Needs, for which Mr. Ruthrauff reported, had considered whether people are satisfied with services received. Once perhaps they were, but no longer! Whose needs does the new city administration propose to satisfy?—the workshop asked. The sophistication and skill of those who arbitrate for the city in labor matters were questioned in this workshop. There was general feeling that there is little chance of reducing expenses or of increased efficiency, but that the use of modern techniques to increase efficiency, as in the case of the New York Fire Department, has hot been adequately explored in Philadelphia.

Mr. Pincus reported for the workshop on Local Financial Resources. What potential is there is there to improve real estate tax assessments?—they asked. Particularly what potential is there as older structures deteriorate and are even abandoned? The workshop, I speculated, walked right up to the edge of considering Henry George's theory of land value taxation. I don't know that they reached it. They discussed the desirability of reassessing the entire city of Philadelphia. They discussed the recent court decisions from Minnesota, California, Richmond and elsewhere in regard to financing public education. For wage taxes or business taxes to increase without corresponding increases in similar taxes elsewhere in the Delaware Valley would be harmful, this workshop advises us. And they mentioned the possibility of a successful Bicentennial in Eastwick which would get me off the hook a bit. I was chairman of the Redevelopment Authority at the time we approved the Eastwick project. Perhaps I should claim that I had in mind making the Bicentennial possible.

The workshop on State Financial Resources reported in the person of Dr. Haakenson and Mrs. Lotman, at least one of whom was described as lovely. You discerned a ray of hope and good cheer entering our deliberations from Dr. Haakenson. Four points emerged. One, we should latch on to any funds we can get from any other sovereign, state or national, whether or not this endangers the traditional balance of our political entities—city, state, and national. Two, Pennsylvania needs a graduated income tax and from this the gentleman from the Constitutional Party dissented. We must have sophisticated, coordinated, original and imaginative planned budgets, this workshop concluded. And our procedures for making public decisions must be dragged screaming and kicking into the 20th century. The workshop concluded that the Assembly should reach some kind of decision as to ongoing action, which I believe is the truth. The resolution you have adopted makes this possible.

Mrs. Lotman reported that the workshop also considered the role of industry in helping make it possible for young men and women to learn vocations—not in substitution for the role of schools but supplementing the role of schools.

Mr. O'Malley, of the Federal Financial Resources workshop, reported that responsibility for the welfare program might well be totally assumed by the Federal government. The responsibility for paying for education and housing too might well be assumed in part by the Federal government, but more as to financing than by way of control. Federal resources are limited, however, and we should be warned that spending more money or getting more money does not necessarily mean achieving a great deal more in the way of desirable results. Some reservations in regard to revenue sharing were noted. Will the money become stuck in Harrisburg and not reach Philadelphia? And from the floor Mr. Gilbert noted the need to spend in such a way as to generate improvement, not just to soften the anguish of an ill community.

You have just heard the panel discussion. It is so fresh in your minds that I believe I would be delineating the obvious were I to give you a run-down on it. I noted, however, Mr. Cashel's reference to possible increased participation by consortia of businessmen in the struggle to meet our needs. And certainly we all join Mrs. Bennett in hoping that schools of education will explore alternative educational programs.

In closing, I thank you for your attention, your attendance, and your participation in this Assembly. I only wish there had been full discussion of whether sufficient increased Federal help for Philadelphia and other cities does not require that the Pentagon pull in its belt.

Thank you for permitting me to summarize this Assembly.

(The resolution adopted unanimously by those present reads as follows:)

"Resolved that there shall be formed an ongoing group to carry forward the purposes of this Assembly, and that membership in such ongoing group shall be open to all who

have participated in our proceedings yesterday and today."

## THE SITUATION IN NORTHERN IRELAND

### HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to voice my concern over the present situation in Northern Ireland. The violence and bloodshed of "Bloody Sunday" has dramatically pointed out the tragedy and horror suffered by Northern Ireland and its people. Its people suffer and its divisions grow greater and deeper daily. The consequences of imposing law and order have been disastrous and repressive. It has become quite clear that the British troops have not only failed but have added to the violence and often caused it. We can no longer tolerate this unjust situation which has brought tragedy and misery into the lives of the people of Northern Ireland.

The Catholic minority in Northern Ireland has over the years been blatantly discriminated against and is denied basic civil rights and equal justice under the law. Abuse, humiliation and frustration have been a stark reality for the Catholics of Northern Ireland. Catholic civil rights groups have agitated for redress of well-justified grievances, such as the denial of the principle of one-man-one-vote, as well as discrimination in housing and employment.

British actions and policies have been a complete failure. I strongly believe that British troops must leave Northern Ireland now, for we have seen that civilians must now protect themselves from the protectors. Civil disobedience has clearly spread rapidly and has intensified hatreds and frustrations to the brink of civil war.

A political settlement cannot be achieved while a systematic repressive military force exists and while this very force is implementing the shameful policy of internment without trial, directed almost exclusively against the Catholics and is generally harassing, intimidating, and terrorizing the Catholic population.

I firmly believe that the long standing policy of discrimination against the Catholic minority must be brought under control and that the long-run solution may be a free and united Ireland. Indeed, it would not be an easy task but it is quite evident that continuation along present lines by all parties concerned presents the greatest risk.

The tragedy of Bloody Sunday and the 13 deaths appear to symbolize the end of Northern Ireland in its present political form; almost all Catholics have withdrawn from government positions, lawyers are considering a boycott of the courts, and thousands of families have refused to pay rents and electricity bills. Clearly these conditions represent a radicalization of even the moderate elements within the Catholic community. The outraged Catholic minority which at first was but demanding equality in housing and employment has come to totally disregard the government as a viable force, and has turned to the IRA The IRA has now become the symbol of liberation. A civil rights leader aptly expressed the sentiments of the Catholic minority shortly following the funerals of the Londonderry victims when he said that faith in the system had been shattered and it would have to be replaced.

I strongly believe that we in the Congress as responsible and concerned individuals should urge the administration to take appropriate actions to place Northern Ireland on the U.N. Security Council agenda and to persuade the British Government to accept a U.N. peacekeeping force. By these actions I would hope that the result would be a country in which the people of Ireland could live in harmony, peace, dignity, and equal justice.

## THE RETIREMENT OF CHIEF MARTIN C. McDONNELL

### HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, occasionally the service of a dedicated local government employee reminds us that all the problems are not in Washington and that local government employees are as important to the Nation as is the Federal Government.

This week the city of San Mateo, Calif., is losing one of its most devoted public servants, Police Chief Martin "Marty" McDonnell, after 41 years of dedicated service. Chief McDonnell joined the police department of San Mateo in July of 1930, when the force consisted of 14 men. From that day forward, except for a brief period of service with the U.S. Navy, Martin C. McDonnell has faithfully served the residents of the city. Upon his appointment to Chief of Police in 1950, the size of the force had grown to 50, and, during his tenure, the force grew to 150 plus school crossing guards and a large reserve corps.

When the Commission on Peace Officers Standards and Training was first formulated in 1959, Chief McDonnell was appointed by Governor Brown to that commission and served as its chairman in 1960, continuing his commission until just recently.

Chief McDonnell has also served as president of the California Chapter of the National Academy Associates, the Bay Counties Peace Officers' Association, and the San Mateo County Law Enforcement Association. He is a past president of the Police Chief's Department and the League of California Cities and a past member of the State League Board of Directors. He has given of himself unselfishly for the community in his years of service, and for this commitment to the betterment of the quailty of life, I commend him. To his wife and family I give my thanks on behalf of the community for their understanding and their willingness to share their husband and father over these years for the good of the community.

Chief McDonnell has guided and developed an excellent law enforcement agency, and the effects of his commitment will remain as an indelible asset to the quality of life of San Mateo, Calif.

The San Mateo Times has rather succintly stated the view of the community on the generosity of Chief McDonnell. I include the recent statement made by this newspaper on the occasion of the announcement of the chief's retirement:

CITY SALUTES AN OUTSTANDING POLICE OFFICIAL

Often it is difficult to measure the impact a man has on his community.

This is certainly not the case, however, with a smiling Irish policeman who officially ended a remarkable 41 years of service to the people of San Mateo yesterday.

The undisputed fact that San Mateo is one of the best communities in the world in which to live derives in no small measure from the superb police services rendered over these years by Police Chief Martin McDonnell.

McDonnell comes from the old school of law enforcement but it is mellowed by an Irish twinkle and a strong sense of compassion for his fellow man. Trained by his predecessor, the late Bob O'Brien, Chief McDonnell has stamped his mark on a fine department.

There is no organized crime in San Mateo; there is a police department with genuine roots in the community.

In the days when it has become fashionable to downgrade police officers and police work it is refreshing to find scarcely a word of criticism of Chief McDonnell or his department.

He has been recognized statewide and nationally for his efforts to raise police standards. He is one of the founding directors of the State Police Officers and Standards and Training Program.

But the full measure of appreciation will come from his fellow San Mateans and Peninsulans who will join with The Times in wishing him a long and relaxed retirement.

We agree with City Manager Don Mueller that "it will be difficult to find a replacement for Marty."

## MASSACHUSETTS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES HONORS JOSEPH M. HEIRTY

### HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 12, 1972, the Massachusetts House of Representatives honored a most dedicated employee—Joseph M. Heirty, retired senior coordinator of recreation in the Boston Parks and Recreation Department of the city.

"Joe" Heirty has for many years served the youth of Boston and is a specialist in the boxing arena. By keeping his boys in sports he managed to keep many of them out of court.

I join in the resolution offered by Representative Michael F. Flaherty and

adopted by the Massachusetts House of Representatives which stated:

Whereas: On February 5, 1972, friends and neighbors of Joseph M. Heirty will join with him in celebration of his retirement as Senior Recreational Coordinator with the Boston Park Department; and

Whereas: Joseph M. Heirty served in the Boston Park Department for 45 years during which he dedicated his life to the youth and the continued improvement of the recreational facilities of the city; and

Whereas: He won the respect and admiration of all those with whom he came in contact by his sincerity of purpose and interest in all youth; therefore be it

Resolved: That the Masachusetts House of Representatitves commends Joseph M. Heirty on his dedication to public service and a job well done; and be it further

Resolved: That an engrossed copy of these resolutions be sent by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to Joseph M. Heirty.

---

## THE ANSWER TO PRISON REFORM AND CRIME CONTROL

### HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have seen the answer to the urgent problems of prison reform and of crime control.

During a recent tour of the Illinois correctional system, several members of the Judiciary Committee had an opportunity to see in close succession the hopelessness of past practices in dealing with crime and criminals, and the hope for the future.

After the sobering experience of touring the overcrowded dungeons which the older prisons in every State represent, my colleagues and I were treated to a real breath of fresh air when we visited the newest State penal institution in Illinois at Vienna.

It is a remarkable place—an exciting place, staffed by qualified and dedicated people who care about the people they are trying to help.

The first indication that this is an extraordinary prison is the physical plant itself. At first glance, it resembles a quiet suburban development—townhouse-type dwelling units on neatly maintained streets amidst grass and trees. No high walls, no bars, no locks, none of the debilitating indicia of the custodial institutions we have been building for centuries and which have been failing for centuries to do anything more than produce embittered, corrupted ex-cons who are 3-to-1 shots to become repeaters.

The residents of the Vienna Correctional Center have nothing to keep them there except their own sense of responsibility. No one does walk away, and the residents are quick to tell visitors that no one dares to jeopardize the programs and the opportunities of the other residents by breaking the rules.

The most exciting thing at Vienna is the attitudes of the residents. They have hope. They have something to look forward to, something to aspire to, thanks to the outstanding vocational and educational programs available to them. Unlike the farcical programs of prison industries in old-line institutions, the men at Vienna are being trained on modern equipment for jobs which really do exist on the outside. They are being trained as typewriter repairmen, keypunch operators, auto mechanics, and welders—not license plate makers or mattress stuffers.

The relationship between realistic vocational training and a convict's chances for making it on his own after release have been clearly demonstrated. The members of the Judiciary Committee who went to Illinois saw a small example of that fact at one of the older State institutions which provides two vocational opportunities to inmates—a machine shop and a clothing shop. The recidivism rate of inmates who work in the clothing shop is over 50 percent, a factor due at least in part to the simple fact that the garment industry has been shrinking for the last 25 years and there is simply no demand on the outside for men with these skills. Graduates of the machine shop, on the other hand, have a recidivism rate below 5 percent.

The educational and vocational programs at Vienna are so good that they are attended not only by inmates but also by people from the surrounding community who may be equally needful of the opportunities such training can provide.

The Illinois State Prison at Vienna is a model of what we ought to be doing. It is an institution that cares more about an inmate's future than about his past. Because the staff cares, because the institution offers a man a real opportunity to make it when he is released, the inmates care, too. Because they are given responsibility and are treated like men, the inmates feel and act like responsible men. The hope we saw in their faces and heard in their voices was the most positive thing society could ask as a return for the dollars and manpower invested in a corrections system.

There is no doubt in my mind that the overwhelming majority of the men who are eventually released from Vienna will make it. They will not return to that or any other penal institution, and that is what counts not only for the men themselves but for the rest of us who might otherwise be victims of crime.

There is no doubt in my mind that the overwhelming majority of people who sit decaying in most of our prisons could also make it, if given the opportunity to do their "time" at a place like Vienna.

The Illinois State Prison at Vienna is nothing less than a world way from the bastilles through which we have been pouring our money and our moral resources down the drain. It is impossible to convey in words the gap between the despair of our traditional prisons and the hope which is found and is felt at Vienna.

I would urge every citizen to heed the advice of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and to visit a prison sometime. But before you give up hope completely on reducing crime by "correcting" convicted offenders, go to Vienna.

An article in the Sunday Star recently featured Vienna as an example of the new hope in corrections. The text of that article follows:

THE MACHINE—THE FAILURE OF PRISONS

(By John Fialka)

Like some giant machine that no one knows how to turn off, America's prison system keeps building large new prisons in rural areas.

A team of experts that is completing what may be the most thorough study of modern prisons yet undertaken has visited 100 prisons in 31 states, all built in the 1960s and nearly all standard products of the machine.

"You know, we heard a lot about community-based programs. This has been the rhetoric lately. We heard a lot about small institutions, too," said William Nagel, a former prison administrator who heads the team for the American foundation, which undertook the project for the Justice Department.

"But what we have seen has been quite large, quite isolated and quite traditional."

A reporter who visited prisons across the country and talked to more than 51 wardens and prison system administrators found no one who would defend the process.

Before beginning their travels early in 1971, Nagel and his colleagues, an architect, a psychologist and a researcher, steeped themselves in the literature of corrections.

It is established dogma, they found, that new prisons should be small, with a capacity of 300 to 500 inmates. The presence of a larger number of prisoners thwarts individualized treatment and brings on an almost constant preoccupation with security.

Furthermore, according to National Crime Commission reports and nearly all other writing done on corrections in the 60s, prisons should be close to major cities, where the prisoners largely come from and where educational, medical and other necessary resources are located.

Yet most of of the team's travels have been from remote airports down country roads to places that are difficult to find, even on state maps. The capacity of the facility at the end of the road was, almost invariably, between 500 and 2,000 inmates.

"Everywhere we would go we would ask them, 'Why the hell did you put it out here?' They would always tell us it was one of two things," Nagel explained to a visitor in the foundation's Philadelphia office.

BETTER EMPLOYEES

"It was either 'The head of the (state senate) judiciary committee lives around here,' or 'You get better employes out here,'" said Nagel. "That's code for white employes."

Nagel is convinced he has discovered who runs the machine.

"Almost universally the heads of corrections are white, rural, middle-class Americans, and they like to work with white, rural, middle-class Americans . . .

"It is a self-perpetuating sort of thing. The rural high school athlete gets a degree and goes into the system. He becomes a lieutenant, captain and then goes into the central office, takes charge of recruiting and the whole thing starts over again."

This cycle, he says, makes it impossible to mount effective programs to recruit guards from urban minority groups, the groups that in many states make up a majority of prison inmates.

The goals of the white, rural, middle class often shape the program and even the architecture of new prisons, Nagel asserts.

"We have seen a lot of make-believe programs. For instance, the college degree programs. That's the kind of window dressing that looks and sounds good.

"But in this world where, God knows, we are terribly short of every kind of artisan and craftsman, they don't begin to address the problem."

CHAPELS FREQUENTLY PROMINENT

In the many slides the Nagel team has returned with, the most splendid part of a new prison depicted is often the chapel.

"Chapels burn me up. More window-dressing. They should be a multi-purpose area. Everybody seems to have an input into this stuff except the inmate," Nagel said.

According to Romaldo Giorgola, the architect who accompanied Nagel, the great majority of new prisons visited were merely refinements of models of prison buildings devised in the last half of the 19th century.

"Most architects have never built a prison in their lives. So they'll sit down with a correctional official and he'll say, "Well, we don't want to use a lot of people to guard them.'

"Then they go to the people who know most about that, the iron grillwork people."

Both Giorgola and Nagel feel that the "hardware experts," invariably called in by architects as consultants, often have the major influence on how a new prison looks and feels.

Security, because it is often seen as the sole purpose, dictates long, sterile corridors, much grill work, and cells where even the steel toilet is visible from a distance.

Nagel suspects these "new" prisons create "an almost Kafka-like lack of reference" that tends to inhibit rehabilitation by making the prisoner feel like a number.

WIRE ADDS TO THE EFFECT

Sometimes he has found wardens who are quite honest about it.

"I found one who had strung concertina wire all over the place and I asked him 'Why do you need this stuff? It makes the place look like a concentration camp.'

" 'Well,' he told me, 'that's what it is.' "

There were only a handful of new "correctional institutions," the team found, that looked like they could be places for correction. But even the best of these are in the hinterlands.

New Jersey has just opened one of them, a barless, campus-like facility in Leesburg, N.J., near Delaware Bay, about as far as possible from the state's most populated areas.

Another is the Correctional Center at Vienna, Ill., a minimum security facility for no more than 500 inmates that looks more like a new town than a prison.

Nagel and others who study prison construction say Vienna is one of the best, despite its rural setting. According to Peter B. Bensinger, director of the Illinois Department of Corrections, the facility was built in southern Illinois, near Paducah, Ky., and more than 300 miles from Chicago where most of the prisoners come from, for a familiar reason: "Vienna was Powell's hometown."

LEGENDARY STATE FIGURE

The reference was to the late Illinois Secretary of State Paul Powell, a legendary figure in state politics who amassed a fortune of $2.8 million while in office and in control of much of the state's patronage.

But Bensinger, a wealthy, 36-year-old, Yale-educated businessman, who recently took over the Illinois prison system, says the days when the Powells commanded the prison planning machinery are over, at least in Illinois.

He plans to develop four more Vienna-like facilities, each to be located near a major city. For now, his showplace is at Vienna (pronounced Vy-enna), a town of 1,325.

When the planners and archeologists of the 21st century set about to trace the peculiar evolution of the U.S. prison system, they will find it all there.

It was planned to be a work farm, in the early 1960s. In the first building constructed, there is a six-sided cement pill-box, complete with bullet-proof windows, gas-proof air vents and rotating gun ports. The pillbox was designed so one man could hold off the prisoners in the building's maximum security cells.

Pictures now hang over the gun ports. The pillbox has never been used because a change in administrations brought a change in plans for Vienna.

It was transformed into a fenceless minimum security facility, where inmates live in single, dormitory-like rooms in structures that look like townhouses.

Walking through Vienna, an outsider finds himself wondering where the real estate salesmen are, or why they haven't put up the signs for the model home.

There are still some signs of the old order. For instance, there is not one but two chapel buildings. These structures helped run the cost for Vienna up to $16 million.

According to Donald E. Hood, the assistant warden, the distinction among inmates, guards, counselors and teachers at Vienna has purposely been blurred to create a community feeling.

The guards wear green blazers and-pastel dress shirts that have only a tiny insignia pinned on the collar. They often can be found working with the prisoners, dishing out food in the dining hall serving lines or helping out in the vocational shops and in the farming operations.

CROSS SECTION OF INMATES

Since the first prisoners arrived in 1965, Vienna has seen a cross section of the system's inmates, some charged with the most violent crimes. The typical inmate is one who has obeyed the rules in one of Illinois' four large, walled prisons and is rewarded with a transfer to Vienna.

Vienna has gone as long as 2½ years without an escape. Recently, however, there have been eight successful "walkaways," and the townspeople have been talking about the need for a fence. The administartors don't want it.

"In an institution like this, your best security is good programming," said Hood, as he showed a visitor through the vocational area, which includes a typewriter repair shop, an automotive shop, and a laboratory where a course is taught in the technology of water pollution control.

Despite its philosophies and its price tag, however, Vienna is still lacking the organization it needs to become the "therapeutic community" that Warden Vernon G. Housewright envisions, with "neighborhood" inmate committees helping to run things.

"So far," he said, "about all I can say is I can't remember the last time we had a fight."

The United States may see more Viennas, not because state prison planners necessarily want to build them, but because new federal aid is likely to have a major influence over design.

In a 1970 amendment to the Safe Streets Act, the new aid was made available for states and local governments who want to remodel or rebuild their jail and prison systems.

The U.S. Senate's main prison buff, Sen. Roman Hruska, R-Neb., and a former aide, Omaha lawyer Robert J. Kutak, who drafted the legislation, earmarked the money for small, community-based facilities.

As a result, the Justice Department's Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has set up a clearinghouse where architects, working with criminologists, must approve plans before they are funded.

They are now reviewing plans for more than 300 institutions, including designs to remodel the entire prison systems of Maryland, Maine and Hawaii.

According to Fred Moyer, the 34-year-old architect who heads the clearing house, located near the campus of the University of Illinois in Urbana, those who want to build a prison or jail with a population larger than 400 or costing more than $8 million can go elsewhere.

NEW BARGAINING POSITION

For an architect, it is an unusual position. "The architect always had problems dealing with the local sheriff. If the sheriff didn't get what he wanted, he'd go find another architect," said Moyer.

He riffled through a sheaf of plans on his desk, coming up with the design for a new regional detention center.

"Look at that. Here is an example of what we're talking about. What they want is a steel tank. We'll have to press them for some modifications."

Dr. Edith E. Flynn, a criminologist who works with Moyer, agreed: "So often the local jail people have come up through the ranks and all they know is they need security, tool-proof steel.

"What we want to do is have the security, yet remove the 24-hour statement of security that you get with bars. And the design should be based on treatment rather than the least possible heat loss."

Moyer is looking into modular, prefabricated units, used for college dormitory construction, that can be adapted for prison use.

After touring many prisons, including several where he saw evidence that inmates can tear up "destruction-proof" steel plumbing fixtures when they are angry enough, he is convinced there has to be another way.

"When you make it out of steel, you are almost asking someone to try and destroy it. What we have to do is try and make things likable."

FUSSY ABOUT TRADEOFFS

Moyer is fussy. When tradeoffs are made for increased security, there must also be an effort, he believes, to develop services that will help get people out of the system, such as alcohol and drug treatment programs.

The clearinghouse may be in for a brisk business. Eighty percent of the local jails in this nation are more than 100 years old. Most of its prisons approach that vintage. Local governments are running out of money.

What will happen in the millenium when the machine that keeps building fortresses in the hinterland finally runs down!

"You know, it might seem odd, but I've thought about that," said Moyer. "A lot of those places have considerable land. They would make excellent wildlife refuges."

---

## POLITICS IS A DANGEROUS PROFESSION

---

## HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, it seems to be a pastime today, particularly among the communications media, to degrade and ridicule persons in public service, and be highly critical of those to whom they refer as politicians.

One definition of politics, which might suggest some respectibility is "the science of government."

But in defense, I am reminded of a passage from F. S. Oliver in "The Endless Adventure" as follows:

"One of the heaviest burdens of a free society is apathy toward our governmental responsibilities, and the twisted image of government officials, often created by the press."

"Politics is the most hazardous of all professions. There is not another in which a man can hope to do so much good to his fellow creatures, neither is there any in which by a mere loss of nerve he may do such widespread harm, *nor is there another in which* he may so easily lose his own soul, *nor is there another in which* a positive and strict veracity is so difficult. But danger is the in-

separable companion of honor. With all of the temptations and degradations that besit it, politics is still the noblest career that any man can choose."

## THE COLLEGEDALE'S CRUNCHY GRANOLA SUCCESS STORY

### HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I have the unusual privilege to bring attention to a unique fast-growing food product of the Third District of Tennessee, which I represent. This product, Crunchy Granola, of Collegedale, Tenn., received nationwide recognition recently in a front page article in the Wall Street Journal under the heading, "What Tastes Terrible and Doubles in Sales Every 60 Days or So?" Crunchy Granola was described as "The biggest thing to hit the cereal market since the cardboard box was invented."

It is produced in a little cereal factory in the enterprising town of Collegedale by a 28-year-old entrepreneur, John D. Goodbrad, who himself prefers Cherrios for breakfast. His employees say that they do not go for the product either, though one admitted she once had a horse that was real fond of it.

Crunchy Granola is not shot from guns; it does not snap, crackle or pop; it has not been endorsed by athletes as a breakfast food. It is concocted from rolled oats, wheat germ, sea salt, sesame seeds, coconut, brown sugar, and soy oil all mixed together.

I must admit I had never heard of Crunchy Granola before I read about it yesterday, although it has been going "great guns" for the past 2½ years less than 15 miles from my home in Chattanooga. And, after having read about this product, I have decided that while I might not want to make a steady diet of it, I am certainly going to try it.

Mr. Speaker, I insert this Wall Street Journal article on John Goodbrad's "little cereal factory" in my district at this point so my colleagues may read it for themselves.

The article follows:

WHAT TASTES TERRIBLE AND DOUBLES IN SALES EVERY 60 DAYS OR SO?—CRUNCHY GRANOLA, THAT'S WHAT, AND LAYTON GENTRY IS READY TO SELL THE FORMULA TO YOU

(By Sanford L. Jacobs)

COLLEGEDALE, TENN.—John D. Goodbrad runs a little cereal factory here that turns out something called Crunchy Granola, but he isn't overly fond of the stuff himself. "Cheerios is all right with me," he confides.

One of his employes, day-shift supervisor Melba Chastain, doesn't go for the product, either. Nor, she says, do her kids. But she recalls she once had a horse that "was real fond" of it.

Crunchy Granola is something a horse might be fond of. It's made of rolled oats, wheat germ, sea salt, sesame seeds, coconut, brown sugar and soy oil all mixed together. Even when soaked in milk, it's about as chewy as leather—and not quite as tasty.

So it's understandable why Mr. Goodbrad and Mrs. Chastain and Mrs. Chastain's kids aren't wild about Crunchy Granola. But one thing isn't understandable: Crunchy Granola is the biggest thing to hit the cereal market since the cardboard box was invented.

"Our sales have been doubling every 60 to 90 days for the past 2½ years," says the 28-year-old Mr. Goodbrad, who returned to this bucolic valley a year ago to run the business that his family started in 1964. At the moment, the family business, Sovex Inc., is running round the clock turning out 12,000 pounds of the stuff a day, and it still can't keep up with demand for the 73-cents-a-pound cereal. A second company, in Chico, Calif., turns out even more. "We're really groovin'," says Wayne Schlotthauer, who controls Chico's Lassen Foods Inc.

Crunchy Granola doesn't snap, crackle or pop. It isn't shot from guns or endorsed by tigers or champions. So why are millions of Americans gobbling it up? No one is positive, but there are several theories. For one thing, it's part of the anticommercialism movement of the young. For another, with its oats and wheat germ it's part of the health food, back-to-nature movement. For still another, some people profess to love it—though New Jersey lawyer John Celantano recommends eating it only on weekends because of its laxative effect. "It's dynamite," he says.

FABLED IN SONG

Whatever the reason, Crunchy Granola has become fabled in the underground and shows every sign of making it in the overground. Although it's still generally sold in health-food stores, some supermarkets are beginning to stock it. It has been mentioned on one of those late-night TV talk shows (Steve McQueen gave a spontaneous, effusive testimonial), and rock singer Neil Diamond has a tune called "Crunchy Granola Suite," which is on an album called "Stones." The song says:

*Let me hear that*
*Get me near that*
*Crunchy Granola suite.*
*Drop your shrink*
*And stop your drinkin'*
*Crunchy Granola's Neat.*

So Crunchy Granola, with current annual sales of about $5 million, seems to have a future. Some big food companies are looking at the two little producers, and Lassen's Mr. Schlotthauer says he's ready to sell. He wants $1 million, in stock—"income taxes would murder me in a cash deal"—and he says he has an interested food giant.

Mr. Goodbrad says he isn't interested in selling the factory here, at any price. But the giants don't believe him, he says. "They just keep coming down anyway in their little jets."

A FUTURE—AND A PAST

If Crunchy Granola has a glamorous future, it also has a glamorous past. It apparently was invented by a man named Layton Gentry, who in 1964 sold his oven and his recipe—all the ingredients listed above plus instructions to mix well, perhaps with a canoe paddle in a basement laundry tub—to John Goodbrad the elder for $3,000. Mr. Goodbrad thought he had purchased a little enterprise to help his wife idle away her spare time, but before long the Goodbrad basement was crammed with ovens, oats and odors, so they built a little factory. Recently they enlarged that little factory, and now they have a big little factory.

Meanwhile, Layton Gentry left Tennessee and headed West. About four years ago he sold the recipe again—this time to Lassen Foods, and this time for more than $15,000. The two companies didn't know they were producing the same product until they bumped into each other at a health-food convention two years ago. Neither begrudges Mr. Gentry for selling his secret twice. After all, says Lassen's Mr. Schlotthauer, "We did right on $3 million in granola last year."

Mr. Gentry, it would seem, didn't drive too good a bargain, but he apparently isn't unhappy. He's a hard man to track down, but Mrs. Gentry—they separated after the move West—says her husband has picked up some more money recently selling the formula to folks in Hawaii, Canada, Australia and Missouri.

But what of the golden opportunity missed? "Well," says Mrs. Gentry, Layton never liked things to get too big, he always said. He was in the Army 12 years. You know what that does to a man."

## VOTING ATTENDANCE REQUIREMENT FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

### HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a joint resolution which, if adopted by the Congress and ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, will amend the Constitution by requiring Members of Congress to be recorded on at least 70 percent of the rollcall votes during a session of Congress or have their office declared vacant.

The purpose of the bill is to require Members of Congress to do what they are elected by the people to do—represent their constituents by voting on legislation before Congress. My bill is really quite simple. It would merely amend the Constitution of the United States in such a way that, if a Member of Congress is not recorded on at least 70 percent of rollcall votes of the House or Senate, the office becomes vacant and the State from which he is elected is notified of the vacancy. The only absences that would not be included in computing the 70-percent voting requirement would be those when a Member of Congress is excused or necessarily prevented from being present due to illness or official business.

In my opinion, justifiable absences should not count against a Member, but it seems to me that, especially in light of the salaries received, we ought to be working and voting much more than some are doing at the present time.

What is wrong with an amendment requiring a Member of Congress to be present to do the job the voters are paying him to do? Absolutely nothing, in my opinion.

The need for this amendment is especially obvious this year—as it has been in past election years—when so many Members are running around the country campaigning instead of tending to the legislative business of the Nation. In my opinion, voters have a right to expect us to be here in Washington tending to business at least 70 percent of the time.

Contrary to what some have said about the Congress, I am not yet ready to concede that we do not have the will to police ourselves and that Congress will not live up to its responsibilities by seriously considering this much-needed amendment.

I for one intend to do all in my power to see that this amendment is adopted and ratified by the States, and I urge you to join with me in that effort.

## ANOTHER IN A LONG LINE OF "FIRSTS" FOR DR. MIDDLETON H. LAMBRIGHT, JR.

### HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Middleton H. Lambright, Jr., of Cleveland, who has engaged in pioneer ventures throughout his life, is about to embark upon another.

He has recently accepted an invitation to become assistant dean of the South Carolina Medical College, a primarily white school in Charleston. Dr. Lambright will be the first black doctor to be responsible for minority relations at the 490-student institution.

Cleveland owes Dr. Lambright a debt of gratitude, and we will miss him. Not only has he served us well as a physician, he has also channeled his prodigious energies into the field of community relations, where he has met with successes to match those attained in his professional life.

I include below a column about Dr. Lambright's many achievements. This article appeared in the January 22, 1972, edition of the Cleveland Call and Post.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in wishing Dr. Lambright success in his newest, and most challenging adventure.

TO LEAVE CLEVELAND—DR. LAMBRIGHT TO BE DEAN AT SOUTH CAROLINA MEDICAL COLLEGE

When Dr. Middleton "Middie" H. Lambright, Jr., leaves Cleveland sometime in February to assume his new duties as Assistant Dean of South Carolina Medical College at Charleston, his home city will lose not only one of its most involved citizens, but one of the finest skilled surgeons.

Son of a pioneer medical man, Dr. Middleton H. Lambright, Sr., who brought him to Cleveland from his native Kansas City in 1908 as a child, "Middie" was almost predestined to develop into a physician.

At the time of his death in 1959, the senior Lambright, at 94, was one of the oldest practicing Negro physicians in Ohio. When forced to give up active practice in association with his son, the elder Lambright diverted his energies to the development of Forest City Hospital, to widen internship and training opportunity for the increasing number of young Negro medical school graduates who were finding it difficult to enter major U.S. hospitals which then maintained quota systems in the selection of non-whites.

Young Lambright attended Glenville High School, Lincoln University in Pennsylvania, and Meharry Medical College, his father's alma mater, where he quickly proved an outstanding student. In 1964 he was named by Meharry as its alumnus of the year.

On graduation from Meharry, he became one of the earliest of a small group of black medical men admitted to internship in old City Hospital, now Metropolitan General, in Cleveland. His internship was followed by a residency at the hospital, where he ultimately went on to become president of the medical staff.

At the time of his acceptance of the South Carolina post, where he will be responsible for minority relations at the 490-student school, Dr. Lambright will become the first black physician to occupy such a post at the school that has a predominantly white enrollment, but which has embarked upon a progressive program of expanding training opportunity for blacks.

Dr. Lambright's departure is sure to leave a void in many facets of community life. His professional and civic involvements included service as a trustee of the Cleveland Welfare Federation, Cleveland Community Fund, Young Men's Christian Association and American Cancer Society. He is also a member of the Cleveland Medical Association, Greater Cleveland Growth Association and City Club.

The extra-curricular activity that obviously gave him a great deal of satisfaction was his service as Medical Director of the Cleveland Boxing and Wrestling Commission. Appointed to the body back in 1948 as medical examiner, he appeared at ringside for the first time on a fight program that was topped by an exhibition bout between the then Heavyweight Champion Joe Louis, and Cleveland's heavyweight challenger, Jimmie Bivins.

Since that time, his has been a familiar and respected ringside functionary at all Commission sanctioned bouts. Before his official appointment to the commission, he gave hours of voluntary service as a medical advisor to the Golden Gloves tournaments of that era, zealously guarding the young aspirants from possible danger.

In 1962 he was elected as the first Negro officer of the Cleveland Academy of Medicine, serving as vice president under President Dr. Henry A. Crawford, and was elevated to the presidency in 1964, becoming the second black doctor to head a county medical society in the United States.

His sister, Elizabeth, with whom he resides at 1144 East 98 St., said that her brother, despite his reluctance to leave Cleveland, had been persuaded by the challenging nature of the South Carolina position, to accept the assignment.

While his medical colleagues here were unanimous in their expression of loss, both for the profession and the Cleveland Community here, they hailed the South Carolina offer as "a progressive step" for both the college and for South Carolina, a Deep South state.

## AIR SAFETY WOULD RESULT FROM AREA NAVIGATION SYSTEMS

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the need to install area navigation equipment on larger aircraft and the need for the FAA to establish alternative airways and procedures for using this equipment are pressing.

Recognition of the great safety contribution which area navigation equipment would provide was made in a speech by John H. Reed, Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board, on January 24, 1972.

This matter deserves urgent consideration from Congress and the FAA:

SAFETY POTENTIAL INHERENT WITH RNAV

(Remarks by John H. Reed, Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board)

I appreciate the opportunity to address this audience of distinguished aviation leaders. Administrator John H. Shaffer and the Federal Aviation Administration are to be congratulated for sponsoring this meaningful conference on a subject so important as area navigation.

I would also like to compliment Mr. Allen Morrissey, of the FAA, for his excellent work in arranging this noteworthy meeting. Certainly the exchange of information among everyone assembled should serve to stimulate progress and enhance the safety of all flight operations.

As most of you know, the Safety Board is charged with the responsibility for assuring safe transportation of people and products, reviewing investigations of accidents to determine their causes, and determining preventive measures to guard against future accidents. Thus, we welcome any recommended change which will raise the level of safety and prevent accidents. We believe that area navigation represents such a change.

The use of airborne equipment which permits accurate navigation, without the need to fly directly over a specific navigation aid, is a logical step toward more efficient utilization of airspace and airports. Such area navigation capability is now economically feasible for the operators of multiengine aircraft. With the advent of this development, the FAA has promulgated procedures and programs for application of area navigation to the National Airspace System.

The Safety Board is encouraged not only by the fact that area navigation will vastly expand the usable airspace capacity, but that it will also result in an increased safety potential. Aviation forecasts generally indicate that the total number of aircraft operations will double by 1980. The number of aircraft requesting traffic control services (that is, operating under instrument flight rules), however, is expected to triple by 1980.

It is well recognized that the combined airport-airway system has already reached capacity at several major airports and a quota system for takeoffs and landings is in effect. In light of this situation, and the predicted growth of aviation, it is only reasonable that ways to expand the usable airspace must be found. Even if the additional capacity were not required, the magnitude of the midair collision potential dictates that present navigation systems and air traffic control facilities be expanded and upgraded.

With area navigation, the means is now available to restructure the airspace into multiple en route corridors between major traffic hubs, literally creating "super highways" in the skies. Through the application of the area navigation concept to the air traffic control system, congestion in a given volume of airspace can be significantly reduced—thus, the exposure to the midair collision hazard can be similarly reduced. The reduction in the number of ATC reporting fixes would effect a reduction in necessary communications, thereby eliminating much of the workolad of the air traffic controller.

Another facet of area navigation that will increase safety is the terminal approach feature. It is not difficult to see that there is an abundance of unused terminal airspace that could become a useful part of the air traffic system. Airports heretofore unusable during instrument conditions can now become satellite airports or "escape valves," if you will, to relieve the pressure and reduce conflicting traffic at some of our larger air transportation centers.

Although, thus far, I have addressed the operational aspect of area navigation, the Safety Board believes that a primary asset of this concept is its inherent potential to prevent accidents.

Through analysis of the accidents that occurred from 1968 through 1970, the Board has been able to identify 33 accidents that had the potential of being prevented had precision approach information been available to the pilots.

For example: On August 10, 1968, 35 of 37 passengers were killed when an aircraft crashed while executing a localizer-only instrument approach. The crew, while attempting to retain visual reference to the approach lights after entering a fog bank, caused the aircraft to descend below airport elevation

and strike the slope of a hill at the approach end of the runway.

A similar case involved a Convair 880 and resulted in the fatal injury of 70 passengers. Once again the crew was executing a localizer-only instrument approach, but this time, at night. This approach ended when the aircraft crashed one and a half miles short of the runway.

More recently an aircraft crashed while executing a VOR approach to an airport at night, under instrument conditions. Because of premature descent, without precision glide slope information, the aircraft crashed ten miles from the airport causing four fatalities.

The circling approach, executed during instrument weather conditions—or at night, taxes the abilities of even the most proficient pilot. Attendant to this type of approach is the potential for another accident parallel to the tragedy that occurred at Peoria, Illinois, just last year. While the Safety Board has not concluded its investigation, we do know that the aircraft had commenced a circling approach in marginal weather; we also know that 16 people died when it crashed two miles from the airport.

These four accidents, and 29 more, might have been prevented had vertical guidance—an optional feature of RNAV—been available during the approach to landing. Too often, the Safety Board's report must state: "Pilot misjudged altitude and distance, prematurely descended into the terrain," or other phrases which indicate that the probable cause of the accident was lack of precision vertical guidance.

With three dimensional area navigation equipment now available we believe that all due speed be exercised toward implementing procedures for using it. Premature descents during nonprecision approaches have haunted aviation for many years, but now the means to significantly reduce this accident cause is available. Area navigation provides the opportunity to achieve greater safety, greater flexibility of routing, and a generally improved aviation environment.

I realize, that on occasion, safety programs appear to be in direct conflict with economic practicality. Each of you must consider what equipment will return the best value for every dollar spent. Whether your decision is to install Doppler, 3-D, Decca, or another system of area navigation, the two prime considerations are safety and economics. I emphasize safety as a vital consideration.

The Safety Board's position on area navigation was stated during our public hearing on the midair collision problem in 1969—and I repeat it now:

"We support the FAA's program to implement the required procurement, procedural and regulatory action at as early a date as possible for a full area navigation system."

I am heartened by the high interest and active participation of aviation's key leaders gation was stated during our public hearing confident we are on the threshold of a major breakthrough for area navigation.

## MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

### HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

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

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

## FREDERICKSON AWARDED SILVER BEAVER

### HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of pleasure that I learned of the honor recently conferred upon Ronald Frederickson of Plainville, which is located within my 10th Congressional District, by the Old Colony Council of the Boy Scouts of America. Mr. Frederickson, who is the Scoutmaster of Plainville's Boy Scout Troop 132, in recognition of his exemplary civic commitment and contributions to the Boy Scout movement, was awarded the Silver Beaver at the Old Colony Council's annual recognition dinner. Mr. Frederickson has earned the respect of the community for his generosity to and interest in youth, and for his willingness always to find time for the youth of Plainville. He has given a great deal, and knows the craft of scouting as do few, through the many years of his personal involvement as a youth, and now as scoutmaster. It is particularly appropriate that Mr. Frederickson received the Silver Beaver Award during this month when the silver anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America is being celebrated. I am pleased to incorporate in my remarks an article which appeared in the Attleboro Sun Chronicle on January 26 concerning Mr. Frederickson:

FREDERICKSON AWARDED SILVER BEAVER

PLAINVILLE.—Ronald Frederickson, scoutmaster of Plainville's Boy Scout Troop 132, has been awarded the Silver Beaver, the highest honor in adult scouting.

The presentation was made at the annual recognition dinner for Old Colony Council. It was held in the student union at Bridgewater State College. Of 50 names considered for the honor, Frederickson is one of six who was approved by the national headquarters of Boy Scouts of America.

PLAINVILLE CONTINGENT

There were about 50 persons from Plainville among the 600 in attendance. Representing the Plainville Lions Club, sponsoring organization for Boy Scout Troop 132, was President Donald Carter and a number of members.

Other officials, present were Selectmen Ray Felix and Robert Loew with their wives; Donald Soule, chairman of the troop committee for Troop 132; Reginald Keyes, advancement chairman for Manitoak District to which Plainville belongs; and Henry Neveux, chairman of Manitoak District.

SURPRISE HONOR

Frederickson was "tapped" for the surprise honor by Dr. Wesley Woll of Hingham, an old friend in Boy Scouting, who escorted him to the platform and was the one to place the medal around his neck. Also joining him on the platform were his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Alec Frederickson.

Active in scouting since boyhood, Frederickson has been a scout, junior staffman at Camp Child, assistant scoutmaster, scoutmaster, Explorer advisor, neighborhood commissioner, graduate of scoutmaster training, a Mafeking and Two-Bead Wood Badgemen.

Malcolm Orent, chairman of the Silver Beaver committee, spoke prior to the presentation and said in part, "Here is a scoutmaster who always takes his troop to camp each summer, who holds a great number of high adventure trips during the year. He, like other good scouters in the council, has always aided in the sustaining membership enrollment and is active in the camp development program."

He continued, "The people of Plainville are proud of you for your work with their boys over these many years and Old Colony Council is proud to award the Silver Beaver for your outstanding service to boyhood."

Also, during this month of recognition of the contribution of the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts of America, I am very gratified to note the outstanding work that is being done by Troop Leader Mrs. Joyce Bosley of the Plymouth Bay Girl Scout Council. Mrs. Bosley has devoted much time and skill to encouraging the work of Scout Troop Number 489, whose members are gaining new confidence and ability in overcoming learning disabilities. The confidence and sense of initiative gained through scouting activities are certainly an inducement to measured success in cognitive studies and Mrs. Bosley deserves enormous credit for her work in initiating such activities. It is a pleasure for me to include in my remarks at this point an article which appeared in the Attleboro Sun Chronicle for the same date, January 26, relating to Mrs. Bosley's fine work with Troop Number 489 of the Girl Scouts:

GIRL SCOUTS LEARN "SPECIAL THINGS"

ATTLEBORO.—It takes a special kind of person to work successfully with a special group of teenage girls. And Junior Girl Scout Troop No. 489 is a special kind of troop.

Each of the nine junior scouts (five from Norton and four from Attleboro) is mentally handicapped.

And this is the first and only local such troop especially developed by the Plymouth Bay Girl Scout Council at the prodding of troop leader Mrs. Joyce Bosley for scouts with their particular learning disabilities.

Mrs. Bosley, a cheerful and plump woman, works devotedly with all of these girls each Monday afternoon at All Saints Episcopal Church. The nine scouts rarely miss a meeting except for illness.

Herself the foster mother of two mentally retarded girls, Mrs. Bosley recognized the need in this area when her youngsters reached scouting age. Luckily, it wasn't too difficult to round up enough potential members to form a troop.

"Many of the girls attend the same special class in school," she explained, "so they joined as a group. And I talked to the mothers of the other girls and everybody was enthusiastic."

While she admits that it isn't always easy, she gets a real pleasure out of working with "my girls". She is assisted by Cadette Scout Alice Trembley, who attends each of their meetings besides the meetings of her own troop. Alice helps the girls in their play and work activities. And working with both scout leaders is Lisa Morrison, whose sister Carolyn is a member of the troop.

"It's difficult to work the (scouting) program into badges because of the requirements," Mrs. Bosley said, "but it's fun for them and they have to be occupied all the time."

But they have made progress with the art in the round badge. And they are working on an American Indian folklore project for International Friendship Week. And the weekend before Christmas, they went on a winter camping trip.

"They learned how to mark a trail, how to build a campfire and its different parts and did all their own cooking," Mrs. Bosley said with pride.

Despite their own mental limitations which

in turn causes a certain lack of physical coordination, the scouts in Mrs. Bosley's words "try their darndest to do" whatever is set before them. So the girls have really made the meaning of scouting work for them, giving them a real feeling of achievement as well as a feeling of belonging.

So for very special Debbie Allison who is a scout in a very special troop No. 489, being a girl scout means "I learn special things."

---

## HEROIN MAINTENANCE—SOLVING THE DRUG CRISIS OR SERVING IT?

---

**HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of publicity about the British approach to addiction—heroin maintenance. As a result, it is imperative that we dispel some of the myths about the British system of drug treatment so that the American people will open up their eyes and recognize heroin for what it is—a killer, not a drug on which a human being should be maintained.

When there is a wolf at the door, people react in all sorts of ways. Some deal with it, some run away from it, and some do nothing but worry.

Well, there is a wolf at virtually every door in America. Millions of people are obsessed by a fear that drug addiction will enter their homes. Tens of thousands already have become painfully aware of how suddenly it can strike.

We are all convinced by now that this thing isn't going to just go away. Addicts will continue to succumb to the drug that has become the single controlling force in their lives. In their desperation for money to support the habit, they will create new addicts. The suppliers will get richer and more motivated, and the heroin epidemic will penetrate deeper and deeper into American life. I think it's obvious that unless we deal effectively with it now, greater tragedy will follow.

Opinions as to how we should structure our counterattack vary considerably. Many people are attracted by the so-called "British system" of heroin maintenance because of the paucity of addiction in that country.

I believe that these people are misled by the British approach. In their anxiety for a solution, they incorrectly attribute the relatively small addiction problem in Britain to the practice of legally dispensing heroin. But the truth is that the failure of the English to control addiction since the beginning of the 1960's has them fumbling for a solution just as we are, and borrowing some of the more restrictive measures that we use.

It was the rapid spread of heroin addiction in the 1960's that first made the British aware that they even had a problem. Before that time, there had been only a handful of a addicts visible, and they were able to obtain their drugs on prescription from doctors. But suddenly the number of addicts began to soar. The figures were doubling every 18 months. The explanation for this was massive overprescribing by some doctors. For the first time a major black market was created as addicts sold off surplus supplies to a predominantly youthful clientele. So, amid great publicity the government set up a chain of treatment centers and prohibited further prescribing of heroin except by doctors specially licensed to work at the treatment centers. Since that time, sharp conflict has arisen among those who run these treatment centers.

The hardliners have tightened up considerably on their supplies of heroin and attempt to wean their patients over to methadone. Others refuse to prescribe methadone and, for the most part, consistently prescribe full measures of heroin. Addicts who are deliberately underprescribed with heroin and given methadone have not been sufficiently monitored to assure that they have successfully made the switch; they are selling their methadone prescription on the black market and using the proceeds to buy illegal, poor quality Hong Kong heroin. Authorities are worried because this practice is becoming more frequent and the black market is growing.

Many addicts are supplementing their meager heroin supplies with barbiturates. They crush the pills and inject them intravenously in a water solution. These drugs were never intended for injection and numerous Picadilly junkies can be found huddled in doorways, with needle sores the size of golf balls festering under dirty bandages.

So this is the true picture of the drug scene in England. Official statistics show that addiction has increased at a faster rate in England than here.

Our problem at home, however, dwarfs that of Great Britain both in scope and magnitude. The most striking difference between the two systems is what appears to me to be the insensitivity of the British approach. Let me ask each of you a question. If your son or daughter were an addict, would you rather have him treated in such a way as to break the habit, or would you rather have doctors continue giving him heroin?

I recently spoke to the staff of the U.S. Embassy in Madrid, Spain. I was asked by a high military officer why I did not advocate heroin maintenance. I told him, "The military has traditionally been a model of behavior for our young people. We have always attempted to protect our servicemen from the problems of society. Would you call for the free dispensing of heroin to GI addicts? When the Defense Department feels that the battle to save the lives of addicted servicemen is lost and when the Pentagon is willing to adopt heroin maintenance, then the people of my community will also give up all hope of rehabilitating addicts and will resign themselves to heroin maintenance."

Heroin maintenance is the cry of some Americans who would like to sweep the addict under the rug. It is the call of those who are afraid or unwilling to deal with the causes of addiction, the environmental and psychological conditions of our society that lead young men and women to narcotics. It is the "instant solution" of those who think that, with free heroin will come—as if from the heavens—and end to crime and violence.

I question the ethics of giving heroin to addicts. For one thing, many physicians find it is incompatible with psychotherapy. The basis of a psychotherapeutic approach is to help the addict come to grips with reality. The heroin addict cannot do this because he literally has a one-track mind. The force of addiction is so strong that he tunes everything else out of his life.

In reality, heroin maintenance would be an effective technique for keeping impoverished black and Spanish-speaking youth immobilized at a time when we should be embarking on an all-out research effort to develop an effective heroin antagonist.

We on the House Select Committee on Crime have introduced legislation to provide $50 million in Federal funds to research heroin alternatives and nonaddictive substitutes. Methadone is not the final answer, although it can be a useful tool in treating addicts. It, like heroin, is addictive. The Food and Drug Administration still has not made a satisfactory study of its dangers and long-term side effects. Methadone maintenance, like heroin maintenance, does not deal with the fundamental societal problems that foster addiction. The British heroin maintenance experiment and the American methadone maintenance experiment have shown an obvious failure to deal with the problems of unemployment, undereducation, poor housing, substandard health care, lack of self-dignity and absence of opportunity that encourage the use of drugs.

It is, thus, the human question that must be our final determining factor.

The British system is considerate of the society at large, but not of the addicts. It smacks of the old days of mental health treatment—let them continue being sick people, just do not let them bother those of us who are well. The ironic thing is that the sick people do bother the well people, as evidenced by the rapid growth of addiction in England.

In devising the scheme of our attack on drug abuse, we must keep in mind that we have a responsibility to all Americans, not just to the well members of our society. We must continue and broaden our programs to treat addicts in heroin-free facilities. We must step up our national and international law enforcement capabilities to stop the passage of heroin into our country, States, cities, and communities. We must crack down on the legitimate businessmen who reap huge profits on heroin paraphernalia. We must acquire better understanding of the many facets of the drug problem through research. And we must continue to provide adequately trained manpower to work toward the obliteration of this problem.

We are on the right track, but we are moving too slowly. To adopt heroin maintenance, however, would derail us, not speed us along the journey to our goal.

## NO FREE AMERICA WITHOUT A STRONG AMERICA

### HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD at this time the contents of a news release I am mailing to the people of northwest Texas. The release expresses my views in support of a strong national defense, and I would hope my remarks are of interest to my colleagues.

The news release follows:

"There can be no free America unless there is a strong America," Congressman Bob Price declared at a businessmen's luncheon at the Trade Winds Motel in Wichita Falls on Wednesday, February 16, 1972.

Price, who has been a vigorous advocate of a strong national defense ever since his election to Congress, criticized those who would disarm America under the guise of re-ordering national priorities. "I am especially amazed by those in Congress, including several Presidential aspirants, who ought to know better, who go around telling the people that money spent for defense is wasted," the Congressman said. "They would have us believe that spending money for defense is like shopping in a grocery store where one simply picks and chooses what he wants to buy. This is completely ridiculous—deciding whether or not we should maintain a strong national defense is like deciding if one should spend money on a life-saving surgical operation. In both cases, it is a simple question of survival, nothing less and nothing more."

Congressman Price further emphasized his firm commitment to keeping Sheppard Air Force Base in Wichita Falls and expanding the mission of the base because of its facilities and greater potential. "The record clearly shows," Price said, "that I have always supported a strong system of defense as long as I have been in Congress. If anyone suggests to you that I am against keeping Sheppard Air Force Base in Wichita Falls, he is either completly misguided or is guilty of a deliberate attempt to distort the facts."

"Because of my deep concern about our Nation's defenses," Price declared, "this past week, I have just completed a rigorous training program which led to an air-borne test flight of the sophisticated SR–71 reconnaissance aircraft. While I am not saying this to boast, I want it to be known that because of my experience as a jet fighter pilot during the Korean War and subsequent experience flying numerous other military jet aircraft, all at the invitation of the Air Force, I am presently among a very few Congressmen qualified to fly and evaluate our modern military aircraft. This experience is invaluable because I am able to judge firsthand the merits of spending billons of dollars for military aircraft, rather than having to depend solely on the opinions and comments of others. This experience further serves me as a member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee and in my assignments as a member of Manned Space Flight and International Cooperation in Science and Space Subcommittees, and Ranking Minority Member of the Space Science and Applications Subcommittee.

Congressman Price praised the SR–71 as a "fantastic aircraft capable of reaching altitudes in excess of 80,000 feet and speeds three times the speed of sound." This aircraft is the first step in a new generation of aircraft that cruise at supersonic speeds, and the mission of the SR–71 is to fly over hostile territory and to survey activities which might be detrimental to the security of the United States. "I am most impressed with this fantastic product of American ingenuity, and this airplane certainly makes an important contribution to guarding the security of the American people," he said.

Congressman Price concluded, "The President in his recent State of the Union message stated that a strong military defense is not the enemy of freedom, but rather the guardian of freedom. No one is more firmly convinced of that premise than myself, and I shall continue to make every effort to promote a sound and efficient posture in the Congress and among the people whom I represent."

## CONGRESSMAN WRIGHT CITES NEW CONCEPTS ON HIGHWAYS

### HON. JOHN M. SLACK

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from Texas, the Honorable JIM WRIGHT, spoke on the evening of January 25, 1972, to the National Limestone Institute's 27th annual convention in the Statler Hilton Hotel here in Washington.

It was one of the most dynamic and enlightening addresses I can remember, Mr. Speaker, and it was all the more remarkable because Mr. WRIGHT spoke not only without a prepared text but even without so much as a note pad.

Fortunately, officials of the National Limestone Institute made a recording of this memorable speech and a transcript is now available. In the belief that the membership would be very much interested in Mr. WRIGHT's perceptive insights into the subtle but dramatic changes now taking place in the Nation's highway program, I am inserting the text of his address in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JIM WRIGHT, OF TEXAS

I am pleased, as I know any of my colleagues here tonight would be pleased, to be here as a stand-in for John Blatnik, who receives your award this year. Sam Rayburn once said that the House of Representatives is the most critical jury in the world. He said, "You don't deceive your colleagues." Those with whom we work, day in and day out in this process of government, have an unerring capacity to discern the difference between the fellow who speaks just for home consumption or just for the newspapers and the one who is a serious legislator. And I believe that anyone here tonight would join in saying that if we wanted someone to epitomize the Congress, if we wanted someone to whom you could look and say, "there's a Congressman"—and by whose demeanor you might judge the rest of us—we'd want it to be John Blatnik. He has courage and character, intelligence and integrity.

I can remember very vividly 16 years ago when many politicians were avoiding the unglamorous subject of dirty water—before ecology became a popular fad. It was John Blatnik and his vision that set us on the road to clean water and began the pilot program which has now mushroomed into one of the biggest programs in the government of the United States.

It was in that same year, 1956, that people like John, and George Fallon, and others on the Senate side, along with your leaders—Bob Koch was there—began that pioneering program known as the Interstate Highway System of the United States. Because of your interest in the highway system, I thought we might, for just a very few minutes, talk about the subtle but dramatic changes that are taking place in the highway program of the nation. It behooves us to try to understand them. They do not mean an end to the highway system. Let me assure you of that.

In a nation which values its freedom of mobility more than any other in the history of the human race, there will not be an end to the need for functional, modern, safely designed highways until the American people quit buying automobiles, and I don't see that happening. Yet, I think we'd be whistling past the graveyard, deceiving ourselves—those of us who are vitally interested in the continuation and maintenance of an adequate highway system in this country—did we not acknowledge that the highway program increasingly is under attack by a new breed of sociologists, ecologists and Waldensian reformers. Increasingly residents of big cities like Washington resist the location of urban expressways through the central parts of their towns. And if these expressions are essentially negative, I think they are but the outward signs of the frustration of a society over its own incapacity to come to grips with some of its own social problems.

In our Committee not long ago, for example, there appeared a delegation from Washington, protesting the location of a badly-needed urban expressway to help ease this glutted traffic that daily sends smoke and fumes surging into the atmosphere. And their argument against it was that it would be "a white man's highway through black men's bedrooms." I don't know anything that is better integrated than a highway but I don't scorn their attitude because I recognize it as an expression of frustration—frustration over social problems that haven't yet been perfectly solved. And yet, we are attempting in the Public Works Committee, under the leadership of John Blatnik, John Kluczinski, and Bill Harsha, to devise a system which will not aggravate, but which in itself can alleviate some of these very social problems that bring about the criticism of the highway system. I don't mean to imply to you that the results of our deliberations this year will satisfy all those who speak in such invidious rhetoric but with such little logic, about our paving over the whole country with concrete. Let's think about it this way: since the highway system of the United States is perhaps the most prominent symbol of our national affluence—the most obvious emblem of the freedom and mobility of our people—it's only natural that it would come under attack by those intent upon minimizing our successes and maximizing every failure of our society.

But let's recognize also that in every age, a nation's public works must become an expression of the inner drives and inner motivations of the people of that particular time. This has been true ever since the Town of Babel. The Great Wall by which China isolated itself and held itself back from progress for many centuries, was an expression of a national fear of outside influences. The aqueducts, Colosseum, and all those pragmatic remains of Roman greatness, were an expression of their culture. And just so the Interstate Highway System, launched as it was in 1956 following a great war, spoke more eloquently than any other single expression of the time of the preoccupations, the desires, the ambitions, the dreams of the American people. It became an expression of our obsession with bigness and with numbers and with numerical greatness. It became an expression of our thirst, our drive, for economic development. And it has been true to those mandates.

When the Interstate Highway was begun those sixteen years ago, our gross national

product was only some $350 billion. And today, after only the twinkling of an eyelid in the view of history, our GNP stands at better than a trillion dollars. The total cost may come to something like $78 billion for the construction of this system of arterial superhighways through which flows the lifeblood of the nation's economy. But that $78 billion already has set in motion private and local investments directly identifiable along its route of better than $550 billion. The ratio is something like seven to one for the economic growth that it has directly generated. And in a country where we must create two million additional jobs in the private sector every year if we are to take up the slack caused by automation and provide jobs for those newly coming into the job market, that is truly significant.

We have discovered through the Interstate system that well-engineered roads can save lives. Measured in terms of millions of passenger miles traveled, the fatality rate on the Interstate system is only half what it is on the rest of the road and street network of America.

So nobody can say that it has been anything but a fabulous, fantastic success. It is the most extensive and most expensive public works undertaking ever attempted by any nation or any civilization in the entire history of the human race. It is only natural that so integral a part of our American life would respond to the new imperatives and the new desires of the American people. I'd like to spell out for you just four ways in which we who serve on the Public Works Committee and others in the Congress who support this program are attempting to make it a solver and an alleviator of the social ills that beset our country.

First we have launched the program known as "Relocation Assistance" to help in a very tangible way the forgotten people of the highway program—families, among them the poor, and small businesses which have been suddenly uprooted. Through this program we want to show in a humanitarian way that the government recognizes their sacrifices and fully expects to recompense them for what they are making possible for the rest of us.

The second fact of the newly emerging highway program is that provision which will preserve park lands and open spaces of this country to the maximum extent possible, and in a practical way serve the desire for ecological development and enhancement of beauty. With the country more and more being urbanized, there is a thirst, an unquenched need for vistas of inspiration. We can preserve those alongside our highways. There is a need for such park lands as we can provide and as much natural beauty as we can preserve so that the highways of America can be avenues of inspiration and serene reflection as well as avenues of transportation.

I don't mean by that we ought to delay construction of a highway for two years, as was recently done in the small Texas town of Sulphur Springs (which is surrounded, I assure you, by much open space) because someone in Washington felt that the project's environmental impact statement was inadequate or because the route took about 15 trees on the edge of a park in the middle of the city. Nobody locally objected to the project, of course, but it was delayed by almost two years anyhow. And this is manifestly ridiculous. But neither do I want to scoff at the desire and the need for open parklands and vistas of inspiration.

In my home town, a few years back, the ladies of the Garden Club became incensed over an attempt on the part of the Army Corps of Engineers to direct through Trinity and adjacent parks—which comprise the only remaining parklands in downtown Fort Worth—a floodway that would claim many of the trees. My good friend General Frank Koisch, who was then a Colonel and the District Engineer, said, "Well, for Heaven's sake, we can, of course, build it on a different route, but we want to build it there because it's cheaper and it's more sound from an engineering viewpoint." But then began to flow the petitions. Finally Frank got one signed in a beauty shop bearing the name, among others, of his own daughter. At that point I sat down and wrote him a whimsical little poem, with apologies to Joyce Kilmer. I think I said: Dear Frank,

I think that I shall never see,
A levee lovely as a tree,
Besides whose trunk the floods have passed,
And flowed into the sea at last;
I know that trees can never vote,
But let that cast no sour note;
Beloved of dogs and garden dames,
They bring petitions filled with names;
So though you bulldoze all around,
Just leave them trees stuck in the ground!

Frank had a kind spirit and a sense of humor and so he did. We've got to find a way, seriously—and we can do it within the highway program—to demonstrate that a sound economy and a sound ecology are not mutually exclusive, that conservation and commerce can advance hand-in-hand when there is a rule of reason. This is what we are attempting to do.

We are beginning a new, imaginative program of Fringe Parking by which we are trying to assist in the creation of the badly needed mass transit system in downtown urban areas. So much money is offered by the Federal government to match local contributions for parking areas to link up the highways on the outside of the city with mass transportation which can be a conduit into the central city. We think this has much promise.

Another thing we authorized in the Highway Act of 1970, which I think we must expand, is a program calling for highways for Economic Development Centers. Now that doesn't mean big towns. That means just the opposite—little towns. If there is anything in this world that we've got to do it is to recognize the imperatives of population growth—not only the "how many?" but the "where?" The most alarming population development in the United States is the trend of people to move in ever-increasing numbers to fewer and fewer places. It has been demonstrated that when mice, or even lower primates, are crowded together into smaller and smaller places, there emerges every anti-social characteristic, from aggression in some to cringing passivity and even sexual aberrations in others.

So it is observed that if our population density continues to increase, every human problem from crime to pollution to psychosomatic illness will increase by geometric progression. The problems of America are increasingly the problems of our cities. And if highways can be constructed in such a way as to encourage the dispersal of population—the decentralization of industry so as to make it possible for more people to live in many of the thousands upon thousands of smaller towns throughout America that have the space and the potential to absorb them—problems from racial polarity to mental illness can be drastically reduced.

So in all these ways the highway system endeavors to serve America, not just as a ribbon of concrete, not just as something we can build and point to with pride and say look how many miles of this stuff we have put down, but as an integral, breathing part of America's life. To the extent that those of us in Congress can do this, it must be done.

I know that many social problems remain unsolved in this country. But we are working on them. We haven't yet made a reality of the promise of equal opportunity for all. Let's admit that. But let's see how far we have come in just the last decade. Ten years ago only 36% of non-white Americans finished high school. This year it will be something like 78%—not nearly good enough but better than twice as good as it was just one short decade ago.

This year in the United States some 22% of all those of an age to finish four years of college will do so. It depends upon what vantage point you have whether you think that's good or bad, or whether you think the cup is half full or half empty. Those of you who have reached my age are at about the median in life and are likely to look back. You've got to compare a statistic with something in order for it to be meaningful. You say, "22%—Gee that's great." You compare it subconsciously with what it was when you were going to college, and only 4½% from my generation were able to finish four years of college. Today the figure is five times as good.

But let me urge you not to be surprised if your son is not impressed with that. He's not looking back to see how far we've come. He's looking ahead to see how far we've got yet to go. And lacking a comparison with which to evaluate, he compares it with the idea. He finds it woefully lacking. And his response is going to be, "Only 22%—that means 78% don't get to finish college. In a country as rich as ours we should do better." So he is right, too. I ask you not to be impatient with those who are impatient with our progress. Though it has been and continues to be the most rapid progress in the attainment of social goals that any nation in the history of humankind has ever recorded, I don't want the young to be wholly satisfied. I want them to have an appreciation of where we've come from and how far we've come, to be sure. I don't want them in their zeal for a faster trip across the ocean of our troubles—in this boat that is demonstrably the fastest ship in the fleet—to set fire to the boat, because that, of course, would be sheer folly.

But stop and reflect that if a young generation ever came to the front in America wholly satisfied, why that would be the end of progress. And so we look to them for innovation and inspiration and idealism and even impatience. To the extent that those of us in the Congress can help to work out these problems, with your understanding and your support, which we desperately need, then we shall be demonstrating anew that this is the best land and the best system of government—with all its flaws and its human imperfections—ever devised by the mind and purpose of man, and that this country of ours is, as it was in Lincoln's day—the last best hope of earth.

---

## ROGERS SPONSORS RESOLUTION ON SUDDEN INFANT DEATH SYNDROME

---

### HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining with the entire membership of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, in introducing a joint resolution concerning sudden infant death syndrome. Very little is known about the causes and prevention of sudden infant death syndrome, yet annually it results in the death of more than 10,000 children, and untold agony for parents who are left with haunting doubts and guilt for which there is no answer.

Federal efforts in SIDS research have received minimal funding from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, and as recently as 1971 only $1,800,000 was allocated for research in this area, or 2.0 percent of the Institute's research budget. When you consider the fact that three children of every 1,000 live births in the United States will die from this syndrome, and that it is the largest single killer of children between the ages of 1 month and 1 year, I think you will agree that the Federal effort has certainly been minimal.

This resolution would direct the Institute of Child Health and Human Development to intensify their research into the causes and prevention of sudden infant death syndrom, and it would direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop an education program for coroners, medical examiners, parents and prospective parents and other personnel involved with providing services to children, to acquaint them with the nature of this syndrome and the needs of families affected by it.

Sudden infant death syndrome is certainly a major health problem, and I am hopeful that implementation of the provisions of this resolution will result in a more complete understanding of the problem and improvement in our ability to deal with it effectively.

## TRIBUTE TO EDWIN G. O'CONNOR, DISTINGUISHED AND DEDICATED JUDGE

### HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, a distinquished member of the bench, from my district in Chautauqua County, Judge Edwin G. O'Connor, was recently taken by death.

Those of us in western New York, where he served so diligently for so many years in the cause of justice will sorely miss him.

Judge O'Connor evoked affection and deep respect of all who knew him. He was refreshingly forthright and had the courage to speak his beliefs with unmistakable clarity.

I was proud to call him a friend. His death is a grievous loss to all and I include in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Dunkirk, N.Y., Evening Observer, which says so well what this man's life meant.

EDWIN G. O'CONNOR

A lot of color was lost to Chautauqua County with the death of County Judge Edwin G. O'Connor. The stentorian-voiced former district attorney had been a familiar figure around the courthouse since his appointment in 1935 as an assistant DA with principal responsibility for criminal cases originating in the northern end of the county.

But he will be missed for much more than his colorful personality. It is a mark of the man that he is remembered as a friend by the attorneys he waged court battles with during a 23-year tenure as district attorney. He is remembered as a friend, too, by more than a few of the criminal defendants who stood before him for sentencing and-or admonition during his nine years on the bench Whatever the reason, long experience, insight, a better-manned probation department—perhaps a combination of all these, Judge O'Connor developed quite a remarkable skill in determining who deserved another chance. Repeaters were much less common than is considered normal among the young defendants to whom he gave a "break."

Those who were closest to Judge O'Connor, other than his family, gathered in his courtroom Monday morning for a memorial. Some words were repeated a number of times. Words like "conscientious," "mercy," "humanity," "dedication," "concern." And more often than any other, "friend."

## CORBETT-FULTON MEMORIAL AWARD

### HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the privilege of addressing the seventh annual Civil Service banquet sponsored by the American Federation of Government Employees Council of Locals in the Pittsburgh area.

I was highly honored to be the speaker for this group, for it is really they who turn the wheels of this great Government of ours and make it work. They perform an outstanding task, sometimes under criticism they do not deserve, and I believe it fitting they be given due credit and recognition for the services they render to all Americans.

A highlight of the evening's program was the presentation of the first Corbett-Fulton Memorial Award, in honor of our late colleagues, the Honorable Robert Corbett and the Honorable James G. Fulton. The award formerly was known as the Civil Service Award, but was redesignated to the dedication of two fine gentlemen who did so much to help Government employees. It is presented annually to an employee who exemplifies the highest standards of those who work for the Government and serve the public.

The winner of this first Corbett-Fulton Memorial Award was Mrs. Philomene L. Fischione of Penn Hills, Pa., a claims clerk in the Adjudication Division of the Veterans' Administration's regional office. She was presented the honor by our colleague, the Honorable H. J. HEINZ, who succeeded Mr. Corbett in the House.

Mrs. Fischione has been an employee of the Government since 1942, when she worked with the Justice Department in Washington. She was transferred to the VA in Pittsburgh the following year. Her activity with the AFGE began in 1964, and since then she has held a number of posts. In 1966, she was elected treasurer of her local, 1627. The following year she was elected financial secretary-treasurer, a post she still holds.

This exceptional woman has attended three national conventions, serving on various committees; has been a delegate to district and local caucuses; and represents her local in the Council of Locals—all on her own time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my presonal congratulations to Mrs. Fischione for her years of service on behalf of our Government. She is most deserving of the honor bestowed upon her. I would like to also extend these congratulations to Mr. Robert W. Huffman, president of the AFGE Council of Locals in the Pittsburgh area, and to his staff who assisted in the selection of the first winner of the Corbett-Fulton Memorial Award.

## FAMILY FARMS GROW

### HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, most any discussion of agricultural policy engaged in by Congress inevitably gets around to what the item under consideration will mean to the family farm. During Senate hearings on the confirmation of Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz, he was asked just what his concept of a family farm is. More recently in the House Committee on Agriculture, during consideration of rural development legislation, he was asked again to define a family farm.

A family farm, of course, is different for about every family. The February 5, 1972, issue of Prairie Farmer magazine published a story describing one type of family farm in Illinois—a very large one.

The farm featured is that of the Pat Scates family near Shawneetown, Ill. It consists of 6,500 acres and is still growing.

How does one family operate a farm that large?

Pat Scates does it with the help of his six grown sons. The farm centers its production on grain and livestock—growing last year 3,500 acres of soybeans, 1,200 acres of corn, 500 acres of wheat and maintaining a 100-head beef cow-calf operation.

Mr. Scates has been farming in southeastern Illinois for many years but the family partnership was established in 1962. The seven members of the family operate under the expanded and growing partnership. The ages of the Scates sons range from 21 to 37.

Each of the sons has individual farming specialities for which he assumes responsibility. One is in charge of maintaining equipment and farm vehicles, another manages the field operations, another is in charge of grain handling and drying, another has general management responsibilities while others are in charge of the livestock operation and sale of the grain.

While the young partners each have their speciality, they all pitch into accomplish the planting or harvesting tasks when those seasons arrive.

The elder Mr. Scates remains active in the management of the farm but readily admits that he stays busy keeping his sons supplied with their needs to keep the farm running smoothly.

The farmland is not all level but rather

a series of bottom lands and hills. It is in several tracts but none of the land is more than 15 miles from the home base of operations.

The Scates family is sold on farming as a family and look to their rapid growth in net worth since forming the partnership as a signal that none of the family members could have increased his assets as quickly by farming alone.

The Pat Scates family farm is certainly not typical of the farms in Illinois but could well be one pattern for families who want to farm together in the future as capital, land, and management needs become more critical. This family has cerainly proved that size is not a factor in whether or not a farm is a family farm.

## DAIRY FARMER NEEDS INCREASE TO 90 PERCENT OF PARITY

### HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, on or before April 1 of this year, the Secretary of Agriculture is required to announce the price support level for milk for the 1972–73 marketing year. I have urged him to set that level at the full 90 percent of parity authorized by law, or about $5.60 a hundredweight.

I believe this increase is necessary to enable dairy farmers to earn an adequate return on their investment. A modern dairy enterprise requires a large capital investment, something approaching $2,000 per cow. At present price levels, however, financial returns are low, so low, said Under Secretary of Agriculture Campbell recently, that most dairy farmers do not even recover their total investments during their occupational lifetimes.

The low returns to dairymen reflect the continual upward pressure on their production costs. Dairy farmers today must operate under severe rules and regulations relating to sanitation and quality of milk, which add to costs. The cost of most other items, such as taxes, transportation, labor, feed for cattle, equipment and supplies, has continued to increase rapidly. That is one reason why the law provides for an annual review of the price support level by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Last April the Secretary set the price support level for manufacturing milk at $4.93 a hundredweight, which represented 85 percent of parity at that time. By April, 1972, however, it is expected that because of increased costs to dairy farmers $4.93 a hundredweight will represent about 79 percent of parity. And, unless Secretary Butz takes action to raise the price support level, a continual increase in prices paid by dairy farmers will reduce the parity ratio to even lower levels.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, many of us were disturbed to read yesterday in the Dairy Industry Newsletter that:

The knowledgeable scuttlebutt in Washington is that the dairy price support increase which dairy farmers received a year ago would have to do for a 2-year period.

To the best of my knowledge, our dairy farmers were never told the increase a year ago would be for 2 years. Nor was that said, or even implied, to any of us in Congress. With all the credibility gaps in Washington, I would hope that another one has not just developed at the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who support an increase now in the support price for milk to the full 90 percent of parity do so because such an increase should at least prevent dairy farmers' income from slipping further behind the income gains achieved in most other segments of the economy. For that reason, I wrote Secretary Butz last week asking him to increase the support level to 90 percent of parity.

A copy of the letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D.C., February 11, 1972.*

Hon. EARL BUTZ,
*Secretary of Agriculture,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you are well aware, on or before April 1st you must announce the price support level for milk for the coming marketing year. I strongly recommend that support level be increased from its present level—$4.93 a hundredweight or approximately 82% of parity—to the full 90% of parity allowed under the law.

You are well aware, Mr. Secretary, that no less than most other farmers, dairy farmers are faced with a cost-price squeeze in which everything seems to go up by the end of the year but the dairymen's profits.

Nothing illustrates that cost-price squeeze better than a recognition of the fact that the support price of $4.93 a hundredweight set last April for manufacturing milk represented 85% of parity. By April, 1972, is is expected that because of increased costs to dairy farmers $4.93 a hundredweight will represent less than 80% of parity.

That kind of decline through a marketing year is not unusual. For the past several years, in fact, the support price, as a percent of parity, has dropped anywhere from 3% to 6% over the marketing year. In 1970–71, for example, the parity price dropped from the 85% of parity established on April 1st to 80% of parity at the end of the marketing year. For 1969–70, the drop was from 83% to 80%, and for 1968–69 the drop was from 89% to 83%.

In my judgment that is unfortunate and unfair. Dairy farmers lose economic ground throughout the year not because of inefficiency or through fault of their own, but simply because the price support level does not keep pace with inflation.

Mr. Secretary, an increase in the support level now to 90% of parity, or about $5.60 a hundredweight, would help to remedy this situation. In fairness to our nation's dairy farmers, I recommend that you take this action.

Sincerely,

DAVID R. OBEY,
*Member of Congress.*

## MORTON PAYS TRIBUTE TO FORMER AIDE

### HON. WILLIAM O. MILLS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. MILLS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton in a letter to newspapers in the First Congressional District of Maryland paid high tribute to Col. James L. Webster, who lost his life in an automobile accident on February 3.

I insert in the RECORD the text of Sectary Morton's letter:

The service to the country of administrative assistants and field representatives in the offices of Senators and Congressmen is little known and scarcely thought about by the public at large. The untimely loss of Jim Webster brings this thought sharply to my mind.

Jim was the first person who became professionally associated with me in my bid for public office in 1962. His contribution to the people whom I represented in the First Congressional District was significant beyond measure and, I am sure, far beyond the awareness of the public. There are others who have served in similar capacities and have given of themselves in a similar way. Jim's devotion to duty, his keen desire to help people and his integrity set him apart.

We who have been given the privilege of representing the people's will in our form of government should be eternally grateful to those who serve so unselfishly, who seek little credit, and whose only desire is to make the system work. I cannot say that I would have been able to assume the awesome responsibilities of today without the unwavering dedication of skilled professionals who have helped so much and asked for so little. Jim Webster was such a man.

I have lost a friend. The Eastern Shore has lost one of its finest citizens.

ROGERS C. B. MORTON.

## THE LOUISVILLE INTERNATIONAL JETPORT—STUDIES IN DECEPTION?

### HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 19, I pointed out the potential folly of the proposed Louisville International Jetport. I observed that, in light of the financial blunder, Dulles Airport, which the taxpayers were dragooned into underwriting outside Washington, the Louisville Jetport was a bad investment as presently conceived.

I enumerated multiple reasons why the Louisville Jetport seemed a risky venture—numerous parallels between the Dulles "white elephant" and the projected mammoth facility at Louisville. Among these were: First, accessibility: Both airports would be located about the same distance from the metropolitan areas and citizens they are supposed to serve—about 40 miles. The Louisville port would be as inconvenient as the Dulles port; second, cost: The Dulles facility was originally estimated at $40 million, but rose eventually to $120 million in expense, and is now operating at an annual deficit of $70 million. The estimates—given with all assurances—were wrong not only on cost but with regard to the rate of expansion in traffic as well. Dulles now handles only about 20 percent of the region's air traffic. The initial estimate by the Louisville and Jefferson County Air Board as to the cost of their airport project is $200 million. Third, the Dulles

Airport, which is designed to serve the extraordinary traffic needs of the Nation's Capital, and which is supposed to serve a metropolitan area over three times the population size of Louisville's, required 10,000 acres. The proposed Louisville Jetport would require—we are told—a rather astounding 35,000 acres.

There is another comparison—a very important one—which I believe should be made at this time. The Cincinnati Airport presently has an area of 3,700 acres. Officials there have come up with a master plan to meet the demands of the future for the Cincinnati area. This plan calls for the acquisition of an additional 1,500 to 2,000 acres within the next 3 years. The master plan calls for a total acreage of between 6,000 and 8,000 acres. Perhaps the most significant point is that the commercial airlines serving Cincinnati at the airport there have signed a 30-year agreement to use these facilities. This clearly indicates that they believe this master plan to be wholly adequate far into the future.

At this point let us consider the populations of the metropolitan areas in our comparison and the acreage which their "Airports of the future" either have or say they will require:

| | *1970 census* |
|---|---|
| Population: | |
| Louisville metropolitan area | 826,553 |
| Washington metropolitan area | 2,861,123 |
| Cincinnati metropolitan area | 1,384,851 |
| Jetport acreage: | |
| Louisville | 35,000 |
| Washington | 10,000 |
| Cincinnati | 6,000–8,000 |

This comparison highlights even more the seemingly incredible and outsized nature of the Louisville Air Board's plan to acquire 35,000 acres for the proposed jetport. Consider for example, that this proposed site is over one-third the size of Trimble or Carroll Counties—or over half the size of Gallatin County.

There are other serious problems associated with the proposed Louisville Jetport—I covered these aspects of the problem more fully here on January 19. The parallels with Dulles and Cincinnati suggest that the officials and planners of the Louisville facility are steering the taxpayer into an error of quite frightening dimensions.

However, we now know that another factor bears upon the construction of the Louisville International Jetport. Thanks to Mr. John M. Berry, Jr., a New Castle, Ky., lawyer, a relationship has been uncovered between the Louisville and Jefferson County Air Board and the University of Louisville Urban Studies Center which can be described alternatively is disingenuous or sinister.

Yesterday, February 16, here in the RECORD, I included the text of a speech made on this subject by Mr. Berry to the New Castle, Ky., Lions Club.

His remarks would seem to verify what I said some time ago about the proposed jetport; namely, that "grant suckers" are involved in trying to link their fortunes for a new town development with those of the air board's jetport proposals—for the purpose of perpetuating themselves through their relocation and development schemes.

Mr. Berry's remarks also point out that, though the air board has said that the "citizens are given the controlling voice in the decision," they may not mean it. For, it appears now that, far from being able to express their thoughts on the proposed project, the citizens of the jetport site may not even know what the project really is.

The facts and related experience of Dulles International Airport and the Greater Cincinnati Airport certainly suggest that the proposed Louisville International Jetport could easily be a first-class boondoggle on the demerits simply of an airport. And it must, I think, be given grave reconsideration on the basis of this fact alone.

However, the matter approaches the status of an enormous swindle of the taxpayer if we consider that it is manifestly possible and probable that the Louisville and Jefferson County Air Board is in cahoots with the urban studies center to flummox the public into paying, not only for a very questionable airport project, but for a gigantic plunge into social engineering and widespread "relocation" as well.

## FREEDOM

### HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, as we stand in this Chamber today, we are carrying on the necessary work of the government of a free people. I should repeat, and we should consider carefully, the concept of a "free people." In another country, where such freedoms as we consider basic rights are also guaranteed—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom to emmigrate, and the right to liberty and security of person—the concept of freedom has a somewhat different meaning than that to which we are accustomed.

In that country, the word "freedom" means the freedom to stay, but not the freedom to leave. In the Soviet Union, freedom means the freedom to remain silent, but not the freedom to speak. Freedom of religion does not mean freedom to worship, but rather, freedom not to worship. Freedom of the press under the rule of the Soviets is the right to print the word of the government, but not the right to print the word of God.

This matter is particularly poignant today, because the Lithuanian community of this Nation is celebrating the 54th anniversary of the brief period of enlightened independence of their homeland.

This proud and peaceful people have, from time immemorial suffered from the accident of geography, which has marked their fate through the centuries. 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. But survive they did, and in 1918, they established the Republic of Lithuania, bringing a cohesive, progressive and democratic government to the people.

Unfortunately, the progress being made by this nation under the modern system of government was not to last for long. In 1939, the Soviet troops moved into the Baltic States and annexed them to the Soviet Empire. Two years later, the Lithuanians effected a successful rebellion and reestablished their free government. Unhappily, it lasted only 6 weeks before Lithuania was overrun by the Germans, who, once again, suppressed their freedoms. After the war, Lithuania was once again ceded to the Soviets, who remain in power today.

It is important to realize, however, that the spark which has shown so brightly in the peoples of the Baltic States, remains alive—these brave people continue to fight for their freedom, from within the country and from without, as in the case of the American Lithuanian Community.

We in America, and especially in the legislative body of our Government, tend often to take our freedoms for granted, but let us, on this occasion, stop and think. Let us renew our conscious efforts to support those who have the freedom to stay, but not to leave, behind the Iron Curtain; and let us pledge ourselves to the goal of true freedom and recognition of human rights for all peoples in this world.

## THE ALASKA PIPELINE

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Alaskan oil pipeline question is one of the major projects on which an objective decision must be made weighting all sides of the issue, obviously keeping in mind the long term national interest.

An editorial in the Star-Tribune of Sunday, February 6, is, in my judgment, the type of calm, reasoned, analysis of the situation that is needed. I insert it into the RECORD as I believe it objectively deserves the attention of the Members:

HOW TO GET OIL WITHOUT DAMAGING ENVIRONMENT

Conservationists have launched a nationwide campaign to urge President Nixon to hold public hearings on the environmental impact of the proposed Alaskan oil pipeline and to defer any decision on the project for at least 60 days after it is made public to permit full public disclosure and comment.

The Alaskan pipeline project, in case anyone hasn't heard about it, is one of the most ambitious construction projects ever proposed. A four-foot-diameter pipe is proposed to be installed from the edge of the Arctic Ocean to the Gulf of Alaska, a distance of roughly 789 miles, to carry two million barrels of hot crude oil daily to tankers. The tanker ships would then transport the oil to the lower United States.

Conservation groups, at least 12 of them, are violently opposed to the entire project. They claim that the proposed pipeline will cross hundreds of miles of frozen, easily-thawed, treacherous arctic and subarctic terrain, "much of its subject to frequent earth-

quakes, much of it mountainous, much of it unstable." They fear that an earthquake might cause a break in the pipeline, disgorging hot oil into any of several hundred unspoiled rivers and streams. They also believe that thawing action of the hot pipe on the permafrost could cause the same type of disaster. And, they aren't a bit happier about the proposal to transport oil from Alaska to the lower U.S. by tanker, noting that a spill would pollute some of the most productive marine habitats in the world, threatening birds, fish and other valuable marine life.

We agree with the conservation groups that the revised impact statement, reported to fill six large volumes, should be subjected to public or Congressional hearings, but at the same time, we would like to ask the conservationists if they have any ideas about how the oil can be transported to the lower U.S. safely.

The oil is needed by this country. A large portion of the U.S. oil supply has been cut-off by the hostilities in the Middle East. Other oil reserves are being depleted and the Arctic oil may be this country's greatest resource in future years. Without oil, the country stops. Without oil, the nation is forced to engage in international actions that can prove detrimental to the entire country.

These facts cannot be overlooked in any judgment of the proposed project, but they should not be allowed to obscure the necessity for protecting our environment either. Alaska could well be our last state with an environment.

---

## UP WITH HIGHER EDUCATION: PLAN FOR ACTION

### HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, during the last few years many higher educational institutions in the United States have been the scenes of wild student disorders, featured by disruption of classes, destruction of property, intimidation of faculties, lowering of standards, and, too often, a servile acquiescence on the part of authorities. The crises that our institutions have faced were not accidental but planned, usually by small groups of professors, students, and outside revolutionaries.

Fortunately the Nation does have educators who see the problem clearly and have the combination of intelligence, courage, and experience to evaluate the situation and to formulate a plan for action against the assaults that have been made.

Among them is Dr. Donald M. Dozer, eminent professor of history at the University of California, Santa Barbara, authority on Latin America, and author of important books on foreign policy of the United States.

In an article in the autumn 1971 issue of the University Bookman, the quarterly magazine of the Educational Reviewer of Bristol, Conn., Dr. Dozer summarizes the current plight of higher education and outlines a 10-front program for the reassertion of authority and revitalization of values that have been impaired on the educational world.

I recommend it for reading by educators in positions of authority, especially those in Federal and State governments.

The article follows:

RIGHT ON—UP WITH HIGHER EDUCATION

(By Donald Marquand Dozer)

"We will take control of your world, your corporation, your university," Mark Rudd, leader of the rebellion at Columbia University, wrote to President Grayson Kirk in the spring of 1968. "There is only one thing left to say," Rudd concluded. "Up against the wall! This is a stick-up!"

Since then, Rudd's defiance of higher education has been echoed by thousands of militant students, non-students, and their faculty supporters. They have thrown colleges and universities on the defensive. They have terrorized university presidents. They have intimidated faculties and have shattered traditional curricula. They are threatening the future of higher education in America.

In the first eight months of 1969 campus disruptions caused property damage estimated at $8.9 million. According to studies made by Alexander W. Austin, research chief for the American Council on Education, 155 out of 195 campuses which his team surveyed experienced disruptive student incidents between September 1968 and February 1970. Of these, 175 incidents were directed against aspects of the college or university itself on 84 of the campuses; the remaining 260 incidents on the 71 other campuses involved protests against Vietnam, pollution, the "Chicago Seven" trial, and the like. Between January and March 1970 more than 30 cases of arson occurred on college campuses with total damage exceeding $500,000. Sather Gate in Berkeley, Morningside Park in New York City, University Hall in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and Isla Vista in Santa Barbara, California, have become bywords for rioting and mindless destruction with higher education as their targets.

Serious as the physical destruction has been, far more serious has been the damage to morale of faculty and students. "We are parents of a student at your campus," runs a letter written to a campus newspaper in California. "We were so proud when our daughter was accepted . . . at your beautiful and excellent school. We are no longer proud. We are appalled that the majority of students . . . would allow a few radicals to ruin the reputation of such a fine school." Higher education is alienated from the public. It is also undergoing a crisis of self-confidence, as faculties and administrators themselves confess their lack of faith in the values they have professed to represent.

The alienation of colleges and universities from society has been mainly self-induced and self-propelled. The cause for it is not to be found in student acts of defiance; these acts have merely exposed the hollowness of much that masks itself as higher education. Long before students began to voice their complaints about the political involvements of institutions of higher education, colleges and universities—both public and private—were mirroring the concerns and preoccupations of contemporary society. They committed themselves to the ideology of a state-structured society which would be exclusively political and salvationist. Through their willing identification with government policies they accepted political criteria as measure of their success as educational institutions, they permitted erosion of their educational integrity, and they forfeited their capacity for academic balance and real dialogue. Drawn by the magnet of political power, institutions of higher learning thus accepted the responsibility of living entirely in the "now," but they still have not moved fast enough into the "now" to satisfy the new "now" generation. As they transformed themselves into political institutions they became the spoils of political opportunists who now desire to use them for their own ends.

In the judgment of modern militants, the university—and perhaps also every other institution—that does not supply the "correct" answer to all problems of the present does not deserve to survive. If they gain control over the university, they will assuredly mould its mission to respond to the fad of the present; they will relate its program directly and exclusively to solving the "now" problems. They demand that traditional structures be reconstructed in such ways as to produce the new world and the new man of the future. To them, therefore, nothing of the past is valid or sacred. As a means of accomplishing their objectives, they are resorting to the kinds of sabotage and terrorism that disrupted universities in Spain in 1936 before Franco and in Cuba in 1959 before Castro.

The thrust of the protest movement in higher education is purportedly directed against the Establishment, by which is meant the organization that has been built and that is being maintained by the older generation. But in a broader sense it is directed against both the structure of society and the principle of form and management in society. To "hang loose" is to reject the need for order in life. The cry for the reconstitution of higher learning demands the denigration of the management function and the abolition of structure. It it succeeds it will convert the matrix of society into a spongy formless thing. To call this movement simply a counter-culture is seriously to underestimate its revolutionary potential.

The gravity of the current malaise in institutions of higher learning and of its spreading infection into high schools cannot be obscured by well-meaning efforts of school officials to excuse the symptoms as a natural result of manifest grievances which are now being called to their attention spectacularly for the first time. These officials respond with breast-beating confessions of guilt and with frantic efforts to alleviate the alleged causes of the complaints. But they are falling almost everywhere to come to grips with the real problem.

The current impasse in higher education can be partially accounted for by the breakdown in administrative authority, by the soft line which college and university authorities have chosen to follow. In 1966, the latest year for which full data are available, the current-fund expenditures of all institutions of higher education in the United States totaled $12.6 billion. In that year those institutions enrolled more than seven million students and their investment in physical plant alone amounted to the enormous sum of $35.7 billion. In the campus riots since 1966 college and university authorities have failed even to discharge their minimal responsibility of preserving public buildings and other public property.

A tragic gap has thus been disclosed between the legal responsibility of university trustees, regents, presidents, chancellors, and deans, and the degree of authority which they have chosen to exercise in coping with critical problems. Among them, retreat is the order of the day and heroism is a commodity in short supply. Higher education seems to have bred a generation of administrative poltroons who are acting out a death wish for the institutions which they head.

One such university chancellor even personally paid the bail of the militants because he "did not want to lose communication with the student body." The president of Kent State University of Ohio charged that the grand jury which acquitted the National Guard of responsibility for the shooting of four students on that campus showed "a frightening misunderstanding of the role and mission of higher education in an American society dedicated to progress." By

implication at least he thus suggested that the university's mission includes rioting, destruction of public property, and complete administrative resignation permitting even anarchy. "The methods of these militants are extreme," admitted another high university official, "but isn't it wonderful that these students are committed?" He failed to point out that the objective of their "commitment" was clearly stated in the declaration of one of the leaders of the student riots at Columbia University in early 1968, "If we don't have enough strength to destroy the nation, by God we can at least destroy Columbia."

It is the duty of administrators to administer, of faculties to teach and of students to learn. This division of authority in higher education has been allowed to go sadly awry. Through default of administrative leadership by presidents, chancellors, and deans, administrators jump through hoops at the command of student extremists and faculties meet in almost continuous handwringing sessions to the neglect of their students and of their classroom duties.

The example set by permissive university presidents and chancellors in yielding to student demands has had the effect of prostituting grading practices in their institutions and of making classroom showmanship and popularity with students the principal measure of the success of the members of teaching staffs. The deterioration of professionalism in academic life is further attested by the proliferation of courses which are offered on a mere pass-fail basis and by the system which has been introduced on the Irvine campus of the University of California allowing students to reject a certain number of their final course grades. This system, the chancellor of that campus has boasted, has had a remarkably beneficial effect upon student morale! And why not?

By and large, universities have long since ceased to dedicate themselves to the pursuit of academic excellence. In this state of academic demoralization higher education has rapidly shed its pose of intellectualism and has declined into a bathos of emotionalism, "relevance," and "democracy."

Students have long known that if they parroted back the "liberal" views of their professors in courses in the social sciences they would receive A grades, but grading practices have now become so lax that even in the so-called "hard" sciences—the physical sciences—students almost never receive failing grades and even in large introductory lower-division courses in such subjects as physics and chemistry students who rank in the lowest 10 per cent of their class are given passing grades of C.

In a course in South American Indians at the University of California, Santa Barbara, students received a final mark of A for dyeing pieces of cloth. In another course the professor, for his final examination, handed out blank sheets of paper to the members of his class, and said, "Write your names on this paper. I will put two words on the blackboard. If you answer *True* you will get a grade of A in the course. If you answer *False* you will get a grade of A minus; and those who helped me distribute papers during this quarter will receive A plusses." On this campus the grade-point average for all students has risen to a substantial B grade or 3.133 on a base of 4.0. Is it any wonder that under these conditions approximately one-fourth of the members of the entire senior class qualify for membership in Phi Beta Kappa?

At the American University in Washington, D.C. President George Williams and a majority of the faculty expressed their sympathy with the so-called National Student Strike, and the administration issued a statement recognizing "the legitimacy of the political concerns raised by the strike." This declaration was countered by one heroic member of the faculty, William F. Fuchs, who served notice on his students in a letter to the editor of a Washington newspaper that he was "staging his own demonstration—a demonstration for society, law, and order, common sense, and discipline. My protest will appear on your report cards. It will look like this—'F'." He continued, advising his students: "Your major undertaking ought to be passing your courses—not passing judgments on the President of the United States, Congress, the Supreme Court, Dow Chemical, everybody over the age of 30, and everybody under the age of 30 who doesn't agree with you."

A university is a place where a certain discipline is required. That discipline must not be made subject to "democratic" controls, to what Chancellor Samuel Gould has called the "authoritarianism of the amateur." The principle of majority rule, which is one of the essential characteristics of democracy, can have little place in a true university community. The mission of the university is a) to impart knowledge, b) to conserve knowledge, and c) to advance knowledge. The only one of these missions which is susceptible to even a modicum of student participation is the first. In the classroom situation continuous responsiveness between teacher and student is a vital necessity, but if teacher and student exchange places the rationale of education evaporates. In the current reversal of roles between teachers and learners the rich and essential disciplines of education are lost, and teachers vie with each other in efforts at influence-peddling with students.

A department of economics at one of the campuses of the University of California has responded to pressures, from both a frightened administration and threatening students, for student voting privileges at departmental meetings by announcing that once each quarter the department will schedule a general meeting of faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate majors at which students will be expected to contribute discussion, suggestions, and questions. But, the department announcement continues firmly, "Student participation will remain advisory. The Department of Economics is not a government nor is it in any way analogous to a government. Individual faculty members were not elected as representatives but were appointed by virtue of skill, training, experience, and accomplishments. . . . Therefore the Economics Faculty reserves the right to conduct its deliberations, discussions, and votes in private session."

In a true university the hierarchy of values will be preserved. In such a university, the past, the present, and the future meet; and those who have experienced the human situation meet and talk with those who have only begun to experience it. It is a place where recipies for successful living of those who think they possess them and those who think they want them can be exchanged and critically examined. Since in this context the learned and the learners do not occupy the same level of learning, a university must operate to some extent hierarchically. It must maintain within its own boundaries the principle of professional elitism which respects the leadership role of the learned on the one hand and the necessary disciplining of the learners on the other.

Constant vigilance must be exercised, however, to prevent this professional elitism from shading into professional snobbery. Like all members of institutional groups, educators tend their own herd of sacred cows. One of these, "Everyone who disagrees with us is an ignoramus," is likely to get loose and wreck the entire barn. Another one, whose name is scarcely even softly whispered, is called "The public be damned." Another is sanctimoniously called "Freedom to live in an ivory tower."

Irving Kristol has pointed out that "when an institution no longer knows what it is doing, it starts trying to do everything." The university, as its name implies, has universal interests and is dedicated to the investigation of all things under the sun. But it is not, therefore, a place for all men. It must be, above all, a place where mind meets mind, and positions in it for both teachers and taught must be reserved for the mentally fit. Those who cannot meet this elementary qualification should seek help in other places, for the university should not be thought of as a relief agency dedicated to salvaging damaged or improvident lives. When such people are brought into the university they find themselves in an uncongenial environment, they soon conclude that they are "sons of the stranger," and they strike back at the forces that placed them there. Even the best-equipped and best-intentioned institution of higher learning must fail if it attempts "to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear."

This truism has been lost sight of in the demands for the universalization of higher education to which colleges and universities have enthusiastically responded since World War II. As these institutions have become objects of mass invasion by the sons and daughters of John Q. Public, they have shown themselves incapable of providing the learned faculties needed to justify their role as citadels of higher education. In substitution they have put at the head of classrooms young instructors who were already indoctrinated in the techniques of political activism and who, unable to carry on classroom dialogues in their own learned discipline, have simply imposed their immature political opinions upon their classes. They have taken advantage of the sincere idealism of the young people under their charge and have induced them with inflammatory rhetoric and impassioned illogicalities to share their own frustrations and to serve their own destructive purposes. To them are attributable many of the depredations committed by militants on college campuses.

A professor of philosophy at Yale University urges a student audience to launch a nationwide student strike. "Go back to your communities and organize," he commands. "Make a summer of organized resistance against oppression." When professors, under the aegis of academic freedom, teach such irresponsible and subversive doctrines to young, highly impressionable people, they must expect to pay a price for their anti-social exercise of this freedom. By such utterances they reduce higher education to lower education, and they should be separated from the university community. The freedoms of education—academic freedom—must be exercised under the law.

Into the vacuum formed by the apathy of chancellors, presidents, and boards of trustees, some "liberal" professors whose teachings through the years have created the climate for student rebellion and have in some cases triggered actual acts of violence, have moved in an attempt to salvage their positions of authority over students, to ingratiate themselves with an outraged public, and to disguise themselves as honest academicians. The best that can be said for them is that, provided their own conversion is now truly sincere, they have literally been hoist with their own petard, they have been failing through the years to perceive the full implications of their own teachings, and they must be characterized now as slow learners, and, as such, too stupid to serve further as mentors of the young.

Students are not entitled to demand "relevance" from their teachers. It has been one of the glories of higher education in America that it has provided a wide range of educational opportunities from which young people could freely choose subjects most conducive to their own growth. This has been considered to be an indispensable attribute of a free society, but it is now being seriously

limited by the demand for relevance. Young people must themselves assume the responsibility of supplying the relationship, if any, between their classroom experience and their own career interests. When students demand that educators supply the relevance in their lives they are asking for more than they are entitled to ask and more than any system of formal education can give them. The late Bishop James Pike once stated that every course that he had taken in college "was relevant, including Greek grammar." The university can only say, "Here I stand embodying certain social values and equipped with certain techniques and procedures and with the facilities and the disposition to discover better ones."

Institutions of higher learning which have allowed themselves to become advocates of suicide, destruction, nihilism, and chaos, which have assumed political roles, which have transformed themselves into universal service institutions, and which have opened their doors with the proclamation "come one, come all," have overextended themselves. Under the assaults which are now being mounted against them and which they are failing to withstand, they would do well to retreat to more defensible positions. Grim as the plight of higher education is, the only hope lies in a reassertion and revitalization of values which have been the casualties of conflict and which now lie discarded in the debris. Those values are the values of civilization itself.

First, colleges and universities must set forth their institutional objectives clearly and simply and restore conditions under which freedom to learn and freedom to teach again become possible. These two freedoms define the limits of academic freedom, which is merely the right of intellectual dissent but does not include any other form of dissent.

Second, public institutions of higher learning must be dissociated from politics to the maximum extent possible within the context of public tax policies, and private institutions of higher learning must dedicate themselves once more to the pursuit of independent education of the traditional type, divorced from political and public influences.

Third, college and university facilities must not be used for activities that do not advance the purposes of higher learning.

Fourth, campuses must not be treated as sanctuaries from the law.

Fifth, the criteria for appointment, retention, and promotion of faculty members must be broadened to include not only scholarly competence and proven teaching ability but also matters of professional conduct, and faculty members who fail to meet these criteria must be dismissed.

Sixth, universities must not appoint or retain faculty persons who are members of an organization which requires its members to accept its orders in violation of the principle of free inquiry inherent in the doctrine of academic freedom.

Seventh, existing faculty imbalances must be corrected to permit consideration of all sides of controversial questions. There is always hope when people are given opportunities to listen to all sides; when they are denied such opportunities errors harden into prejudices.

Eighth, policy-making authority which has been delegated to academic senates and faculties should be converted into a mere advisory power which will be given due consideration by officials responsible for the administration of public colleges and universities.

Ninth, the principle must be maintained that students are admitted to the university at the invitation of the university and that membership in its society is a privilege, not a right. If, on the contrary, access to higher education continues to be construed as a right, then all placement tests must be abolished, and all admissions offices in colleges and universities must be closed. The young man or young woman who comes up to the university and is duly admitted to its privileges should be explicitly put on notice both orally and in writing: "You are now entering into an institution which has been established for the purpose of offering you an academic education. We shall do this to the best of our ability according to rules of discipline applicable to both faculty and students. Should anyone disagree with any part of our programs he should present his grievance to proper officials of the university for consideration. Criticisms whenever justified will be appreciated and the appropriate rectifications will be made. During the course of the year we will not permit demonstrations or clamorous dissent that tends to constrain civil liberties in any manner, and persons who act in that way will be expelled or dismissed."

Tenth, when a student submits himself to the university experience under these conditions, he and the university enter into a voluntary contractual relationship which can be ended by the failure on the part of either to abide by the terms of the contract. For this reason the university can and should require the student to deposit a bond for his good behavior and respect for its property and other physical facilities.

Compliance with these ten points is essential to enable colleges and universities once more to perform their primary task, which is to instill in young people a deep conviction of the need for critical intellectual inquiry into the human situation and a steadfast determination to cling to those values which are demonstrably true.

## RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM—TROTTERS SHOALS

### HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Fred West, editor and publisher of the Abbeville, S.C., Press and Banner, is devoted and dedicated to the progress and development of the Savannah Valley and the entire area of western South Carolina.

The following editorial by Mr. West supports the Trotters Shoals Dam, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress who authorized this great project:

RICHARD B. RUSSELL DAM—TROTTERS SHOALS

A real Christmas present for a large number of persons in Abbeville County would be an announcement from some of South Carolina's "late-blooming" ecologists to the effect that opposition to the approved construction of Trotters Shoals Dam is being dropped. Such interest would have been welcomed a few years back, when there was a slight chance the building of the dam could have been prevented. Opposition now can only be classed under the heading of harmful interference.

These late-comers on the scene are also urged to study the whole picture of the area and weigh their recommendations on a complete set of facts. Some changes have occurred within the past several years.

Let's look at a few of them! Lake Hartwell is a reality and a very real hazard to the entire area between that dam and the backwaters of Clark Hill. The nature of things is such that periodically large amounts of water must be released from Lake Hartwell. Woe to those who happen to be near the Savannah River at such times. Water rises rapidly. Human lives have been lost. Others have escaped by the skin of their teeth.

What of cattle and game that might be in the danger area? It doesn't take a conservationist to answer the question. What can be done along the river? Nothing! Hunting? Those who venture into the area gamble with their lives.

The lake planned for Trotters Shoals will be a constant level facility—a very real recreational advantage. Too, it will minimize the effect of the thousands of tons of water from Lake Hartwell. Game can establish itself in a safe area and hunting should be improved.

Only after the dam is constructed and the water impounded can the area even hope for industrial development. Surely, the area will not be suitable for certain types of industry, but it is not now because of fluctuating water level. Prior to the construction of Lake Hartwell, this was not a real problem in this particular area, for there had never been a flood. The picture changed with that construction.

The ecologists and conservationists would do well to apply themselves to additional studies and to take under serious consideration all the facts—as they exist today and not as they did several years ago.

## FRANK BOWRON OF WYOMING

### HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, last week at Casper, Wyo., the Presbytery of Wyoming of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. unanimously elected Frank L. Bowron, a 45-year-old Casper attorney, as its commissioner to the 184th general assembly of that denomination which will be held in Denver in May of 1972. Previously, the Wyoming Presbytery had, by acclamation, voted to place Mr. Bowron's name before the general assembly as a candidate for moderator, the highest position in the national church. This is the first time in history that a Wyoming man has been so honored.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of a friendship with Frank Bowron that goes back for 25 years to a time when at the age of 21 he was first elected a delegate to the State Democratic Convention where he was chosen to serve as chairman of the platform committee and became the youngest person ever elected a delegate to the Democratic National Convention from the State of Wyoming. A year later he came to Washington as an employee of the U.S. Senate under the partronage of the late Senator Lester C. Hunt, and at the age of 22 he headed the student division of the Democratic National Committee.

I feel it is worth noting, too, that a measure of Frank's ability is the fact that while serving as head of the student division and working 8 hours a day for 6 days a week in his Senate job, he also completed both prelaw and his requirements for his law degree at George Washington University in less than 4 years.

Combined with his ability to handle tremendous loads of work, he has a quality of fairness and a sense of justice

that resulted in his being selected as chairman of the platform committees of five successive Democratic State conventions, a selection made primarily because he was the one man everyone could be sure would give all a fair hearing and opportunity to present conflicting views to the convention. He headed the rules committee for a National Young Democratic Convention for the same reason. In recent years, he has been unanimously selected as parliamentarian for State conventions of the Democratic Party, an honor which is especially significant in these times of bitter differences on national and international issues.

If I tried to pin down the basic reason that Frank Bowron has moved into these positions of trust, and I have only named a few of those posts. I would say that it is because he is a man of faith: First, a faith in God, and His great capacity for love through that faith; second, and this naturally follows from the first, a faith in his fellow men and their basic goodness; and third, and perhaps most significant to the churches of the Nation at this particular time, Frank Bowron has a faith in our economic and political system and especially in the ability of our people to make changes through that system in the interests of justice.

Mr. Speaker, our late President John F. Kennedy said:

Those who would make peaceful revolution impossible make violent revolution inevitable.

During the past decade we have lived through a period of violence, of riots, picketing, and of boycotts in the name of social and economic justice. During the 1960's, it seemed to many of us that churchmen, if not church leadership, condoned such violence as necessary to accomplish change. Possibly this violence did result in some benefit, certainly it called national attention to many problems in our society; but the mood of America today has become one in which violence will surely be counterproductive, can result in even greater repression, and will defeat its own ends.

Those of us who, like Frank Bowron, are opposed to violence in accomplishing change are sometimes accused of trying to maintain the status quo. Looking at Frank's record, there can be no doubt that he has not just advocated nonviolent change, but he has accomplished nonviolent change. He has found peaceful ways to make changes in our society. He has the imagination to come up with solutions which have found acceptance without disturbances. Frank Bowron is not just a "letterhead liberal," one of those people who lend distinguished names to causes they espouse and then fail to follow up with real action, but he has been a mover, a doer, a changer, yet always within our system.

When I read of the riot at Attica in New York State, I thought of the situation in the State prison at Rawlins, Wyo. In 1964, some 5 or 6 years before the Presbyterian Church nationally became concerned with prison reform, Frank Bowron was working on a report and recommendations for the prison at Rawlins. That report was issued in 1966, and a storm broke over the capital building in Cheyenne. The Presbytery Committee on Church and Society met with the State prison board, composed of the Governor and four other State elected officials.

Six months later when the Governor appeared before the Presbytery, the first thing he said was, "I want to thank every man here for your perceptivity and tenanciousness. Your frightening report is the unvarnished truth." He then proceeded to outline the beginning of the programs for education and rehabilitation which had been put forward by Frank Bowron and his committee. Today, while we cannot claim that Wyoming's prison system is perfect, we are not afflicted by the difficulties facing many of the States in the Nation, and our rate of recidivism has dropped from the highest in the Nation to one of the lowest.

As I read of demonstrations and violence aimed at integrating public places, I am reminded of a situation at the Casper Air Terminal in the 1950's, when a restaurant at that facility refused to serve blacks. When a complaint was made to Frank Bowron, it took him exactly 2 days to accomplish the integration. He telephoned our late Senator Joseph O'Mahoney and asked him to have the Federal agencies in charge of airport funds hold up any moneys to the Casper Air Terminal until integration was ordered. The airport board took immediate action to integrate the restaurant. This was accomplished without fanfare or publicity, without pickets or riots.

When I read of young people in trouble with the law, I think back to Frank Bowron's record as municipal judge of the city of Casper. For a number of years, various groups had petitioned the city council and State legislature for a juvenile court system, all without success. After he was appointed judge, Frank put into effect, through court order, a procedure which accomplished a juvenile court system.

When the city council budgeted $200 per month for a part-time clerk for the court, he persuaded Mrs. Marion Kreiner, a retired social worker, to go to work for him as a juvenile counselor and probation officer, a post which she handled with such success that after her death several years ago the city named one of the municipal parks after her. This position is now an integral part of the city government and has aided countless young people who are in trouble.

When I read of the reforms in the political party selection of delegates to guarantee minority representation, I am reminded that Frank Bowron, as Democratic State committeeman in 1956, secured election of the first blacks who were ever elected as delegates to the Demcratic State Convention.

While Frank has been active in the Presbyterian Church for many years, I think it is probably the events of the past year and his role in them that has caused the Presbytery of Wyoming to offer his name for the highest post in the church.

A little over a year ago, Frank moved his church membership from First Presbyterian, a church located on the south side of Casper, to Winter Memorial, a multiracial mission church with a membership of 140 men, women, and children located in North Casper, an area shown by the 1975 Federal census to be the place in Wyoming with the worst housing conditions and one of the lowest income groups. The area the church serves is 50 percent nonwhite, the streets are unpaved, basic services are lacking. The greatest problem at the time was a lack of adequate drainage with resulting flood damage after heavy rains or snow.

Within 2 weeks after he joined Winter Memorial, when one of the ruling elders was transferred out of Casper, Frank was elected a ruling elder, and named by the session to a committee called "Associates in Development," as well as a representative to the Casper Strategy and Action Committee, composed of representatives of the three Presbyterian churches in the city. I think the words of one lady who attended her first meeting of the latter group can express what happened:

When I went home from the meeting, I told my husband, "I've finally met a mover."

Mr. Bowron will probably never get credit for starting this sewer project, because by the time he was through everyone there thought it was his own idea. The plan was to enlist the help of all the churches in Casper to build a storm sewer system in the center of North Casper and to go out and raise the money. The next day, Frank met with Father Brady of St. Anthony's Catholic Church and got a pledge of $1,000. The following week Winter Memorial donated $3,000, Shepherd of the Hills conducted a solicitation which collected $855, from its members, and Bethel Baptist gave $350. By this time, the city government got into the act and agreed to pay assessments for the property it owned in the area, and local residents and property owners decided to organize an assessment district to help pay for the project. The North Casper residents had previously resisted any efforts to establish an assessment district. Winter Memorial held meetings of the residents in the area and explained the project to them, and the district was organized without a single objection being filed with the city government. The funds collected for what became known as ESP, the ecumenical sewer project, were used to pay the assessments for people who showed that they could not afford to pay.

At the same time that the sewer project was getting underway, Frank proposed another project to the congregation: that they borrow funds to purchase land near the church for a playground for youngsters in the neighborhood.

Clarke Vestal, Frank's minister, perhaps expresses it better than I could:

Frank's ideas, initiative and ability to translate our goals into action have aroused hopes, but I think that the reality of the completion of the storm sewer project has done more for this area than anything else in building the self-respect and self-confidence of our people. One lady told me, "We've wanted to do this for forty years, but no one ever told us how before Mr. Bowron."

Reverend Vestal pointed out to me that perhaps the greatest indication of the morale of the people of his church has been a 10-percent increase in membership and a 25-percent increase in pledges of financial aid at a time when the national

church has experienced a membership decline. The session of the church unanimously voted to triple its contribution to the general assembly in a year when funds to the national church have been drastically curtailed.

Reverend Vestal said:

But by far the greatest indication of our improving mental health in this area was a special fund drive for Self Development of People. Our church's contribution went up 1500% over last year, more than half of it coming in on the Sunday when Frank Bowron spoke in support of the fund. In an area with an average income of less than $3,000 a year, we collected more than $500 in pennies, quarters and dollars.

Another result of ESP has been the organization of a group called the Casper Churchmen composed of laymen serving on church governing boards in the city, meeting to coordinate community projects and exchange ideas and information, a drawing together of churches in a common cause, which one minister has called "the biggest step in the ecumenical effort that has ever been made in Casper."

In 1967, a month after the voters at Casper had rejected a $400,000 library bond issue, Frank was named to the county library board. He immediately began a one-man campaign to replace the old Carnegie building erected in 1910. He dramatized the condition of the building by getting a paint manufacturer to donate white paint, and with television cameras grinding, he went to the roof and repainted the dome of the building. Two years later, as chairman of the library board, he proposed a $1,100,000 bond issue that captured the imagination of the public and he guided the campaign to pass it. This summer at Casper a magnificent new public library will be opened, complete with the Nation's first video reference service to broadcast information and education programs throughout central Wyoming.

Mr. Speaker, it would be difficult to classify Frank Bowron as a "liberal" or a "conservative." He has always supported progressive programs to help other people, but while he was a World War II veteran eligible for subsistence under the GI bill, he refused to apply for Government help, and worked his way through law school. As a Wyoming veteran, he is eligible for a veteran's exemption, but although he owns considerable property he has never made a claim for this bonus.

He has said:

I strongly feel that help must be given to those who need it, but the good Lord blessed me with health and an ability to make my own way and I have never found it necessary to seek such assistance.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of his outstanding qualifications to be moderator of the United Presbyterian Church, I recognize that Frank Bowron's chances of being elected are slender. The Wyoming Presbytery will have only two of the 850 votes at the general assembly. Frank Bowron has not served on national committees of that denomination and is not part of the "establishment" that any organization seems to develop, and highly qualified men and women closely identified with that "establishment" are also candidates for the position. I am sure, however, that the very fact of his candidacy creates a symbol of hope for the future course of our churches, and I am sure, too, that his candidacy will have an impact upon the course of the church, because all of his life Frank has been a guiding force. More than that, however, it provides a symbol to men and women of all faiths that the injustices in our society can be corrected without violence and through the orderly process of changing within our system. That is the new direction for the church and the Nation in the 1970's, and unless the church follows that direction, there is little hope for reconciliation within individual denominations and no hope for reconciliation among all of our people.

---

## BRANDT DELIVERS TO U.S.S.R.

### HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that West German Chancellor Willy Brandt, in attempting to sell his government's Ostpolitik to the German people and the rest of the free world, has claimed that his overtures to Soviet Russia were based on the wishes of the United States. I am advised that both he and Foreign Minister Walter Scheel, chairman of the Liberal Free Democratic Party, have maintained that the United States has supported exactly the same types of treaties and has followed the same type of policy which West Germany has with Communist countries. These are not the facts.

There is strong conviction in the United States that the Federal Republic of Germany has made itself a bad deal in its treaties with Moscow and Warsaw.

The alleged advantages for West Germany in these treaties consist mainly in Communist promises that traffic to West Berlin will now be guaranteed by the Soviet Union. Whether this is, in fact, an improvement remains to be seen. It may well be that reliance on a treaty—on Communist promises—will actually weaken the present situation.

The treaties have already had their bad effects. In order to put pressure on the West Germans to ratify them, the Communists have restricted the number of Germans they will allow to leave Poland, indicating to many that the Communists intend to use innocent people as pawns to gain what they want. It would be nothing new, of course.

In reaching out for these treaties with the Communists I believe Chancellor Brandt has, unwittingly or otherwise, given the Russians much of what they have wanted for years.

The Russians now have a means of extortion which they can hold over the heads of the West German Government. The Russians have increased West German economic, scientific, and technological aid to their puppet regimes behind the Iron Curtain; they have West Germany's recognition of Communist domination over Eastern and Central Europe; and they have Chancellor Brandt's promise to work for the creation of a European Security Conference on Communist terms.

One has to ask why Brandt and Scheel and others, such as Egon Bahr and Herbert Wehner, go to the lengths they have to assist the Soviet Union.

The policies of Chancellor Brandt toward the Communist nations of Europe are only mirrors of Communist policy which is, in its aim, directed at the destruction of the alliances between the nations of the free world. I do not believe those policies will ever have the support of the American people.

---

## THE NATION SALUTES THE HONORABLE HENRY J. VAN DYKE, POLICE CHIEF OF WAYNE, N.J., CHAMPION OF THE PEOPLE IN PUBLIC SAFETY AND PROTECTION

### HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed my great privilege and honor to participate in a testimonial dinner to my lifelong friend, the Honorable Henry J. Van Dyke, chief of police of Wayne, N.J., commemorating his lifetime of outstanding service as champion of the people in seeking optimum public safety and protection for the citizens of our community. I respectfully request that you join with me in this national recognition of his dedication, sincerity of purpose, and achievements in unselfishly and willingly serving with America's finest—pounding the beat as a young police recruit in 1943 to a leader among his fellow associates at the helm of law enforcement and crime control programing during a period in our Nation's history when established procedures of "law and order" were being threatened and put to their greatest test.

Chief Van Dyke was appointed to the police department of Wayne, N.J., on October 7, 1943. His exceptional qualifications of leadership were quickly recognized and he progressed rapidly through the ranks, being promoted to captain on January 24, 1949, 6 short years later. He assumed the office of deputy chief on August 1, 1958, and was promoted to chief of the department on October 17, 1961.

During his career the chief saw the department grow from an agency of less than 10 men to a department of almost 100 men. The original three police cars of the department have given way to a fleet of almost 30 police units. As specialization in law enforcement became more and more prevalent, various units or bureaus were created under the direction of the chief and staffed with officers highly trained and skilled in their various categories. Under the arrangements made by Chief Van Dyke, men were enrolled in the various police schools operated by the Federal Government, the State, and the counties in order that

their knowledge of police operations and techniques might be developed and kept up to date.

Chief Van Dyke himself is a graduate of the New Jersey State Police Academy, the FBI National Academy and approximately 75 other schools and training sessions in the field of law enforcement. He created the Tri-State Conference on Identification and in 1957 was awarded a bronze plaque for his contributions to scientific crime detection. He is a past president of the New Jersey State Identification Association, a past president of the New Jersey Chapter of the FBI National Academy Associates, past president of the Passaic County Chiefs of Police Association and vice president of the New Jersey Association of Chiefs of Police. He also served as chairman of the Tri-State Committee on Organized Crime under the Metropolitan Regional Council. He is also a past president of Kiwanis, a member of the Masonic Lodge, and the Wayne Elks Lodge. Chief Van Dyke also holds the title of "Honorary Chief of the Community Volunteer Fire Co. No. 1," of Wayne.

Henry Van Dyke retired his police badge this past month but his honor and faithful service to Wayne and its people have been lastingly etched in the minds and hearts of all of us and will never be retired. Many, many thanks, Chief. The Nation does indeed salute you.

## AN UNCOMMON MAN

### HON. WILLIAM O. MILLS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. MILLS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully insert in the RECORD a commentary of which no greater could be made than that placed in the Star-Democrat in memory of a dedicated employee and resident of the First Congressional District of Maryland, Mr. Henry W. "Hank" Montgomery, who lost his life in a tragic accident on February 3. This truly memorializes an uncommon man.

The commentary follows:

AN UNCOMMON MAN

Hank Montgomery was an uncommon man.

Not only was he a good journalist, photographer and excellent at newspaper layout and design, but he was able to inspire those who worked around him for he freely gave of his time and talent so that they might one day take over his job.

He could write not only hard news, but his real field was reaching into the story and finding the soul of the subject.

But Hank was more than just a newsman; he was a concerned human being.

A born leader, he was rich in friends from all sections of life, and they deeply valued his friendship and he theirs.

Caring about his fellow man, he greatly furthered the cause of human relations in the community, partly because he knew the secret of feeling other peoples pain and was willing to reach out and help.

Hank deeply loved Talbot County, and his family, friends and associates will have the legacy of his thoughts to read and the fond memory of a caring and creative man to remember.

He was before his time in many ways and he will always be timeless.

## ARGUMENTS FOR KEEPING THE DISTRICT FOR ALL THE PEOPLE

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in testimony before the House Committee on the District of Columbia on the home rule issue—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 3503-3505 of February 9, 1972—I spoke in favor of my bill H.R. 355, "to retrocede a portion of the District of Columbia to the State of Maryland" as a plan which would achieve the objectives of the home rule proponents yet not violate the basic constitutional principle whereby the Congress shall "exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever" over the District of Columbia.

I mentioned the rampant crime in the District and the threat of a militant group such as the Black Muslims gaining control of the District as two reasons why Congress should retain control over all the people's city.

Two recent articles substantiate my statement. In one article aptly entitled "Why the Capital Is a Jungle," columnists Reed Benson and Robert Lee, writing in "The Review of the News" of February 16, 1972, vividly depict the incredible crime situation in the Nation's Capital as well as providing reasons for the condition.

The other article is a news account in which self-appointed Gen. Hassan Jeru Ahmed, founder of the Blackman's Volunteer Army of Liberation, pictured in an army uniform with a star on his collar, announced his intention to seek the Republican nomination for the city's nonvoting congressional delegate seat in the spring primary election. He also told of plans for a massive vote registration drive by members of his paramilitary organization.

All of which goes to prove the wisdom of the Founding Fathers.

I ask that the two articles follow my remarks in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Review of the News, Feb. 16, 1972]

WHY THE CAPITAL IS A JUNGLE

(By Reed Benson and Robert Lee)

*The President is promoting permissiveness by freeing convicted murderers and doctoring key statistics.*

During his State of the Union Address on January 20, 1972, President Richard Nixon assured the nation that "The rate of increase in crime has been slowed—and here in the District of Columbia, the one city where the federal government has direct jurisdiction, serious crime in 1971 was actually reduced by 13 percent from the year before."

The President knows that if it can be made to look as if the Administration's crime-fighting program is working, the crime issue can be converted into a political plus for Mr. Nixon. And if, in addition, it can be made to appear that the Administration's program is working best in "the one city where the federal government has direct jurisdiction," it will help justify further federal interference in—*and control over*—state and local law enforcement agencies. What is the truth of the matter?

When dealing with crime figures, attempts to run the statistical maze and arrive at the truth can be very frustrating indeed. Consider, for instance, some of the problems about available figures which have arisen in the District of Columbia during the past year. On February 6, 1971, during National Crime Prevention Week, President Nixon issued a statement claiming that the nation's capital "has shown a significant downward trend in crime."

Eight days later, however, a report in the Washington Star revealed that the "downward trend" may have been more show than substance. The Star explained what had happened:

A curious set of statistics, not included in the crime figures for Washington made public by police, raises serious doubt about whether the city's heralded drop in crime during 1970 actually occurred.

The statistics are in the little-noticed crime category of "larceny less than $50" and they lend credence to charges by some officers that police officials have forced them to downgrade the value of stolen merchandise so that the theft would not appear in the crime figures released to the public.

Tending to support these charges was the fact that the decrease in "larceny over $50" (a reduction amounting to 2,134 offenses during 1970) was balanced by an increase in "larceny under $50" (an increase amounting to 2,800 offenses). One policeman, mentioned by name in the Star article, revealed that officials had ordered officers routinely to devalue stolen property in order to keep down the number of "index" larcenies,[1] and that reports turned in by police officers are now scrutinized by superiors "for the purpose of re-evaluation." A Department official (who preferred to remain anonymous) confirmed that there had indeed been some downgrading of the value of stolen property. He said that pressure had been put on district inspectors to produce a reduction of crime statistics in their sections of the city, and that five inspectors had been transferred in 1970 when crime figures rose in their areas. The implication was that such pressure created a tendency for some officials to "juggle the books" in order to obtain "decreases" in crime within their jurisdictions.

Nevertheless, in a message to Congress on April 7, 1971, President Nixon boasted of the District's supposed decline in crime, claiming that "people who live in the District, people who work here, and our millions of visitors from around the world, are safer on the city's streets." You will walk many a street here in the capital before you will find a resident who believes *that*. Even on Capitol Hill, itself, crime has during the past year steadily increased to shocking levels. As Senator Alan Bible (D.-Nevada) noted on December 11, 1971, "Assault-type crimes, robberies, burglaries, and rapes are not new to Capitol Hill, but they are becoming more frequent." The Senator gave some details:

"It was a shock for me to get a report from Capitol Police Chief James Powell, advising that so far this year within the Capitol Hill complex there have been 43 robbery holdups, 35 robberies by force, 37 autos stolen, 127 larcenies from autos, 19 pocketbook snatchings, one homicide, nine assaults, three rapes, and 64 other types of criminal acts. That this number of criminal acts can occur within an 11-month period at the complex of buildings and streets surrounding the Capitol of the United States is completely intolerable."

Other indications of runaway crime in Washington were revealed in such news reports as the following from the Washington Daily News of November 4, 1971:

[1] The seven "index" categories of "serious crime" are: murder, rape, robbery, burglary, aggravated assault, auto theft, and larceny *over* fifty dollars.

The homicide rate in the District is more than twice that of New York City....

So far this year homicides (236) have passed last year's total....[2]

The Health Department, which charts the mortality rate, says that District residents between the ages of 15 and 44 have a better chance of being murdered than of being killed by a heroin overdose, automobile accident or any natural cause.

The city medical examiner has called the homicide rate "epidemic" and the U.S. Attorney calls it "alarming."

That murder continued to escalate over even the previous year was confirmed the following month in a tragic manner. Here is a report from the Washington Star of December 20, 1971:

Eight persons were killed in six unrelated District homicide cases in 26 hours this weekend....

Homicide detectives said they could not recall so many separate homicide cases in such a short period in the District.

The case is similar with the crime of rape. On November 10, 1971, the Washington Daily News revealed:

Every 12 hours a woman is raped here and the frequency of attacks has startled police, frightened women and puzzled psychologists.

In the District, the number of reported rapes has climbed significantly and three of the city's suburban police departments say that the number of rapes in their jurisdictions has already equalled or passed last year's total.[3]

Yet, the figures on rape released by the District Police Department on January 20, 1972, claimed a substantial decline in the rape rate during 1971.

Obviously the figures are being juggled! Here is what was happening. Beginning in April of 1971, significant adjustments were made in the manner in which reported rapes are tallied for statistical purposes. So extreme has been the resulting confusion that one source discovered a fourteen percent decrease in rape where another found a seventy-four percent increase in the incidence of that crime.

While the manipulation of figures has resulted in controversy over whether crime in the nation's capital is decreasing, there is no controversy when it comes to the nation as a whole. Crime is still going up by more than half-a-million additional crimes each year. Even the Nixon Administration has been compelled to admit this. But the Administration has done everything possible to present this fact to the public in such a way as to give the opposite impression.

For example, a dispatch in the *Washington Star* for September 8, 1971, reported that the office of Attorney General John Mitchell had begun rewriting F.B.I. interpretations of national crime statistics, and that "As a result of the interpretations placed on the crime situation by Mitchell's public relations staff, it has been made to appear that the FBI believes the crime rise that began under a Democratic administration almost a decade ago is tapering off. The figures, however, show that reported crime is rising at about the same velocity as before."

After noting that this procedure is "in line with the Nixon administration's law and order political strategy," the article went on to illustrate how the figures are being manipulated:

Ever since the bureau began releasing crime figures in 1933, Director Hoover had drafted the statements to explain the figures. This changed in June 1970 when Hoover's office prepared a statement, under his letterhead, that characterized the statistics to be released that day as follows:

"For release Monday p.m., June 22, 1970—According to figures made available through the FBI's uniform crime reports and released by Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell, serious crime in the United States continued its upward trend, recording a 13 percent rise nationally for the first three months in 1970 when compared to the same period in 1969."

The statement as rewritten in Mitchell's office and actually issued under Hoover's letterhead began as follows:

"For release Monday p.m., June 22, 1970—Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell announced today that the FBI's uniform crime reports show that the rate of increase of violent crimes in the first three months of 1970 slowed by 7 percent in the major cities of the nation—and by 3 percent in the nation as a whole.[4]

Significantly, the dispatch also noted that "Comparisons between the FBI's explanatory material and the press statements of past years make it clear that only in Mitchell's tenure has Hoover's copy been edited."

Another illustration of the game of statistical charades being played with the crime statistics appeared in the *Washington Star* for September 30, 1971:

Atty. Gen. John N. Mitchell pointed with pride yesterday to a 16 percent decrease of "serious crime" in Washington during a period in which murders increased by 6 percent and the number of forcible rapes nearly doubled.

This seeming contradiction apparently arises because violent crimes against persons are combined on an equal basis with the lesser, but far more numerous, crimes against property. Thus, one murder or one rape carries no greater weight than one auto theft or a fifty-dollar shoplifting. Decreases in crimes against property (a doctored statistic, as we have shown) easily offset increases in violent crimes in the overall percentage calculations. Thus it may be possible that the crime situation in Washington is improving somewhat for those who would rather be murdered than have their cars stolen. But, for most Americans, a set of statistics based on equal weight for rape and fifty-dollar larceny is questionable to say the least.

The above situation reminded one Congressman of a man who drowned in a river with an average depth of only six inches. Others are reminded of the description of a statistician as one who, on discovering a man with his head in an oven and his feet in a bucket of ice, is likely to conclude that, on the average, the man's temperature is normal.

None of the above is meant as criticism of the job being done by rank-and-file policemen in the District of Columbia. Like our men in Vietnam, who have been hamstrung in their war against Communism by political restrictions administered from above, the police here have had incredible obstacles thrown in the path of their war against crime by "Liberal" courts, radical politicians, and even some of their own leaders within the Police Department itself. Consider the facts:

On November 4, 1971, the Washington Daily News reported that, while the District homicide squad boasts of solving ninety percent of its cases, "only half of the suspects captured get indicted and only a third of the suspects indicted get convicted." And on November 17, 1971, the Washington Star revealed that "More than 1,400 persons charged with crimes in Washington and freed by local courts—either while awaiting trial or following conviction for an offense—were rearrested and charged with new crimes during an eighth-month period this year, according to a study by District police." The Star went on to note that "In one of the homicide cases, the 25-year-old suspect had been released on personal recognizance—his promise to appear for trial—in January 1971 while awaiting trial for armed robbery and again the following month after being arrested on a second armed robbery charge."

There have in recent weeks been some serious charges of police corruption levelled against some elements within the District Police Department. While it is too early to tell how much substance there is to the allegations, it would come as no surprise to find a few "bad cops" within the Department. Especially since some of the very worst enemies of the police have been assigned in recent years to act as *recruiters* here for the police. For instance, the *Washington Post* for October 11, 1970, mentioned that a fellow named Marion Barry "has been instrumental in recruiting 'community-involved' officers for the metropolitan [*police*] force." Who is Marion Barry?

Prior to moving to Washington in 1965, Barry served as head of the New York office of the revolutionary Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee. Afterwards, he helped expand Washington's S.N.C.C. office. He had previously been arrested and convicted on assorted charges in Memphis, Knoxville, and Chicago, and asserted on one occasion: "Riot power and rebellion power might make people listen now." The Communist *Worker* for January 10, 1965, listed Barry as a featured speaker at a New York meeting honoring the fortieth anniversary of International Publishers, a Communist publishing firm.

Marion Barry became a top official of Pride, Inc., an outfit funded by the Labor Department ostensibly to provide jobs and training for youths in the District of Columbia. An indication of the organization's slant was its refusal in 1968 to celebrate George Washington's birthday on February twenty-second, choosing instead to celebrate its holiday a day later on the birthday of the notorious Communist, W.E.B. DuBois.[5]

In January of 1968, Barry joined with Communist Stokely Carmichael and other revolutionaries to form the Black United Front in the District of Columbia. Six months later, after a District police officer was slain with his own revolver while trying to make a lawful arrest in the line of duty, the Black United Front issued a statement asserting: "The methods of self-defense [sic] used by the family charged with the alleged slaying of the honky cop is justifiable homicide." That is *part* of the background of police recruiter Marion Barry.[6]

Another member of the anti-police Black United Front chosen to help recruit for the Department was Calvin Rolark. The *Washington Star* of April 26, 1970, carried a news item that revealed: "As part of an intensive drive to attract local residents to become policemen here, the Metropolitan Police Department has hired Calvin Rolark, one of the founders of the Black United Front, as its recruiting coordinator." The *Star* went on to quote Rolark as boasting: "I have been a critic, a severe critic, of the police depart-

[2] The final homicide total for the year reached 275.

[3] Such "improvement" in the District's crime situation recently led one agency of the federal government to install combination security locks on the doors of its twenty-two washrooms.

[4] This business about "slowing the rate of increase" is roughly equivalent to a doctor's assurance to a patient that his health is improving because, while his temperature rose seven degrees yesterday, it only rose another four degrees today.

[5] See the *Congressional Record*, vol. 114, pt. 4, p. 4008.

[6] Unless you are familiar with the incredible situation which exists in Washington, you are probably going to find it hard to believe that last fall Marion Barry was elected a member of the D.C. Board of Education. And on January 24, 1972, by the *unanimous* vote of his fellow Board members, he was elected *president* of the School Board.

ment." Little wonder that the Washington police now find themselves in trouble.

Another significant question which arises from discussions of crime in Washington is whether it is being curbed or just spread around. On June 30, 1971, the *Washington Star* reported that serious crime in the District for the first quarter of the year had dropped by 17.5 percent. That figure, as we have seen, is highly dubious. But what is interesting is that the *Star* noted at the same time that over the same period serious crime in the suburban cities of Alexandria and Arlington, Virginia, had risen 28.8 percent and 11.1 percent, respectively. During 1970, when District crime reportedly dropped by 17 percent, crime in the Maryland suburbs increased 18 percent. During 1970, some 28 percent of those detained in the jails of Montgomery County, Maryland, were actually residents of the District, as were 33 percent of those detained in the jails of Prince Georges County, Maryland. One observer compared what is happening to the use of insect repellent, instead of an effective insecticide, to cope with cockroaches. It simply drives the pests into neighboring apartments. As a police captain from a Maryland suburb told a U.S. Senator: "If you want to help us, you should build a 40-foot chain link fence along the District line and put barbed wire on top."

Obviously that is not the solution, for it does not strike at the real problem. During our study of the crime in Washington, we ran across a case history which we think does indicate why crime is rampant in this federal city, and suggests where the fault lies.

In 1960, a gambler in the federal District named George (Cider) Brown was slain during a holdup attempt. A youth named Eddie Harrison was subsequently arrested, convicted of first degree murder, and sentenced to death. Harrison spent sixteen months on death row, and then saw his conviction overturned on appeal because his "lawyer," it turned out, had been a layman without legal training. So Harrison was tried again, was convicted, and received a twenty-year-to-life sentence for the same crime. But this conviction was also overturned on appeal, on the ground that Harrison's confession had been "illegally" obtained.

So Eddie Harrison went to trial for the third time, and was again convicted. But the conviction was overturned by a Supreme Court ruling that tainted testimony from the second trial, which had been introduced at the third trial, compelled Harrison to incriminate himself wrongly.

So Harrison was tried—and convicted—for a fourth time. The case was appealed, but with all technicalities apparently having been exhausted, this time the appeal was denied. Two years later, however, President Richard Nixon responded to what the *Washington Post* later described as "broad-based community pressure," and commuted Harrison's sentence!

And then, on June 6, 1971, the Washington Post carried an Associated Press dispatch which began:

BALTIMORE, June 5 (AP).—Eddie M. Harrison, convicted four times of the same slaying in Washington but freed after 8½ years in prison by order of President Nixon, has received a $500,000 grant to run a program for the rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents here.

The Manpower Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor agreed Thursday to supply the funds and a contract has been signed by Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro III.

One month later, on July 6, 1971, President Nixon told news media executives attending a background briefing in Kansas City, Missouri:

I have stated categorically, and I state it again here today, that in this administration, the era of permissiveness in law enforcement has come to an end. We are going to continue to support strong laws dealing with criminal elements. . . .

This sort of basic dishonesty cannot long be tolerated in a free nation. Americans will not long be fooled by such deception.

It has often been said, as a figure of speech, that crime has turned many American cities into jungles. A few years ago, when vandals wounded two alligators during the New York World's Fair, one wag commented that New York was probably the only place in the world where an alligator couldn't feel safe at night. But here in this federal city, it seems, the situation is even worse. Here is a news item from the *Evening Star* for January 15, 1972, which begins:

A 20-year-old mother, her baby wrested from her arms, was raped by two men, one of whom wore a ring in his nose, as she walked home from a friend's house, along East Capitol Street, police reported yesterday.

Such is the state of life in the jungle that is Washington, D.C.

---

[From the Evening Star, Feb. 12, 1972]

HASSAN HITS VOTE BOARD

(By Lynn Dunson)

Gen. Hassen Jeru Ahmed, founder of the Blackman's Volunteer Army of Liberation, again has accused the D.C. Board of Elections of failing to do its job and has threatened to take legal action unless more registration sites are opened.

Hassan renewed his attack against the board at a press conference yesterday where he formally announced that he will seek the Republican nomination for the city's nonvoting congressional delegate seat in the spring primary.

Hassen, who last month registered to vote for the first time, is the first Republican to announce his candidacy. He has been unable to vote in the past because of criminal convictions.

Congress in December passed legislation allowing former felons to vote if they have been out of prison at least three years.

Residents may now register to vote at public libraries, the board of elections office and the Division of Motor Vehicles office, but Hassen said that was not enough.

He also charged that the board has failed to notify some 32,000 persons that they are about to be purged from the voters rolls because they have not voted in the past four years. The purge is required by law.

But yesterday, Norval E. Perkins, election board secretary, said that arrangements are already under way to increase registration efforts. Registrars will operate sign-up booths in the city's high schools beginning Monday, he said, and other registration points will be added later.

Perkins also said that in mid-March notices will be mailed to all persons who are in danger of being dropped from the voting list. Registration closes April 23.

In 1970, Hassan threatened to get a court injunction against the nonvoting delegate election because the board of elections was not registering enough people. As a result, the board intensified registration efforts.

Hassan said that he and the members of his paramilitary group will embark on a massive registration effort of their own with the aim of getting 20,000 additional Republican voters in the District.

"I am not a 100 percent Republican," Hassan said yesterday. "I am not joining the 35,000 old-line white Republicans in the District. I am joining the Republican party to bring a change."

He said that he knew he was not welcomed by the Republicans and has not heard from them.

Hassan said that he would seek the spring nomination on a platform of home rule and complete Congressional representation for the District.

He also used the occasion to repudiate Rep. John R. Rarick, D-La., who suggested during testimony Tuesday before a congressional committee that District residents who do not work at essential government jobs should be relocated to sparsely populated areas.

Rarick caused great consternation among spectators and some congressmen on the committee with his remarks strongly opposing home rule, during which he called District residents "squatters" and said that home rule would mean a Black Muslim takeover of the District.

---

## PRESIDENT NIXON ABLY REPRESENTED AT LINCOLN MEMORIAL CEREMONY

---

## HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, at the historic Lincoln Day ceremonies conducted at the Lincoln Memorial on Saturday, our colleague, Congressman ROBERT MCCLORY of the 12th District of Illinois, represented President Nixon in the wreath laying and other ceremonies. This highly colorful and impressive ceremony commemorating the 163d anniversay of Abraham Lincoln's birth, also marked the 50th anniversary of the dedication of the Lincoln Memorial. As in earlier years, the program was organized by the Military Order of the Loyal Legion.

In addition to our colleague, Congressman MCCLORY, the ceremony highligted the presence of the Honorable Robert F. Froehlke, Secretary of the Army, who read Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

The Loyal Legion Award to college students was presented to Miss Mary Sand of South Dakota State College for her original paper entitled, "Foreign Relations and Diplomacy Between Great Britain and the United States During the Civil War, 1860–65."

The military Guards of Honor and escorts were ably organized by the commanding general of the Military District of Washington, Maj. Gen. Roland M. Gleszer.

The role of master of ceremonies was again filled by Frederick Drum Hunt of the Loyal Legion.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present the message of the President of the United States as read by Congressman MCCLORY and Mr. MCCLORY's individual remarks delivered on that occasion. Also, I am including the formal program and a descriptive statement concerning the Lincoln Memorial and the role of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion in keeping alive the Lincoln Day Memorial ceremonies since 1922.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, D.C., February 7, 1972.*

HON. ROBERT MCCLORY,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR BOB: When you represent me at the wreath-laying ceremony at the Lincoln Memorial, I hope you will convey my best wishes to all who pay tribute to the leadership which this strong yet simple man brought to a divided nation over a century ago.

He was an open man, genuine, rough-hewn

and full of hope for America. His abiding faith in God and in the ultimate wisdom and goodness of the common people guided him all the years of his life and touched the soul of the land. His forthright and honest words sank deep into the understanding of every listener, and what he said of Henry Clay, a man he deeply admired, could well be applied to Lincoln himself:

He loved his country partly because it was his own country, but mostly because it was a free country; and he burned with a zeal for its advancement, prosperity and glory, because he saw in such, the advancement, prosperity, and glory of human liberty, human right and human nature. He desired the prosperity of his countrymen, but chiefly to show to the world that freemen could be prosperous.

Now, one hundred and twenty years later, we work in a divided world to establish a peace to end all wars, and we seek to move America forward here at home bringing its people together and building a new and lasting prosperity. We need more than ever the qualities of Lincoln to inspire us and give us confidence to do our duty as we understand it, to serve America better so that America may better serve mankind.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

---

INDIVIDUAL REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN ROBERT MCCLORY, AT THE WREATH LAYING CEREMONIES, LINCOLN MEMORIAL, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 12, 1972

Mr. Secretary Froehlke, Ambassador Rossides, Fred Hunt, distinguished guests and friends: At any Lincoln Day ceremony it is customary to include some appropriate quotation from Abraham Lincoln. This is not difficult, as Lincoln was a prolific writer and he had a most eloquent literary style. Accordingly, it is merely a question of what quotation of Lincoln's is most appropriate on any given Lincoln Day anniversary.

In this year 1972, as we approach hopefully and prayerfully a peaceful conclusion to the War in Indo-China, it seems logical to recall a few words uttered by Lincoln on March 4, 1965 when he delivered his Second Inaugural Address. In the final paragraph, Lincoln said for both that period and now:

"With firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; . . . to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations."

Our President, whom I am privileged to represent here today, in disclosing the eight point program for peace submitted as a basis for terminating the War in Indo-China, in his recent television report to the American people, used these words:

"This has been a long and agonizing struggle. But it is difficult to see how anyone, regardless of his past position on the war, could now say that we have not gone the extra mile in offering a settlement that is fair, fair to everybody concerned . . . Honest and patriotic Americans have disagreed as to whether we should have become involved at all nine years ago; and there has been disagreement on the conduct of the war. The proposal I have made tonight is one on which we all can agree.

"Let us unite now, unite in our search for peace—a peace that is fair to both sides—a peace that can last."

The war was not yet over and the difficulties were far from reconciled when Lincoln stood in front of the Capitol for his Second Inaugural. Yet his message of hope for a return to order, justice and peace were examples of the same yearning for freedom, justice and peace which motivates the President who occupies the White House today. Therefore, recalling but a few of the mighty words which were uttered by Lincoln on that occasion—and which are carved on the walls of this hallowed temple—we can repeat them here today and pray for their fulfillment.

For in this day in our history as a nation we may rededicate ourselves during the winding down of the Indo-China War as truly as our forefathers did during the winding down of the great War between the States—and to do all we can to achieve "a just and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations."

---

MILITARY ORDER OF THE LOYAL LEGION HAS KEPT TRADITION ALIVE SINCE 1922

The ground-breaking ceremony took place February 12, 1914, the 105th anniversary of the birth of President Lincoln and the corner stone was laid exactly one year later. However, it was not until 1922 that the fine Memorial was completed. The Lincoln Memorial Commission under the Chairmanship of President Taft had selected the site and the architect was Henry Bacon. Daniel French was sculptor of the fine statue and Jules Guerin painted the interior on canvas.

Recalling the founding of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion on the day of Lincoln's death, April 15, 1865, President Harding asked the Loyal Legion to arrange a suitable ceremony for the occasion. The Commander-in-Chief of the Loyal Legion at that time was Lieut. Gen. Nelson Miles, first Chief of Staff of the Army. He called upon all Companions (members) of the Loyal Legion to assist. Another Companion, Major Vogel (later a Maj. Gen.) was Commandant of the Marine Barracks at that time. Under his command, the Marines furnished all of the ushers, the band and all of the other necessary support. The Marines continued this fine service each year until the establishment of the Dept. of Defense.

The 1922 ceremony was so impressive that the Companions of the District of Columbia Commandery of the Loyal Legion determined to hold a ceremony each year on February 12th and have continued to do so regardless of the day of the week or the state of the weather. In doing so, they have had full support from the Military District of Washington which is in charge of all ceremonies of a military nature, the National Park Service which is custodian of the Lincoln Memorial, and the Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

For the past fifteen years, other patriotic and civic societies have been invited to participate in the ceremony by placing floral tributes. Let us hope that this recognition of a great President and of the traditions of our fine country may continue for another half century.

---

PROGRAM, FEBRUARY 12, 1972

PRESENTATION OF THE COLORS—THE NATIONAL ANTHEM

The Gettysburg Address read by the Hon. Robert F. Froehlke, Secretary of the Army.

Presentation of Award given by the Loyal Legion Bulletin to Miss Mary Sand of South Dakota State College for an original paper entitled "Foreign Relations and Diplomacy between Great Britain and the United States During the Civil War, 1860–65".

The Wreath of the President of the United States, Hon. Robert McClory, Member of the Congress from the 12th District of Illinois repersenting the President. Escorted by Maj. Gen. Roland M. Gleszer, Commanding General, Military District of Washington.

The Wreath of the Diplomatic Corps, The Hon. Zenon Rossides, Ambassador from Cyprus.

The Wreath of the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Richard S. Bodman, Assistant Secretary representing Secretary Morton.

The Wreath of the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, Hon. Walter E. Washington.

The Wreath of the National Park Service, Lawrence C. Hadley, Assistant Director.

The Wreath of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion, Col. Brooke Montgomery Lessig of Philadelphia, Commander-in-Chief.

TAPS

Message from President Nixon delivered by Representative McClory.

Additional floral tributes:

The Dames of the Loyal Legion of the United States.

The Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War.

The Auxiliary to the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War.

The Lincoln-Cushing Camp of the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War.

The National Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic.

The National Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War.

The Ellen Spencer Mussey Tent #1, Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War.

The Woman's Relief Corps, Department of the Potomac.

The National Society Daughters of the Union, 1861–65.

The Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia.

The Society of Mayflower Descendants.

The National Society of Daughters of the American Revolution.

The Sons of the Revolution.

The Sons of the American Revolution.

The Aztec Club of 1847, Military Society of the Mexican War.

The American Legion Auxiliary.

The Retired Officers Association.

The Reserve Officers Association.

The Military Order of World Wars.

The League of Republican Women of the District of Columbia.

RETIRE THE COLORS

(Master of Ceremonies, Frederick Drum Hunt.)

---

## REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

## HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my February 1972 report from Washington to the residents of California's 30th District. The report highlights some of major legislative and national issues being considered by the 92d Congress.

The report follows:

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON—STATE OF THE ECONOMY: JOB CRISIS

(By Congressman EDWARD R. ROYBAL)

During the past years the U.S. economy has entered a period of accelerating inflation. Attempts to curb it have only produced severe unemployment throughout the country. Today we are facing an unemployment rate of nearly 6%, doubling the rate three years ago. This job crisis has extended into the older as well as newer communities of the 30th District. In fact, the jobless rate in some sections of my district has soared as high as 16%. In East Los Angeles, the rate is nearly 200% above the national average. In Bell and Huntington Park, it is over 150% and in Maywood, above 130%. In my efforts to solve this inflation-unemployment spiral, I proposed several solutions early in last year's session.

CREATING JOBS

I supported legislation to add $1 billion to the economy through a public works program. This bill had a threefold purpose: to create meaningful employment for the jobless while initiating badly needed local im-

provements and relieving the heavy burden of local taxes for these improvements. This proposal was later incorporated into a multi-billion dollar version which passed Congress but was unfortunately vetoed by the President. Later a compromise bill, the "Emergency Employment Act of 1971" became law providing $2¼ billion over the next two years for public service jobs at state and local levels. The Act gives priority to Vietnam veterans, low income persons, migrant farmworkers, persons with limited English, and the recently unemployed technicians and professionals.

As part of this job strategy, I introduced the "Economic Disaster Area Assistance Act of 1971" providing federal aid to regional and local areas suffering the weight of lingering high unemployment.

CURBING INFLATION

On the inflation side, I introduced legislation to set up a flexible, broadly based wage and price board seven months before the President's own action in this area. We can no longer permit an inflationary cycle to grip this country with such devastating effect. We need an equitable wage and price policy closely tied to effective, long range public employment programs. I believe this balanced approach would end the economic merry-go-round we have been experiencing this past decade. I am concerned that the "trickle down" theory professed by the Administration—which reduces business taxes in the hope of creating jobs—will not adequately tackle our severe job crisis. For this reason I recently sponsored a proposal to add 500,000 more public jobs to the 130,000 total under the emergency employment program.

INDOCHINA POLICY

The recent peace plan by the President has brought us to a crucial point in our Vietnam negotiations. The Presidential plan sets forth conditions that can only guarantee our continuing presence in Indochina's civil wars. In effect it requires North Vietnam to surrender territorial gains while endorsing an American-backed, Thieu-dominated election. The call for a ceasefire, attached as it is to mutual withdrawal, would only result in considerable military and political loss for the North. It is no wonder that the North has rejected these conditions over the past 15 months.

If we hope to end our involvement, we must begin to adopt a broader perspective: the Vietnam war is a civil war, a national struggle. Achieving political stability in Indochina is a local and regional problem We cannot continue to play the world's policeman. As an early opponent of the war, I have consistently worked for its cessation, calling for public congressional hearings in 1965 and later proposing a date of withdrawal conditioned only on release of our prisoners.

The Pentagon Papers revealed a basic flaw in our Vietnam policy—the neglect and underestimation of the human costs involved. Not only has our policy brough ecological havoc to Vietnam but deaths of countless Americans and Vietnamese. By continuing the air war, we have only multiplied the tragedy and increased the number of captured American pilots. I am afraid that the current peace plan will breed further involvement. It is my hope, however, that we may still salvage some settlement from the Paris peace talks.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The returning veteran is finding himself caught in a crisis of unemployment and rising costs. To take advantage of his G.I. benefits he must endure a maze of red tape and bureaucracy. If he comes from a low income background, he is likely to become discouraged very quickly and join the ranks of the jobless. Despite his two or more years of service for his country, he is faced with returning to the same cycle of poverty and marginal existence.

In an effort to reverse this trend, I recently became co-chairman of the Los Angeles Veterans Education and Training Action Committee. Its purpose is to bring our Vietnam veterans into the economic and educational mainstream through a veteran-run, community-directed program. Legislatively, I have proposed a tax incentive for employers who hire unemployed Vietnam veterans in hopes of creating additional jobs for them. Other proposals I have supported include: comprehensive medical care, drug treatment, community nursing care, and strengthening of the Veterans Administration's health services.

FOR OLDER AMERICANS

A major theme of the 1971 White House Conference on Aging was the need for a national commitment to help our older citizens. There are now over 19 million older Americans—a group representing 9% of our total population and more than 16% of the adult population. For too many years we have paid lip service to the problems of the senior citizen without pressing for immediate legislative action. To remedy this neglect I have introduced several comprehensive proposals.

Key features of two of my major bills include a strengthened role for the Administration on Aging, low-cost transportation, expanded work opportunities, including the expansion of the Retired Senior Volunteer and Foster Grandparents programs, more effective linkup of all federal aging programs, pre-retirement training, multipurpose centers, continuing education, nutrition programs, improved health and social services, and the establishment of a national research center to study aging.

The Select Education subcommittee has already conducted hearings on comprehensive social services for the older citizen in several cities and plans to continue these hearings this year. It is my hope that sweeping legislation can be enacted this year similar to the one I have outlined above.

Fellowship Program—I have had two deep abiding interests: one in Latin America and the other in education. Last year I was successful in developing a fellowship program for our low income students who wish to study at the University of the Americas in Mexico City. High school seniors are invited to apply by calling my Los Angeles office at 688-4870.

NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAMS

There has been growing public concern over the cost of health care, especially among middle income Americans. In a recent poll of my district, an overwhelming majority endorsed the idea of a nationwide health insurance program to reduce rising medical expenses. I have sponsored a bill to create a national health system covering almost all medical costs for all Americans. There would be no exclusions because of income, employment or age. Its chief benefits include (a) comprehensive health services including diagnosis and treatment, preventive care, and costs for physicians and specialists, (b) hospitalization benefits without limit, ambulance services, nursing home care, (c) eye care, (d) comprehensive dental care for children under 16, (e) allowances for prosthetic aids and (f) prescription drugs.

Extensive Congressional hearings are being held to analyze this and other health care proposals. I anticipate that all of these bills will undergo several modifications before a final health bill is presented to Congress. The goal of such legislation must be quality health care for all Americans at a reasonable price.

UNSAFE SCHOOLS

As you recall, last February the Los Angeles area experienced a serious earthquake with considerable damage. A national board of experts reported that as the result of this tremor our older schools (many do not meet California safety standards) suffered extensive damage. It is estimated that over 700 unsafe buildings exist in Los Angeles county with more than 1,700 throughout the State. By midsummer this year the Los Angeles school district intends to close 28 school buildings.

There is little time left to avert this growing school crisis. I have introduced a "National Act for School Construction" to replace structurally unsafe and deteriorating school buildings. The bill defines unsafe schools as either vulnerable to natural disasters, endangering the lives of students and staff, or deteriorating and unfit for quality education. First priority goes to schools endangered by natural disaster. Costs would be shared by Federal, State and local governments. If local districts lacked sufficient funds, the Federal and State governments would absorb the cost.

I think the lesson is clear: we either replace or strengthen these buildings or we continue to expose our children to a daily hazard.

JOB DISCRIMINATION

Recently I took the unusual step of suing the federal government for job discrimination against the more than 12 million Spanish speaking Americans. Joining in the civil rights suits were the National League of United Latin American Citizens and the California arm of the American G.I. Forum.

The suit seeks to end the exclusion of the Spanish speaking from federal decision making positions both in Washington and in areas having a large concentration of Spanish speaking people. Despite constitutional guarantees and civil rights laws, the government has shown a documented neglect over several decades in hiring Spanish speaking Americans. The result has been a virtual caste system that has turned the ideal of equal employment into another American myth. Although representing over 6% of the total U.S. population, the Spanish speaking hold only 2.9% of federal jobs, and only one third of one percent of top policy making positions.

The class action seeks a court order requiring the government to develop a plan that would bring federal local employment in line with the percentage of Spanish speaking in each state as well as nationally. For instance, in our state Mexican Americans make up 16% of the population but hold only 5.6% of the federal jobs here—an underrepresentation of over 50%. This inequity extends to local government jobs as well. In Los Angeles county, although comprising 18% of the population, Mexican Americans represent only 3% of county officials. The suit also seeks to end the current standard civil service and postal exams, which discriminate against minorities and do not adequately reflect the measure of a person's talents or job skills. I anticipate court action sometime this year.

COALITION CONFERENCE

Late last year I joined with three other congressmen (Senator Montoya, Representatives Badillo and Lujan) in calling for a national Spanish speaking conference. The purpose of this meeting was to develop a unified social and political strategy through a bipartisan coalition of all Spanish speaking groups. When we first envisioned this unity conference, we expected only 250 people. The response far exceeded this figure—nearly 2,000 participated from all over the country.

The desire for national unity and a growing sense of political awareness pervaded the entire two day conference. As I pointed out in my opening remarks, "The search for unity is more than a search for symbolic cultural solidarity. . . . It is the strong human desire for self preservation, a desire that compels us to seek a united strategy to overcome the many problems which weigh most heavily upon us."

The conference passed many significant resolutions on employment, health, education, community action, and welfare. It became the catalyst for local and regional orga-

nizing efforts to form this permanent coalition. Unity will not happen overnight—it can only be accomplished through planning, hard work, and cooperation of all Spanish speaking groups. As I stated at the conference, "We cannot in two days solve problems that have existed for more than a hundred years, but we can agree on issues of immediate concern that deeply affect the welfare of our people." I have been encouraging local and regional meetings as a preliminary to permanent coalition. Once this has taken place in every major state, then we can call a national convention. This community process is crucial to building a nationwide bipartisan force which represents the needs and priorities of the Spanish speaking people.

LEGISLATIVE HIGHLIGHTS

Bilingual Education—As the first sponsor of the Bilingual Education Act in the House of Representatives, I recently introduced two follow-up bills—one adding $100 million for this year's bilingual programs and another funding the training of bilingual teachers.

Child Care—Supported comprehensive child care to provide day care and health and educational services for children of working mothers (later vetoed by the President). Also fought successfully for full funding of the school lunch program despite the Department of Agriculture's abortive attempt to reduce federal support.

Civil Liberties—Introduced bills to repeal the emergency detention law, advance women's rights, lower the voting age to 18, prohibit the military's practice of collecting data on civilian political activity, protect the newsman's confidential sources, and lower the eligibility age for Congress and Senate.

Consumer—Supported bills on consumer class action suits, a consumers' board on public utilities, and a separate consumer protection agency. In related development I introduced a bill authorizing the Federal Communications Commission to investigate the reasonableness of telephone prices and rates.

Labor Rights—Introduced proposals to extend the right to organize to public employees, protect day or temporary help workers, protect migrant farmworkers under federal labor laws and extend unemployment insurance to them.

Pollution—Introduced a score of proposals attacking the problems of air and water pollution, marine dumping, noise abatement, pesticides, detergents and disposal of biological warfare agents.

## RUSSIA AND CHINA: CONTROLLED CONFLICT

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon departs for mainland China today, on a trip that will be very closely watched in Moscow. It is useful at this time to examine the nature of Sino-Soviet relations and the factors affecting that relationship.

Richard Lowenthal did a fine job of this in an article appearing in the April 1971, issue of Foreign Affairs. He dealt with the historical, geographical, ideological and strategic aspects of the relationship and noted that the impact of a third power, the United States, should not be forgotten.

I inserted another article on Sino-Soviet relations in the RECORD of February 9, 1972, and I recommend both pieces to my colleagues.

The article follows:

RUSSIA AND CHINA: CONTROLLED CONFLICT

(By Richard Lowenthal)

It is now eleven years since an ideological dispute between the Chinese and Soviet communist parties burst into the open on the occasion of the 90th anniversary of Lenin's birth, and almost eight years since the pattern of world affairs became definitely "triangular" with the open break between the two leading communist powers. Since then, the view of some Western dogmatists that personal rivalry between Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung for the control of "world communism" was the only cause of the rift was plainly refuted as it continued after Khrushchev's fall; but at the opposite extreme, forecasts about tension between the two communist giants building up steadily toward nuclear war appear hardly more plausible at the present time.

What events have tended to show so far is rather the persistence of controlled conflict between Moscow and Peking, with the ups and downs of crisis and relative détente familiar from other great-power conflicts of the nuclear age. A new wave of speculation has been generated in recent months by the efforts at a normalization of Sino-Soviet state relations and the subsequent revival of bitter polemics over the Polish December crisis, by the shifts in the Chinese party leadership since the end of the cultural revolution; and by the approach of the 24th Congress of the CPSU. These may justify one more attempt to analyze the factors underlying this strange relationship and its possible impact on the future.

It is useful to recall at the start that history and geography oppose China and Russia far more to each other than they oppose either to the United States. They are neighbors with the longest common frontier in the world; and among the European powers which took advantage of China's weakness in the nineteenth century, Tsarist Russia was the closest and territorially the most rapacious. It was revolutionary ideology alone that tended to bridge this "natural" conflict of interest after 1917, and the bridge remained imperfect and fragile at best. Soviet Russia's Mongolian and Manchurian policies ensured that Chiang Kai-shek never ceased to distrust the powerful ally—even in his early days as a national revolutionary leader.

Mao Tse-Tung rose to leadership of the Chinese Communists after experiencing, in 1927 and 1934, the disastrous consequences of the party's obedience to Soviet advice; he rose to national power by repeatedly defying that advice; and he had to pay for Soviet support not only by "leaning to one side" in world affairs, but by signing—in February 1950—the last of the unequal treaties in modern China's history. So conscious was Mao of Stalin's tendency to use the Chinese Communists as expendable pawns, and of the potential conflict underneath the ideological solidarity, that from his Yenan days he deliberately trained his cadres to follow their own model of revolutionary strategy, and only his own ultimate authority.

Outwardly, he had to tolerate Soviet bases in Manchuria and to fight Russia's war in Korea while Stalin lived; but once the Vozhd was dead, Mao hastened to depose and arrest Kao Kang, long Russia's trusted man in the Chinese leadership, and to negotiate a revision of the unequal treaty. The different ideological emphasis, developed in following an increasingly independent road to power, now became a compass for an increasingly independent national policy.

The death of Stalin had given China equality of status within the alliance; the crisis of de-Stalinization seems to have been viewed by Mao as a chance to win major influence on Soviet policy without conflict. In the fall of 1957, he offered to Khrushchev the support of his intact authority for overcoming the crisis in the bloc and at home—at a price. His demands included substantial new capital aid, delivery of the latest weapons including in due course atomic bombs, and a more forward joint policy in Asia—and at least the first two were apparently promised to him.

But the state of Soviet resources and the East European situation prevented major capital aid to China, while the Soviet view of the world relation of forces combined with the vulnerability of the advanced Soviet economy to limit Moscow's willingness to take major risks on Peking's behalf. Furthering atomic proliferation to build up an independent great power bordering Russia must have appeared to the Kremlin as the most foolhardy risk of all. From the end of 1957, the differences in the situations and interests of the two powers thus led to a whole series of Chinese disappointments—over capital aid, over atomic proliferation, over Middle Eastern diplomacy, over military aid in the Quemoy crisis, over Soviet-American and over Chinese-Indian relations.

To those disappointments, the Chinese reacted in the course of 1958 and 1959 first with implied, then with increasingly explicit, attacks on Soviet ideological positions, in the hope of exerting effective pressure on the Soviet leaders by hitting their vulnerable spot—the weakness of their ideological authority. It was the public appearance of such symptoms of an "ideological dispute" that first indicated the existence of the underlying power conflict to the non-communist world.

II

But once the common ideology is no longer sufficient to bridge the conflicting policies of communist states, conflicting ideological arguments will be advanced to justify those policies—and will make compromise more difficult. As each side seeks to present its own practice as orthodox and its opponent's as heretical, it attacks by implication the legitimacy of the rival leader, and is perceived by him as threatening the stability of his rule.

The very first disappointment—Russia's inability to supply the capital needed for China's industrialization—led Mao not only to launch the "People's Communes," but to proclaim them as a shortcut to the "higher stage" of communism—a challenge to the Soviets' birthright as pioneers on that road which they were bound to reject. True, the economic setbacks of the "Commune" experiment led the Chinese to withdraw that challenge in early 1959, and the first muted ideological dispute was thus patched up; but the same setback led one of Mao's domestic critics, Marshal P'eng Teh-huai, to seek Khrushchev's support—an approach which the Soviet leader failed to discourage.

When Mao learned of this, he must have felt that both his own control and China's independence were threatened by Soviet subversion. His second, less muted ideological attack, which culminated in the Lenin anniversary speeches and articles of April 1960, was thus prompted not only by the growing conflict over foreign policy, military support and international revolutionary strategy, but by a sense that he was fighting for his survival as leader of an independent great power.

On the other hand, the fact that both V. M. Molotov, then Soviet Ambassador to Mongolia, and the Albanian Communists began to argue on Chinese lines soon convinced Khrushchev and his associates that they had to defend the cohesion of their empire against a subversive attack from Peking. The brutality of the total withdrawal of Soviet technicians from China in the summer of 1960 and the persistence of the Chinese challenge in the face of that blow, disproportionate and irrational in relation to the original policy conflicts, become comprehensible only in the light of the ideological broadening of

those conflicts to encompass the domestic and imperial control of both leaders.

By the time of the last joint world conference of communist parties, held in Moscow in November and December 1960, the Chinese leaders were thus convinced that they would have to go their own way without Soviet help, unless and until there were radical changes in Soviet leadership and policy. In the circumstances, the compromise hammered out at this conference could be tactical only, and it proved short-lived because it had a different tactical meaning for each of the two sides.

The Soviets had formally renounced their "leading role" in the world movement because they wanted to be rid of ideological debates: relying on their superior material strength to impose their course in foreign affairs, they were willing to stop criticizing what Mao did at home if Mao would stop criticizing what they did in Russia and East Europe. The Chinese, on the contrary, were interested in maintaining formal unity only as a basis for carrying on a long-term ideological struggle throughout the world movement—including Russia and East Europe.

When the difference became obvious in the Chinese support of Albania against Soviet pressure, a third and open phase of the dispute started, in October 1961, with the clashes at the 22nd Congress of the CPSU. But now, because of the adoption of a new party program at that congress as well as the increasingly apparent internal struggles in China over methods of industrialization, the basic divergence of the domestic development of the two became involved in the dispute.

The need of an advanced industrial (and nuclear) power for continuity of production, hence for domestic stability and internal peace, and its reliance on a highly graded scale of material incentives and privileges seemed directly opposed to the need of an overpopulated, agrarian country with immense problems of modernization for a harsh régime of sacrifice. China needed to keep the masses fired by revolutionary enthusiasm and by the spirit of a besieged fortress.

As Mao Tse-tung engaged in a bitter struggle for the distinctively Chinese form of revolution within his own party, he had to hold up the post-revolutionary materialism of Soviet society in the sixties as a warning example of the revisionist degeneracy to which any alternative road would lead.

The consequences of different national conditions and stages of development were thus raised to the rank of incompatible principles; the objective divergence of the Russian and Chinese roads was magnified by ideology; and the earlier doctrinaire differences about the international struggle against imperialism were absorbed into two complete, mutually exclusive versions of what had once appeared as a common, Marxist-Leninist doctrine.

With the sense of a basic community of goals thus destroyed, the earlier conflicts about the proper contents of a common strategy on the world scene were soon replaced by outright power rivalry between the two nominally still allied states. Even before the rival doctrinaire structures had been fully worked out by their creators, the dual international crisis of the fall of 1962, in the Caribbean and on the Sino-Indian frontier, showed that all sense of solidarity between Moscow and Peking had disappeared: the Chinese delight in embarrassing the Soviets during their retreat from Cuba was matched by the Soviet willingness to aid Indian rearmament.

As the Caribbean defeat led to a Soviet decision to seek a détente in relations with the West, regardless of Chinese denunciations, the last official meeting between delegates of the Soviet and Chinese communist parties, held in Moscow in the summer of 1963, was conceived by each side solely as an occasion to "unmask" the other, and its breakdown marked the effective end of the Sino-Soviet alliance: during the year that followed, the public exposition of the two competing ideological systems and the splitting of a number of communist parties along those lines was paralleled by a series of official disclosures about the earlier conflicts in foreign and military policies, and by a growing number of frontier incidents.

Yet compared with the fundamental power rivalry and the divergence of roads of development, the friction at the borders constituted a subsidiary phenomenon. Its first high point was reached when Mao, in an interview granted to Japanese visitors in the summer of 1964, complained about the massing of Soviet forces on the borders of Kazakhstan and Sinkiang, and Moscow failed to deny the charge. But what Mao feared was clearly not a Soviet attempt at territorial conquests, but a preventive strike at China's fledgling nuclear installations. A few months later, the fall of Khrushchev and the first Chinese atomic explosion ended that particular fear.

III

Khrushchev's successors do not seem to have been under any illusions that the former ideological unity of the communist powers could be restored—not, at any rate, while Mao was in power. But they have made repeated if not consistent efforts to achieve the more modest goal of a "normalization" of Sino-Soviet relations. They aim at a state of affairs in which the two communist great powers would pursue their respective interests independently, now in cooperation, now in conflict with each other, but without fanatical and systematic hostility.

Given that the Soviet Union was necessarily opposed to Chinese pressure in India and Chinese influence in Pakistan, could it not at the same time cooperate with China against the Americans in Vietnam? While taking their precautions along the border, seeking to deter Pakistan from relying on China in her conflict with India, and working to forestall a growth of Chinese influence in Japan, the Soviets have therefore not only repeatedly offered a cessation of hostile ideological polemics, and invited the Chinese Communists to join another international conference of communist parties, but have made specific offers for a "united front" in support of North Vietnam, both on the government and party levels.

The Chinese have consistently refused those offers, to the dismay of the independent communist parties of Asia. As many of their earlier sympathizers turned into ideological neutrals while their most promising allies, the Indonesian Communists, suffered disaster in the fall of 1965, the prospect of a powerful bloc of pro-Chinese communist parties vanished.

Yet Mao was willing to pay the price of growing international isolation because by then the domestic power struggle had absolute priority in his eyes; and for that he needed the bogey of Soviet revisionism leading to a restoration of capitalism. If Liu Shao-chi had to be branded, in the course of the cultural revolution, as the "Chinese Khrushchev" walking the capitalist road, evidently no united front was conceivable with Soviet leaders whose policy had been unmasked as "Khrushchevism without Khrushchev."

In the course of the cultural revolution, Soviet-Chinese relations thus fell to their lowest point yet; as insults to each other's diplomatic personnel led to the withdrawal of both ambassadors, Chinese propaganda called for the overthrow of the revisionist traitors by the Russian people and Soviet propaganda for the overthrow of Mao Tse-tung, the destroyer of the Chinese communist party. The Soviets, at least, may for a time have believed that such an outcome was possible. However, as Mao's domestic victory became evident with the approaching end of the upheaval, the Soviets returned once more to their earlier efforts to work for a pragmatic normalization.

In fact, the end of the cultural revolution has brought a growth of pragmatic influence in the Chinese leadership and a return to a more "normal" conduct in foreign affairs—but at first, Sino-Soviet relations remained an exception. Though evidence on the responsibility for the Ussuri River incident of March 1969 remains conflicting, an analysis of possible political motives strongly suggests a Chinese initiative. The disputed islands themselves are worthless.

The prospect of a multiplication of similar incidents along the endless frontier offered to the Soviets no possible gain, but the nightmare of having to tie down large forces for recurring, indecisive battles against an enemy specializing in hit-and-run warfare and disposing of inexhaustible manpower. The Chinese, on the other hand, whose propagandist exploitation of the incidents was far better prepared—with detailed maps—could make excellent use of them for maintaining the "besieged fortress" spirit in general and popular hostility to the "new Tsars" in particular beyond the end of the cultural revolution.

Conversely, it seems plausible that the Soviets were responsible for the subsequent renewal of clashes on the border of Sinkiang, as they were certainly responsible for spreading the rumor, in the summer of 1969, that they might still decide on the preventive strike against China's nuclear installations which Mao had feared five years earlier.

However unconvincing the rumor was in view of the probable cost of such an attempt at this stage, it may have helped to bring the Chinese to the negotiating table after Kosygin's meeting with Chou En-lai in September of that year, and to end the frontier fighting for the time being.

The course of the negotiations has so far been inconclusive—apparently not because of any substantial difficulty in agreeing on the demarcation of the existing frontier, but because of the Chinese insistence that the Soviets should formally and publicly admit that this frontier was the result of unjust and unequal treaties imposed on China by the Tsars. In demanding this admission, the Chinese assert that they claim it merely as a matter of undeniable historical truth, without any thought of actually changing the frontier to reverse the Tsarist annexations. But the Russians clearly feel that they cannot make such a formal admission without laying themselves open to later susbtantive Chinese demands.

Hence the Chinese appear to have hit on a means for keeping the frontier question open, and thus maintaining popular hostility, without dangerously provoking the Russians by actual fighting. In a similar spirit, Peking finally agreed to resume the exchange of ambassadors with Moscow, and on the occasion of last year's November celebrations for the first time publicly reciprocated the wish for the normalization of state relations which the Soviet government had repeatedly expressed. At the same time the Chinese continue to emphasize their uncompromising ideological struggle against Soviet "revisionism" and "social imperialism."

Yet while that distinction is in principle acceptable to the Soviets and indeed corresponds to the kind of modus vivendi they have long proposed, in practice the Chinese persist in drawing the line between state relations and ideological struggle in a manner which endangers vital interests of the Soviets and cannot be tolerated by them: for the Chinese concept of ideological criticism includes the right to conduct propagandist attacks on the Soviet domination of Eastern Europe, and even on the unity of the nationalities of the Soviet Union.

True, the Chinese attacks on the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia took place while the cultural revolution was still in progress and

before any talk about normalization of state relations. But in December 1970, Chinese propaganda interpreted the crisis of the Polish régime, in which the Soviets were not visibly involved, in exactly the same spirit as a revolt of the Polish working class against the "revisionist" régime in which the Soviets had allegedly threatened to intervene, and forecast the ultimate victory of the Polish people over "Soviet social imperialism."

To the Soviets, such propaganda naturally appears as incompatible with "normal state relations;" and this applies even more to the continuing Chinese efforts to encourage separatist national movements among the Ukrainians and other constituent nationalities of the Soviet Union. More than a year after the start of negotiations between the governments, Russia and China thus seem back at the point at which the last compromise between the parties broke up a decade ago: at the Chinese refusal to accept the Soviets' control over their own power sphere as the minimum basis for a modus vivendi.

IV

In trying to evaluate the prospects of the conflict, it may be useful to start by separating its components. The first striking fact is that the basic power rivalry between the two communist giants has survived the disappearance of many of the original policy issues of the late 1950s—issues that were linked to the situation of China's material dependence on a richer and more powerful ally. As a nuclear power with an independent role in world affairs, China clearly determined never again to rely on Soviet economic or military aid for achieving its policy aims; nor has the Soviet Union any more grounds to fear that it might be drawn against its will into risky adventures by the now defunct alliance. What has remained, however, is the power rivalry itself—the interest of Russia in slowing down the growth of the industrial and military might of its eastern neighbor, and the determination of China to overcome the obstacle.

At present, the rivalry manifests itself above all as a struggle for influence in Asia. That struggle takes the form of political competition in North Korea, which has become independent of both, and in North Vietnam, which both have supported without ever cooperating directly.

It takes the form of primarily economic competition with Japan. It appears as a direct clash in the Mongolian Peoples' Republic, where China is trying to undermine Soviet control, and in South Asia, where the Soviets are objectively aligned with the United States for the protection of India and have profited from the collapse of Chinese influence in Indonesia.

The importance of the frontier issue in the wider power conflict remains highly controversial among outside observers. The nature of China's overpopulation is not such as to constitute an urgent compulsion to expand her territory: China remains short of capital rather than land.

Nor is there the slightest evidence of a Chinese inclination to engage in dangerous military adventures at the present stage—rather it is the contrast between wild language and cautious behavior that continues to impress the student. Even for the longer run, assuming an absolute and relative growth of China's military power and an eventual exhaustion of the reserves of arable land with a further increase of her population, it is by no means "fatalistically inevitable" that she must seek to expand at Russia's expense, at the risk of nuclear war, rather than move south against weaker neighbors or seek peaceful economic solutions.

But neither can the possibility of such a development be excluded from the Soviet point of view in the light of the growth of Chinese armaments, of her present hostility, and of her insistence on the illegitimate origin of the present frontier. Seen from Moscow, the rise of China to the full status of a modern world power, which may be slowed down but is unlikely to be prevented, remains a potential long-term threat to Soviet territorial security—by now presumably the only serious threat of that kind.

If we now turn to the ideological aspects of the conflict, the struggle for control of the nonruling communist parties has lost much of its earlier importance because of the comparative failure of Chinese efforts in this field. The dominant fact here has been the collapse of the hopes for a block of major Asian communist parties under Chinese leadership since 1965, with the turn of the Korean and Japanese Communists and even the Indian left-Communists toward "neutral" independence and the catastrophe of the Indonesian party. But in Latin America, too, the Chinese have been unable to establish a solid influence among the more or less "Castroist" groups opposing Moscow's "peaceful road" to power, or to prevent the Cuban party itself from attending the Moscow world conference of 1969.

In Europe, the Chinese-oriented splinter groups have nowhere become more than a nuisance for the established communist parties, able at best to delay the evolution of the latter into potential participants in government coalitions useful to Soviet diplomacy. Nor has the Maoist influence among the student "New Left" become more than one unstable element in a general ideological ferment, as it met in the course of time increasing competition from the old-line communists in Western Europe and from the Trotskyites in the United States.

The Chinese themselves seem to have come to realize their failure as an international doctrinaire center: there is evidence that for the propagandist struggle against the West and the Soviets, they are relying more and more on supporting militant movements of an outright nationalist character, like the Palestinian guerrillas, rather than left-wing ideological sects.

By contrast, the ideological legitimation of divergent roads of domestic development has remained a far more vital element in the conflict; but it is also far more liable to be affected by changes in the leadership and domestic policy of either country. Among the latter, changes in China are likely to have a more far-reaching impact on Sino-Soviet relations. A Soviet turn toward a new effort at modernizing reform could now only produce an intensification of Chinese ideological invectives, while a turn toward a wholesale rehabilitation of Stalin's memory and methods, from which its more primitive advocates are said to expect an ideological reconciliation with the Chinese, would leave the basic differences unaffected and only deprive the Maoists of the tactical pretext that they are defending the Stalinist tradition.

In fact, the basic features of Soviet society which form the counterfoil to Mao's vision, such as its reliance on highly differentiated material incentives and its rigid bureaucratic stratification, go back to Stalin's own decisions, as Mao knows perfectly well; and they are unlikely to disappear through any change in the Soviet leadership conceivable at this stage.

On the other hand, a turn on China's part in a more "materialist" and therefore more Soviet-like direction, with more stress on material incentives and continuity of production and less reliance on revolutionary enthusiasm, is conceivable after the disappearance of Mao. Indeed the signs are not lacking that forces favoring such a "pragmatic" turn have increased their influence in the Chinese leadership since the end of the cultural revolution, and that they are the same who have pressed for a normalization of state relations with the Soviet Union (so far, as we have seen, with limited success).

In that sense, a decline in bitterness of China's ideological hostility toward the Soviet Union and a move toward a climate of peaceful coexistence between independent communist powers building different types of "socialism" would be a possible development after Mao's demise. But it would not, of course, end the power rivalry between them; it might even, by speeding the success of China's modernization, make her a more formidable rival of Russia at a quicker pace.

The power rivalry, then, will continue to be decisive for the substance of the conflict, while ideological factors may influence its more or less acute and intensive forms at particular times. That substance excludes a true "reconciliation" between the two leading communist powers in the sense of a return to a stable alliance based on the primacy of common ideological convictions and goals. But given a measure of rationality of the leadership on both sides, the fact of a serious conflict of power interests makes nuclear war between them no more inevitable than between either of them and the United States.

The continuation of limited and controlled conflict between Russia and China thus remains a far more plausible prospect than its end by either reunion or catastrophe. But in an increasingly triangular world, that leaves unanswered a question of decisive practical importance for the West: the question of priorities.

In a triangular constellation, different combinations of cooperation and conflict are possible at different periods, with two of the major powers combining on different issues against the third. Yet it is in the nature of such constellation that the combination that will become effective at any particular time is not predetermined, and therefore not predictable. It will be decided by the choice of the most urgent issues at any given moment, and that depends on the political skill of the leaders of each of the new Big Three—including the United States.

## FIGHTING SICKLE CELL ANEMIA IN CLEVELAND, OHIO

### HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, three Cleveland doctors have recently taken upon themselves the responsibility of screening high school students for the sickle cell trait and the disease itself. The doctors are Harold Ford, John Lewis, and Clifton Turner. I have taken a strong interest in their efforts, and have agreed to assist them in an advisory capacity.

Currently, Doctors Ford, Lewis and Turner are operating a pilot project in Glenville High School in Cleveland, Ohio. They are educating every student as to the goals of their program, the nature of the disease, and the manner in which the disease is transmitted. In the evenings, a similar educational project is underway for the students' parents.

Initially, all students were tested for the sickle-shaped red blood cell. Those persons whose test results were positive will be screened again, to determine whether they carry the trait or the disease. Students who are shown to be

victims of sickle cell anemia will receive full counseling and medical treatment.

From the pilot project, the doctors hope to be able to obtain firm ideas about the length of time required for such educational and treatment programs; the incidence of sickle cell anemia among the high school population; and the need, in the black community, for a program such as theirs.

Depending upon the results of the pilot, the doctors hope to expand their efforts to a larger scale program. Although it is still early. I am confident that, when they choose to expand, Doctors Ford, Lewis and Turner will have national support. Thus far, they are supported by the March of Dimes, the Urban League, and the Black Athletic Foundation. The list of supporters is destined to continue to grow.

I was pleased to note that the good doctors' efforts have received recognition in the Cleveland Call and Post. Following is the article which appeared in the paper on January 22, 1972:

SICKLE CELL DETECTION OCCUPIES AREA PHYSICIANS

(By Tom Ehrbar)

Efforts to fight sickle cell anemia, a disease which ravages the black race, are steadily intensifying in Cleveland.

All black children will be screened for sickle cell next year. Councilman Virgil E. Brown heads a detection program to be implemented by the National Foundation March of Dimes (NF-MD).

Likewise, the Foundation for Research and Education in Sickle Cell Disease (FRESCD) of New York has volunteered to send in a team to instruct doctors, nurses, and technicians in screening methods.

The screening will be followed by clinic care and family counseling.

WHAT IS SICKLE CELL?

Sickle cell anemia means that the red cells of the blood are not circular like they should be, but sickle shaped. This prevents the cells from carrying an adequate supply of oxygen.

Thus a victim of the disease has shortage of breath, severe glandular pains, lessening of appetite, impaired sense responses, low resistance to infections, and finally a much diminished life expectancy.

Those races whose ancestors came from Africa are most likely to have sickle cell. One out of every ten black Americans have the trait; one out of every 400 have the active anemia. This means that well over two million people in this country are carriers; more than 50,000 are stricken with sickle cell.

A GENETIC DISEASE

The trait is passed genetically, and cannot be spread from one person to another like a cold.

Every time a man and a woman, both of whom have the trait, have a child, the chances are: a) two in four that the child will have the trait just like its parents; b) one in four that the child will have the anemia; and c) one in four that the child will have no form of the disease at all.

Of course, if either parent has the anemia, or if both do, the odds that the disease will be transmitted are considerably raised.

Detection, care, and counseling for those tainted by sickle cell have been sadly absent in the past. It was an ignored black disease.

But recently there has been an awakening—almost bold steps taken to combat the anemia. A big share of federal monies earmarked for research should be approved during the next congressional session. Right now, there is no cure for sickle cell.

Three Cleveland doctors who were well ahead of this awakening are Harold Ford, John Lewis, and Clifton Turner. They share a pediatric clinic at 14900 Kinsman.

Six years ago they began to spot-check for incidence of sickle cell. They were overwhelmed by the frequency.

So in 1968 they decided to make the sickle cell test obligatory for every patient. They acquired the best screening devices around. None else in the city was testing for the disease at the time.

Thus far the three doctors have examined 9,000 persons. Their results agree with national figures—about 900 have been marked with the trait, about 20 with the anemia.

TESTS ARE MADE

Here is how they make the test.

First, a technician pricks your finger to get a small drop of blood.

Then, the blood sample is inspected under a microscope to see whether the cells are circular or sickle shaped.

If they are sickled you will be asked to return for a different kind of blood test, that is a bit longer.

This sample will be placed on electrophoresis graph which measures how fast the cells migrate when prompted by electricity. And this will ascertain whether you have sickle cell trait, anemia, or possibly a variant of the disease.

The results of these procedures enables one of the doctors to give you specific medical advice. If you have sickle cell trait you will be counseled about its tendencies, and about the chances of genetically transmitting the characteristic. If you have anemia you would be given further tests, special medical treatment, and counseling.

All three doctors are adamant that, as a standard policy, all young people are checked for sickle anemia. They will lend their talents, their time, and their testing devices toward accomplishing that end.

---

## PASSPORT TO CHICAGO

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in a series of articles designed to remind residents of the Chicago area of the diversity, uniqueness, and history of their city, the Chicago Daily News carried a very informative article on ethnic groups in the metropolitan area. The article, "Passport to Chicago," by reporter Laura Green, was carried in the Chicago Daily News of Saturday, February 12.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting and valuable contributions of an ethnic group to the metropolitan area is the Polish Museum of America which is a real treasure for historians and researchers, and is the type of positive undertaking that demonstrates the contributions which Americans of various ethnic origins have made in America.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Feb. 12-13, 1972]

PASSPORT TO CHICAGO—MELTING POT NOW WORKS IN REVERSE

(By Laura Green)

Some people like myths. Henry Ford believed in the melting pot.

He set up a big kettle in his factory, asked his immigrant workers to wear 'greenhorn' outfits the first day, then throw them in the melting pot and replace them with American denims.

He believed the theory that said a man would give up his cherished customs, forget his first language and become exactly like his neighbors.

But in Chicago, a 10-minute trip through most neighborhoods will show you that the melting pot didn't work.

From the expressway, Chicago's churches rise above the skyline in silhouettes of domes and spires. The huge stone piles dominate the neighborhoods like they are supposed to do in Europe.

The green turret of St. Stanislaus Kostka, the second oldest Polish church in the country, rises above the two- and three-story Victorian houses in the neighborhood, while the copper cupolas and high domes of St. Nicholas Ukrainian Catholic Cathedral dwarf the dirty brick houses around it.

The streets are dotted with little groceries, movie houses, bakeries, driving schools that teach you to dodge traffic in five languages, gift shops, restaurants and parcel stores to send supplies to relatives behind the Iron Curtain.

Business is often done Old Country style. A grocer or butcher may sell rolls and cheese for a sandwich like a German corner grocery. Another may total his sales on an abacus. Shop owners hang signs in their native languages and greet you in the neighborhood tongue.

Chicago radio stations have foreign-language broadcasts and Channel 26 produces mostly ethnic TV programs. The Yellow Pages show 35 foreign language newspapers.

Everyone has a voice and these voices are growing stronger. Middle-European workers have found spokesmen in the Rev. Andrew M. Greeley, University of Chicago sociologist, and writer Michael Novak, who describe the frustration of the men and women who did all the 'right' things and still weren't accepted as 'real' Americans.

An amendment to a higher education bill to fund ethnic heritage studies centers is picking its way through the U.S. Congress and has a good chance of passing this session. The Chicago public schools introduced black and Latin studies programs several years ago and are discussing others.

Today, the children of the let's-get-Americanized generation are trying to understand their dual heritage.

"We want to find our own answers to what it means to be a Japanese-American. We want to learn more about our origins," said Hiroshi Kanno, president of the Chicago branch of the Japanese American Citizens League. "We cannot be a silent community on the issues that affect us."

A long-haired Ukrainian-American high school student, one of 700 1st- to 12th-graders who spend every Saturday at St. Nicholas Ukrainian Catholic Cathedral's School of Ukrainian Studies, explained it this way:

"I'm an American first, but this is our tradition and we should know about it. Just because I'm a good Ukrainian doesn't mean I can't be a good American, too."

"We're all looking for roots in a fast-growing culture," said the Rev. Paul Asciolla, co-editor of the Italian-American monthly Fra Noi and an administrator of the Italian home for the aged at Villa Scalabrini.

"We're hunting for our grandfathers and we've got to find them somewhere," he said.

Why did it happen now? When did roots become something to be proud of rather than stumble over?

The catalyst was the civil rights movement. When the people who struggled longest for their rights and identity stood up and said, "We're black and we're proud," others listened.

"We learned from the civil rights movement," said Mitchell P. Kobelinski, president of the Copernicus Foundation, which is try-

ing to build a Polish cultural center. "People recognized their individual rights. And many said, 'Hey, we're proud too.'"

"Italian-Americans have always cherished their culture and traditions. Perhaps the civil rights movement helped give us a name for it," said Anthony J. Fornelli, vice president of the Joint Civic Committee of Italian-Americans.

Chicagoans keep their traditions alive in several ways.

There are hundreds of ethnic professional, fraternal and service organizations. Theater groups. Opera productions of everything from atonal Lithuanian multimedia pieces to "Madame Butterfly" in Polish. Choirs. Tape and film projects to interview old immigrants and artists. Folk dance groups and classes. Movie houses and film societies that show recent Latin, Greek and Japanese films. Museums and galleries for anyone who wants to get acquainted with his neighbors' traditions or steep himself in his own. Many festivals and parades.

The most important are the crowded full-time and Saturday schools where children study the language and history of their past. Greek parents send their children to parochial schools where they learn to read and write in both English and Greek. The Lithuanian Youth Center and the Ukrainian Studies Center have extensive teacher-training programs. Polish children fill weekend classes in churches throughout the city.

"Our schools are the best way to pass on our Greek heritage to third- and fourth-generation children," said Andrew T. Kopan, who is active in several Hellenic-American associations. "Our community leaders come from these schools."

Yet this turn toward ethnicity hasn't solved the problems.

Second-generation Chicagoans have joined the race to the suburbs and the "old" neighborhoods are disappearing. Sometimes, in suburbs like Melrose Park, with its many Italian-Americans, or in the Czech suburb of Berwyn, a new community is created. But in the cities, freeways, urban renewal and an influx of new neighbors with different traditions take their toll. The University of Illinois Circle Campus replaced large Italian and Greek neighborhoods. The Kennedy Expressway, a mobile second generation and a growing Puerto Rican immigration to Chicago have changed the old Polish community along Milwaukee Av. and will some day replace it with a Latin one.

"Urban planners always saw ethnic communities as bad," said Father Asciolla. "They'd say 'Well, it's not bad, if it's maintained in the proper way.'" And up went the freeway. And in came the condominiums.

The planners called the neighborhoods expendable and conventional wisdom called the residents racists.

"The neighborhood is seen as a last intractable frontier," said Father Asciolla. "You must understand that, for the people there, it contains their hard-earned house, their investments, their institutions, their community and security. They weren't going to move aside for anybody—black or white."

There's still prejudice.

"I couldn't begin to tell you of the suffering I've seen in the states where I've worked," said Luis G. Machado, Midwest director of the migration division of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico's Department of Labor. "There is such hatred, such a lack of welcome for Puerto Rican citizens. We have no representation in Government, no services."

Several organizations are working to end professional and executive discrimination in the Chicago area. The Filipino-American Council of Chicago seeks legislation to enable dentists and optometrists, who trained with American texts and methods at home, to practice without returning to school.

Polish-American and Italian-American organizations surveyed Chicago's major banks, utilities and industrial corporations and found almost no Italian- or Polish-Americans in their executive suites.

"There is still subtle discrimination against Japanese-Americans," said Ross Harano, Midwest co-ordinator for the Japanese American Citizens League. "We can't buy homes some places. There's still a limit to how high we can go in a corporation."

There are many ethnic communities in Chicago, each with a different tradition but all with the same determination to keep their cultures alive. They share a pride in their past and in their contributions that have given American life an infinite richness and variety.

---

## DEDICATION OF THE FREDERICK DOUGLASS HOME

### HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 14, 1971, the Anacostia home of Frederick Douglass was dedicated as a national shrine. I was privileged to attend the dedication ceremonies and to join Secretary of the Interior, Rogers C. B. Morton, in cutting the ribbon. It is fitting that Frederick Douglass' Cedar Hill home, where he lived from 1877 until his death in 1895, be restored and preserved for future generations to enjoy. Congress voted the money for the restoration in recognition of Frederick Douglass' dedication to human rights and freedom. Born a slave, he had no formal education, yet he became an eloquent and steadfast leader, working for the abolition of slavery. He managed to educate himself to become one of the most respected orators and writers of his age.

The significance to history of an individual's actions is that his efforts directly or indirectly improve the opportunities for a better life for those that will live after him. It is more fitting an honor for those of us who follow after him to continue his work, but it is also important for us to recognize the contributions he made.

The contribution of Frederick Douglass to our American heritage is immense indeed, and the Frederick Douglass home will stand as a shrine, displaying for all Americans the mementoes of his life.

The following is the text of the speech made by Secretary of the Interior, Rogers C. B. Morton, at the dedication ceremonies:

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR ROGERS C. B. MORTON AT DEDICATION CEREMONIES OF FREDERICK DOUGLASS HOME

When I was sworn in as Secretary of the Interior, the President charged me with two great responsibilities. He said I must lead the way in the conservation of the beauty of our land and its vast resources and tirelessly pursue the preservation of those things important to our American heritage and cultural life.

This shrine which we dedicate today is a great example of preserving something of value that will be enjoyed and revered by all those who visit it and even those who casually pass by.

How fortunate we are to have our great National Park System with all its skills and competence. Not only to bring back to life those important areas and structures that have laid dormant so long, but also, to manage them, display them and artfully make them available to all Americans.

We are excited about bringing the Frederick Douglass Home into the Department of the Interior during this, the centennial year of the National Parks.

One hundred years ago . . . Yellowstone National Park . . . far in the West . . . was brought into being out of the wonderland of the frontier.

I dare say that few here today have had the opportunity to see this magnificent monument of nature so very far away.

But the President, understanding this, has directed that the Parks . . . in the second century of their history . . . be brought to the people. His legacy of Parks program assures this will be done.

Today is a very special day. As today, in the spirit of conservation and preservation:

In the spirit of this Administration.

In the spirit of our great National Capitol Park System, and

In the spirit of Frederick Douglass, who devoted his life to the highest American principles, we are joining together, to dedicate this his home.

Frederick Douglass leaves for America's history a dramatic reminiscence of a great and moral man. A man whose powerful voice still rings with lessons for our own time.

In the knowledge that the Frederick Douglass Legacy stands for the benefit of all Americans, it is significant that Congress has marked this, his home, as a National Shrine.

President Nixon allocated over $400,000 for Cedar Hill's restoration but the high privilege of bringing it to life is your's and mine today.

The American poet, Walt Whitman, was a contemporary of Douglass. Both felt the country's vigor. Whitman wrote after the Civil War.

"Political democracy, as it exists and practically works in America, with all its threatening evils, supplies a training school for making first-class men. It is life's gymnasium, not of good only, but of all."

He gloried in the fact that the American contest for life was open to all men. Douglass proved Whitman right.

For Douglass, both life and freedom began at age 17 when he over-powered a professional slave broker, and fled from a plantation where his birth had only vaguely been recorded as to time and place.

Believing justice was too often in jeopardy, Douglass always eloquently stood in its defense.

It wasn't easy, it occupied every year of his life; and when Douglass died in 1895, the task was still not completed.

Douglass added volumes to the understanding of what it meant to be a *free and dignified man.*

He hammered away at Southern slavery and Northern hypocrisy when he said:

"You degrade us, and then ask why we are degraded—Douglass said—"You shut our mouths and then ask why we don't speak—You close your colleges and seminaries against us, and then ask why we don't know more."

Douglass continued his fight for equal rights after the Civil War.

Three grateful post-War administrations placed him in high office. Douglass spent the last 15 years of his life here at Cedar Hill and he always remained the crusading defender of justice in jeopardy.

The inspiration of Frederick Douglass raises a dignity in all men. Today, we dedicate his home knowing that future generations will find this inspiration; this greatness, this decency that made Frederick Douglass an outstanding American.

Thank you for inviting me to share with you, the honor of bringing new life to the Frederick Douglass Memorial Home.

## SOUTH DAKOTA STATE LEGISLATURE—HARD WORKING AND PRODUCTIVE

### HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, the legislature of the State of South Dakota is composed of dedicated and hard working men and women who are very properly concerned about a large number of problems that are national in scope as well as those that more directly affect South Dakota. This concern is well reflected by the thoughtful resolutions that were passed by the legislature during the recent session which has just adjourned. I feel that the ideas and comments contained in these resolutions are of such importance that they should be called to the attention of each and every Member of Congress. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I include these resolutions in the RECORD at this point:

SOUTH DAKOTA HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 505

A resolution, Citing legislative interest in the preservation of Wounded Knee Battlefield and return of its ownership to the Oglala Sioux Tribe.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota:

Whereas, the historical and aesthetic integrity of the Wounded Knee Battlefield as a registered National Historic Landmark is presently endangered by commercial exploitation; and

Whereas, said integrity would be best preserved if the site were returned to the ownership of the Oglala Sioux Tribe;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Forty-seventh Legislature of the state of South Dakota, that appropriate state agencies in cooperation with the Federal Government shall direct their efforts toward the preservation of the Wounded Knee Battlefield to achieve Indian ownership of this significant site.

Adopted by the House February 8, 1972.

DONALD OSHEIM,
*Speaker of the House.*

SOUTH DAKOTA HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 506

A concurrent resolution, Citing legislative interest in the designation of the Missouri River from Yankton, South Dakota to Lake Sakakawea, North Dakota as a national recreation area and encouraging the Congress of the United States to approve such designation.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota, the Senate concurring therein:

Whereas, a proposal has been made by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Department of Interior, for the establishment of the Great Prairie Lakes unit of the National Recreation Area system, which would extend from Yankton, South Dakota to Lake Sakakawea, North Dakota, and

Whereas, such improvement would offer the people of this country recreational pleasures of outdoor living, fishing, camping, water skiing and other related activities:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Forty-seventh Legislature of the State of South Dakota, the Senate concurring therein, that the Congress of the United States be urged to designate that reach of the Missouri River from Yankton, South Dakota to Lake Sakakawea, North Dakota as a National Recreation Area in accordance with a plan of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, subject to preparation of a master plan acceptable to the affected states and to the federal government; and

Be it further resolved that construction, operation and maintenance of the Great Prairie Lakes unit of the National Recreation Area system be under direction of the Chief of Engineers.

Adopted by the House January 31, 1972.

Concurred in by the Senate February 5, 1972.

DONALD OSHEIM,
*Speaker of the House.*
WILLIAM DOUGHERTY,
*President of the Senate.*

SOUTH DAKOTA HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 515

A concurrent resolution, Memorializing the federal Water Resources Council and Office of Management and Budget to reconsider the interest and discount rate of not less than seven per cent which is to be used on federally financed water resource development projects.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota, the Senate concurring therein:

Whereas, the Federal Register, Vol. 36, No. 245, Part II, dated December 21, 1971, in Section IV D3 on Page 24167, states that an interest and discount rate of not less than 7% be used on federally financed water resource development projects, and

Whereas, no other federally financed program such as housing and other social welfare programs, highway programs, or other programs that enhance the economic well-being of the nation, carry an interest rate above that rate representing the average cost of money to the United States Treasury, and

Whereas, the state of South Dakota has been promised water resource developments to compensate the state for losses in land resources resulting from construction of four Missouri Basin mainstream reservoirs, and

Whereas, no project could be determined feasible under such an unreasonable interest and discount rate, and

Whereas, the state of South Dakota has spent much time and public funds in preparation of laws and formation of legal entities to support the promised water resource projects,

Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Forty-seventh Legislature of the state of South Dakota, the Senate concurring therein, that the federal Water Resources Council and Office of Management and Budget is hereby respectfully requested to withdraw the seven per cent interest and discount rate to be used on federally financed water resource development projects and establish an interest rate consistent with orderly water resource development; and

Be it further resolved, that copies of this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted by the chief clerk of the House of Representatives of the state of South Dakota to the federal Water Resources Council and the Director, Office of Management and Budget and also to the Congressional delegation of the state of South Dakota.

Adopted by the House January 27, 1972

Concurred in by the Senate February 3, 1972.

DONALD OSHEIM,
*Speaker of the House.*
WILLIAM DOUGHERTY,
*President of the Senate.*

SOUTH DAKOTA HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 517

A concurrent resolution, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to amend the Clayton Act in order to provide for the continuance of the family farm and to prevent monopoly.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the state of South Dakota, the Senate concurring therein:

Whereas, it is desirable to preserve free, private enterprise, to protect small business and prevent monopoly, and to protect opportunity for family farmers in interstate commerce, as well as to protect consumers; and

Whereas, vertical integration of the agricultural industry by the processing, distributing, and retailing industries and conglomerate businesses have created situations of unfair, monopolistic competition for the family farmer; and

Whereas, this situation has contributed to the decline of rural populations and the consequent crowding of metropolitan centers; and

Whereas, it has resulted in a noticeable decline in competition in some phases of agricultural production and threatens others; and

Whereas, it should be the national policy to restore competition to the agricultural industry and to provide for the continuance of the family farm; and

Whereas, legislation has been introduced which would provide for the continuance of the family farm and to end these undesirable monopolies:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Forty-seventh Legislature of the state of South Dakota, the Senate concurring therein, that the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged and requested to enact said legislation to amend the Clayton Act; and

Be it further resolved, that copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted by the Chief Clerk of the South Dakota House of Representatives to each member of the South Dakota Congressional Delegation, and the United States Secretary of Agriculture.

Adopted by the House January 28, 1972.

Concurred in by the Senate February 7, 1972.

DONALD OSHEIM,
*Speaker of the House.*
WILLIAM DOUGHERTY,
*President of the Senate.*

SOUTH DAKOTA HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 518

A concurrent resolution, Memorializing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to offer an earlier date for the opening of the sandhill crane season.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota, the Senate concurring therein:

Whereas, the sandhill crane is a migratory bird and remains in South Dakota for a short time; and

Whereas, the months of November and December often provide severe weather and such weather may cause the sandhill crane to leave South Dakota; and

Whereas, the sandhill crane migration has begun as early as late August; and

Whereas, the sandhill crane, if left undisturbed, has caused considerable damage to corn crops in the state of South Dakota; and

Whereas, hunting pressure can ease the problem of crop destruction by forcing the birds to move; and

Whereas, the popularity of crane hunting as a sport is dependent upon the season being open during the peak migration:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Forty-seventh Legislature of the state of South Dakota, the Senate concurring therein, that the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior be memorialized to open the sandhill crane season in South Dakota the first weekend in October; and

Be it further resolved, that the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the state of South Dakota be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior and to the South Dakota Congressional Delegation.

Adopted by the House, February 3, 1972.

Concurred in by the Senate, February 11, 1972.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION, STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

A concurrent resolution, Memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to initiate and implement action to remove the income limitation on those living on social security.

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein:

Whereas, the income of those living on social security is generally very low; and

Whereas, inflation has struck hardest those living on fixed incomes; and

Whereas, the limitation is not in effect for those age 72 and over:

Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the Senate of the Forty-seventh Legislature of the state of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein, that the Congress of the United States initiate and the President of the United States implement without delay the removal of any income limitation for those living on social security; and

Be it further resolved, that copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of the Senate to the state of South Dakota to the members of the South Dakota Congressional delegation and to the President of the United States.

Adopted by the Senate: February 8, 1972.

Concurred in by the House of Representatives: February 10, 1972.

WILLIAM J. DOUGHERTY,
*President of the Senate.*
DONALD OSHEIM,
*Speaker of the House.*

## HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

### HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, I introduced H.R. 13033, a bill to provide home rule for the residents of the District of Columbia. The bill is similar to the one which was overwhelmingly passed by the Senate last October 12, and I hope my colleagues in the House will give it their approval soon. I believe it is a good bill and one best suited to meet the two objectives which any home rule legislation must meet: maximum self-determination for the residents of the District and adequate safeguards to protect the Federal interest in the Nation's Capital.

When one stops to think about it, it is amazing that home rule should still be a topic for debate in this Congress. The historical, philosophical, and practical bases for this legislation have already been forcefully set forth by many of my colleagues. They have been obvious for so long, I am at pains to understand why a home rule bill has not been enacted into law long before now.

I will not take time to repeat these arguments here. They are well known to us all. Rather, I will use this opportunity to explain the primary provisions of H.R. 13033:

First. It establishes an 11-member City Council, elected by the voters of the District. The City Council is granted all legislative powers, with stated exceptions, including a prohibition against any act which concerns the functions or property of the United States.

Second. It provides for an elected Mayor who shall serve for 4 years and shall be the chief executive and administrator of the District government.

Third. It provides a fixed Federal payment to cover the proper share of the expenses of the District government. The payment shall be determined on the basis of a percentage of the amount of District fees, charges, miscellaneous receipts, and tax revenues.

Fourth. The Federal interest is protected by providing that any act passed by the City Council and approved by the mayor is then transmitted to Congress. Each house then has the power to veto such act within 30 days. Further, Congress retains its constitutional authority to enact legislation for the District on any subject.

For more than 100 years, the residents of Washington have been denied a basic right which is enjoyed by every other citizen in this country, the right of local self-government. During this time, the District government has stumbled along with little or no direction. Today, even its most staunch defenders admit that the District government needs drastic reorganization if it is to function efficiently and meet the needs of its citizens.

I believe the basic reason for the decay of the city government is the lack of centralized authority. At the present time, responsibility for the city is shared by a Congress which does not have the time and a city administration which not have the authority to run the city properly. The survival of this city requires a strong government which is responsible not only to Congress but to the people who live in the Nation's Capital. I believe H.R. 13033 will accomplish this goal.

## NIXON AIDE'S ILL-CHOSEN WORDS

### HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Plain Dealer recently spoke out forcefully against the statement of Presidential aide, H. R. Haldeman, that those who oppose the Nixon peace plan for Indochina are "consciously aiding and abetting the enemy." Ohio's distinguished morning newspaper pointed out, this view that if one is not totally in favor of a certain political position, he must be totally against it, is very reminiscent of the McCarthy era, and it is an attitude that has no place in American politics today.

I commend to my colleagues the full text of the Plain Dealer's thoughtful and perceptive editorial:

NIXON AIDE'S ILL-CHOSEN WORDS

The White House chief of staff, H. R. Haldeman, went way out of bounds yesterday in rebutting critics of President Nixon's Vietnam peace negotiations. He was interviewed on NBC's "Today" show.

It leaves a bad, bitter taste in one's mouth to hear Haldeman say these critics "now are consciously aiding and abetting the enemy of the United States."

Echoes of the harsh Red-hunting, witch-hunting days of 1951 are set off when Haldeman says that "the President's critics are in favor of putting a Communist government in South Vietnam."

This is bad language. It is a smear that means "traitor" and "soft on communism" if not "pro-Communist."

Labels like these do not apply to prominent critics of Nixon policy, such as Sen. Edmund S. Muskie, D-Me. Nor do they apply to others who are critical of the President's conduct of peace efforts, whether those critics are in or out of politics. Many Americans have different views of the Vietnam situation and different ideas for seeking peace and for the future of South Vietnam.

Once President Nixon disclosed and gave his justification of his eight-point peace proposal, Haldeman was saying, anyone who opposed Mr. Nixon must be "consciously aiding and abetting the enemy of the United States" and must favor putting a Communist government in Saigon.

In other words, either agree with the Nixon position or you are in favor of the Communist enemy.

Haldeman's logic went askew. His view is narrow if he thinks everyone not in 100% agreement with his boss must be 100% against his boss.

And we find his words objectionable. If this is a foretaste of the coming presidential campaign, the voters will be in for considerable unpleasantness.

## HANOI OBSTRUCTS PEACE EFFORTS

### HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent editorial which appeared in the February 10, 1972, issue of Catholic Standard:

CRITICAL DECISIONS

The recent disclosure of the terms of the secret negotiations between Presidential adviser Henry Kissinger and representatives of the North Vietnamese government make certain conculsions obvious. The North Vietnamese never had—nor do they now have—any intention of negotiating for peace within the accepted terms of international discussions. Every concession made by the United States in its effort to secure a just and equitable peace settlement has been followed by further and greater demands from Hanoi.

It really should not surprise anyone who has followed the course of the conflict and the accompanying negotiations that once again we are confronted by another impasse because of an outrageous demand for further concessions. Yet it is so obvious that once again it is we who will withdraw from our position without any real compromise or concession coming from the enemy. Not a single invader will be withdrawn from South Vietnam, Laos or Cambodia. This course has been apparent and inevitable since our policy of withdrawal became our publicly recognized national policy.

Our policy in Vietnam is now dominated by the disheartening reality that we are bartering for the release of whatever number of American prisoners are thought to be in the enemy's hands. As sad as their plight is and as determined as we must be to secure their release, they are only one part of the total picture that brought us into the conflict and now dictates our disengagement from it. Their welfare is a major concern, but it should not be the only concern. However, it appears to have become so.

Those who have in the past and still agitate for a precipitous withdrawal from Vietnam ignore the real possibility that during the course of a hasty withdrawal many thousands more Americans could fall into the hands of the enemy. These prisoners could be considered non-negotiable by the enemy because that's the way the enemy plays the game.

The President and his advisers have critical decisions to make. They may not be right on all things. But they must be able to negotiate from strength if there is to be any hope for a vestige of a just and reasonable peace and, perhaps, for the release of the prisoners.

## INVESTIGATION OF INS

### HON. JACK H. McDONALD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, nearly 2 weeks ago I wrote the President asking that he request the resignation of Immigration and Naturalization Service Commissioner Raymond F. Farrell. At the same time, I wrote the chairman of the House Government Operations Committee, the gentleman from California, asking that he conduct an investigation of the INS in an attempt to ferret out some spending irregularities which I have discovered.

I felt at the time I wrote the letters a deep dissatisfaction with the way the INS was being managed. Today I am good and mad at what must be the worst run division in American Government.

During a recent trip to Los Angeles, I met with INS personnel. The evidence I obtained there consists of several hundred complaints by citizens in the southern California area reporting to the INS the presence of illegal aliens working and/or residing there. These documents are in my possession because the INS ordered them destroyed in order to make room for more complaints. They were all received in May 1971. None of these complaints have been investigated.

Two weeks ago in the New York office, I viewed some 45,000 uninvestigated complaints. In January of this year, the INS office in Los Angeles destroyed some 2,000 uninvestigated complaints representing a total of 20,000 illegal aliens working or living in this country. Since last June, complaints representing more than 130,000 illegal aliens in the southern California area have been destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, let me cite a few examples pointing out the lack of administrative control within the INS:

One memo in my possession was written by a district director listing some of the problems he is having in his district. Portions of the memo state:

Correspondence, reports and other material is being held up for long periods of time due to lack of sufficient personnel.

Files are not received upon request. File charges are not immediately filed, and files cannot therefore be located.

The normal flow of supplies has been curtailed and we cannot obtain several necessary forms.

The director stated:

All of the foregoing has had a most demoralizing effect upon all personnel and created a loss of pride and respect for the service as a whole.

That memo was ignored. Another example, regarding the INS budget and its effect on operations, apparently also went ignored. It reads in part:

Experience has shown that about 75 percent of the complaints received from the public, if worked promptly, are positive. Many involve multiple apprehensions. With sufficient manpower, area control category investigations, receipts and completions would increase an anticipated 3,000 units per year. This estimate was proven during fiscal year 1970 when a detail of 50 additional officers resulted in the apprehension of over 10,000 illegal aliens during a six-week period. There is no indication that there will be a decrease in area control apprehensions for many years.

But the clincher is one written to Mr. Farrell by a district director:

Generally, the situation described in our prior monthly reports continues to worsen as backlogs increase in all operations due to insufficient manpower, aggravated by the necessity of terminating all temporary and school-program employment, lack of financial resources, inadequate equipment, and the necessity of juggling employees from one operation to another in an effort to keep all backlogs equal.

It has become increasingly apparent to us in the field that there appears to be a complete lack of communication between Central Office Operations that keep demanding unrealistic performance and Central Office Management that controls the funds. This schizophrenic, paranoid type of management must inevitably result in complete destruction of the Immigration and Naturalization Service as a separate agency.

I have been investigating this problem for only a few months, and am getting angrier with each passing day as the evidence of cavalier disregard for the purposes and goals of the INS mounts.

Mr. Farrell's failure to react to this debilitating influence of illegal immigrants has been an invitation for increasing numbers of illegal aliens to sneak into this country and stay here with little fear of capture or deportation. I will repeat my request to the President that Commissioner Farrell be asked to resign at the same time I submit this new evidence.

## DESPITE UNEXCELLED PUBLIC SERVICE, BUSES FACE UNFAIR COMPETITION

### HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, the intercity bus industry has often been overlooked in the determination of our Nation's transportation policies. Yet, intercity buses serve more than 30,000 cities and towns in this Nation—far more than all other public carriers combined—providing vital low-cost transportation.

This, combined with the industry's excellent safety record, has been succinctly outlined by Mr. Raymond F. Shaffer, president of the Greyhound Corp., in a speech at the recent annual meeting of the American Association of State Highway Officials, which I commend to my colleagues.

I call particular attention to the final several sentences, in which Mr. Shaffer points out that this privately owned system is now facing unfair competition from Amtrak. Mr. Shaffer's comments should be given much weight by Congress in considering future appropriations for Amtrak.

Mr. Shaffer's speech follows:

REMARKS OF R. F. SHAFFER

Mr. Turner, Fellow Panel Members, Ladies and Gentlemen: Thanks for inviting me. I am honored to be asked to participate with this distinguished panel.

Once I told my friend, John Reed, President of the Santa Fe Railroad, that I could say something that he couldn't say about his railroad—that I had been a gandy dancer on his line.

I can say something similar to you about your highways. In 1929, I was a "spudder" on the concrete road being built between Kansas City, Missouri and Lee Summit, Missouri. Also, in the summer of 1930, I laid every piece of steel and placed every expansion joint on Old Highway 40 between Wamego and St. Marys, Kansas. So, you might say I am familiar with your work from the ground up.

I've been in the bus business all my adult life—38 years—and I want you to know that I recognize and greatly appreciate the importance of your work. As Henry Ford once so aptly put it, "We are a nation on wheels." And wheels can't move us or our products unless we have good highways.

I can remember 50 years ago my father working for paved roads through our county. In those days they were called Macadam roads, after John L. MacAdam, the Scotch engineer who started the process. And when we paved some roads, they were paid for by us, the farmers whose properties were adjacent to the road. The theory used was "benefit district." Most of the farmers then did not own automobiles, yet they were expected to pay for the road.

Through associations such as yours, the National Gas Tax Administrators Association, and others, our industry is now paying its fuel tax to the various states on the basis of actual miles operated within each state.

Twenty-eight of our states dedicate their fuel tax monies to the construction of highways. Our industry has worked long and hard to promote this legislation and views with considerable concern the mounting efforts of those in Washington and elsewhere who would raid the Highway Trust Fund for a great variety of non-highway purposes. Our industry opposes any diversion of the Highway Trust Fund and will continue its efforts in the states presently not participating to further legislation allocating monies collected for highway use to the betterment of the highway system.

Our entire economy is affected by your work. I am afraid most of our citizens take our highways for granted and do not realize how this nation is tied together with highways.

Let me recite something specific about the improvements you have accomplished. Twenty-five years ago, it took our bus 9½ hours to go from Washington to New York and it was necessary to make two rest stops. Today we run it with some schedules, non-stop, in three hours and 56 minutes.

To get back to the subject at hand, I think we should look at what our industry is doing with what you have built and how we fit into the complete intermodal concept of transportation for our country.

The intercity bus industry operates 23,000 buses strictly in intercity service on 200,000 route miles. Of the 23,000 intercity buses, my company, Greyhound, operates 6,000 buses over 100,000 route miles in intercity service, plus three sightseeing companies in southern Florida, our Gray Line New York Tours, Gray Line in San Francisco and we serve eight of the nation's 12 largest airports. LaGuardia, Kennedy and Newark are served by our Carey operation, and we serve Washington National and Dulles in our nation's Capitol, as well as Atlanta, Detroit and here in Miami. In addition, we operated 1,000 escorted tours every year. That service combined operates approximately 550 million miles per year, so I think we qualify as a highway user.

I think one of our jobs today is to let officers and administrators like you know what we can do. Many people still do not realize what a service we offer nor the extent of our coverage.

Mr. Johnson gave us a good outline for a panel discussion. When I first read it, I thought perhaps the best thing I could do would be to send our Public Relations man to tell everybody that we are rendering a good intercity bus service on our highways, but Mr. Johnson's provocative statement stirs up the thinking cells and that's good.

First, let me show how our industry serves America along with the other public carriers. Here is the latest Amtrak timetable. It lists service to 410 towns and some of it only twice or three times a week. Here is the Official Airline Guide. It lists service to 708 cities. And here is the Intercity Bus Service Guide. It lists 16,088 cities and towns, and we lay claim to another 25,000 communities or crossroad settlements too numerous to mention where a person can be expected to be picked up or discharged by bus or where they can receive a package express shipment.

I should also acquaint you with the volume of intercity bus travel. Sylvia Porter, well known financial columnist, wrote on August 17, 1971, and I quote:

"Before this year ends we will have taken close to 400 million intercity bus trips in the U.S.—more than double the 1971 number aboard domestic air flights."

Safety—Convenience—Economy—and Frequency have been our stock in trade.

Dealing first with safety. The results of your work really show up in safety statistics. I can recall in our company a goal of 25,000 miles between collision accidents.

Today, we consistently operate 200,000 miles between accidents and we obtain close to a million miles between accidents on the Turnpike and Interstate Highway System. To be sure, in those years we have improved our driver screening and training, and bus performance has improved, but your highways have made a big contribution to this improvement in safety.

Next, convenience. We are flexible and we have taken advantage of all the new highways to make our service more attractive by less time in traffic congestion and at the same time making our service readily available in center city or the suburbs.

Next, economy. Bus fares average less than four cents per mile. For economy, there is no better way.

As for frequency, our industry provides convenient departures. In some of our sparsely settled communities we may operate three or four schedules per day. But the frequency steps up in ratio with the population. For example, all of us tend to point to the northeast corridor—Boston, New York, Washington, when discussing high frequency. Trailways and Greyhound together operate 70 schedules per day from New York to Washington and 40 per day from New York to Boston. Those are schedules, not buses. From Friday through Sunday there may be from two to ten sections on any of those schedules.

I think it would be meaningful in this discussion to point out what we have done to make our service attractive as related to passenger comfort. Our buses are air conditioned—we have air suspension ride—reclining seats—tinted picture windows to keep out glare—and every bus has a restroom.

As for the future, we're very excited about two new developments: (1) we have a new turbocruiser being tested in regular route service. This turbine-powered bus represents a significant breakthrough in technology. To our customers, it will mean a smoother, vibration-free ride. As a contribution to ecology, it is virtually pollution free. And (2), we have a new bus which is 102 inches wide. We have spent two million dollars developing it, and we have operated 100 of them, where they are legal, over 30 million miles without a single accident where the extra six inches could be blamed. Your Association approved this bus and we appreciate your support. With this bus, we can provide more passenger comfort.

This bus is legal in 22 states and is presently pending in Congress. We can operate it in 33 states as soon as Federal enabling legislation is passed. A bus this wide is not new to bus riders—only to intercity bus riders. Buses this wide have been in service 20 years in our city transit systems. In fact more people ride on 102-inch-wide buses than any other size. Fifty-five of our cities use them, but of course, not with the refinements in comfort we have in this bus.

I have tried to point out that our industry is rendering service, nationwide, by use of our highways and we are prepared to do more.

Months ago, we filed agreements with Amtrak whereby we would honor any ticket they sold on our service. This will allow a person to travel on one ticket, using both Amtrak and bus service.

I must be candid and state that I do not like our hard earned tax money being used by Amtrak to operate at a loss and hurt us by cutting the fares. Amtrak just recently announced a reduction of 22½% in its one-way fare between New York and Boston—from $12.75 to $9.90 despite the fact that its monthly deficit on the New York-Boston operation is approximately $250,000. As a result, Trailways and Greyhound were compelled to reduce their fares from $10.45 to $9.65.

They are not serving a need if they force us to reduce a service that is paying its own way just to add volume to their operation which is losing money anyway. That is not creating new business and, in my opinion, this goes beyond the original concept of Amtrak.

We are ready, willing and able to interline business with the airlines too. Highways will the link between communities and airports for a long time to come in most of our cities and we know how to serve them.

Our message remains . . . "Leave the driving to us."

Thank you.

## A SALUTE TO DR. AND MRS. GORDON CLARK

### HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, at this time throughout the city of Iowa Park and Wichita County in Texas, citizens are reflecting on the contributions that Dr. and Mrs. Gordon G. Clark have made during their 50 years of professional and civic services to that community.

Dr. Clark has recently announced that he is retiring from the medical practice he established over 50 years ago. During those years Dr. Clark has acquired a truly remarkable record of achievement as a dedicated family physician, trusted personal counselor, and revered civic leader.

Mr. Speaker, for the tenure of my work as the U.S. Representative for the citizens of the 13th District of Texas, I have met few individuals who have given as much of their own time, their energy, and their devotion to the community in which they lived than Dr. Gordon Clark and his gracious wife, Oscar.

As testimony to the great love that the citizens of Iowa Park have for this remarkable man, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues remarks made by Agnes and Louis Quick when they learned of Dr. Clark's retirement from active medical practice:

What will we do? Words seem so inadequate when trying to express appreciation for one who has been such a vital part of our lives as a doctor and friend. A doctor who gave untiringly of himself to alleviate the pain and suffering of others: a doctor who came to our home when he was needed, regardless of the hour or the weather: a doctor who shared in our joy at the birth of our children and grandchildren; and a doctor and friend who sat by and sympathized with us in times of sorrow,—that is our beloved doctor and friend—Gordon G. Clark. May God bless him and his every interest.

Multiply this sentiment by the thousands of individuals with whom he has worked during a span of over half a century and it becomes clear why he is loved so dearly by the citizens of Iowa Park and why I wish to echo the praises to this remarkable Texan before my colleagues of the U.S. House of Representatives this afternoon.

Along side her busy husband, Oscar Clark has also generated the admiration of several generations of Iowa Park residents. Her untiring concern for the well-being of the community's young people, her work on behalf of the local chapter of the American Red Cross, her time and attention to the benefit of men stationed at Sheppard Air Force Base, in addition to the contributions she has made to her church community have made her of immeasurable value to people in all walks of life throughout the county.

I ask my colleagues to join with me in saluting the remarkable record of community service that Dr. and Mrs. Clark have achieved during their 50 years residence in Iowa Park, Tex., and in extending to this wonderful couple our wishes for a happy retirement.

## A TRIBUTE TO PROF. WILLIAM PAUL WALKER

### HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest regret that I must report that the State of Maryland recently lost one of its outstanding sons, Prof. William Paul Walker, who was born, lived, worked, and died within the borders of

the Free State. He now rests in Carroll County, Md.

For more than 44 of his 72 years he served the people of Maryland as a scientist and educator in the Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics at the University of Maryland. He taught and guided graduate students in taxation and public finance. He authored or coauthored well over 100 research publications and special studies, including 38 annual reports of the joint tax committee of the Maryland State Grange and Farm Bureau. He pioneered in agricultural taxation, and was a key force in the development of Maryland's laws regarding farmland. His contributions to the work of many taxation and highway commissions appointed by four governors of the State were significant, as was his work with many committees of the Maryland General Assembly. He earned and received a national and international reputation as an expert in his field.

His giant accomplishments were recognized by the Maryland State Grange in 1962, and the Maryland Farm Bureau in 1966. In 1969 he was designated Maryland's "Man of the Year in Agriculture" by the Maryland State Grange.

Professor Walker was a quiet scholar who tied concepts and principles in public finance and taxation to the practical decisions of State governmental administration. Maryland is a stronger State because of his life, and its people are better served because of his work. He loved the rural areas and the farm people of Maryland, but he worked for an improved interrelationship of all our people, rural and urban alike.

The citizens of Maryland could never repay him for his service, but we can express our deepest gratitude and I insert this acknowledgment of our profound appreciation into the RECORD at this time.

---

## TRAGIC TRAFFIC TOLL

### HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, Martin M. Puncke, Acting Chief, Systems Operations Division, U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, discussed before the Safety First Club of Maryland, on February 14, 1972, the significant steps that are being taken on a national level to reduce the tragic traffic toll in the United States.

At this point in the RECORD, I insert Mr. Puncke's remarks in order that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read his remarks:

REMARKS BY MARTIN M. PUNCKE

I am pleased to be here with you for two important reasons: To bring you a report on a number of ongoing Department of Transportation activities which affect every citizen, and to seek your support for our efforts to achieve the Department's goal of reducing the nation's traffic fatality rate by one third by 1980.

In an organization such as the Department of Transportation, concerned with all transportation modes and their many ramifications, I find it more than difficult to be selective in reporting on those activities of primary interest to you.

Effective January 1, 1972, the Department of Transportation moved to make it easier for consumers to obtain safety information on new automobiles.

Under an amendment to a Federal regulation, prospective car buyers will be able to retain and take home the consumer information on new automobiles which has been made available only in dealers' showrooms. The take-home information will have to be provided without charge.

Under the amendment the consumer information must be in sufficient quantity to be retained by prospective purchasers, or be mailed to a prospective buyer upon his request.

We are proposing that our two old standards on motor vehicle inspection and vehicle registration be combined into one standard to be known as "Vehicle Requirements."

This proposed standard will cover all aspects of vehicle registration, and an entirely new section regarding the maintenance of equipment installed on new vehicles as required by the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards (new car standards like the collapsible steering column, seat belts, headrests, etc.). This section will also deal with the alteration of vehicles—the raised front or rear ends, the inappropriately large tires, the "ape hanger" front ends of motorcycles, and things of that nature.

The last section will deal with the maintenance of the vehicle. The first is to get the unsafe vehicle off the road, and give the States the widest possible latitude in accomplishing this purpose of getting unsafe vehicles off the road and getting the concerned citizen to do a better job of maintaining his vehicle.

That this is a worthwhile objective cannot be denied. We believe that approximately six to seven percent of traffic crashes may be due to mechanical failure. "Due to" in this case means that had the mechanical failure not occurred, there would have been no accident. This means that 3,000 lives may be lost each year from mechanical failure. We also are quite sure that mechanical condition is a factor in 17 percent of the crashes—smooth tires on wet roads, a leaking brake cylinder—things of that nature.

Even though inspection may not have the glamour or priority of our alcohol program, or our experimental safety vehicle program, we are not forgetting the need for people to maintain their vehicles.

We have mentioned a Consumer Information Program, Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance, and I am sure you are all familiar with programs to improve the safety features of new vehicles, so I am not going to discuss these any further.

I am going to tell you about what is going on to improve the quality and behavior of drivers. This is more in my area of responsibility, and since these programs must be implemented by State and local officials, you should be familiar with some of them.

Let me tell you about a program that has just started, a Selective Traffic Enforcement Program—the Administration's STEP effort. It is designed to demonstrate traffic enforcement countermeasures that will result in accident reductions and to identify the quantity and quality of traffic enforcement effort needed to impact on accidents.

To a limited extent this program has demonstrated a high payoff potential by the results of a project in selective traffic enforcement initiated in Flint, Michigan.

Traffic fatalities, for example, were reduced by 59 percent and personal injury accidents were reduced 24 percent with an increase of 44 percent in moving hazardous violation arrests.

In addition, the Flint enforcement effort made 205 felony contacts while working traffic. We believe this potential needs to be further developed and realized on a broader basis than is now the case. The ultimate goal is to apply results to a national undertaking administered by State and community safety programs. At present, Chattanooga, Tennessee; El Paso, Texas; and Sacramento, California, are under contract for a three-year STEP project.

Several months ago we proposed to the Secretary of Transportation a Driver Control Program as our next major priority in the State and Community Program.

By Driver Control we mean the sum total of all actions affecting a driver from his initial licensing to the time he ceases to drive. This program will encompass the driver licensing and relicensing processes; driver improvement, including rehabilitation and retraining; Medical Advisory Board; administrative system of driver referrals; administrative adjudication of traffic law violations; as well as various types of enforcement actions.

In a more direct way, we could term this as our negligent Driver Control Program since it seeks to restructure driver behavioral patterns. Each project undertaken will provide a systematic method for identifying errant and negligent drivers for rehabilitative or license denial action.

I could talk for hours about the advances made in highway design and construction, signing, break-away sign supports, forgiving roadsides, etc.

But just stop for a second and ask yourself this question: What good does it do to have sophisticated highway design and construction, the latest in signing and markings, etc., when in one split second your life and mine, and our loved ones can be snuffed out by a drunk driver.

Most of us use drugs in one form or another. We smoke, drink coffee, take medicine, and may have a drink before dinner. Amphetamines, sedatives and barbiturates are a part of many of our daily lives.

Most of us in this room use some form of drugs daily. How many of us drank coffee today? This was a nerve-wracking day. Did you take a tranquilizer to settle your nerves? When we leave here tonight how many of you will take a sleeping pill to help you fall off to sleep? But let me point out the most widely used drug in our society—and the most abused—alcohol.

While we in the Department of Transportation have no intention of changing America's attitudes and habits about ordinary social drinking, we feel it is necessary to take strong action about the relatively small group of people who use alcohol abusively and drive.

In 1970 over 55,000 highway deaths occurred in the United States. Fifty percent, or roughly 28,000, involved alcohol. Two-thirds of these accidents involved people with a serious alcohol problem. They were problem drinker-drivers. One-third involved heavy social drinkers or inexperienced youths who on occasion drove while intoxicated.

It is a startling fact that the highway toll has been three or four times greater than all homicides. There are, however, two other factors which merit equal attention. For each death there are a score of individuals who are maimed, crippled or disabled. The second factor is that in America's health problems, cancer, heart disease, typically, though not always, attack the middle aged and elderly; while the highway is the killer and maimer of our children and young adults. Indeed, it is the chief cause of death from age 2 through 36. Half of all fatally injured drivers are under age 30.

Recognizing this, Secretary John A. Volpe, U.S. Department of Transportation, has launched as his top priority highway safety

effort a national campaign aimed primarily at this small group of problem drinker-drivers. This campaign is a cooperative one with the States and communities. It is in your State and in your community that the action must really take place. Washington can only point out the facts, suggest methods, and give strong emphasis and encouragement to stiff programs to control this number one killer on the highway.

Almost three percent of American drivers are alcoholics. About four percent, if not alcoholic, are heavy escape drinkers. This seven percent is the primary focus of the national program.

Let's take a look at what we hope to accomplish.

To drink or not to drink is an individual concern. But to drink and then drive is a community concern. That's the idea that must be sold—the understanding that must be universal. We have to change a deeply-ingrained pattern of conduct. Unfortunately, it is part of the American social pattern to drive after drinking. And that pattern must be reversed. Americans must become sensitive to the drunken-driver problem—sensitive to our own limitations, sensitive to others, and constantly aware of the social forces that would compromise our good judgment.

I am constantly amazed—and appalled—by our apparent tolerance of this national tragedy. If a 747 jet crashed every week killing 385 persons, we would demand a grounding of that aircraft. Think of the hue and cry if just one football stadium collapsed each Sunday killing 385. Consider the national outrage if 385 persons were killed in one week from food poisoning, or water contamination, or any other unnatural disaster. Yet that is the number of persons who die every week as a result of drinking and driving—the number of persons who will never again ride a 747 or attend a football game.

Preliminary estimates now register a total of 55,000 highway fatalities in 1971. That's an increase of 200 over 1970—200 human beings who—had they not ridden into the valley of death—would be leading happy productive lives today. And this tragedy illustrates the problem we face. Because it is also true that in 1971, the death rate per 100 million miles traveled declined from 4.9 to 4.7, the lowest in history. Yet even this achievement is unacceptable.

Perhaps it would be easiest to stop drunk driving by adopting some of the harsh penalties prescribed in other nations: ten years in jail with a $2800 fine in South Africa. Capital punishment in San Salvador.

But we certainly don't advocate these punishments. We would much prefer, for instance, a concerted effort to make our court systems more responsive.

It's not our goal to lock up every drunk and throw away the key. It's our goal to keep them from driving. And I'm pleased to note that the national press—newspaper, television and radio—is beginning to pick up the theme. The word is beginning to get around—that we have a solution, that it can work, that it is working.

In Charlotte, North Carolina, the liquor stores are giving each customer a breath-testing kit that will tell the customer when he (or she) is too drunk to drive.

Nassau County, New York, has a new 24-hour telephone hot line which a drinker may call to ask for transportation.

Ann Arbor, Michigan, gives a person convicted of drunken driving the option of going to jail or agreeing to swallow one anti-alcohol pill every day—then even one drink makes him unpleasantly ill.

In Seattle, Washington, an ASAP (Alcohol Safety Action Program) worker is meeting with judges and attorneys to make pre-sentencing recommendations—recommendations that could lead a convicted drunk driver out of jail and into an appropriate rehabilitation program.

The press is beginning to report those stories. These are our solutions—countermeasures in action. And there's plenty of room for involvement by safety organizations. Whether it is the adopting of national resolutions, recommending state action programs, or becoming a volunteer worker at the local level—we need your help. We need your expertise—as opinion leaders, as organization leaders, as concerned individuals.

May I spend a few minutes discussing the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's program within the State of Maryland.

The Department of Mental Health and Hygiene has entered into a contract for an Alcohol Safety Action Program encompassing the area of Baltimore City and part of Baltimore county. The project director is William Terwilliger and the program involves several disciplines. Enforcement is represented by the Maryland State Police and the Baltimore City Police, the District Court system, the Department of Motor Vehicles, the city and county Health Departments, and the Baltimore Area Council on Alcoholism.

The financing level is $2.6 million over a three-year period. This is one of 35 cities throughout the United States which has been selected as a demonstration city for this type of program.

The Highway Safety Act was passed by Congress in 1966 and funds were made available to the States in FY 1967 From FY 1967 through FY 1972, the State of Maryland has received $5,478,385 from the Federal Government to carry out the provisions of the highway safety standards authorized in the Act. The sixteen standards cover areas of highway safety such as driver licensing, registration, motorcycle safety, codes and laws, courts, emergency medical services, driver education, traffic records, police traffic safety programs and pedestrian safety.

In Maryland the greatest amount of funding has gone to five areas. $1,260,445 to Driver Education; $523,732 to Emergency Medical Services and $686,640 to Police Traffic Services; $1,089,444 to Traffic Records and $686,248 to Pedestrian Safety.

During FY 72, which is July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, Maryland's appropriation is $1,224,776. Planned expenditures are listed in the Annual Work Plan submitted by the State to the Federal Government.

The NHTSA is waging this fight on several fronts. This is not a job for a single government agency nor a single segment of society. However small it might be, that crack in the door can be opened wider only if every American accepts the idea that traffic safety is the responsibility of everyone It is a PEOPLE program. Everyone must participate, every person behind the wheel, and every pedestrian walking the streets.

Progress is measured at NHTSA in terms of lives saved; every step, every decision is made for people—not just half the people part of the time, but ALL the people ALL the time.

## GRAND GULF: NEW LIFE FOR AN OLD TOWN?

## HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, the Mississippi Power & Light Co. recently announced construction of a nuclear powerplant on the Mississippi River near Grand Gulf, Miss.

Grand Gulf is one of the oldest towns on the Mississippi River. Although its days of an important river port are now history, a nuclear age facility may be the beginning of a new era.

The history of Grand Gulf was recently outlined in an article which appeared in the Vicksburg Sunday Post, January 30, 1972. I think my colleagues will find it to be of interest:

GRAND GULF: NEW LIFE FOR AN OLD TOWN?

(By Gordon Cotton)

The landing at Grand Gulf is lonely and silent. On the west shore of a mile-wide bend in the Mississippi River lies Coffee's Point, outlined by a narrow strip of white sand and covered with cypress and oak and swamp willow. A field, divided by a fence, borders the east bank and ends abruptly a mile inland at the base of a limerock bluff. To the north of the bluff flows the Big Black River, its waters merging with those of the Mississippi to form a large whirlpool—a grand gulf.

The blast of a riverboat's whistle breaks through the quiet, a modern reminder of an era when, about 130 years ago, Grand Gulf, Mississippi was second only to New Orleans in shipment of cotton and third-ranked in commercial importance in the state.

But all that changed when first the unpredictable river and then fire set by Yankee troops took their turns at destroying the town.

For over a century there seemed little hope that Grand Gulf's past glory would ever flourish again, but with the announcement last week that Mississippi Power and Light Company would build a $400,000,000 nuclear power plant a mile south of the old town, speculation soared concerning the economic impact on the area.

Some think that Grand Gulf may again enter into an era of economic prosperity. The owner of a local store foresees increased business as laborers are brought to the construction site and officials of the Grand Gulf State Park hope for an increase in visitors.

For one life-long resident, however, little change in the town itself is expected.

"A boom here?" Mrs. Lenora McAlpin, who holds the honorary title of mayor of Grand Gulf, said. "No sir. There's no place to live here, no where to trade. Oh, there'll be a lot of workers, but they'll be coming and going from other towns every day."

Lenora sees the nuclear power plant construction as a "big boost for Claiborne and surrounding counties" but thinks Grand Gulf will remain virtually unchanged. Nuclear power doesn't bother her, she said. "They won't let anything go wrong—if it blows up it'll get them as well as me."

Whether or not Grand Gulf's economy will be revived, the town has definitely left its mark on Mississippi history.

Just when the name Grand Gulf was given is not known, but it appears on French maps dating from around 1700, and one early explorer noted in his journal in 1700 that his party passed "Grand Gulf . . . on the left hand side."

It is thought that the first settlers moved into the area about that time, and early writers noted that the Indian uprisings devastated the settlement in 1729.

Later explorers warned about the treacherous bend in the river where there was "a sudden and violent eddy, which threatened to run our boats upon the snags or crush them against the logs and rafts which floated on every side."

Large-scale settlement came in 1771 when Gov. Phillip Barbour of Virginia was given 5,000 acres; Col. Thaddeus Lyman received 20,000 acres in 1774. Both brought in colonists to settle their vast land grants.

These settlers were Tory in both sympathies and in deeds during the American Revolution, and some suffered at the hands of the Spanish and the Patriots. Following the Revolution, another influx of settlers began.

Braving the trip overland was a hazardous

journey, but one by river could be just as dangerous. One traveler told of how the swirling gulf had capsized his boat, destroying all his possessions and drowning his family.

Grand Gulf soon became known up and down the river because of the whirlpool, or gulf, and boatmen were warned that the swirling waters would dash their vessels to pieces.

Yet the settlers came, and by 1821 clearings dotted the area. The wilderness had given way to farms, the farms to plantations, and the river which had been a hindrance became the life of Grand Gulf.

A school was started in 1821, and religious services were held by the Baptists and by Alexander Campbell, who organized a Christian Church there.

When the City of Grand Gulf was planned in 1828 by Amos Whiting, Ezra Marble and White Turpin and surveyed by William Davis, 80 city blocks were envisioned.

At that time Grand Gulf contained three stores, one tavern and several dwellings, and the postmaster, Dr. Thomas Newell, began a stage line to Port Gibson, which was eight miles inland. The next year a road was constructed to the county seat.

John Wilmot Thompson, an enterprising farmer on Bayou Pierre, operated a toll ferry across the stream, and when the Grand Gulf Railroad was chartered a few years later, Thompson refused to sell right of way for the tracks, fearing that his ferry business would be ruined. The case went to court and Thompson lost. Undaunted, he took his slaves at night and by torch light removed the spikes from the newly-laid rails.

Yet the railroad went through, the second in the state, and by transporting cotton from the interior the iron horse helped to transform the Grand Gulf wharf into one of the busiest on the river.

In 1833 the legislature issued a charter of incorporation, and the following year W. M. Smyth began a bi-weekly newspaper, The Grand Gulf Advertiser.

The steamboat trade, aided by the railroad, made Grand Gulf a city of commercial importance. In 1835, in less than nine months, 47,770 bales of cotton were shipped from the wharf.

Evidently Grand Gulf's more than 1,000 citizens believed in the future of the town, for in 1836 the Advertiser reported that $12,000 for a lot 60 x 120 feet on Front Street had been refused, and Editor Smyth predicted that within ten years it would be worth $30,000.

By 1837 Grand Gulf contained 76 city blocks and boasted three hotels, five taverns, a distillery, a theatre, a slave auction block, two tinsmiths, a gunsmith, a jeweler, six general doctors, two surgeons, one obstetrician and two dentists. There was also a town hall and a fire station with two engines.

Elaborate entertainments were held, a little threatre group was active, cultural and scientific societies existed, and a temperance movement was under way.

A nursery also flourished, there was a large commercial orchard, an insurance company with capital of $500,000 was formed, and the Episcopalians built a sturdy brick church.

Stores advertised everthing from silver coffin plates to Monongahela whisky.

The progressive city fathers took steps to hard-surface the streets, an accomplishment which Natchez soon imitated, buying the rock from Grand Gulf.

When the panic of 1837 hit Grand Gulf, the city issued its own paper currency in a variety of denominations. Times quickly improved, and by 1839 the railroads showed assets of over three million dollars.

In that same year, the legislature chartered a shipping company which was to create direct trade between Grand Gulf and Liverpool. Some business was transacted but the venture was not a success.

Local river trade and traffic was more successful. An average of 35 steam boats stopped weekly at Grand Gulf and eight of them are known to have sunk there. One, the George Washington, exploded, setting fire to the town. In later years, a more famous vessel, the Robert E. Lee, took on its first shipment of cotton at the Grand Gulf landing.

No doubt there were many stories of adventure which involved Grand Gulf citizens, but none was more exciting than that of Henry Watkins Allen who, as a runaway lad of 17, came ashore at Grand Gulf where he clerked in a store, studied law, and married into a wealthy family. During the War for Texas Independence, Allen left to join Sam Houston and was given the rank of captain. After the San Jacinto victory, he returned to the Gulf and achieved prestige as a lawyer and planter and fame as a duelist. In the 1850s Allen moved to Louisiana. Twice wounded in Confederate service, he ran for governor of Louisiana during the war and was elected. Following the South's surrender, Allen, refusing to be reconstructed, fled to Mexico City where he edited an English-language newspaper.

Grand Gulf had its share of problems along with its prosperity. Yellow fever, cholera, fires and a tornado ravaged the town over the years before 1860. But a near-fatal blow occurred between 1855 and 1860 when the river slowly began to move inland, its waters gnawing away 55 city blocks—the entire business section—until most of the town was gone and only 158 people remained when the firing started at Fort Sumpter.

During the war, Grand Gulf again figured prominently as Union ships shelled the Confederate positions on the bluff. But their damage was slight as the swirling waters tossed the gunboats around and around, sending their shots awry. After five hours of battle, the Yankees withdrew with heavy casualties and one less boat; from the bluff Confederate guns still roared defiance.

But that wasn't the end of the war for Grand Gulf. Twice landing parties came ashore, and after their second visit, only two or three dwellings had escaped the torch.

Grand Gulf never recovered though the river reverted to its original bed years ago and cattle now graze where the bank and hotels once stood. Only a few houses remain along the dusty streets.

Epitaphs in the cemetery, which spreads like a blanket across the crest of the bluff, best tell the story of Grand Gulf. Here, where crumbling brick walls and iron lace fences stand beneath the shade of cedars and crape myrtles, the tales of a town long dead are etched into the sculptured monuments.

A slight breeze stirs the moss hanging from the trees, and again through the quietness you can hear the whistle of another boat passing the Grand Gulf landing.

Perhaps it is only a nostalgic sound, a sentimental reminder of another era. Perhaps.

Or perhaps it is an indication that Grand Gulf is about to live again.

---

## GETTING BUSTED ABROAD

---

### HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, in increasing numbers American young people are traveling abroad. Problems that lie in wait for them, in some cases, are graphically described in an article called "Getting Busted Abroad" which was published in the February 14, 1972, issue of the Nation.

The article is of particular interest to me because some of the young people referred to are residents of the San Francisco area. However, conditions are described which should be of concern to all of us—young people, parents, Members of Congress. For this reason, I am placing the article in the RECORD:

GETTING BUSTED ABROAD

(By Bernard Weiner)

Hundreds of American young people are discovering, to their dismay, that in this era of the "global village," many of the other villagers are not quite ready to accept their life style. As a result, they spend years rotting in primitive jails. They come as tourists into slowly changing, but still fairly traditional cultures—such as those of Mexico, Spain, Greece, the Middle East—with their conspicuous hair, bizarre dress, loud music, sexual freedom and euphoric drugs. While they loudly condemn the typical American bourgeois tourists (often their own parents) for disrupting the traditional economy and customs of such places, they fail to see their own flamboyance as something that local officials might interpret as a threat to cherished conventions.

Many of them use marijuana, hashish, occasionally LSD, and some of them become dealers in these illegal drugs for the others. Increasingly, foreign authorities have come to the conclusion that the tourist money brought in by this sort of international hip-tourism is of less moment than the actual or potential "social harm" these young people bring with them. So they bust the "hippies" on whatever grounds they can—sometimes for vagrancy or cohabitation (as happened last summer on the Spanish island of Ibiza in the Mediterranean), but usually for possessing drugs, which may have been planted by the local police or customs officials. If the sentences are harsh enough, these functionaries hope, the threat to their proud cultures and to their own young people can be checked. And in the process, they can preserve the traditional atmosphere which attracts the more affluent tourist.

The "hippies" who fall foul of the law are usually unfamiliar with the legal system in the country through which they are passing, have few contacts with influential natives, do not know their rights—or whom to buy off for how much—and may suffer serious abuse, sometimes physical, at the hands of local law enforcers. In some places, they cannot expect to receive much aid from representatives of their own governments, who often are in an ideological, if not practical, alliance with the police.

A typical case—but with atypical, even frightening, aspects—is that of Jack V. Maniaci, a young Warner Brothers Records promoter from California, who for the past year has been locked in a prison in Las Palmas in the Spanish Canary Islands. Maniaci was arrested February 1971 for alleged involvement in smuggling quantities of hashish from Morocco to Las Palmas. When he was arrested on the ship arriving from Africa, Maniaci had no drugs on him, but police said another youth, a 16-year-old Canadian who was also aboard the ship, had confessed that the drugs found in his possession had come from the Californian. Maniaci says the Canadian told him later in prison that he had been beaten badly in order to force the confession from him; Maniaci's lawyer and his assistant say the Canadian's bruises were still evident months later.

It is interesting at this point to note what happens to a youngster who is arrested in a strange land; how he goes about defending himself, and what part U.S. consular officials can be expected to play. One can conceive the role of a consular agent in some small tourist city in three ways: as an official agent of the U.S. Government, as a neutral trans-

lator when the occasion arises, and as being—to put it gently—eager to maintain good relations with the police.

When Maniaci was busted, he was thrown into a 3-by-4-ft. dungeon and left there for nearly five days before being interrogated by the recently formed drug squad of the Las Palmas police. He says he made frequent requests to see the local U.S. consular agent, Manuel Martin, but the police slammed shut the gate of his cell whenever he raised the point. Word was finally sent to Martin and two days later he appeared at the jail. Probably to avoid suspicion of "kickbacks," consular officials are forbidden to recommend a local attorney. So he gave Maniaci a list of the lawyers available in town and told him which ones spoke English. The prisoner blindly picked one who spoke English, having very little alternative.

During interrogation, Maniaci gave his statement, his "confession." (Maniaci says he was told that unless he made a "confession," they would throw him back in that 3-by-4 dungeon for five months.) According to Spanish law, a suspect can challenge the translated language of the confession. Maniaci insists that he did not confess to having furnished the Canadian with the hashish, but the translated version says that he did. He wanted, he says, to challenge that wording, but was told by a court official who spoke some English that if he did he would fall into serious trouble; that since he had no drugs in his possession when arrested, he should let the wording stand. That way, he could be sure of a lenient sentence, perhaps only a few months for vagrancy and then deportation. Completely in the dark about Spanish law, terrified of going back to the dungeon, and Martin not being available for advice, Maniaci took the advice of his Spanish "friend" and let that all-important challenge slide by.

Meanwhile, other long-haired foreign youths were being rounded up, fifteen in all, and the local papers began playing up the capture of an "international drug-smuggling operation." (The Spaniards didn't miss that angle either; they took one look at Maniaci's Italian name—and that of another suspect, a boy from San Francisco—and, according to one paper, became panicky, believing that the Mafia was sending in drug smugglers "masquerading as hippies.") The fact that no hard drugs were involved and that hashish has become common in the dropout culture around the globe carried no weight with the Spanish media, with the drug squad which had a reputation to establish, or with national leaders. "Three years ago, there were no such arrests to speak of," Eduard Blanco, director-general of Spanish security, told reporters in Madrid last year. "Things have reached beyond what tolerance can permit, and the time has come when we have got to do something to keep our country clean from undesirable people."

The lawyer selected by Maniaci was also defending the other fourteen suspects—a clear conflict of interest since one of those was the Canadian youth whose "confession by persuasion" had implicated Maniaci. Maniaci's parents wrote Martin to ask what was going on. The lawyer, he replied, had visited their son in prison and is doing the best he can. At that point, however, the lawyer had never set eyes on Maniaci. When his parents and friends learned that, they hired a San Francisco attorney, Morley Shapiro, who had had some success in similar drug cases in Amsterdam. Shapiro flew to Spain, fired the local lawyer and obtained others, and set about during his three-week stay to investigate the case, the behavior of Martin in the whole affair, and some other startling findings—including the willingness of the American Express office in Las Palmas to turn over mail and packages to the local police.

According to Shapiro, the police originally had a court order empowering them to seize mail of one of the American suspects, but the police were then told to stop any such interdiction. However, Shapiro has a copy of a tape-recorded conversation with an American Express mail clerk who says she was ordered by her boss to turn over to the police the mail of a selected group of Americans and Canadians—as well as to note any hippie types coming into the office who looked "funny."

Shapiro also came back with a tape-recorded conversation with Maniaci in the prison about his case, his treatment, how his "confession" was obtained by means of threat, and so on. Once back in the Bay Area, Shapiro also produced an affidavit from a person in Morocco who swears that he, not Maniaci, gave the hashish to the Canadian.

When Martin learned of the role of the American Express Company in this case he became extremely concerned. So did the United States Embassy in Madrid, and State Department personnel in Washington, the latter learning about this aspect of the case from Shapiro, since Martin's report somehow never made its way to the State Department. The embassy in Madrid maintains that the practice has now been stopped, which may or may not be so, but in any case provides no legal or political help to those whose privacy has already been violated. (A public relations man for American Express in New York, when asked what the company's policy was in releasing to foreign authorities mail addressed in its care, said: "There is no policy because it doesn't happen—it has never been asked of us.")

Meanwhile, Maniaci—like many of the 700 or so other young Americans who were busted abroad last year—remains in prison, his trial not scheduled to begin for at least several months, more than a full year after his arrest. His lawyers are finding it difficult to enter the affidavit from the man who says he passed the dope to the Canadian in Morocco. Martin and the other U.S. officials can (or will) do little to aid him. If he is convicted, and according to precedent he may well be, he could receive as little as six years or as much as twelve years in Spanish prisons. (Maniaci told Shapiro that he'd rather rot in San Quentin or Folsom than remain in the Las Palmas jail, which, he said, is like "an insane asylum and a nightmare.")

State Department indifference is by no means unique to Maniaci's case. Another Bay Area youth, Richard Gary Branchaud, was picked up by the Las Palmas drug squad in December on a marijuana charge. His mother says her son had to wait five days after his arrest to speak with Martin, and she herself was not notified until a week after that. "Why did five days elapse after Gary's arrest before he got to see the consulate?" she asked. "Where was Manuel Martin while Gary was being interrogated and 'confessing'?" Sharon La Bere, a young Bay Area woman who was recently released from a prison in Iran after being charged with "spying," had a similar experience. She condemned the U.S. consulate in Tehran for "complete lack of help. They wanted me to write an apology to the Shah. They said I'd be in prison for fifteen or twenty years if I didn't cooperate with the secret police. All the help I had, and it was little enough during a trial conducted entirely in Persian, was a court-appointed attorney who first saw me fifteen minutes before the trial."

"The hands-off policy used by U.S. consular officials," says lawyer Shapiro, "can be equated with letting these kids get convicted." And he adds, basing his remark upon what Martin told him about the help he received from the embassy in Madrid—it is insane to suppose that the so-called "legal adviser" there is not sufficiently familiar with Spanish criminal law to aid young Americans in legal trouble. It could be, however, that the Administration values U.S. air bases in Spain too much to show any special concern for "hippies" in trouble.

## VENEREAL DISEASE—A PROBLEM FOR THE ENTIRE NATION

### HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation providing for the prevention and control of venereal disease, which has reached epidemic proportions and threatens the health and welfare of future generations. Approximately 650,000 new cases were reported in 1971. Unfortunately most cases of venereal disease are not reported to the health authorities. The U.S. Public Health Service estimates there were more than 2 million actual new cases of venereal disease last year. The incidence of venereal disease has risen significantly over the past 3 years. New York State has experienced continual increases in cases of venereal disease and is concerned that the numbers will reach frightening proportions. In 1972, the Communicable Disease Center, within the National Institute of Health reported 884,000 cases of venereal disease in New York City and 164,000 in upstate New York.

In June, the communicable disease appropriation expires, and Congress will have the opportunity to review the present program and assert itself in a strong effort to single out the venereal disease problem, by supporting this legislation. By showing special attendance to programs, designed for prevention and control of gonorrhea and syphilis, it is conceivable that the growth of these diseases can be regulated and eventually diminished.

The bill authorizes $15 million for fiscal year 1973 and the next 2 succeeding years for technical assistance and project grants for research, demonstration or training programs in venereal disease prevention and control. The technical assistance and grants would be made available to universities, hospitals, and other public or private nonprofit entities.

For the establishment of State comprehensive venereal disease diagnosis and treatment programs, for which formula grants in the amount of $25 million annually are authorized, the allocation is based upon incidence of venereal disease and population—with a $50,000 State minimum—and each State is required to submit a plan for the establishment and maintenance of adequate public health programs for the diagnosis and treatment of venereal disease including provisions for statewide laboratory diagnostic services.

Project grants of $30 million authorized annually to States and political subdivisions for venereal disease prevention and control programs which require: Disease surveillance activities, including reporting, screening and followup; case finding and followup activities and professional and public venereal disease education activities.

The funding levels provided for in this bill follow the recommendations of the American Social Health Association, American Venereal Disease Association, and the Association of State and Territorial Health officers.

My colleague in the Senate, JACOB JAVITS has introduced a companion bill and has gained the support of many fellow Senators.

Mr. Speaker, the time is now, to act on the problem of venereal disease and your support of this measure will create the impetus to control its spread.

## A TIME OF PRAYER

### HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most inspiring and commendable proposals I have heard in a long time is an idea recently advanced by Mr. and Mrs. Phil Regan, of Pasadena, Calif. These noted, public-spirited citizens who exemplify the finest in home, civic and community life have requested all the major broadcasting networks in America to observe 30 seconds of silence on Monday, February 21 at 12 noon—at the time President Nixon will be conducting his historic talks with the leaders of the People's Republic of China.

This is a call to the television and radio networks for a simple 30 seconds of silence for prayer or meditation on the subject of international peace, by a country which has never silenced these media. It is a call for universal accord through such expression regardless of race, color, or political or social philosophy.

The networks have repeatedly expressed their concern for the public interest and have devoted a considerable amount of valuable air time to public service programs. What, Mr. Speaker, could be more in the public service than this humanitarian appeal?

The Regans have sent copies of their proposal to the President, to all the Members of this Congress, to our Governors, and to the leaders of industry, labor and all segments of American society. They also informed various world leaders of their plan, and in a remarkably short period of time they have received direct letters of endorsement from President Nixon who hailed the suggestion in an enthusiastic personal note, from His Holiness Pope Paul VI who reaffirmed his fervent hopes for international harmony, from President Pompidou of France, Prime Minister Trudeau of Canada, Prime Minister Lynch of Ireland, and many others who have quickly acknowledged their support. This is a heartening response, and surely a deserving one for so worthy a cause.

Mr. Speaker, I want to convey my sincere compliments to Jo and Phil Regan, celebrities in their own right, but above all, patriots in the finest American tradition. I insert a copy of their proposal in the RECORD in order to commend the Regan appeal to my colleagues in the Congress. I trust that they too will join next Monday in this call to prayer for international harmony.

The proposal follows:

(The following letter has been sent to the Presidents of all the major networks:)

FEBRUARY 1, 1972.

DEAR SIR: This is a call to prayer for international peace at high noon on February 21, 1972—at a time when our President will be meeting with Chou En-Lai in Peking. As two Americans and great-grandparents who love this country, we call upon you to use your network at high noon on February 21 for 30 seconds dedicated to silent prayer. We implore you to join the other networks in asking your millions of listeners to send up a united prayer that sanity and normal balance prevail in the world and that a wave of international amity and peace be instilled in the hearts of men throughout the world, particularly the leaders of nations. Those who do not pray can silently hold peace and brotherhood in their hearts for thirty seconds. Let us not be lacking in solidarity but united in diversity and help make the universal brotherhood of man a certainty instead of an altruistic dream.

Will you joint with the other networks in giving 30 seconds of silence on TV and radio to this country which has never silenced your network?

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. PHIL REGAN.

P.S.—A copy of this letter was mailed to the individuals and organizations listed below:

His Holiness Pope Paul VI, President Nixon, Vice President Agnew, 50 Governors, 435 U.S. Congressmen, 100 U.S. Senators, Members of the Cabinet, The Chief Justice, City Mayors, Police Chiefs, J. Edgar Hoover, James Rowley, FCC, Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, United Nations, Paris Peace Talks, Associated International and National Press, UPI.

Whitehouse Press, various newspapers, heads of 40 leading industries, all labor unions, Veterans Administration, American Legion, Women's Temperance Union, General Federation of Women's Clubs, League of Women Voters, Military Chaplins' Assoc., heads of Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish associations, National Parent Teachers Assoc.

Women's Lib., Chou-En-Lai, Prime Minister Heath, President Willy Brandt, Leonid Brezhnev, Prime Minister Sato, Marshal Tito, President George Pompidou, Prime Minister Golda Meir, Premier Indira Ghandi, President of Mexico, Emperor Haile Selassie.

President of Ireland, Queen Elizabeth of England, Fidel Castro, Prime Minister Trudeau of Canada, President Allende of Chile, Prince Juan Carlos of Spain, Ton Buc Thang of Vietnam, Chaing Kai Shek, Prime Minister of Ceylon, Prime Minister of Italy, Prime Minister of Australia, the Premier of the Arab Republic and others.

The major networks to which this letter was sent were ABC, NBC, Mutual, Metromedia, CBS and KCET.

The response has been gratifying. Some of those who responded have included His Holiness the Pope, President Nixon, Vice President Agnew, the President of Ireland, the President of France, and many others.

Jo and PHIL REGAN.

PASADENA, CALIF.

## NORTHERN IRELAND RESOLUTIONS

### HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, all Americans were deeply shocked and saddened by the brutal slaying of 13 men in Derry 2 weeks ago. It is clear that the situation in Northern Ireland cannot be allowed to continue as it is. The British Government must recognize and act on its responsibility to deal justly with the people of Northern Ireland. The internment policy must end; the occupying troops must be withdrawn and replaced by a truly neutral peacekeeping force; and steps must immediately be taken toward the creation of a new political structure that will replace the existing one which has lost its claim to legitimacy.

Several official agencies in Massachusetts have recently spoken out eloquently on this subject in a manner which expresses the views, not just of the people of Massachusetts, but, I believe, of all Americans who believe in the principles enshrined in our own Declaration of Independence and Constitution. The text of these resolutions follow:

RESOLUTIONS URGING A SETTLE IENT OF THE CIVIL STRIFE IN NORTHERN IRELAND

Whereas, The civil strife in Northern Ireland during recent months has become the social cynosure of the European community and the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas, The most recent deaths of thirteen citizens of Northern Ireland has highlighted the tragic dimensions of this internal unrest; and

Whereas, A world saddened but wisened by a savage and brutal Second World War can no longer tolerate the oppression of a people because of their religious, ethnic or racial identity; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate officially expresses to the government of Great Britain the sense of the Senate that the time has come for Great Britain to end the needless oppression and suffering extant in Northern Ireland by relinquishing her claims and ceasing her administration of Northern Ireland; that the time has come to move speedily and with all due regard for and protection of the civil rights of all groups and persons involved to satisfy Irish irredentism and effect the unification of the Irish people; and that the time has come to simultaneously right the wrongs of the past and help ensure a tranquil, prosperous era of cooperation and alliance for Great Britain and Ireland; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Clerk of the Senate to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, to the members thereof from the Commonwealth and to the Secretary General of the United Nations.

RESOLUTIONS PROTESTING THE PRESENT POLITICAL DIVISION OF IRELAND

Whereas, The present political division of Ireland is not in keeping with the principles of self-determination and is not based on the racial, economic or historical background of the people of Ireland; and

Whereas, The Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory unless a clear majority of the people of Ireland in a free plebiscite determine and declare to the contrary; and

Whereas, This approach to the problem of a united Ireland is entirely in keeping with the free democratic ideals and principles of our own democracy and all free nations of the world; and

Whereas, Ireland from the very beginning of our own beloved country through tremendous hardships and adversity has always been a staunch and unflinching friend of America; and

Whereas, The current Northern Ireland movement is aimed at securing equality for all in local government, voting and public housing, at ending property ownership requirements to vote and at terminating dis-

crimination in public housing allocation by local officials; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives hereby urges the United States Government to use its good graces and attempt to assist in bringing about a peaceful solution to the Northern Ireland problem presently plaguing the Irish people and thereby lay the foundation for uniting this great nation under one flag; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, to the members thereof from the Commonwealth and to the Secretary of State.

---

RESOLUTIONS URGING THE WITHDRAWAL OF BRITISH TROOPS FROM NORTHERN IRELAND

Whereas, The presence of British troops in Northern Ireland has increased the tension which has existed therein for many years; and

Whereas, Riots and bloodshed resulting from the presence of such troops have become an almost daily occurrence; and

Whereas, On Sunday, January 30, 1972, British soldiers fired at Irish Catholic sympathizers thereby killing thirteen persons; and

Whereas, The continued presence of British troops in Northern Ireland will result in further riots, bloodshed and deaths; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives urges the President of the United States to use the full weight and power of his office to effect the immediate withdrawal of British troops from Northern Ireland; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, to the members thereof from the Commonwealth and to the British Consul.

---

RESOLUTIONS URGING THE UNITED NATIONS TO CONSIDER THE ISSUE OF NORTHERN IRELAND

Whereas, The Massachusetts House of Representatives deplores the violence and bloodshed which has occurred in Northern Ireland; and

Whereas, Continuance of violence in Northern Ireland affects not only that country but much of the civilized world; and

Whereas, It appears unlikely that peace will be restored in Northern Ireland unless British troops are removed therefrom and unless the parties involved in such violence negotiate in good faith to restore peace; and

Whereas, The United Nations presents an ideal and readily available agency through which such negotiations may be conducted; therefore be it

Resolved, That the United Nations be requested to immediately consider the situation in Northern Ireland with a view to effecting the elimination of violence and a political solution to the problems of Northern Ireland by negotiation of the parties involved; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, to the members thereof from the Commonwealth and to the Secretary General of the United Nations.

---

MASSACHUSETTS EXECUTIVE COUNCIL RESOLUTION

Resolved: That the Executive Council of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts be recorded as requesting the immediate withdrawal of all British troops from Ireland; and

That the President of the United States, the Secretary of State and the Massachusetts Congressional delegation be informed that the Executive Council favors the withdrawal of diplomatic recognition of and suspension of foreign aid to the British Empire until all invading British troops are removed from Irish soil.

---

LYNN, MASS., CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION

An order was unanimously adopted at the City Council meeting held on February 8, 1972 requesting that a letter be sent to you protesting the massacre of Irish Civilians by British soldiers, the internment of people without trial, and the presence of British Troops in Northern Ireland.

---

CITY OF SALEM, MASS., RESOLUTION

At a regular meeting of the Salem City Council, held in the Council Chamber on Thursday, February 10, 1972 the Council adopted an order in behalf of all Irish and non-Irish citizens of Salem, protesting the massacre of Irish citizens living in Northern Ireland. They protest the jailing and mistreatment of Irish citizens without benefit of a trial and the antagonistic presence of British troops.

They request the immediate cessation of these gross inhumanities and open display of complete disrespect for the most basic human liberties of the many friends and relatives of people who are residents of Salem, and the immediate withdrawal of all British troops from Northern Ireland.

---

## EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL AMERICANS

### HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I recently received two excellent letters from gentlemen affiliated with Tougaloo College in Tougaloo, Miss. Mr. George Earle Owen is a member of the Christian Church and a trustee of Tougaloo College. My good friend, Mr. Merle H. Miller, is a prominent Indianapolis attorney who has for some time worked with Tougaloo College.

I believe the following statements of the gentlemen speak for themselves in reminding of the need to renew our commitment to affording all Americans an equal educational opportunity:

FEBRUARY 14, 1972.

Hon. ANDREW JACOBS, Jr.,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. JACOBS: I write in support of proposals in both House and Senate which would increase substantially funds available for Higher Education. As a trustee of Tougaloo College in Tougaloo, Mississippi, I am concerned especially with those programs designed to support developing institutions and disadvantaged students.

Tougaloo College is a small predominantly black institution. Most of the 750 students at Tougaloo come from Mississippi and over 80 percent from families with annual incomes under $6,000 a year. On the average Tougaloo must provide approximately $1,200 aid toward tuition, room and board costs of $1,800 for each student.

I am especially impressed with the E.O.G. program in the Senate bill. Such a program would guarantee the basic needs of our students and would encourage the State of Mississippi to develop a scholarship program.

In addition to increased student aid, we at Tougaloo depend heavily on the programs for Institutional Aid and Developing Institutions. Both the House and Senate bills would provide the kind of aid we need. The Senate bill has an additional provision for Emergency Distress Grants which are needed urgently by many institutions like ours.

Also, we continue to depend on Work Study, Student loan and aid to disadvantaged students. The Ethnic Heritage Studies Centers piece of the Senate bill is a very Creative idea in which Tougaloo would certainly be interested.

I urge your support of these proposals and hope that the strongest possible bill will emerge from the Conference Committee.

GEORGE EARLE OWEN,
*Trustee, Tougaloo College.*

---

ICE MILLER DONADIO & RYAN,
*Indianapolis, Ind., February 10, 1972.*

Hon. ANDREW JACOBS,
*U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR ANDY: The occasion for this letter is the Higher Education Bills now pending before the House and Senate. You are aware of my involvement with Tougaloo College and through that I have kept up on the other black colleges. I have come to realize that for the next generation, at least, the only chance for many blacks to get a higher education is through these black colleges which accept students with poor preparation and are yet able to turn out material for graduate schools in the North.

There is an educational and cultural gap between the 18-year old black student who has graduated from high school in Mississippi and the students who would be entering Indiana or Old Miss that precludes a meaningful college experience for most of them. Yet by the time they graduate from Tougaloo 40% are able to go on to graduate schools in the North.

The black colleges in the South that provide this vital function to our country are all practically bankrupt because they geared their programs to take care of more students supported by Federal aid and then that aid was curtailed. So we are vitally interested and our survival is really dependent upon the enactment of some Federal program that will enable these students to get a higher education. On the average, Tougaloo provides $1,200 aid toward tuition, room and board costs of $1,800 for each student.

If you can help to move along some Higher Education Bill that will rescue these black colleges, I shall be grateful.

Sincerely yours,

MERLE H. MILLER.

---

## ACTION ON ARTILLERY ROAD

### HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, the attached commentary gives expression to pride in a previous heritage and the dedication and spirit it exemplifies.

"Action on Artillery Road" was prepared by Lawrence M. Duryee who is co-chairman with Mrs. Duryee of the Historical Committee of the Middlebury Land Conservation Association.

The commentary follows:

ACTION ON ARTILLERY ROAD

(By Lawrence M. Duryee)

There is a pond in our village which is unique. It is more appealing than any pond I have ever seen. It is really a small lagoon

in the country, surrounded by purple swamps and wild flowers of every hue. Marsh grass is so abundant that birds of countless species feed in its lush undergrowth. You stand at the edge of the meadow just where the winding stream called Goat Brook carries its millet and lichen into the marshes and watch the fascinating wild life—ducks, Canada geese, herons and American coots. Motorists driving in a great hurry along the state road look across Fenn's Pond and suddenly slow down. They are captivated by what they see. It is a place of renewal which nature put here long ago.

Close friends of this country lagoon have become enthusiastic historical researchers. It was at the top of the nearby hill called Breakneck during a crucial phase of American Revolution that General Rochambeau's army of four thousand troops encamped. The road, such as it was—winding up the steep slope—proved almost impassable for the French artillery and it has been known at intermittent intervals ever since as Artillery Road. Rochambeau's well equipped army of four regiments was en route to meet General Washington.

This day of June 27th, 1781 they looked down with keen interest on that small pond, on that same meadow, and on Goat Brook. They had tramped twenty miles and they were hot and tired. The cool waters of the stream and lagoon revived them. Thus Fenn's Pond has earned its modest place in history! The site of Rochambeau's camp is commemorated by a stone monument erected at the top of the hill not far away. Authentic military maps of the French army designate this place as "Camp Breuknek" (Camp No. 9). It was after this arduous march from Newport to Virginia that this French army helped Washington defeat Cornwallis at Yorktown.

The part that our village played during the Revolution has inspired many local historians. It has also provided proud owners of old houses in the vicinity with reason to boast that le Compt Rochambeau dined in one of their candle-lit rooms and slept upstairs in a feather bed. You would actually think the great General had nothing else to do but eat and sleep.

A hundred and fifty years ago a clapboard house was built just at the edge of the meadow. It has weathered New England winters well—a God-Fearing memorial to the men who built it. Fenn's Pond has nothing very close to it before except a narrow dirt road leading to the village green. The road went by the blacksmith shop. Goat Brook, winding along at the foot of the hill between wider banks, slid silently into the marshes. It fed the lagoon and helped give life to birds and animals. And often to humans as well. Small boys standing among the marsh marigolds plied their fishing rods in the April sunshine.

The most exciting event in the life of the community occurred last spring. A large family of Canada geese suddenly appeared at the edge of the marsh! Their eggs had been laid in the tall grass. Here they raised their young, completely oblivious to the roar of traffic. The geese with their gosslings proudly lined up between them would parade majestically, single file—a dramatic background for the convoy of wood-ducks and mallards diving for food.

Fenn's Pond with its colorful wild life has dwelt in the hearts of the towns-people for as long as any one can remember. It was therefore incomprehensible that any man-made interference would ever disrupt this peaceful lagoon. With anguish coupled with deep personal resentment people in the village learned of a reported sinister money-making scheme concocted by a real estate developer. His plan threatened the pond's very existence. He would ruin the lagoon by totally enclosing it in concrete pipes! Bulldozers would smash the dam at its eastern end and fill in Fenn's Pond. Even a modern supermarket could eventually rise in its place. All the historic and idyllic surroundings—the birds, the animals, marsh and meadow—would be nothing but a memory.

At first dismay, then indignation spread through the town as the unbelievable news travelled from house to house. At this point Yankee practicality replaced emotions. Fenn's Pond, the 7½ acres of land, and the 1820 house hard by became the focal point of one of the most dedicated and embattled union of citizens ever banded together. The Middlebury Land Conservation Association was formed under state statute. This legally constituted group then went into every sector of the village and pleaded for immediate support to purchase, with hard cash, the lagoon and the entire surrounding area.

The drive went into high gear under excellent leadership. The appeal was personal, conducted largely by word of mouth. At first progress was slow. Legal obstacles were questioned and submitted to competent lawyers. No government money was sought. No wide publicity or fanfare was used. Perservering, hard-working people were inspired by a common urge to preserve this small body of water. They worked doggedly and with devotion to save the minute piece of earth they loved. Money came from all parts of town and even from outside the state. One gift sent by a casual summer visitor arrived from as far away as San Francisco. The most heart warming experience was the receipt of a check for one dollar sent by a young enthusiast who went without his lunch to help save the pond. In a few short months over 400 people subscribed more than $35,000!

This unique body of water, the marshes, field and winding stream still live because people care. Friends of the pond have preserved by permanent legal ownership not only an enduring sanctuary for birds but an important bit of history as well. What a blending of emotions these inspired! The battle against the bulldozers was won with the fervor of a crusade.

Today the conflict against "modern" technology continues elsewhere partially because of the success at Fenn's Pond, where geese, ducks, muskrats and frogs raise their young unmolested. An occasional horse muzzles the quiet waters of Goat Brook. As you gaze down today on this peaceful scene from the top of the hill you wonder what Yankee pioneer, Algonquian or Cherokee Indian, French soldier or courageous Connecticut milita-man trod the road by the pond, saw the forebears of these very birds flying low over the waters. What weary horseman or itinerate Connecticut tinkerer refreshed himself here long ago?

There are other ponds in Connecticut; many are seriously threatened. They plead for nothing more than to be allowed to quench the thirst of a 'possum or red fox, or feed a flock of migrating ducks. Friends of this village pond know that the true wealth of a place is determined by many things other than its price in the marketplace.

The 1820 house at the meadow's edge was sold recently by the conservation group to an enthusiastic young couple. Care is being used to restore the place to its original condition. An acre of lawn and shrubs surrounding the dwelling have already been reclaimed. Funds obtained from this sale will permit the Middlebury people to tackle their next preservation, which they are sure will be as successful as their "Action On Artillery Road".

---

## AERO-FIRE

### HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues recent comments made by Congressman JERRY PETTIS before the President's National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control.

Congressman PETTIS is a member of this Commission and as such has become an authority on the subject. I originally became acquainted with his expertise in this field when, as a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee, he began exploring the use of new technologies in the field of fire prevention and control.

I believe his comments are important and can be of use to fire departments everywhere. In light of the seriousness of recent forest fires, his recommendations about applying advanced technology to combat wildfire losses by utilizing a program called Aero-Fire are particularly timely. The comments follows:

COMMENTS BY CONGRESSMAN JERRY PETTIS

Chairman Bland, distinguished Commissioners, ladies and gentlemen.

We have been told that prehistoric man "discovered" fire and learned to make it serve his primitive purposes. That must surely have been the dawn of science and technology on planet Earth. We have claimed that fire became the "servant of men" from that time on. The truth is—we really haven't mastered fire yet. On all too many occasions, even today, fire is still our master. In fact we don't understand this natural phenomenon well enough to master it—not yet.

In the past the public has stoically accepted all the losses caused by catastrophic fires and has been willing to rely upon traditional fire fighting techniques for protection. But public attitudes are changing. People are beginning to demand better protection from their losses. An indication of public recognition of this need for improved protection is evidenced by this Commission and the concerns that you represent.

I'm sure that we're all hoping for the final mastery of fire. We're tired of wasting life and property. You are all experts in your fields and collectively can make important impacts upon our understanding of the fire problem and upon its early solution.

So I won't try to duplicate your expertise. Instead, I'll call upon my own experience and focus comment on one phase that's most familiar to me. I spent several very informative years on the House Science & Astronautics Committee and more recently, I've moved to the Ways & Means Committee. That makes me quite aware of how and why we spend our taxes. I'm especially sensitive to waste—and to me, fire, out of control, is a very wasteful force—wherever it may be.

We've all heard a lot about potential applications of space age technology for solving down to earth problems. In solving some of our problems, the payoff for transferring space technology is still difficult to define and may even take years of research and testing to identify. But in the field of fire suppression there are new ways to apply some of the techniques and technology originally developed for the missile and space programs.

There are several facts that strongly recommend this modern research and development "systems" approach. First of all, if we can do it, we're getting a bargain. A great deal of the technology is already here today and has been paid for by the federal government. We have a lot of equity in it and we deserve to get the dividends. This means that with relatively modest funds the technologies which were very costly to develop for the military and space agencies could become available for fire suppression applications. Secondly, the industry which has developed this technology and would have to participate in its transfer to other purposes is largely available to work on these problems. This

means, time saved in obtaining operational systems through the R & D process. Finally, many of the problems to which this technology was applied are directly related to similar civil sector problems An example would be the valuable experience that resulted from the fatal Apollo fire.

Let me describe a few specific examples of this kind of aerospace technology transfer that can have an impact on the reduction of fire losses.

One major effort to apply this advanced technology to combat wildland fire losses is called Aero-Fire. This program which is being conducted by the Forest Service is still new but it has already identified some of the key technologies that can be productive in this area.

It has long been known that effectiveness of the initial response is critical, and in over 97% of the fires this response has been effective. The 3% of the cases in which this effort has not succeeded still results in annual losses of over $600 million each year not to mention the irreplaceable losses of life or the long term loss of watershed and recreation areas.

The Aero-Fire program has analyzed techniques for increasing the capability of aircraft to deliver fire retardants using aerial technology previously developed for weapon delivery systems.

It seems appropriate to point out that in the eagerness to beat our swords into plowshares we may not be able to recognize how much of that process is actually taking place each day. As in the past perhaps the dread of the atomic age may have inhibited the peaceful applications of atomic energy. We may not all enthusiastically endorse military R&D or even the space program but our biases should not distort our ability to see new ways to apply the valuable spin-offs of military and space R&D to solving routine people problems at the earliest possible date. It has been suggested that we need peaceful substitutes for the stimulus that war or defense has traditionally provided for advancing the state of our technology. Many believe that space exploration is such an opportunity. The re-direction of our talents, materials and energies to solving down to earth problems like fire suppression can also become a stimulus to new technology. But first we should use what we already have. The need for modern combat aircraft developed all-weather infrared viewing techniques for flying under low light level conditions. This technology seems to be directly applicable to flying and "seeing" in heavy haze or smoke. Techniques of this kind are being studied in the Aero-Fire program.

The problems of command and control, communications and surveillance are also being studied as they relate to the dispatching of the initial fire-fighting response and the coordination of efforts in combating large or multiple fires.

An experimental command center has been conceived and already simulated at which a wide variety of essential information is displayed using TV and other audiovisual techniques to assist the command personnel in making the best possible operational decisions in the critical time available. It's like a smaller version of Apollo Mission Control.

At this command center the first boss is provided with maps of almost any scale which are projected on viewing screens with overlays of topography, structures, roads, vegetation, fire danger, and wind. The real-time positions and status of critical equipment and personnel are also displayed. The fire which is being mapped by infrared heat sensors can also be overlaid along with periodic projections of its growth or suppression. This command center can also free the personnel of routine clerical problems by managing the details of time, status and cost statistics for the personnel and equipment assigned to the fire. The surveillance of the fire zone by TV or FLIR, which stands for Forward Looking Infrared, will also be transmitted to and displayed at the command center console to assist in the evaluation of the fire's status. The hardware to equip this command center is available today and a dynamic mock-up has already been constructed. The development of new software which would include a computerized simulation model of the fire and the fire fighting progress will require a substantial research effort.

When this automated console is adequately programmed for use as a wildfire simulator it can serve as a training tool for teaching the special regional problems of wildfire suppression. It will be capable of providing a realistic experience environment to professional fire fighters to completely familiarize themselves with regional differences of terrain, fire and fuel types without requiring them to learn all of their lessons through on-the-job training under the extreme pressures of actual fire-fighting operations. It can also be used out of fire season to maintain an inventory of the forest, for harvesting and recreational use.

These techniques were extensively used as you know in preparing our astronauts to operate in the hostile environment of the moon. They worked so efficiently because they had already been "on the moon" hundreds of times before in very realistic simulated environments.

The Aero-Fire program, is an example of what one responsible agency, the Forest Service, has been able to accomplish with the vision to use this approach of technology transfer.

There is another example based on a recent proposal from the same aerospace industry which helped to formulate AERO–FIRE. This group has identified some potential applications of advanced technology to the solution of the urban fire problem. It now appears that it may be possible to speed up the detection and location of fires through improved sensors and data handling techniques. The dispatch and command function equipments developed for space and military operations have been studied extensively. A great deal of this technology appears to be applicable to the problems of dispatching and directing urban fire personnel and equipment. Improved communication techniques developed over the past decade will undoubtedly play an important role in the direction of fire fighting personnel. Finally, there are sophisticated surveillance techniques based on infrared technology which can be used to monitor the fire suppression progress and to determine when it has been adequately suppressed. The use of this kind of advanced technology should produce a much more effective command of the human and material resources used in the overall fire fighting operation.

Before I conclude, let me quickly identify two other benefits which can be realized from the transfer of this technology.

Space technology incorporates the new disciplines of systems management which have been developed to a high degree. These management techniques assure careful planning, the definition of goals and program objectives resulting in the maximum utilization of the scarce or expensive research resources and assets. This technology also makes use of the interdisciplinary engineering which is often the key to useful systems.

The other major benefit to be gained from this transfer is the development of improved training techniques. My former pilot training makes me particularly sensitive to the value of operational training within a dynamic, realistic simulated environment. Jet pilots don't have to actually emergency land an aircraft full of passengers—even once—to know exactly what to do to avoid loss of life and property. The pilots know—and so does the crew—and they learned it through realistic simulation—on safe ground. That's one of the reasons why what was once a "'dangerous" mode of transportation has become so safe for so many today. In fact it was because it was too dangerous to learn under operational conditions that the industry developed a way to learn so much from simulated experience. There is a useful analogy here to the dangerous environment of fire fighting.

The scientific art of simulation—a form of role-playing with mockups and hardware development that creates a total environment in which man can learn to develop technical skills and individual decision-making abilities—has evolved remarkably during the space program.

Astronaut Walter Cunningham described this training simply but eloquently. After his Apollo flight he said, "I kept thinking—It's supposed to be real—it's got to get real any minute now. And you know, it never did. Until I was in orbit it was just another simulation. That's the way they prepare you."

I think we must agree that this form of training has been very effective. Perhaps the greatest success of the aborted Apollo 13 mission was the way we performed in a crisis. The training was so good that disaster was turned into triumph.

With some of these considerations in mind I too would like to go on record as advocating the need for a national fire academy of some kind. But what kind—an ultra-modern totally new training center facility—or an expertly designed national training program integrated into the curricula of other institutions—that will effectively attack and reduce the problem? Certainly not a school for perpetuating costly and outmoded techniques or for slowing down the process of hardware obsolescence. After a realistic educational experience, on the job training for fire fighting students, whether professional or amateur, could then be arranged when they have the expertise to apply what they have learned. That's when operational experience can have the biggest benefit to professionalism.

---

## U.S. POLICY ON ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE AND INVESTMENT SECURITY IN DEVELOPING NATIONS

---

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a recent Presidential policy statement on economic assistance and investment security in developing nations is of significance in understanding the international financial entanglements into which our country has been drawn.

The President in proposing to solve our international financial disputes stated,

Accordingly, I support the existing International Centre for the Settlement of Investment Disputes within the World Bank Group, as well as the establishment in the very near future of the International Investment Insurance Agency, now under discussion in the World Bank Group. The Overseas Private Investment Corporation will make every effort to incorporate independent dispute settlement procedures in its new insurance and guarantee agreements.

The policy statement and the ensuing press conference statements were released by Mr. Petter G. Peterson, then Assistant to the President for Interna-

tional Economic Affairs and now the President's nominee as U.S. Secretary of Commerce.

I include the Statement by President Nixon and the report of Mr. Peterson's News Conference in the RECORD at this point, to be followed by a news article from the Wall Street Journal of February 11, 1972, and a relevant section from the Economic Report of the President, January 1972.

The articles follow:

PRESIDENT NIXON ISSUES POLICY STATEMENT ON ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE AND INVESTMENT SECURITY IN DEVELOPING NATIONS

(Following is a statement by President Nixon issued on January 19, together with excerpts from the transcript of a news conference held in the White House press briefing room that day by Peter G. Peterson, Assistant to the President for International Economic Affairs.)

(Statement by President Nixon)

We live in an age that rightly attaches very high importance to economic development. The people of the developing societies in particular see in their own economic development the path to fulfillment of a whole range of national and human aspirations. The United States continues to support wholeheartedly, as we have done for decades, the efforts of those societies to grow economically—out of our deep conviction that, as I said in my inaugural address, "To go forward at all is to go forward together"; that the well-being of mankind is in the final analysis indivisible; and that a better fed, better clothed, healthier, and more literate world will be a more peaceful world as well.

As we enter 1972, therefore, I think it is appropriate to outline my views on some important aspects of overseas development policy. I shall discuss these matters in broader compass and greater detail in messages to be transmitted to the Congress in the coming weeks. Nineteen seventy-one saw great changes in the international monetary and trade fields, especially among the developed nations. A new economic policy was charted for the United States, and a promising beginning was made on a broad reform of the international monetary system—starting with a realignment of international exchange rates. Now, in 1972, the problem of how best to assist the development of the world's emerging nations will move more to the forefront of our concern.

Any policy for such assistance is prompted by a mutuality of interest. Through our development assistance programs, financing in the form of taxes paid by ordinary Americans at all income levels is made available to help people in other nations realize their aspirations. A variety of other mechanisms also serves to transfer economic resources from the United States to developing nations.

Three aspects of U.S. development assistance programs received concentrated attention during the past year. These were:

Continuing a program of bilateral economic assistance.

Meeting our international undertakings for the funding of multilateral development institutions.

Clarifying the role of private foreign investment in overseas development and dealing with the problem of expropriations.

As to our bilateral economic program, it is my intention to seek a regular and adequate fiscal year 1972 appropriation to replace the present interim financing arrangement which expires February 22. I urge that this be one of the first items addressed and completed by the Congress after it reconvenes. Looking beyond this immediate need, I hope the Congress will give early attention to the proposals which I submitted last year to reform our foreign assistance programs to meet the challenges of the seventies.

In regard to our participation in multilateral institutions, I attach the highest importance to meeting in full the financial pledges we make. In 1970, the United States agreed with its hemispheric partners on replenishing the Inter-American Development Bank. Our contributions to this Bank represent our most concrete form of support for regional development in Latin America. While the Congress did approve partial financing for the Bank before the recess, it is urgent that the integrity of this international agreement be preserved through providing the needed payments in full.

These Inter-American Bank contributions—together with our vital contributions to the International Development Association, the World Bank, and the Asian Development Bank—are the heart of my announced policy of channeling substantial resources for development through these experienced and technically proficient multilateral institutions. These latter contributions also require prompt legislative action, and I look to the Congress to demonstrate to other nations that the United States will continue its long-standing cooperative approach to international development through multilateral financial mechanisms.

I also wish to make clear the approach of this administration to the role of private investment in developing countries and, in particular, to one of the major problems affecting such private investment: upholding accepted principles of international law in the face of expropriations without adequate compensation.

A principal objective of foreign economic assistance programs is to assist developing countries in attracting private investment. A nation's ability to compete for this scarce and vital development ingredient is improved by programs which develop economic infrastructure, increase literacy, and raise health standards. Private investment, as a carrier of technology, of trade opportunities, and of capital itself, in turn becomes a major factor in promoting industrial and agricultural development. Further, a significant flow of private foreign capital stimulates the mobilization and formation of domestic capital within the recipient country.

A sort of symbiosis exists—with government aid efforts not only speeding the flow of, but actually depending for their success upon, private capital, both domestic and foreign. And of course, from the investor's point of view, foreign private investment must either yield financial benefits to him over time or cease to be available. Mutual benefit is thus the *sine qua non* of successful foreign private investment.

Unfortunately for all concerned, these virtually axiomatic views on the beneficial role of and necessary conditions for private capital have been challenged in recent and important instances. U.S. enterprises, and those of many other nations, operating abroad under valid contracts negotiated in good faith, and within the established legal codes of certain foreign countries, have found their contracts revoked and their assets seized with inadequate compensation or with no compensation.

Such actions by other governments are wasteful from a resource standpoint, shortsighted considering their adverse effects on the flow of private investment funds from all sources, and unfair to the legitimate interests of foreign private investors.

The wisdom of any expropriation is questionable, even when adequate compensation is paid. The resources diverted to compensate investments that are already producing employment and taxes often could be used more productively to finance new investment in the domestic economy, particularly in areas of high social priority to which foreign capital does not always flow. Consequently, countries that expropriate often postpone the attainment of their own development goals. Still more unfairly, expropriations in one developing country can and do impair the investment climate in other developing countries.

In light of all this, it seems to me imperative to state to our citizens and to other nations the policy of this government in future situations involving expropriatory acts.

1. Under international law, the United States has a right to expect:

—That any taking of American private property will be nondiscriminatory;

That it will be for a public purpose; and

That its citizens will receive prompt, adequate, and effective compensation from the expropriating country.

Thus, when a country expropriates a significant U.S. interest without making reasonable provision for such compensation to U.S. citizens, we will presume that the United States will not extend new bilateral economic benefits to the expropriating country unless and until it is determined that the country is taking reasonable steps to provide adequate compensation or that there are major factors affecting U.S. interests which require continuance of all or part of these benefits.

2. In the face of the expropriatory circumstances just described, we will presume that the United States Government will withhold its support from loans under consideration in multilateral development banks.

3. Humanitarian assistance will, of course, continue to receive special consideration under such circumstances.

4. In order to carry out this policy effectively, I have directed that each potential expropriation case be followed closely. A special interagency group will be established under the Council on International Economic Policy to review such cases and to recommend courses of action for the U.S. Government.

5. The Departments of State, Treasury, and Commerce are increasing their interchange of views with the business community on problems relating to private U.S. investment abroad in order to improve government and business awareness of each other's concerns, actions, and plans. The Department of State has set up a special office to follow expropriation cases in support of the Council on International Economic Policy.

6. Since these issues are of concern to a broad portion of the international community, the U.S. Government will consult with governments of developed and developing countries on expropriation matters to work out effective measures for dealing with these problems on a multilateral basis.

7. Along with other governments, we shall cooperate with the international financial institutions—in particular, the World Bank Group, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Asian Development Bank—to achieve a mutually beneficial investment atmosphere. The international financial institutions have often assisted in the settlement of investment disputes, and we expect they will continue to do so.

8. One way to make reasonable provision for just compensation in an expropriation dispute is to refer the dispute to international adjudication or arbitration. Firm agreement in advance on dispute settlement procedures is a desirable means of anticipating possible disagreements between host governments and foreign investors. Accordingly, I support the existing International Centre for the Settlement of Investment Disputes within the World Bank Group, as well as the establishment in the very near future of the International Investment Insurance Agency, now under discussion in the World Bank Group. The Overseas Private Investment Corporation will make every effort to incorporate independent dispute settlement procedures in its new insurance and guarantee agreements.

I announce these decisions because I believe there should be no uncertainty regarding U.S. policy. The adoption by the United States Government of this policy is consistent with international law. The policy will be implemented within the framework of existing domestic law until the Congress modifies present statutes along the lines already proposed by this administration. The United States fully respects the sovereign rights of others, but it will not ignore actions prejudicial to the rule of law and legitimate U.S. interest.

Finally, as we look beyond our proper national interests to the larger considerations of the world interest, let us not forget that only within a framework of international law will the developed nations be able to provide increasing support for the aspirations of our less developed neighbors around the world.

MR. PETERSON'S NEWS CONFERENCE

Mr. PETERSON: In this Presidential policy statement, just to summarize it, the President, first of all, reasserted his commitment to development assistance, both bilateral economic assistance and funding of multilateral institutions. Also, he clarifies the role of private foreign investment in overseas development and he deals with investment security or, to be more specific, the problem of expropriation of U.S. private investments.

I would like to give you a bit of background on the importance of these U.S. private direct investments, which, incidentally, are largely in plant and equipment.

In 1970, the United States had about $78 billion, measured in book value, in private direct investment abroad. In 1970, something around $20 billion or so was in less developed countries. So, the first obvious point here is that we are dealing with very large and impressive numbers and commitments.

The trends, however, in certain areas have not been as favorable as we would have liked. For example, in 1960 something over 35 percent of the total U.S. direct private investment abroad was in less developed countries. In only 10 years, 1970, this had fallen to something like 28 percent of our total direct investment.

During this same interval—to take one area of the world in which we have a very strong positive interest and would like very much to stimulate more government and more development assistance; namely, Latin America—whereas up to 1960, over 26 percent of our private investment had been in Latin America, if you look at the new investment in the last decade in that part of the world, it had fallen to 14 percent of total U.S. direct investment.

Now, it seems quite clear that this is not a response to the development needs of the less developed countries, which remain enormous and growing. But it is, at least in a significant part, a response to a rapidly growing concern over investment security, particularly in less developed countries.

Now, this concern expressed itself in a variety of different ways and different places. As you might expect, the business community has expressed growing concern. But also some elements in Congress have expressed a strong preference or an interest in so-called mandatory requirements that all economic benefits would be withheld in any case where inadequate compensation is paid where expropriation is involved.

I should underscore what is covered in the President's statement that the issue here is not whether a country has a right to expropriate, though we might question the wisdom of that in certain cases, but whether it is nondiscriminatory, prompt, adequate, and effective compensation.

Now, in those cases where reasonable provision is not made for adequate compensation, then the Presidential policy statement asserts a U.S. policy—what might be called a presumptive policy—that the U.S. bilateral economic benefits will not be extended unless there are reasonable steps to provide adequate compensation or where there are major other factors that affect U.S. interests which would require the continuance of all or part of it.

The policy statement further confirms the so-called presumptive policy by saying the United States Government will withhold its support from multilateral loans in multilateral development banks. In such cases, incidentally, of multilateral loans, I would assume that the Secretary of Treasury would normally consult with other countries who might not share our views in the attempt to gain multilateral support for our position in that particular case.

To sum up a bit, I think it was concluded that everyone would benefit by having a clearer picture of our policy that minimized ambiguity. In the absence of such a policy, it seemed quite possible that the vast majority of less developed countries might suffer reduced investment flows at a time when they need them even more, as a result of adverse treatment of private investment in one or a very few countries.

To put it more positively, if we are to reverse the downtrend in support of less developed countries, which we certainly want to do, we felt such a policy is a requirement as a way of gaining more congressional and public support in this country for increasing development support.

I should also clarify that this presumptive policy does not apply to humanitarian assistance, and of course, it strongly reasserts the President's support for international settlement procedures in this increasingly important world of private investment. Thank you.

Q. Mr. Peterson, at the top of page 3, paragraph 2, it says: "In light of all this . . . the policy of this government in future, situations involving expropriatory acts." Does that mean that this policy only commences now and goes forward or that it applies to those expropriations that have already taken place, such as in Chile, such as in Peru and other countries? In other words, is it retroactive?

Mr. PETERSON. In the first place, you will see that the statement refers to new benefits, and I should clarify that new bilateral benefits would be considered those for which there has been no U.S. financial commitment; that is, no funds have been obligated. And what would be included there are benefits that are either under consideration or are being requested by the recipient country.

The President is issuing this policy statement as a very important first step, as a guideline, if you will, for handling particular cases. You will see in the statement that specific mechanisms are provided within the Council on International Economic Policy to recommend specific cases and recommend courses of action.

So, I think it is intended to deal as a policy statement, a so-called presumptive policy, but it is not intended to cover particular situations in particular countries.

Q. But the Peruvian expropriation took place in 1968.

Mr. PETERSON. All right. With regard to the Peruvian situation, this statement should imply no change in our current assistance relationship with Peru. As I have indicated, it is a general statement which clarifies, we hope, our policy toward future situations. It does not change the status of the so-called IPC [International Petroleum Co.] case, and I would want to add that we continue to be hopeful that a solution is going to be found in the case of Peru.

Q. Does this confirm existing policy, or does it strengthen or tighten it?

Mr. PETERSON. We would hope that it clarifies it, and to the extent that it does clarify it, I guess you could say it is a policy with a new thrust at least.

Q. There is no real change, is there?

Q. What is the difference between this and the Hickenlooper amendment?

Mr. PETERSON. Well let's take the issue of whether there is a change or not. In the past these cases have been handled more or less on an ad hoc case-by-case basis. In this case, in the case of this new policy statement, the presumption will be that these benefits will be withheld, in which event, if one wants to justify not withholding them—or, that is, continuing them—the case will have to be made as to why this should be an exception.

So I would say the thrust of it is new emphasis on relating economic benefits or the withholding of economic benefits in cases where there has been expropriation.

Q. What statutes will have to be changed?

Mr. PETERSON. I don't believe this requires any change in the statutes. This is a policy statement.

Q. I mention it only because the President's statement refers on page 4: "The policy will be implemented within the framework of existing domestic law until the Congress modifies present statutes along the lines already proposed by this administration."

Mr. PETERSON. The revisions to the Hickenlooper amendment were submitted, as I recall, last spring—I believe in April. And what this refers to is the changes that were provided at that time in the Hickenlooper amendment.

Q. What is meant by the word "nondiscriminatory" on page 3, ". . . taking of American private property will be nondiscriminatory"?

Mr. PETERSON. I would assume what that means is if it were applied, for example, only with regard to the United States and not other countries, we would consider that discriminatory.

Q. You said, Mr. Peterson, with regard to Peru, this policy does not change the status, and our decision in the case of Peru will be to continue economic aid. Can you make the same statement about Chile regarding the dispute between Tenneco and Anaconda and International Telephone? It is important down there, isn't it?

Mr. PETERSON. I believe it is the case that a very, very large proportion of any aid going to Chile is now in the humanitarian category and not in the category of bilateral economic assistance.

Q. Were Chile to apply or request additional foreign aid under the standard foreign aid program, this, then, would apply?

Mr. PETERSON. Yes, if it were decided that reasonable provision were not being made for expropriation, it would apply in any new benefits. To repeat, at the present time I think the benefits are all in the humanitarian category.

Q. There are some multilateral loans, aren't there, still? Didn't Chile have a loan request before the Eximbank?

Mr. PETERSON. If there were multilateral requests, that implies new benefits, and—I have already stated the criteria—they would obviously be covered by this policy.

Q. Going back to the question of newness on this, the language under paragraph 1, "reasonable steps" and "U.S. interests," this is largely the same kind of language found in the Hickenlooper sugar quota, the same provisions that have kept us from lowering the boom, say, in the IPC case.

All this means in essence in those countries that would be exempted in any case will still be exempted, and those countries on which the boom would be lowered, it will be lowered a little harder?

Mr. PETERSON. That is your statement, of course.

Q. Is that the case?

Mr. PETERSON. I would say there is quite a difference between a presumption that says where reasonable provision is not being made the economic benefits will be withheld and a policy that looked into each case on an ad

hoc basis where the case needed to be made in order to withhold benefits. I would say it is quite a different thrust to a policy.

Q. Mr. Peterson, in what other less developed areas besides Latin America has there been this downward trend of direct investment?

Mr. PETERSON. Incidentally, I should indicate that even in Latin America there has been an increase in the last 10 years in dollar terms. What I am referring to is, the share of the total has decreased substantially. I think in most other areas of the world the share has either stayed where it was or increased in total U.S. investment.

Q. As a practical matter, how does the United States policy decision work at the multilateral development banks? Does our representative vote no, and is that compelling on the loan in terms of the weighted vote?

Mr. PETERSON. Well, the representative there, of course, has a variety of options. One is to either vote against the loan or to abstain. As to the effect of that decision, it varies by the institution. In the case of the Inter-American Development Bank, for example, it is controlling. In the case of the other multilateral banks, it is not controlling, but obviously significant.

Q. Mr. Peterson, how do you define a presumptive policy? For example, the President says we will presume the United States will not extend new bilateral economic benefits. What is the difference between that and saying we will not extend new bilateral?

Mr. PETERSON. If one were to say we will not do it, it would in effect become automatic. As the statement makes clear, one could visualize situations where major national interests are involved in which one would continue in any event. But the presumption in most cases would be that they would be withheld.

Q. Does this affect military assistance?

Mr. PETERSON. No, this is in the economic development assistance area only.

Q. Mr. Peterson, does the timing of this policy announcement today have anything to do with the reports or threats, however you might characterize them, of expropriation moves in India, Pakistan, or the Middle East area?

Mr. PETERSON. That is one question I am glad you asked. This study was initiated at the President's direction last June and has been thoroughly reviewed by various policy bodies in the government and therefore was not related to the cases that you are talking about.

Q. In that connection, Mr. Peterson, would you say whether the introductory paragraphs of this referring to the mutuality of interest would cover cases such as the India-Pakistan war, where funds are being used which the United States would rather see used in other directions, as a reason for suspending our aid? Does this policy statement cover that kind of circumstance?

Mr. PETERSON. No, this policy statement deals with the presumptive policy in which adequate provision has not been made for adequate compensation in the case of expropriation, and it deals with that specific policy.

Q. Mr. Peterson, in the experience to date, have you not been acting under these same guidelines?

Mr. PETERSON. It has been a case-by-case analysis, I think is about what I can say. I would leave it to you to summarize what we have been doing. I think by having a presumptive policy the effect might be in some cases to accelerate, one might say, the decision on what to do and presumably in those cases it would be to withhold.

Q. Mr. Peterson, considering the dwindling size of U.S. bilateral aid, is this policy likely to be considered much of an incentive by less developed countries?

Mr. PETERSON. Well, obviously we are hopeful that Congress will see fit to authorize aid. Secondly, and longer term, we think the reduction of ambiguity in the cases of investment security is one of the important things that we require to get more support. I think it has been evident that this is an issue that has at least been one significant factor in explaining reduced support for increased aid.

Q. Mr. Peterson, on page 4, the President's statement refers to discussions within the World Bank Group and creating the International Investment Insurance Agency. Has the situation now changed so that you are optimistic that agency will be created any time soon?

Mr. PETERSON. Discussions have continued. We are reasonably optimistic that progress will be made. I want to reaffirm what I said at the end of my opening summary statement that the President believes that it is a very fruitful area for international cooperation; that is, to define criteria and to jointly take action in these cases.

Q. Sir, when you talk about dispensing of economic matters, do you mean Eximbank or Food for Peace or the Peace Corps, as well as the AID loan?

Mr. PETERSON. Principally we are talking about economic development assistance and the multilateral loans.

Q. You are not prepared to discuss the effect on the Eximbank and the Peace Corps and Food for Peace?

Mr. PETERSON. The Peace Corps, of course, is not thought of as bilateral economic assistance. The group that has been set up to implement this policy will very quickly get, I am sure, to a more precise definition of what kinds of benefits and what kinds of situations.

Q. Mr. Peterson, who in this government will make the ultimate decision about whether compensation has been fair, equitable, and prompt or not?

Mr. PETERSON. I would think that if by an ultimate decision you mean one that is extremely important about which there is not agreement, that this might, on occasions of that sort, be referred to the President. We would hope, however, that the mechanism that has been set up would lubricate the process of not only making the decisions promptly—

Q. You mean that Council?

Mr. PETERSON. Yes, that is right. Making them promptly, but achieving agreement.

Q. Are you saying, Mr. Peterson, that one of the reasons for declaring this policy at this time is that we have simply been too soft and too reluctant to use sanctions of economic aid in the past?

Mr. PETERSON. I think what we are saying is that there apparently has existed some ambiguity as to what we would do and that our interest and other countries' interests would be served by clarifying what we will do in most cases.

Q. Have we ever cut off aid to another country as a result of expropriation?

Mr. PETERSON. I think we have on a few occasions, yes.

Q. Has there been more than Ceylon?

Mr. PETERSON. Ceylon is the one that always come to mind. There are no other official cases.

Q. By the way, as long as we are in the process of getting the names of things, because of the statement on multilateral development banks, will you list for us the multilateral development banks that will be affected by this policy statement for the record?

Mr. PETERSON. We will give you a list, but they all will be affected. The thrust of what I intended to say earlier is that our position in those institutions varies.

Q. One consideration in the past has been stiff sanctions against, for example, one Latin American country might alienate others still more against the United States as a superpower to the north. Is there less of a concern under this policy?

Mr. PETERSON. You might not only call it a presumptive policy, but a nondiscriminatory policy. We intend to apply this policy to all countries, and we think by removing that ambiguity it is clear that all countries will be treated alike.

* * * * *

Q. Mr. Peterson, is the administration concerned that the trend toward expropriation of privately owned U.S. properties in Latin America specifically is on the upswing? Is this part of the reasoning here? Do you anticipate further disputes or further international problems over expropriation of American firms?

Mr. PETERSON. Let's look at the objective evidence. First, the objective evidence on what is happening is the material I gave you. Secondly, I don't think there is any question there has been increasing concern. The thrust of this policy is really to strengthen and clarify policies that have existed in the past with a specific objective, namely, to try to minimize future cases, because it is our view that if there are expropriations where reasonable provision is not made and if there is ambiguity about what we will do, on the long term this is destructive of our very strong desire to increase development and the strong desire of those countries to get more development.

So, the objective of this, hopefully, would be to minimize such possibilities in the future, and we certainly don't anticipate any increase in it.

The PRESS. Thank you, Mr. Peterson.

---

[From the Economic Report of the President, 1972]

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REFORM

The Smithsonian Accord dealt with the most pressing issue which faced the international monetary system after August 15. It thereby set the stage for the more extended task of designing a new order for international monetary cooperation, on which more intensive work will begin in 1972.

Measured by overall results, the international economic arrangements in force since World War II were strikingly successful. The basic goals of the founders of the Bretton Woods system were achieved to a high degree. Trade and payments among nations were increasingly freed and grew rapidly. International consultation and cooperation developed to an extent previously unknown. The balance-of-payments problems which individual nations experienced at various times did not prevent the general pursuit of policies of relatively rapid and steady growth. In total, the record of the 25-year period was one of unprecedented progress for the world economy—and this is an impressive tribute to the functioning of the so-called Bretton Woods system.

At the same time, the way the monetary component of the system actually operated departed in many important respects from the mechanics envisaged by the participants at Bretton Woods. As reviewed in past *Reports* of this Council, a pronounced asymmetry developed between the role of the United States and the role of other countries. The stability of the system—its ability to reconcile trade, balance of payments, and reserve goals of various countries, to provide adequate liquidity, and to achieve elasticity in financing—came to be heavily dependent on the willingness and ability of the United States to lose reserves, to absorb more or less persistent deficits in its external accounts, and to maintain a passive role with respect to its own exchange rate. The dollar became the center of the system, and this placed particularly heavy responsibilities on the United States to maintain stability domestically along with open trading and financial markets.

The system which evolved had advantages and disadvantages from the standpoint of both the United States and other countries.

Whatever its merits, the important underlying premises of a dollar-centered system are no longer valid. With the strong recovery of the European economies, with the striking growth of Japan, and with industrialization proceeding elsewhere in the world, the position of the United States in the world economy is no longer as predominant as it was in the 1950's. The development and extension of the European Community, with its plans for increasingly close economic and monetary integration of the region, adds an important new, if still uncertain, dimension to the picture. In monetary terms, the U.S. reserve position became inconsistent with a presumption of convertibility of the dollar into reserve assets. This was aggravated by the repercussions of domestic inflation since the mid-1960's, which weakened the U.S. trade and payments position.

Reform of the international monetary framework has been the subject of extensive discussion for many years. The creation in 1970 of a new international reserve asset, Special Drawing Rights, is a major innovation in the system. A thorough report by the Executive Directors of the International Monetary Fund on the role of exchange rates in the adjustment of international payments, also issued in 1970, both reflected and contributed to the growing consensus that there is a need for greater flexibility in official exchange rates.

In 1972 further and more far-reaching negotiations on restructuring the international monetary system will begin. Although the eventual shape of the new order will not be known until these negotiations are completed, the primary questions with which the negotiators must deal are clear.

1. One issue is the degree of "fixity" that should be provided for in the exchange rate mechanism. The Bretton Woods system contemplated that each IMF member government would establish a fixed par value for its currency and maintain this value in the exchange markets within a narrow margin of plus or minus 1 percent. The par value would be adjusted only when a fundamental disequilibrium became manifest over a period of time, and then presumably by a substantial amount. In practice, this rigidity, broken at intervals under heavy pressure, may have become self-defeating in terms of maintaining the broader stability and continuity of the system. Should the new system place an equal emphasis on exchange fixity by requiring all nations to establish official par values? If so, should the band of exchange rate variation permitted around par values be widened? Alternatively, under what conditions should countries be permitted to let exchange values of their currencies be determined by market forces, as Canada and others have found it convenient and useful to do in the past?

2. A second, related issue concerns the mechanisms to be utilized for maintaining reasonably balanced international payments positions. As indicated, the Bretton Woods system tended to think of an exchange rate change as an adjustment of last resort. Nations whose currencies became overvalued relative to other currencies have tended to delay unduly before making a change in the exchange rate. Furthermore, because nations with undervalued currencies also resisted exchange rate changes, and were able to do so longer, most exchange rate changes have been downward. The operating question is how changes might be made in a less disturbing way in the future, with pressure more evenly distributed among surplus and deficit countries, and with the United States having the same degree of freedom of action as other nations.

As noted, there is a growing consensus in favor of greater flexibility: However the correct degree of flexibility, the rules for implementing the process, and the role of the IMF in this implementation process need to be examined and defined.

The need for wider margins than the ±1 percent specified in the Fund's Articles of Agreement is also well recognized. The Smithsonian Accord provides temporarily for margins of ±2¼ percent. The proper width of margins for the longer run must be determined.

Negotiations on the future adjustment process will also cover issues other than exchange rate flexibility. These will include ways and means of influencing short-term capital movements and the degree to which the mix of monetary and fiscal policy should be influenced by external considerations.

3. A third issue is the question of how much liquidity the system needs and how this liquidity should be provided. The amount of liquidity needed will depend on how the other questions are answered, including particularly the flexibility and efficiency of the adjustment mechanism. The question of how liquidity is to be provided raises the issue of the role of alternative reserve assets. The United States and many other countries share the conviction that gold should and will play a diminishing role in the system. Already, considerable progress has ben made in developing the SDR as an alternative international reserve asset, but many questions remain, including the appropriate role of the dollar and other reserve currencies.

The agenda for negotiations is a large one. Fortunately, there is wide agreement that the objectives of the Bretton Woods system remain as valid as before and negotiations will be based on the fundamental premises that nations want to promote international monetary cooperation, balanced growth and increased freedom for trade and payments, stability in the exchange markets, and the avoidance of competitive undervaluation of rates. The challenge will be to find the mechanisms that will assure those results, taking into account the realities of the 1970's and the new balance of economic power and responsibilities.

TRADE POLICY DEVELOPMENTS IN 1971

For over three decades the free world has been gradually liberalizing commercial policy to achieve the economic and political benefits of an open trading world. The United States has taken a position of consistent leadership in this movement. This course recently has faced and survived two major tests. There have been strong pressures in the United States itself to redirect policy toward quantitative restrictions on trade and investment. While the United States extended import restraints to a few additional commodities in 1971, legislation that would apply quantitative restrictions broadly to imports has not been enacted. The second major test, and one that became subject to spirited debate in 1971, came with the trade policy actions to combat the U.S. payments deficit taken in connection with the New Economic Policy. Although it provoked considerable controversy, the import surcharge did not set off the series of retaliatory actions abroad that had been feared in some quarters. And it was removed before the end of 1971 when the currency realignment made it no longer necessary.

During a period when commercial policy is under major pressure for change—as it has been during the past 2 years—it is particularly important that necessary preoccupation with month-to-month events not be allowed to blur appreciation for the long-term objective of U.S. international economic policy. That objective is an open world economy in which trade and investment flows among countries are not distorted by national barriers to free exchange. Moving toward that objective will enhance broad foreign policy objectives for this country, and it will provide important economic benefits. International exchange permits mutually beneficial specialization in production among countries; it provides healthy competition to ensure efficiency in domestic industries; it expands the variety of goods available to U.S. consumers and producers; and in times of inflation it provides a wholesome brake on price increases.

To many Americans the benefits of liberal trade policies are not highly visible because they are broadly diffused. But the short-run costs that trade liberalization sometimes imposes on specific groups are usually highly visible indeed. Thus, the costs of liberalization are more keenly felt than the benefits, and that tends to make removal of trade and investment restrictions difficult to achieve.

Substantial progress has nevertheless been made toward free international exchange in industrial goods during the past 25 years, mainly by reducing tariffs. But much work remains. The President anticipated the controversial and difficult policy issues confronting the United States when he appointed the Commission on International Trade and Investment Policy to study U.S. positions and to recommend a policy for the 1970's. He also recognized that proper formulation and implementation within the executive branch required better coordination among the agencies engaged in international economic policy. In early 1971 he established the Council on International Economic Policy in the White House.

The President's Commission on International Trade and Investment Policy, whose membership was drawn from business, labor, and the universities, presented its report in July, *United States International Economic Policy in an Interdependent World.*

The Commission's recommendations included, on the one hand, measures designed to strengthen the capacity of U.S. industry and labor to compete effectively and, on the other proposals for negotiations with our major trading partners. Specifically recommended were actions which might reduce the adverse effects on U.S. exports of the European Community's Common Agricultural Policy and the Community's widening preferential tariff arrangements and international action to deal with market disruptions due to imports.

For the longer term, the Commission recommended negotiations "looking toward the progressive reduction and eventual elimination of barriers to trade and investment," including reform of the international monetary system, with negotiations eventually leading to the "elimination of all barriers to international trade and capital movements within 25 years."

The purpose of the newly organized Council on International Economic Policy is to strengthen the policymaking process. The Council is chaired by the President, and its members are the Secretaries of State, Treasury, Defense, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, the Ambassador at Large, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, and the Assistant to the President for Domestic Affairs. The President stated in his Executive Order that the Council was to (a) "achieve consistency between domestic and foreign economic policy," (b) "provide a clear, top-level focus for the full range of economic policy issues," and (c) "maintain close coordination with basic foreign policy objectives." The work of the Council is directed by its Executive Director, who is also Assistant to the President for International Economic Affairs. As his first assignment, the Executive Director was instructed by the President to prepare a review of the position of the United States in a changing world economy. This briefing was presented to the Council in April 1971 and was subsequently reviewed with leaders in Congress and others outside the Administration. The Council is now pursuing work programs in a variety of

areas—such as export promotion, more comprehensive adjustment assistance programs, and foreign investment policies—and is planning for a series of foreign economic negotiations.

In addition to strengthening its own apparatus for policy formulation in the trade sector, the Administration has extended contacts with our trading partners. The President's Special Trade Representative has participated in the High Level Trade Group assembled by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development to explore avenues for major negotiations which might lead in the next few years to a more effective climate for international trade and investment. This group began monthly meetings in November and aims to complete a report for the Council of the OECD in the spring of 1972.

The Commission's report and the coordinating work of the Council have helped to identify the major policy issues in the area of international trade and to initiate steps through which these issues will be resolved.

*Export policy*

The disappearance of the traditional U.S. trade surplus in 1971 itself raised a fundamental question. Is a trade surplus desirable or essential for the United States?

On one side of this question is a view that exports should always exceed imports by a wide margin because net exports are both a stimulant to the domestic economy and a symbol of relative economic strength. This position views exports as inherently desirable and imports, unless unobtainable domestically, as undesirable or at least suspect. The policy prescription corresponding to this mercantilist position calls for adoption of the measures necessary to keep the volume of U.S. exports higher than the volume of imports in every single accounting period, regardless of cyclical circumstances or developments affecting other elements in the balance of payments.

In another corner are those who argue that after years of investment abroad the United States has achieved a special status in the world. It is a major creditor nation which receives a large and growing income from overseas investments. It is possible, indeed appropriate, for a nation in this position to use some of this income to finance a net inflow of imports. These net imports are the fruits of resources the Nation has foregone consuming or investing domestically in previous years.

In fact, however, the appropriate approach to exports depends upon the approach that is taken to all of the other elements in the balance of payments. While the United States is a major creditor nation—the inflow of net investment income was over $6 billion in 1970 and is expected to grow in the future—a large net investment income does not mean that the country can afford an equally large trade deficit. U.S. policies involve other major payments commitments—grants and loans to less developed countries, mutual security costs, pensions and remittances to citizens living abroad, and funds for additional overseas investments. To the extent that these commitments are desirable, as they clearly are, they also have to be financed. Given the probable size of these flows in the immediate years ahead, it is unlikely that net investment income will be large enough to cover them, to say nothing of a trade deficit as well. Thus a trade surplus will be required if our goal is external balance. Moreover, export growth will permit imports to expand.

For the long run the optimal policy toward exports, as well as toward imports, is one directed to achieving efficient resource allocation within a system of generally balanced international payments.

The preferred means of correcting any disequilibrium that might arise in a nation's balance of payments is through a change in its exchange rate. This method, unlike other ways of restoring equilibrium, does not distort the relationships among transactions: All sellers and all buyers of foreign exchange are affected alike. A change in the exchange rate of the dollar was the process used by the United States in 1971 to correct its balance-of-payments deficit.

However, in a world where trade and investment flows are subject to either special impediments or incentives, more direct measures to stimulate exports may sometimes be justified. Legislation to authorize Domestic International Sales Corporations and steps to expand export credit facilities are examples of such measures.

*Domestic International Sales Corporations*

The provisions of American and foreign tax laws in many cases have provided an incentive for U.S. firms selling abroad to establish production facilities overseas. U.S. tax liability is not incurred on income earned abroad until it is repatriated, and effective foreign tax rates are often less than those in the United States. Exporters from domestic sources, on the other hand, face immediate tax liability.

This imbalance has been removed in part by the Revenue Act of 1971. Under provisions of the new law U.S. exporters will be able to enjoy tax treatment comparable to that of U.S. producers located abroad. The law provides for formation of a new type of corporation to be known as a Domestic International Sales Corporation (DISC). Taxes on 50 percent of a DISC's income may be deferred indefinitely, provided that 95 percent of the DISC's receipts and assets relate to qualified exports. Loans to a parent company to finance research and development expenditures, inventory accumulation, or investment in plant and equipment can be counted as export-related assets, so long as the proportion which these loans bear to total expenditures for such purposes does not exceed the proportion of the borrower's total sales accounted for by exports. Dividends to DISC stockholders are to be fully taxed.

The Administration's 1971 proposal concerning DISC underwent two major changes in Congress. First, the 100-percent deferral originally requested by the Administration was reduced to 50 percent. Second, Congress added a proviso to discourage a DISC from investing tax deferred income in foreign production facilities. In the bill enacted, the tax deferral on any DISC profits which are lent to parent companies will be terminated if such profits are judged to have been invested in a foreign plant and equipment.

The potential for tax deferral in a DISC is intended to provide U.S. exporters with tax advantages similar to various advantages provided exporters in other countries. The availability of DISC will also blunt one incentive that has existed for U.S. firms to locate production facilities abroad rather than at home.

*Export Credit Facilities*

The competitive position of sellers in different countries for third-country export markets is influenced by the export credit facilities they can offer, and many governments have taken measures to provide especially advantageous financing for exports. In the United States export credit facilities are influenced by general monetary policy, by various banking regulations, by the operations of the U.S. Export-Import Bank, and by policies of other governmental financing and procurement agencies. Apart from monetary and pricing policies which led to an easing of interest costs for all borrowers in 1971, two steps were taken which increased the special credit facilities for exporting.

On August 17 legislation was enacted to exempt export credits from the Voluntary Foreign Credit Restraint guidelines administered by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. The formula announced by the Board of Governors in November freed both bank and nonbank financial institutions to expand their lending for exports. It was also designed to remove some existing or potential inequities among the institutions participating in the program.

Legislation passed in August removed Export-Import Bank receipts and disbursements from Federal unified budget totals and provided new leeway for the Bank's export financing activities. New short- and intermediate-term discount programs, together with activity under its other programs, should increase the Bank's total authorizations for loans, guarantees, and insurance from $5.4 billion in fiscal 1971 to $11.5 billion in fiscal 1973.

*Easing the adjustment to imports*

Changes in the volume and composition of a country's imports usually reflect underlying changes in incomes, tastes, or comparative costs. The release of resources from industries that lose their competitiveness is offset by expansion in industries that become more competitive. The value of total production is increased by the reallocation of resources to what have become more productive uses.

In some cases, however, imports increase so rapidly that they displace domestic resources faster than these can be transferred to other uses. Public policy cannot ignore such disruptions to individual markets or areas, particularly if there is general excess productive capacity and limited opportunities for resources to shift. Positive programs of adjustment assistance are then required to facilitate the necessary transfer of resources into other uses and to ease the financial stress on the workers and owners involved. The adjustments can also be moderated by controlling the pace at which imports are permitted to increase.

Moderation of imports through arrangements with the main suppliers is a technique that has been used for several years both here and abroad. U.S. steel imports are now subject to such agreements. Cotton textiles and certain meats have been for some time subject to intergovernmental agreements. Government agreements to limit the rate of growth of manmade and woolen fiber apparel and textiles were concluded in 1971.

Imports of textiles and apparel have long constituted a special problem for the United States. On the one hand, textiles have an important place in the budget of all Americans, and the benefits of low-cost imported products are widely shared. On the other hand, the 2.3 million persons employed in the textile and apparel industry in the United States tend to have characteristics that make adjustment to new employment especially difficult.

The rate of growth of cotton textile shipments to the United States came under regulation in the multilateral Long Term Arrangement on Cotton Textiles of 1962. Imports of yarns, fabrics, and apparel made of wool and manmade fibers, however, have continued to grow at a rapid rate. The volume of imports of manmade fiber textiles increased more than seven times between 1964 and 1970; and in the first 6 months of 1971 the flow increased almost 80 percent above the level of the corresponding period a year earlier.

After especially difficult negotiations, memoranda of understanding were signed in October with the governments of Japan, the Republic of China, Korea, and Hong Kong, the leading sources of supply. Under the terms of these memoranda, the parties agreed to limit their exports of manmade fiber and wool textiles to this country. The agreements limit the growth rates for various categories of these imports to levels in the range of 5 to 7.5 percent per annum. Such

rates, while much lower than the growth rates recently experienced, still somewhat exceed the growth in the U.S. market. The agreements are intended, therefore, to provide time for the domestic industry to adjust, while still permitting American consumers increasingly to enjoy the benefits of low-cost imported supplies.

The use by the United States of voluntary agreements with foreign governments or private groups to restrain shipments to the U.S. market has some attractions over other forms of import restraint such as tariffs or import quotas. Tariffs and quotas are often subject to international treaties and agreements, and further resort to them may also require legislative action. Restraints that are built into law have often become permanent even when the original need for restraint was itself only a temporary one. In contrast, the technique of requesting foreign suppliers voluntarily to limit their sales in the United States is simpler and avoids the complications of law.

However, voluntary agreements also have serious disadvantages. While the limitation of foreign supplies in the U.S. market lifts domestic prices for the goods above what they would otherwise have been, thereby providing the intended relief to domestic sellers, the higher prices that American users pay in this instance are not offset through the higher government tax revenues that would have been collected had higher tariffs been used to achieve the same purpose. It is also not clear that voluntary agreements are always easy to remove. In order to make the restraints operative, suppliers need to coordinate their production and sales plans. In the past, export restraint mechanisms have frequently been used as instruments of monopoly power. Dissolving them has without exception been extraordinarily difficult. The fact that they originate now under duress from the buyers rather than from the volition of sellers may not in the end change their character.

There is a more fundamental danger in too widespread a use of the export restraint technique. This is the additional threat it poses to hopes for a world organized predominantly on free-enterprise principles. Market-oriented societies can be efficient and progressive when competitive forces are present to inhibit the exercise of arbitrary power. But competition requires nurture. Voluntary agreements which encourage foreign sellers to organize in order to restrain their American sales foster those cartels and exporters' organizations which we have for many years sought to eliminate. Clearly voluntary agreements need to be used with circumspection.

The need to protect U.S. industries from market disruptions in the near future will be reduced significantly by the recent realignment of currencies. Products imported from Japan and many Western European countries will be higher priced in U.S. markets as a result of the revaluations of these currencies. At the same time, the impetus to U.S. export industries from the currency realignments, together with the general thrust of economic expansion, will provide more varied and more productive alternative uses for resources now employed in the industries most vulnerable to imports.

*Agricultural trade*

International trade in agricultural commodities continues to be impeded by a variety of import restrictions. The economic and social conditions in nearly every major industrialized country present serious problems of adjustment for resources employed in agriculture, quite apart from international trade considerations. Most governments have responded to this problem by adopting domestic price-support measures that are supplemented by restrictive trade policies. Tensions over these policies have been growing and surfaced prominently in 1971.

Unlike trade in manufactured products, agricultural trade received little substantive attention in the successive rounds of negotiations which reduced international tariff barriers in the postwar years. Indeed, many developed countries, including the United States, pursued domestic agricultural policies that resulted in an increased level of protection against agricultural imports. This was particularly true in the European Community, where internal prices have been pegged substantially above import prices through a complex system of import levies and export subsidies.

During 1971 the United Kingdom, partly in preparation for EC membership, moved from a consumer-oriented, relatively liberal, import policy toward the EC system by raising minimum import prices on grains and other commodities. The support price to Japanese rice producers was nearly doubled during the 1960's and is one reason why Japan is no longer a significant importer but instead faces burdensome rice surpluses.

The United States has a significant comparative advantage in many agricultural products and therefore has a clear interest in reducing existing impediments to trade in these products. It is also clear that price-support techniques now used in most industrial countries, including the United States, are major impediments to the development of freer trade in agriculture.

Agricultural support policies in the United States have been substantially modified in recent years. Direct payments have been substituted for high price supports for major grains and cotton, commodities that are traditionally exported. This change has permitted market forces to have more influence over actual prices and has reduced the necessity for large export subsidies and import restrictions. The Agricultural Act of 1970 extends these reforms and improves upon them by giving farmers greater freedom in their planning decisions.

Despite these reforms a number of commodities continue to receive support through the price mechanism, and pose problems for a liberal trade policy. Price supports for milk, for example, have been increased over 50 percent in the past 6 years. Partly for this reason and partly because of distortions in world markets caused by similar programs abroad, most dairy imports are now subject to quotas. Four additional dairy products were brought under quotas beginning in 1971. Also, like most developed countries, the United States maintains a sugar program that encourages domestic production through high internal prices. Quotas limit imports and thereby support internal prices. The U.S. sugar program was extended for 3 years in 1971. Several traditional export commodities are supported by limitations on production and substantial export subsidies. About 60 percent of our rice production, for instance, is exported with the aid of export subsidies and concessional sales to developing countries.

There is now realization that agricultural trade is an important item on the negotiating agenda. There is also agreement that freer trade in agricultural products can occur only if the basic problem of agricultural adjustment and the techniques for providing assistance to farmers are dealt with in an international context. As the President's Commission on International Trade and Investment Policy stated, "the time is ripe for a concerted international effort to deal with all aspects of the problem including, in particular, the levels and techniques of agricultural support."

The Commission's analysis, and work done elsewhere, suggest the following important guidelines for future negotiations on agricultural trade:

Discussions over agricultural trade policies will be unproductive until domestic techniques of support are modified.

New policies will be needed to aid the adjustment of some resources, particularly low-income workers, to more productive and higher income pursuits.

Importing countries must participate with exporting countries in facilitating adjustment if an improvement in the international use of resources is to be obtained.

While each country must be free to provide income assistance to those employed in agriculture, the mechanisms for this assistance should minimize interference with production, consumption, and trade.

*East-West trade*

The widening of the political dialogue between the United States and Communist nations in 1971 was accompanied by trade expansion measures.

Commercial relations between state-controlled and free-enterprise economies present problems unlike those which are experienced in trade between predominantly market-oriented economies. Private firms, for example, can be at a disadvantage in dealing with large state-trading agencies, and legal recourse by individual firms against foreign states may be difficult. It is awkward to apply commercial policy codes that have been negotiated among governments of market-oriented countries—such as those embodied in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—to rigorously socialized states. And the Communist countries can more readily employ economic relationships for political ends than is possible for the free-enterprise states. Furthermore, legislation in the United States and elsewhere places restrictions on private and public trade and credit in connection with Communist countries. And regulations in both the Communist countries and the West restrict the movement of trade representatives. Finally, the Communist states are not party to a number of important international economic organizations and conventions.

Several significant changes occurred in U.S. trading relationships with the Communist countries in 1971. The President's announcements that he would visit Peking and Moscow in 1972 were preceded by a proclamation in June lifting the embargo on imports from the People's Republic of China and freeing a long list of U.S. goods for export to that area. A requirement that 50 percent of U.S. exports of wheat, flour, and other grains to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union be carried in U.S. vessels was also lifted. The termination of this requirement facilitated the sale in November of over $125 million in U.S. feed grains to the Soviet Union—the first such grain sales since 1964. An amendment to the Export-Import Bank Act in August authorized the President to extend Export-Import Bank credits to further exports to Communist countries when he finds this to be in the national interest. In his first use of this authority, the President directed the Bank to participate in financing exports to Rumania.

Two Soviet Deputy Ministers of Foreign Trade visited the United States in 1971, and at the end of the year the U.S. Secretary of Commerce led a trade delegation from this country to Moscow and Warsaw. U.S.-Soviet talks on trade and shipping are to be continued in 1972.

*Generalized preferences for exports of developing countries*

In October 1969 the President voiced his support for the adoption by all developed countries of a liberal system of generalized tariff preferences for the exports of lower-income countries. The step is seen as a means of facilitating the economic growth of less developed areas by encouraging their integration into an interdependent world economy. It is also a means of reversing the trend toward specialized preferences whereby a limited number of developing countries have secured access to the markets of particular developed countries, especially those in the Eu-

ropean Community. All too often this has occurred in conjunction with "reverse preferences" which open the developing countries' markets in a discriminatory way. Proposals made by the members of the OECD were accepted in 1970 by the United Nations General Assembly as a "mutually acceptable" basis for the establishment of a generalized preference system. The European Community and Japan have initiated systems based on their proposals.

Action on Generalized Preferences by the United States was delayed in 1971 by the unsatisfactory state of the balance of payments. The agreement of December 18 on exchange-rate realignment, in moderating the potential balance-of-payments problem for the near future, enabled the President on December 21 to announce his intention to submit Generalized Preference legislation to Congress in 1972.

*A positive program for freer trade*

In international trade, as in domestic trade, increased specialization and exchange offer prospects for large gains in productivity. Imports enrich both consumption and investment by increasing the variety of products available to users and by lowering their costs. At the same time imports into a country provide the funds with which other countries can purchase its exports. Reductions in impediments to freer flows of trade, therefore, lead to higher standards of living which are widely shared.

To prevent the changes in patterns of production and consumption which accompany a growing interchange of goods and services from being disruptive, it is important that market adjustments of two kinds take place efficiently:

1. When imbalances develop between the growth of exports and imports, and if these lead to an overall payments imbalance, a mechanism is necessary to bring about corrections. Variations of international exchange rates, by realigning costs and prices among countries, constitute one very efficient process.

2. When changes in demand patterns call for changes in the patterns of production and employment, a mechanism of internal adjustment is needed to make sure that capital and labor in industries which lose market position can shift readily to growing opportunities in other fields.

In 1971 the United States initiated major steps to improve both of these forms of adjustment. Important measures were taken in the international monetary field, notably a significant realignment of exchange rates and a broadening of the band within which exchange rates can move freely. In the domestic economy, general policies were adopted to curb inflation and to expand economic activity and employment opportunities, and work was begun to develop broader arrangements for assisting adjustment by firms and workers affected by the liberalization of trade.

Measures were also taken which can enhance the contribution which two major sectors of the economy make to exports.

One of these sectors is high-technology industry. Such industries require large investments in research and development. This Nation's comparative advantage in the sector depends on its continued technological leadership. To maintain this leadership the Administration has developed proposals to stimulate research and development investment.

The other sector is agriculture. The potential for U.S. agricultural exports is not now realized because serious impediments bar the way to increased trade in agricultural products, mainly in the form of high price supports in important markets abroad. While U.S. agricultural policy has been substantially revised in recent years, away from high price support programs, corresponding action has not been taken in other countries. Negotiations are in progress which have as their goal the reduction of impediments to agricultural trade.

Most of the postwar growth in international trade has come from increased exchange of manufactured products, and it has taken place among the developed nations of the world. As less developed countries move away from heavy reliance on primary production into manufacturing activities, they too will need to participate more actively in the interchange of manufacturers. Agreement has been reached among the developed countries of the world, and between them and less developed countries, on a program through which exports from less developed countries will be given preferential treatment in developed country markets. In the implementation of this program the United States is seeking to minimize the discrimination which developed countries apply to such imports by source and to eliminate the practice by which "reverse preferences" have been granted by some of the developing countries to some developed ones. Legislation to implement a U.S. program in this area is in preparation.

Over the past 20 years the major economies of the world, including the United States, have enjoyed very high rates of growth in output and income. These rates have been higher than anyone predicted at the end of World War II and clearly higher than could have been predicted on the basis of experience prior to that time. One reason that these gains have been possible has been the rapid expansion in the interchange of goods and services that has been brought about by a steady dismantling of impediments to international trade.

Continued progress toward further reductions in existing barriers will require positive policies by both the United States and its trading partners. The international monetary arrangements will have to be made more flexible to accommodate unpredictable changes in world production and consumption patterns. At the same time domestic and international policies will have to provide a milieu of expanding employment opportunities in order to facilitate the reabsorption of resources displaced by change.

If both sets of policies are successful, the shifts which result from change will cease to be feared as harmful dislocations and will be recognized as part of a desirable movement toward higher economic benefits in which most people share.

---

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 1, 1972]

DOLLAR BATTERED ON INTERNATIONAL MARTS, DESPITE ASSURANCE REALINEMENT IS STEADY

Despite Nixon administration assurances that last December's world currency realignment isn't in danger of blowing up, the U.S. dollar came under further pressure yesterday on international marts.

Against some currencies, the dollar dropped near the floor rates set by last year's so-called Smithsonian Accord.

Some dealers said "the continuing high price for gold" was partly behind the assault on the dollar.

Also cited were persistent doubts about the ability of the U.S. to solve its balance-of-payments deficit, which occurs when foreigners obtain more dollars than they return.

Still other financial sources noted that the U.S. still hasn't indicated any willingness to resume swapping dollars for gold, or some other reserve asset. President Nixon closed America's gold window Aug. 15, and Wednesday's bill to Congress to raise the U.S. official bullion price to $38 an ounce from $35 didn't touch on convertibility. This, administration officials said, will have to be left to a world session on permanent international monetary reform.

In London, however, one financial source said that "until some progress is made towards a restoration of convertibility, exchange markets around the world are bound to stay unsettled."

The unease on the Frankfurt market pushed the dollar's price to a new low of 3.1875 marks from 3.968 the day before. Yesterday's closing quote was substantially below the new parity rate of 3.2225 marks set last December and only a notch above the new 3.15 floor rate permitted under the Smithsonian Accord's ground rules.

The West German central bank was conspicuously absent from the latest Frankfurt dealings, but figures released by the institution yesterday showed it had actively supported the dollar in recent weeks.

In the week ended Feb. 7, the bank said, its stock of immediately convertible foreign currency holdings swelled by about $300 million. Since the start of the year, the hoard has climbed nearly $700 million, the bank said.

Much of these holdings were greenbacks acquired by the central bank to prevent the dollar from slumping below its new floor rate.

In London, the pound closed at $2.6056, making it considerably more expensive in terms of the dollar than Wednesday's close of $2.60475.

The dollar sat on the floor against the Belgian franc, and central bank intervention was needed to prop the dollar in the Netherlands and Italy.

In Tokyo, the dollar slumped to 305.4 yen from 306.05 yen the day before and well below the new parity of 308 yen. The floor for the dollar in Tokyo is 301.07 yen.

Gold trading was termed "moderate" in London, but there was enough support to push the price to $48.45 an ounce, up 35 cents on the day.

---

## EULOGY TO DON ELLINGER

### HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, those of us who were fortunate in knowing Don Ellinger will miss him deeply. His life and ideals inspired us in so many ways and they should continue to do so.

At the Mass of the Resurrection celebrated by his brother, the Rev. Walter Ellinger, we sensed renewed inspiration in Don's legacy of love, his wonderful family.

At that mass, attended by so many of Don's friends of public office, of his union, and friends, the courage and dignity of his gracious wife, Ruth, and their nine children, told us that Don had truly won his reward, his victory, his immortality.

There was a feeling of sureness in the words of the scriptures:

For those who live in the Lord, life does not end, it merely changes.

Don Ellinger made changes in good ways, in the lives of others, in politics, in his country.

He did it by his counsel, his example, his ingratiating personality and his honest and direct style.

His zeal for political action in the International Association of Machinists made him the master of the technique of supporting and electing good candidates for high offices. More than that, after election, Don "held their feet to the fire"

to further the great causes in which he deeply and truly believed.

He fought and made others fight to alleviate poverty, to improve health, to secure shelter for the homeless and to remove the stigma of racial injustice from our land.

That he carried these causes so far is his testimonial in life. As he leaves us now it is with a sure knowledge that to be worthy of his friendship we must turn to the work of human renewal with greater commitment.

We do not raise monuments to men like Don Ellinger; he would be embarrassed by some status symbol of brick and mortar.

We are left with something more valuable than any monument human hands could construct, that is, that a man like Don Ellinger, by his efforts, can change the world in which we live—the world he has just departed.

I shall never forget his friendship and his selfless efforts to help me to succeed so that together we could try to be of help to others.

May it please his wife and sons and daughters and all his family to know that we are so grateful that you shared Don with us as now he goes to God.

## DANIEL W. HANNAN HONORED BY JAYCEES

### HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the Pittsburgh Junior Chamber of Commerce annually recognizes certain individuals for their outstanding accomplishments and leadership in their chosen fields.

This year one of those honored by the Jaycees was Mr. Daniel W. Hannan of Clairton, Pa., a man I am pleased to call a close, personal friend. He was selected as "Man of the Year in Labor" for 1971. It is an award he richly deserves.

Mr. Hannan is a man of many qualities. Normally a quiet, soft-spoken man, he can display bulldog tenacity when fighting for a cause he believes to be just. As a citizen, he takes great pride in his country and a deep interest in the operation of Government on any level. As a steelworker and president of Local 1557, USWA, since 1967, he is dedicated to improving the standard of living for those who labor beside him in the mills at Clairton. As a father and resident of Clairton, he conducts a relentless battle against air and water pollution which may endanger the lives of his family and his neighbors.

Mr. Hannan is not unknown to some of my colleagues in the House or to Members of the other body. He has written or spoken to several of them, expressing his views and opinions on legislation being considered by Congress. In either case, Mr. Hannan does not mince words but bases his arguments on facts and figures pertinent to the issue in question.

During the past few years he has made known his feelings on a number of important measures: the occupational safety and health act, the question of controlling foreign steel imports through mandated quotas. He is actively following the hearings on pension protection currently being conducted by the Select Subcommittee on Labor.

However, don't be misled in thinking Washington and labor are Mr. Hannan's only interest. Pennsylvania's elected officials in Harrisburg are well acquainted with his views on the state income tax and other matters.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is significant to explain how the Pittsburgh Jaycees select their "Men of the Year." The organization's Man of the Year Committee, which is composed of past presidents and past committee chairmen, solicits the names of potential awardees from former winners. Upon receipt of the suggested names, a ballot is prepared and sent to a list of community, civic, business and governmental leaders, in addition to previous award winners. Upon their return, the ballots are counted and the various winners determined.

Obviously, then, the selection of an awardee is not to be taken lightly. It signifies the respect and admiration that people in all walks of life have for an individual. It is indicative of the confidence and faith they have in that person's ability to lead and to accomplish.

The Pittsburgh Jaycees, their members and former award winners are to be commended on their selection of Daniel W. Hannan. He fills the bill.

## RATTLING THE BUSHES FOR CHRISTMAS BIRDS

### HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, the annual bird count of the Audubon Society has been a special labor of love for many communities in the Sixth District for years. It serves to chronicle the continuation in residence of those varieties that have not been driven away by urbanization and environmental hazards. It provides personal opportunity for a colloquy with nature.

One of the great enjoyments of bird watching is, of course, that each count provides a new adventure. Sherman resident Dwight Tracy recounts in an entertaining, well-written narrative his unique adventure during a recent bird count.

For the interest of my colleagues, Mr. Tracy's report of his outstanding bird counting experience as it appeared in the Sherman Sentinel follows:

RATTLING THE BUSHES FOR CHRISTMAS BIRDS

(By Dwight Tracy)

I got off to a bad start on the Christmas bird count. Determined to take part this year in the annual Audubon venture, I set out happily on Christmas Day and in short order tallied a splendid red-shouldered hawk. I called in my report to Lois Batchelder. "That's fine," she said, "but Christmas isn't the day for the Christmas count. We count on New Year's Day in this sector."

Scratch the hawk.

No, actually that isn't true. He does count, sort of. The count period, you see, extends from December 18 to January 2. To help keep track of our flying populace and all it signifies for man, alert birdwatchers all over keep track of sightings during that time and turn in their findings at the end of the period. But still, every area has its special BIG DAY. And that's when the birds really count. Exactly how that works I haven't quite figured out yet.

Anyway, New Year's Day found me back at it again, ready to give my all for the Hidden Valley Sector. I loaded up the feeder and sat back, clipboard in hand, binoculars on strap, tweedy jacket in place and aspirins ready.

Presently a chickadee arrived. I checked him off: "Chickadee, one." After awhile he left. And that appeared to be it. The feeder hung deserted. An element of competition arose. Soon I began suspecting rival birdwatchers of having lured everyone off to their feeders earlier in the day—when I didn't feel ready to get up. Well, certainly I wasn't going to turn in a list containing only one chickadee. Determined that there had to be more birds than that around here, I cut a long stick and set about thwacking the denser bushes.

I raised Sixpence the cat on the second hit, and produced Other Cat soon after. I continued thwacking. At last another chickadee dashed out of the undergrowth. Or at least I think it was another one. Chickadees have a certain quality of sameness. He disappeared even before I'd written "Chickadees, two." But moments later another one whizzed past. Just as I was erasing "two", a fourth flashed by.

Enraged, I scrounged the cellar and soon reappeared with both the stick and a can of spray whitewash. "Now we'll see who's getting counted more than once!" I shouted at the bushes. At once chickadee number one, or perhaps five, zipped around, and I gave it to him. Or I tried to. Most of the whitewash went on our sliding doors. I hadn't led him enough. The chickadee lapped the feeder and came in on another run. Dropping to one knee I gave him a couple of bursts. Slight error. I'd fired into the wind. The whitewash will come off my face all right. But I'm concerned about the jacket.

As neither the thwacking nor the marking were getting me anywhere, I decided to change tactics. I decided to be dishonest; that's what I decided. Now while I wouldn't write down a bird that wasn't actually seen, it does happen that there's one in the cellar that I see every day. He's a great horned owl, but since he is only a temporary resident of Sherman—incarcerated in our basement while an injured leg heals—Big Owl isn't technically eligible to be counted. But I ask you, faced with a tally sheet filled only with what was probably the same chickadee, what choice did I have?

Accordingly, I brought Big Owl up for a bit of fresh air. And as he sat out there on his block, I took my sweet time about counting him. Boy, I figured the odds of anyone else getting to count an owl at about 1,000 to 1. Using my best Palmer method, I slowly wrote "Great Ho," when, on the "o" a crow appeared overhead. He was doing aerial somersaults and cawing his head off. I abandoned "horned" for the moment, and in the appropriate space started to write "mad crow." But just then three more crows, all equally insane, arrived. Before I could note "four," all the crows in the world appeared. The owl had blown their minds and they were swooping, shrieking and dive-bombing while Big Owl cowered on his block and I waved my stick and fired the whitewash.

They overpowered us. Both the owl and I broke for the basement. Huddled together

for safety down there, Big Owl watched as I completed the list: "Chickadee, one; Great Horned Owl, one; Crows, 10,218,397." And that'll be it, Audubon. Take it or leave it.

---

## THE UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

### HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Labor each month presents the Nation with its diagnosis of the economy through its unemployment figures. If they were accurate, they might be helpful, but we know there are ways to use figures to glean a brighter picture than what is actually the case. A column by Martin Gopen called The Job Scene in the January 27 Bay State Banner makes many very sound points on these figures presented to the public by what Gopen calls "sunshine peddlers." Too many blacks are not included in the figures and the same is true for the Spanish-speaking population, as the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy was well aware. For my colleagues. I wish to insert the column into the RECORD:

THE JOB SCENE

(By Martin Gopen)

The great temptation at this time of the year is to sit down and write a piece evaluating the year's end labor statistics. The U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics has issued its annual mass of tables, graphs, percentages, trends, cycles, dips, upswings, etc. all measured in percentiles, trends, seasonally adjusted declines and other esoteric categories.

In studying the massive report, again the temptation is to extract certain statistics and regurgitate them back out like a parrot, trying not to use this year's batch of Labor Department euphemisms like "persistent rate of unemployment," "essentially unchanged," and "not appreciably different," all of which are designed to suggest stability.

We do know that the reported or published rate, of unemployment has been above 6 per cent for the total work force during the past year, the highest in ten years. and we also know that black unemployment has remained around twice that amount or a reported 11 per cent and that teenage unemployment is three times higher than the 6 per cent figure.

Without debating the accuracy of the figures, we know that the economy has not been able to absorb the new workers coming into the labor market such as the returning veterans, the high school graduates, and the married women attempting to return to the labor market. We also know that the present crunch on jobs adversely affects the blue collar worker more than the white collar worker and that those with the least skills are affected the most and this is really all we know.

Four years ago, this column reported on the late Senator Robert Kennedy's testimony before Congress claiming that the Labor Department's system of reporing the unemployment rate left much to be desired in giving the public a true picture of the employment situation in this country. He referred to those persons (mostly black and Spanish) who were not counted in the unemployment ranks as "the Lost Battalions."

Two years ago, this column told of the late Whitney Young's charges that the Labor Department was still manipulating the statistics so as not to paint too bleak a picture and also spoke of the uncounted numbers of unemployed. He called them the "Hidden Hunger."

Well, the latest to pick up on the "truth in reporting" effort is Senator William Proxmire (D.-Wisc.). He has charged that the Nixon Administration has replaced regular civil service workers at the Bureau of Labor Statistics with "hand picked assistants" who have more public relations background than labor reporting.

Senator Proxmire further charges that the Administration combed the labor and employment statistics each month this past year before they were made public and then announced only the good or stable parts of the report.

This charge takes on added dimension because every political prognosticator will be using the reported unemployment rate as a barometer for the presidential election. The fate of the candidates will, in part, be determined by the fluctuations of that rate and the interpretations given to that figure. The economy will be an issue in '72 and its measuring stick will be the monthly unemployment rate.

To that end, this column will resist the temptation to use those figures until some degree of validation is secured.

This problem of credibility in reporting is not just the province of the Labor Department or of the Pentagon in reporting the war's activity. It's indicative of a public malaise that can be called "institutionalized paranoia." This is where a public institution refuses to admit to a true picture of a situation, not necessarily of their making, because they don't want the responsibility to correct same.

Schools refuse to admit to imbalance profiles because the onus would be on them to redress the situation. Civil Services does not acknowledge that their structure discriminates for the same reasons. Recently a labor union proudly announced a "50 percent increase in minority enrollment." Translated, where they had two blacks out of 136, they now have three blacks or a "50 percent increase."

The public can not get too upset at these deceptions because the public at large has not challenged officialdom or the media that dutifully reports these deceptions without question. The public has cynically accepted these statistical manipulations as a piece of the ever increasing alienation it encounters from the insulated and isolated bureaucracy, thus widening the accountability gaps between people and their institutions. Those institutions, in turn, will escalate the process as the check and balance system deteriorates.

What is needed here is an effort or a new direction in consumer advocacy. The consumer in this case is the taxpayer, who is in dire need of protection from the sunshine peddlers who are covering up their own inability to grapple with problems by presenting rose colored glasses in the form of self-serving statistical pronouncements and interpretations.

---

## HOWARD TAKENAKA, SCHOOLTEACHER, PRINCIPAL, COUNSELOR, COMMUNITY LEADER, RETIRES AFTER 44 YEARS OF DEDICATED SERVICE

### HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday evening, February 20, 1972, a Honolulu man will be honored at a banquet marking the end of the 44 years he has devoted to educating the young people of Hawaii. Howard Takenaka has served admirably as teacher, counselor, and principal, and I am proud to be able to call him my friend.

Howard Takenaka retired at the end of 1971 as principal of the Sanford B. Dole Elementary School in the Kalihi-Palama area of Honolulu. He noted that he and his wife, Jane, who taught for 37 years before retiring recently, had been "surrogate parents to about 100,000 Hawaii boys and girls."

Mr. Takenaka's circle of activities was a wide one. His involvement with community organizations was extensive, because his commitment to the community itself was so deep.

When his many friends and admirers gather to honor him on Sunday evening, he will be remembered as a man who believed in being a "no-nonsense" schoolteacher and principal, but one who tempered his discipline with kindness and understanding.

Howard Takenaka served as a sterling example to the young people of Hawaii. As a former educator and his personal friend, I can attest to the fact that his life is a worthy model for all teachers and, indeed, for all mankind.

At this point I offer for inclusion in the RECORD the text of an article about Howard Takenaka which appeared recently in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of Honolulu:

EDUCATOR TO BE HONORED: AFTER 44 YEARS, HOW CAN YOU SAY GOODBY?

(By Ted Smiley)

Christmas vacation was not a happy time for Howard Iwao Takenaka.

He woke up one morning, dressed, had his usual light breakfast and drove to the Sanford B. Dole Intermediary School in Honolulu's Kalihi-Palama area.

Takenaka unlocked the door to his office, cleaned out his desk and left the school, bringing to an end 44 years and four months as a teacher, principal, counsellor, guide and leader of Hawaii's young people.

"I couldn't stand to face the children and say goodbye," he said. "I couldn't stand it. I would have broken down. Christmas time is a happy time. It's no time for tears, for time past and gone."

Mrs. Takenaka—Jane Y. Morimoto Takenaka—understood. In her own right, she was a teacher for more than 37 years.

"I can speak for Howard," she said. "We have no regrets, no remorse. If we had life to live over again, we'd do the same thing. Be teachers.

"Yes, there are heartbreaks. But there are joys."

"Jane and I," Takenaka said, "have been surrogate parents to about 100,000 Hawaii boys and girls.

"I know I had a reputation for being a nononsense teacher and principal. For being tough. Sometimes I was too tough. Sometimes I was too easy. A teacher has to do his best, and hope it's right."

"Howard was tough," Mrs. Takenaka said. "But he was fair. The children understood that. So many boys—boys, usually, but a few girls—were bitter at first. Then, later they would come up to Howard and thank him. Thank him because he was tough."

Listening to the Takenakas is like listening to a trombone and a flute in obligato. After more than 41 years of marriage, their voices and thoughts complement each other's in intricate, rhythmic harmony.

"School is made for children," Howard

said. "Every child has a right to live, to grow up."

"Every child needs understanding and love," Jane said.

"A teacher, a principal, never must be afraid to apologize when he's made a mistake," Howard said. "He's got to be big enough to admit he can be wrong."

Neither Howard nor Jane sees anything wrong with being disciplinarians—or tempering discipline with affection and understanding.

Howard, slim, trim, and still shooting in the 80s on the golf course, was born Jan. 5, 1907 in Waimea on Kauai. His father, who came here in 1900, was a plantation laborer.

It wasn't easy for Howard to complete junior high school on Kauai, then to come to Oahu, where he lived in the Okumura Boy's Home while attending McKinley High School.

He received his teacher's diploma from the Territorial Normal School, his bachelor's degree from the University of Hawaii, and his master's degree from Columbia University in New York City.

After Howard and Jane were married in 1930, both taught in the Kaiwiki School in the Big Island.

"We were assigned a teacher cottage," Jane said. "We were more than just teachers. We were social workers, family counsellors, lawyers, community leaders—you name it, we did it."

"Looking back," Howard said, "those probably were the most satisfying days of our lives. We were totally involved with our pupils and their families."

Ability and willingness to work the clock around brought advancement, and expanding duties cut in to the free time of the Takenakas.

Nevertheless, Howard moved into the upper echelons of the American Institute of Parliamentarians, the Hawaii State Parliamentary Association, Hawaii Government Employes Association, Oahu Aloha Chapter of Credit Unions, Hawaii Credit Union League, Kalihi Valley Council, Model Cities and various Masonic organizations.

In theory, Jane Takenaka retired several years ago, but you'd never believe it from her schedule.

She teaches several adult classes on a volunteer basis, including basic English at Farrington Community School, the Young Buddhist Association and the Sato Mission.

"I taught the children for 37 years," she said. "Now I teach the parents.

"For years, the older people could sign their Social Security checks with an "X"; now that's illegal. They have to sign their names. We teach them, and it opens new doors to them. It's deeply satisfying to help them learn to read and write. It's thrilling."

Both Jane and Howard can talk for hours about the individual pupils they have taught.

"I may not always associate a name with a face," Jane said, "but I usually can place the boy or girl at a certain desk in a classroom."

"Everywhere I go," Howard said, "I run into my pupils; in restaurants, in stores, in the tax office, I see a face smiling at me, and I'm asked, 'Do you remember me?'

"I was at a banquet last week, and the waitress asked me that. Of course I remembered her." "'I'm a grandmother, now,' she said. "It made me feel very old."

"One of my worst moments came during the Korean War," Howard said. "Kaimuki High School boys were forming a volunteer group. There was one boy, especially, I hated to have leave school. He came in and asked for permission. He had to have permission.

"I pleaded with him to stay in school. At last I asked him to think it over that night. I said if he still wanted to go next day, I'd give permission. He went. He never came back. I lie awake nights, remembering."

On Sunday evening, Feb. 20, Howard and Jane will be honored with a banquet in the Hilton Hawaiian Village Longhouse.

"Howard sneaked out of school without saying goodbye," said Jane, still blackhaired and vivacious. "He won't be able to get out of this. I'll make sure he shows up."

"If the speeches get too long, or too maudlin, I'll show 'em I'm still a disciplinarian," Howard said with a mock scowl.

His former pupils will believe that.

## FREEDOM OF INFORMATION: OFFICIALS THWART PUBLIC RIGHT TO KNOW

### HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, Science magazine for February 4 carries an article by Nicholas Wade on the history and workings of the Freedom of Information Act. Author Wade concludes by expressing the opinion that—

But unless Congress decides to give it some teeth, the Freedom of Information Act will continue to guarantee the public's right to know only what government officials don't mind revealing.

I think the forthcoming hearings by the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, chaired by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD), will emphasize that Congress meant what it said in passing the Freedom of Information Act: that disclosure of information shall be the rule, not the exception.

The Science article follows:

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION: OFFICIALS THWART PUBLIC RIGHT TO KNOW

"The public's need for information is especially great in the field of science and technology, for the growth of specialized scientific knowledge threatens to outstrip our collective ability to control its effects on our lives. . . . It would defeat . . . the purposes of the Act to withhold from the public factual information on a federal scientific program whose future is at the center of public debate."

So ruled David L. Bazelon, chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia, in a decision that ultimately flushed out a confidential scientific study of the supersonic transport compiled for the President's science adviser. The act that Bazelon interpreted is the Freedom of Information Act, an important but underexposed statute which formally inshrines the public's right to know what its government does. The act stipulates that every government agency shall, with certain specified exceptions, make its records promptly available to any person on request.

The willingness with which government officials would reveal the private records of their activities to anyone who asked, and promptly at that, is not difficult to imagine. The act did not have an easy birth—Congress gestated it for 11 years—and the Department of Justice has made determined attempts first to throttle the infant law, and more recently to emasculate it when it began to show signs of potency.

How well is the Freedom of Information Act working? "If an applicant appeals to the director of an agency and shows willingness to go to court, he will generally get his information," says an aide to Representative William S. Moorhead (D–Pa.), chairman of the House committee that oversees the act. Probably the vast bulk of requests for information addressed to the federal government by press and public are satisfied without recourse to the Freedom of Information Act and, judged by standards elsewhere, the U.S. government is a paragon of open-handedness. Nonetheless, Congress found it necessary to pass the act, and there exists an important category of information supposedly within purview of the act that is not easily come by. Behavior under the act varies widely from agency to agency—two of the most recalcitrant, in the opinion of public interest groups, are the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the Department of Agriculture. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), on the other hand, seems to be adopting a more liberal interpretation. The sticking point at which many bureaucrats start to deny requests under the act is with information that reflects in any way on the internal workings and performance of the agency.

DELAYS AND EVASIONS

The Freedom of Information Act has received rather little judicial attention since it came into force on 4 July 1967 and its eventual impact is hard to assess until further precedents are established. But several weaknesses are already apparent. By and large government officials are able, when they wish, to thwart the intent of the law simply by delay. A requester of information can wait up to 2 years or more before all the administrative remedies have been exhausted and a case has come to court. Few newsmen have that kind of time to spare. For this, among other reasons, of more than 200 cases brought under the act, fewer than 10 have been filed by newspapers, which were envisaged as the chief beneficiaries of the act.

The principal users of the law are corporations, which have the time and money to make it work for them, and public interest groups representing the consumer and environmentalist movements. The latter have won some famous victories, such as the release of a confidential report on the supersonic transport and, more recently, the publication of environmental impact statements on the Cannikin underground bomb test at Amchitka. Equally important were two cases concerning meat inspection records and pesticide registration, which were won by Harrison Welford, a consultant to Ralph Nader's Center for the Study of Responsive Law, against the Department of Agriculture. But the impact of these and other precedents has fallen far short of shaping the act into an effective instrument of public information.

The most vocal critics of the act are the public interest groups, which have found their requests for seemingly innocuous information, such as scientific data, repeatedly rebuffed by the government. "It's a very sketchy law which was badly drafted to begin with, and it's not terribly useful," says an attorney with the Environmental Defense Fund. According to Harrison Welford of the Nader center, the act has not lived up to its initial promise because of the evasion techniques developed by government officials. In *Sowing the Wind*, a study of Department of Agriculture policies on meat and pesticide regulation, Welford lists some of the common tactic used by agency officials for thwarting the act.

*Contamination tactic:* Unclassified material that may prove embarrassing is mixed with a few items of information that can be withheld under the act, such as trade secrets, and the whole file is labeled as classified.

*Specificity tactic:* The agency delays replying to a request for several weeks and then states that the request is not specific enough.

*Search fee tactic:* Even if the agency concedes that the information should be made public, it may impose an arbitrarily high fee for collecting it.

*Trade secrets tactic:* The formula of a pesticide or other chemical is a trade secret that is properly exempt under the act, but the agency applies the exemption to all of the other information provided by the manufacturer.

Representative John E. Moss (D-Calif.), the author of the act, intended it to represent "an in-between solution which will guarantee the right of every citizen to know the facts of his government while protecting that information which is necessary to the functioning of government." Nine categories of information are protected by the act, including matters of national security, trade secrets, inter- and intra-agency memoranda, files compiled for law enforcement purposes, and matters specifically exempted from disclosure by other statutues. The legislative intent of the act was to make disclosure of information the general rule, not the exception, and to place on the government the burden of justifying the withholding of a document.

The bill passed the House to the sound of a 307 to 0 vote and many elevated observations on the people's right to know. Representative Donald Rumsfeld (R–Ill.), for example, now a counselor to the President, described the act as one of the most important measures to be considered in Congress in 20 years. The bill, he said during the House debate on 20 June 1966, "Will make it considerably more difficult for secrecy-minded bureaucrats to decide arbitrarily that the people should be denied access to information on the conduct of government or on how an individual government official is in handling his job."

The bureaucrats have not suddenly changed their mental habits in the Administration of which Rumsfeld is an eminent member. Here is a not untypical example of how an unwelcome request for information may be handled. On 7 July 1970, Dale Hattis, a researcher at the Stanford University School of Medicine, asked the FDA for the data on which its officials assessed the safety of various food additives and pesticide residues. It took the FDA 11 months and 28 days to compose a reply, in which Hattis was told that he should be more specific. (This is an identical version of the specificity tactic used in the Department of Agriculture.)

Hattis then narrowed his request down to data on a single food additive, sodium nitrite. Sam D. Fine, FDA associate commissioner for compliance, replied that "toxicological and other technical information is valuable commercial property that is regarded as confidential information." Hence the data on sodium nitrite safety supplied by the manufacturers counts as a trade secret and is exempt from disclosure under the act, Fine told Hattis (the trade secrets tactic). The FDA possesses some toxicological data on sodium nitrite not supplied by manufacturers; Fine offers this data for a compilation and copying fee of $99.50 (the search fee tactic). Hattis has enlisted the advice of an attorney at the Environmental Defense Fund, which is now contemplating bringing suit against the FDA under the act.

"I have always believed that freedom of information is so vital that only the national security, not the desire of public officials or private citizens, should determine when it must be restricted," President Johnson proclaimed on signing the act into law. Another example of the government's interpretation of the act is the response to a request by Carolyn Morgan, a Washington, D.C., housewife, for the toxicological data relating to birth control pills. Replying on behalf of the FDA, Roger O. Egeberg, then assistant secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, told Morgan that some of the information she requested was protected under the act by exemption number 3 (matter exempted by other statutes), number 4 (trade secrets and confidential), number 5 (intra-agency memoranda), and number 6 (personnel and medical files). (It is a standard stratagem to claim as many exemptions as possible—in a court case there's more chance that one may stick.)

Egeberg proceeded to point out that the exempt and nonexempt information in the material Morgan had requested were mixed together in 1929 files, and that to separate the two categories would cost $12,600 in labor (a combination of the contamination and search fee tactics). There would also be a copying charge of 25¢ per page, and an advance fee of $5000 would be required. "We think that such a search would be wasteful for both parties," Egeberg opined to Morgan. Morgan has since brought a suit against the FDA which is now in the appeal stage.

One reason why agencies have been able to run circles around the law is that the government's campaign against the threat to bureaucratic secrecy is skillfully generaled by the Justice Department. When the act first came into force, a memorandum was issued by the attorney general (then Ramsey Clark) which in effect instructed the agencies how to make the broadest interpretations of the nine exceptions. The memo was also not above putting the agencies up to such tricks as charging fees, covering indirect costs as well as copying, in order to "discourage frivolous requests."

The effect of these instructions as they percolated down through government has been noted by Wayne Winters, editor of the weekly *Epitaph*, published at Tombstone, Arizona. When the act was first passed, Winters successfully obtained internal documents from the local offices of the Forest Service at Tucson and Albuquerque. (The documents concerned the Forest Service's methods of evicting gold miners from forest lands. They form the basis for an article by Winters in the 27 March 1969 issue of the *Tombstone Epitaph* entitled "A Harassed Miner is Blown to Kingdom Come—Red Run Their Hands—Bureaucrats Drove Miner to Death Via Continued Harrassment".) Later the local Forest Service offices took a more restrictive view of the Freedom of Information Act. Winters told *Science:* "They became evasive because information came out of Washington telling them how to get around the law. We have a law we didn't have before—I don't think any of us uses it as much as we ought to."

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT DEFENSE

Under Justice Department tutelage, the agencies interpreted the act's exemptions as broadly as possible in order to discourage intruders. But the courts often construed the exemption more narrowly and the government started to lose a few cases, including one in which the Consumers Union sued the Veterans Administration for the results of tests conducted on various brands of hearing aids. More seriously, the summer of 1969 was the first time that students working for the Nader Center—Nader's raiders—descended on the agencies in massive force. A second memo was dispatched from the Justice Department to the general counsels of all federal agencies, calling for a change in government tactics. The memo, dated 8 December 1969, was drawn up by two assistant attorneys general, William H. Rehnquist, now a justice of the Supreme Court, and William D. Ruckelshaus, now the administrator of the EPA. "Although the legal basis for denying a particular request under the Act may seem quite strong to an agency at the time it elects finally to refuse access to the requested records," warned the memo, "the justification may appear considerably less strong when later viewed, in the context of adversary litigation, from the detached perspective of a court and from the standpoint of the broad public policy of the Act." The memo, in so many words, warned that agencies should consult with the Justice Department before letting anyone drag them to court, lest a body of precedents be built up in favor of the public and against the government. The memo concluded with an oblique reference to the consumer movement's growing curiosity about agency methods of regulation and an invitation for agencies to collaborate on methods of meeting the threat ("If the activities of your agency involve testing or information pertaining thereto, we would welcome any statements of experience, policies or views which you may care to provide").

Rather few cases have come to court under the act—about 200 since 1967—presumably because, in accordance with Justice Department strategy, agencies are often advised to yield up their secrets to a persistent requester rather than risk a court case. A questionnaire sent out to all agencies by Representative Moorhead reveals that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) has received 368 formal requests under the act in the 4 years of its existence. Of these, 258 were granted, 77 were denied entirely, 16 were denied in part, and a further 17 cases are pending. Examples of information denied by HEW are a request from the Homestake Mining Co., San Francisco, for data about mine workers who have contracted lung cancer; a request by the Washington, D.C., public relations firm Hill and Knowlton for correspondence between Ralph Nader and the FDA; an application from the pharmaceutical company Upjohn to view HEW's 5-year budget projections; a request by CBS/KNX of Los Angeles for access to the FDA's files on stannous chloride.

HEW does not seem to have been involved in any landmark cases, unlike the Department of Agriculture, which has managed to fight and lose three cases, two to Welford of the Nader Center and one to Aviation Specialties, a company that sued to see the records of a contract it had bid for unsuccessfully. Probably the case that has hurt the government most as far as setting precedents is concerned was the skirmish over the report on the supersonic transport prepared for the Office of Science and Technology (OST).

The report, an adverse critique of the SST, was written by a committee under IBM physicist Richard L. Garwin in 1969. The OST was sued by a number of environmental groups for refusing to make the Garwin report public. A lower court ruled that the OST was part of the President's personal staff, not an agency, and that its records were therefore protected by the mysterious but unchallenged doctrine of executive privilege. On appeal, Judge Bazelon ruled that the Garwin report was not covered by executive privilege unless the President expressly invoked the doctrine, which he had not done in the Garwin report case. (This state of affairs owes much to Representative Moss, the progenitor of the act, who helped persuade President Nixon and his two predecessors to say that they would claim executive privilege only personally and *in extremis*. Formerly, the agencies had made free with the privilege in the President's name.)

Bazelon directed the lower court to consider whether any of the nine exemptions of the Freedom of Information Act was applicable to the Garwin report. But the exemptions were to be interpreted narrowly. Bazelon declared in his 23-page opinion: "The touchstone of any proceedings under the Act must be the clear legislative intent to assure public access to all government records whose disclosure would not significantly harm specific governmental interests. The policy of the Act requires that the disclosure requirement be construed broadly, the exemptions narrowly."

Bazelon's opinion represented just the kind of interpretation the Justice Department had been striving to avoid. A week before the lower court was due to reconsider the case,

the Administration eschewed the risk of a further unfavorable precedent by releasing the Garwin report, declaring that it did so to "dispel any further misconception . . . that the government may be concealing factual data on the SST program."

Two other recent events that have served to narrow the scope of the exemptions are the Cannikin case, which unfolded in August and October last year, and a ruling by the EPA on the toxicological data relating to pesticides. Ironically, both of these rulings were effected by men who, while in the Justice Department, had directed government strategy for broadening the act's exemptions. Ramsey Clark, who was responsible for the 1967 memorandum on the act, acted as attorney for 33 members of Congress who last year sued to see a report on the underground nuclear bomb test at Amchitka, codenamed Cannikin. The report, classified as secret, included the assessments of the weapon's likely impact on the environment prepared by the EPA and the Council on Environmental Quality.

CANNIKIN HAZARDS REVEALED

A lower court held that the report was covered by the act's exemption for national security matters, but the government's position was not assisted by the public comment of EPA administrator Ruckelshaus that he saw no reason to classify the EPA contribution to the report as top secret. An appeals court reversed the lower court's ruling, saying that there was no basis for "withholding on security grounds a document that, although separately unclassified, is regarded as secret merely because it has been incorporated into a secret file." The ruling led to a requirement that the Administration release those parts of the Cannikin report dealing with the environmental impact of the explosion. The public learned that the chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality had advised the President that the test might trigger a tsunami, a danger that "it is not possible at this time to assess quantitatively."

Another important interpretation of the act is a ruling made last month by Ruckelshaus, who had been coauthor of the Justice Department's December 1969 memorandum on the Freedom of Information Act. In a notice published in the *Federal Register* of 18 December, Ruckelshaus states that data on the toxicity and efficacy of registered pesticides, as supplied by their manufacturers, should be made available to the public under the act. These data, Ruckelshaus rules, do not fall into the category of trade secrets or confidential information.

The EPA's new policy on manufacturer's toxicity data is diametrically opposed to that of the FDA and of the Department of Agriculture, before the latter's administration of pesticide regulation was transferred to the EPA. According to Welford, who sued the Department of Agriculture for this among other data, "Ruckelshaus was surprised at the degree to which USDA had withheld information when it was in control of pesticide regulation."

Apart from corporations, it is public interest groups such as the Nader center that have made most use of the Freedom of Information Act. But even they are skeptical about its effectiveness. Says Welford: "The legal process is too ponderous to handle something as perishable as information. Because of the delays involved, I doubt if many public interest groups will use the act." In Welford's meat case against the Department of Agriculture (he was suing for access to the letters of warning sent out to processors found violating the wholesome meat regulations), some 2½ years elapsed between the filing of the suit and the final court verdict in Welford's favor. (A Nader's raider sent to inspect the long-sought files has found that 99 percent of all alleged violations of meat regulations are treated only by letters of warning.) But even this victory has been blunted because, in what the Nader lawyers consider a clear contravention of the court ruling, the Department of Agriculture refuses to grant access to the back-up files on which each letter of warning is based.

Another consultant to the Nader center, Peter H. Schuck, considers the Freedom of Information Act to be almost impossible to enforce because it creates no incentives for officials to comply promptly with a request for information. "The pervasive attitude in government is 'If you don't like it, sue us,'" Schuck says. He and Welford believe that the law should provide penalties for officials who are found to have withheld information unjustifiably.

Despite the act's many deficiencies in practice, there seems to be agreement that it is worth having. The Nader center, for example, is considering hiring an attorney to work full time on freedom of information suits. And the threat of being taken to court has some moderating influence on the natural secrecy of bureaucrats. The meat inspection case, Welford says, "really scared the hell out of the USDA when they lost, and has clearly made a difference to our relationships over there."

Public interest groups and others might have less reason to be disappointed with the way the act is working if Congress had taken a closer interest in it. "They should be very interested in the act," says Schuck. "After all, a lot of groups like us are doing the jobs that Congress should be doing, and we are after the same kind of information that Congress needs to perform its oversight function." Representative Moorhead's subcommittee is now preparing to hold hearings on the act, the first since it was passed. But unless Congress decides to give it some teeth, the Freedom of Information Act will continue to guarantee the public's right to know only what government officials don't mind revealing.

## WILLOWBROOK—THE LAST GREAT DISGRACE

### HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, recent media exposure of the deplorable and inhumane conditions at Willowbrook State School in New York has brought shock and renewed concern from people across the country.

Willowbrook, built in 1941 to care for 3,000 mentally retarded patients now houses more than 5,200 people. Despite the vivid accounts of the neglect and overcrowding now existing at Willowbrook, there is a waiting list of approximately 1,000 more who wish admission to the world's largest mental institution. More than three quarters of the patients are classified as having IQ's ranging from below 20 to 36 and these youngsters are considered untrainable and cannot be taught the basics of self-care.

The conditions described on television and radio, as well as in newspapers and magazines paint an agonizing portrait of what a society can do to its sick and less fortunate. The blame for these conditions rests with all of us rather than with the attendants and the administrators. The values of a society are reflected in its treatment of those who are unable to care for themselves. Clearly, we have failed to meet our responsibilities in this area.

I have recently been informed that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Elliot Richardson, has pledged the full resources of his Department to help alleviate the problems at New York State's mental health facilities. Plans are now being made for a team of experts to visit the institutions involved. The team will consist of Federal specialists and a number of outstanding non-Federal consultants who will begin their work during the week of February 28.

As a public service, WABC–TV in New York, inspired by Newscaster Geraldo Rivera's revelations, ran several short features on Willowbrook. Because wide public interest was aroused quickly and because the public wanted to know more, the ABC affiliate aired a more detailed program which described the horrible conditions at the institution. I am convinced that because of the great service which this station rendered, the public and those in a position to effect change at Willowbrook will take quick action to erase this sad commentary on our times. All of us owe a great debt of gratitude to Geraldo Rivera for his courageous reporting and his vigorous pursuit in bringing these facts to the attention of the American public. His persistent and unrelenting determination will help bring a better way of life to those people living at Willowbrook.

While I would have liked every Member of Congress to have seen the entire television special I believe much can be gained by reading the transcript of the program.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if there are no objections, I wish to insert into the RECORD the transcript of "Willowbrook—the Last Great Disgrace" which was presented by ABC–TV in New York on February 2, 1972:

WILLOWBROOK—THE LAST GREAT DISGRACE—FEBRUARY 2, 1972

ANNOUNCER. There are some aspects of life which society has hidden from public view. The following program will remind you that they exist and that we all bear a responsibility to humanity. If you have children, you may want to exercise parental guidance.

ROBERT KENNEDY. When I visited the state institutions for the mentally retarded, and, I think, particularly at Willowbrook, that we have a situation that borders on a snake pit and that the children live in filth, that many of our fellow citizens are suffering tremendously because lack of attention, lack of imagination, lack of adequate manpower gives very little future for the children or for those who are in these institutions. Both need a tremendous overhauling, and I'm not saying that those who are the attendants or the ones who run the institution are at fault. I think all of us are at fault. And I just think it's long overdue that something be done about it.

GERALDO RIVERA. It's been more than six years since Robert Kennedy walked out of one of the wards here at Willowbrook then told newsmen of the horror he'd seen inside. He pleaded then for an overhaul of the system that allowed retarded children to live in a snake pit. That was way back in 1965 and somehow we'd all forgotten. I first heard of this big place with the pretty sounding name because of a call I received from a member of the Willowbrook staff, Michael

Wilkins. The Doctor told me he'd just been fired because he'd been urging parents with children in one of the buildings, Building #6, to organize so they could more effectively demand improved conditions for their children. The Doctor invited me to see the conditions he was talking about, so unannounced and unexpected by the school administration, we toured Building #6.

The Doctor had warned me that it would be bad . . . it was horrible. There was one attendant for perhaps 50 severly and profoundly retarded children. The children, lying on the floor and smeared with their own feces, they were making a pitiful sound . . . a kind of mournful wail that it's impossible for me to forget. This is what it looked . . . This is what it sounded like . . . But how can I tell you about the way it smelled? It smelled of filth . . . It smelled of disease . . . and it smelled of death.

We've just seen something that's probably the most horrible thing I've ever seen in my life. Is that typical of ward life?

Dr. WILKINS. Yes. There are 5,300 patients at Willowbrook, which is the largest institution for the mentally retarded in the world. The ones that we saw were the most severely and profoundly retarded. There are thousands here like that . . . not going to school . . . sitting on the ward all day . . . not being talked to by anyone . . . Only one or two or three people to take care of 70 people on the ward . . . Sharing the same toilet . . . contracting the same diseases together. One hundred percent of the patients at Willowbrook contract hepatitis within six months of being in the institution . . . Most patients at some time in their life have parasites . . . The incidence of pneumonia is greater than any other group of people that I think exist in this country . . . Trauma is severe because these patients are left together on a ward . . . seventy retarded people basically unattended . . . fighting for a small scrap of paper on the floor to play with . . . fighting for the attention of the attendants, who are overworked trying to clean them, feed them, clothe them and, if possible, pay a little attention to them and work with them and develop their intelligence. But what, in fact, happens is that they go downhill.

GERALDO RIVERA. Two days after our first unofficial visit, our camera crew was given an authorized tour of the facility. While unannounced we had found the children naked and basically unattended, then we were shown children who were fully clothed and generously attended. It was to insure that this sudden improvement in the quality of life was permanent that we returned without the knowledge of the school administration and through a back door. It was the first day all over again.

Dr. WILKINS. For these people life is just one hour after another of looking at the floor. There's no training going on here.

GERALDO RIVERA. Can the children be trained?

Dr. WILKINS. Yes. Every child can be trained . . . You know . . . these kids . . . there's no effort . . . We don't know what these kids are capable of doing. Some training programs go on at Willowbrook, but the State provides a bare minimum, just enough so that they can call this place a school . . . Clearly these kids aren't getting any training. I mean, I don't think I even have to say that. They're just sitting here on the ward . . . These are the hours in which they should be in school and they're not.

GERALDO RIVERA. What ward is this now?

Dr. WILKINS. This is Building 27 . . . These patients do have clothes on today. But as you can see, the one thing that can't be hidden is that there are no training programs. That all these patients do is sit during the day. They are not occupied. Their life is just hours and hours of endless nothing to do . . . no one to talk to . . . no expectations . . just an endless life of misery and filth. What you see, it makes you think that it's hopeless . . . but you know they only look this way because they haven't ever had opportunity for training. Now if you or I were left to sit on a ward, surrounded by other mentally retarded people, we would probably begin looking like this, too.

GERALDO RIVERA. The Willowbrook State School is this country's largest home for the mentally retarded. It's called a school, but that's more a statement of aspiration than of fact. Fewer than 20% of the 5,230 people who are kept here attend any kind of classes.

When the State of New York entered a period of economic retrenchment two years ago, a hiring freeze was clamped on this and other institutions in the Department of Mental Hygiene. In the intervening months, Willowbrook lost 600 employees through attrition. For the budget of fiscal '71–'72 the Governor recommended a hold-the-line appropriation of $603 million for the Mental Hygiene Department. The Legislature, seeking to trim the waste and fat from the budget cut it down to $580 million. Willowbrook lost another 200 employees and a situation that two years ago was bad became hopeless. The attendants tried to care for their wards but were simply overwhelmed. The attendant-to-patient ratio which should be about 4–1 dropped to 30 or 40–1 and the average feeding time per patient which should be 20 or 30 minutes went down to 2 and 3 minutes.

Dr. WILKINS. Many of the profoundly retarded children aren't capable of feeding themselves. In my building we had no staff to train them in a systematic way to use utensils to feed themselves . . . That can be done, but what's necessary is to feed them. You take a bowl of food that you've made into a mush-like substance with a big spoon and you ladle it out into their mouth. In the buildings where the kids can't feed themselves there are so few attendants that there is only an average minimum time—three minutes per child, per feeding.

GERALDO RIVERA. How much time would be needed to do the job adequately?

Dr. WILKINS. The same amount of time that your children and my children would want to have breakfast.

GERALDO RIVERA. What's the consequence of three minutes, per meal, per child?

Dr. WILKINS. The consequence is death from pneumonia.

GERALDO RIVERA. North of the City on the way to Bear Mountain, is a lovely-looking place called Letchworth Village Rehabilitation Center. Set among the hills and woods of suburban Rockland County a passerby could easily mistake the place for a country club or a college campus, but the early morning mist gave the place an eerie feeling, like a set from a horror movie. And once inside that feeling became suddenly appropriate. It was a repeat of the misery and degradation of Willowbrook.

Congressman Mario Biaggi had planned an official tour of the facility for ten o'clock in the morning, but by this time, wary of what I felt were attempts on the part of the Department of Mental Hygiene to make the situation look better than it really was, my camera crew and I got there two hours before that. As the hour of the official tour approached, bundles of clothing were brought in for the children and the process of cleaning up was begun. Even so, none of these cosmetic changes could do much to improve the place.

Congressman BIAGGI. Who's in charge here, Gerry?

GERALDO RIVERA. Mrs. Nixon . . . This is . . .

Congressman BIAGGI. Mrs. Nixon? I'm Congressman Biaggi. How are you? Why are these patients unclothed?

Mrs. NIXON. We don't have enough clothing We don't have the proper help to keep clothing on them. We have a few nudists that will not keep clothes on. They will pull them off. But most of all we don't have the help to keep the kids properly dressed.

Congressman BIAGGI. You're talking about more money for the institution?

Mrs. NIXON. Well, that we could use because then we would have more help.

Congressman BIAGGI. How understaffed are you?

Mrs. NIXON. Very understaffed. There are days we have four or five attendants to take care of 134 kids. Like today, we have four people on to take care of the entire group of kids.

Congressman BIAGGI. We have a condition in a very beautiful ground, very well-built buildings, where inside we have housed the children of many of our citizens who are subjected to what appears to be the worst possible conditions I've ever seen in my life. I visited penal institutions all over the country . . . I visited hospitals all over the country . . . I visited the worst brigs in the military . . . I've never seen anything like it.

GERALDO RIVERA. About 25% of the funding for Letchworth Village comes from the Federal Government and one of the requirements for continued eligibility is that there be 80 square feet of space per patient . . . Here they get only 35 square feet. In the face of this terrible overcrowding there was a ward there that stood empty because they hadn't the funds to hire the 38 people it would take to staff it.

How can this be?

MILTON RESSEL. Well we need 38 additional positions, then we would be able to staff this area and reduce our overcrowding in overcrowded areas.

GERALDO RIVERA. It's a sin, my God, a sin.

MILTON RESSEL. Well, we have submitted and we are expecting that we might be getting them and then we will be able to reduce the overcrowding in certain areas.

GERALDO RIVERA. There's at least one more horrifying aspect of life at Letchworth. . . More than 300 able-bodied patients, both physically and mentally able to work outside the institution, are not being allowed to. They are being used to fill the places of the too few employees. They get paid $2.00 a week for their efforts . . . about what they'd make each hour on the outside. And there was another development on the day we visited Letchworth.

It was eight days after our investigation had begun. Governor Rockefeller admits the growing public outcry over the conditions at Willowbrook . . . made an announcement. He was restoring the $20 million he had stricken from the budget of the Department of Mental Hygiene. Willowbrook, it was said would be able to rehire 300 of the 900 employees it had lost since November, 1970. Letchworth Village would be able to rehire about 200. But the additional employees, while perhaps slowing the downward course of these two institutions, would not be able to change the basic nature of the two places, mere depositories for the retarded.

Do you think what we showed on television in the past week is an adequate reflection of the situation?

Dr. ALLEN MILLER, Commissioner of Mental Hygiene, N.Y.S. I think it focused and made vivid the problems at Willowbrook.

GERALDO RIVERA. Do you think it was an honest portrayal?

Dr. MILLER. I think it was an honest portrayal of the problems at their worst. It may not tell the whole story of Willowbrook and it certainly doesn't tell the whole story of the retarded, but it does describe unmistakeably the kind of problems that we've seen and now, thanks to the coverage, many people are seeing. If the public eye leaves Willowbrook and all of the other places and we once again find ourselves, we and the directly involved parents, trying to go it alone, then I think we struggle to maintain our few

gains and we struggle slowly to get ahead and perhaps if you were to come back a year from now and look again you might see we've made headway. . . I'd expect you would, but you won't see it all solved in two weeks. I wish you would go back in two weeks and in two weeks and in two weeks because I think that a window on these conditions and maybe even allowing to begin to see not only what it is but what it could be and even what it is already in some places . . . so to reinforce a sense of hopefulness and to reestablish in people's minds that we're talking about human beings with potential. I would hope that you would see continued change and if you didn't see it that you'd say so.

GERALDO RIVERA. Two weeks after that interview I took Dr. Miller up on his invitation to revisit Willowbrook. I found no meaningful change in the quality of life for the 5,230 people who live here. The attendants are trying their best but the staff is just too small to do anything more than just try and keep the place clean. When there's one person to take care of 30 or 40, nothing good can possibly happen . . . No rehabilitation . . . no training . . . nothing. The attendants are as much the victims of the conditions here as the patients are. And this visit has reminded me of something else Dr. Miller told me. He said, "Now that society has moved to clean up the lunatic asylums, the prisons and the hospitals, the way we care for our mentally retarded is the last great disgrace."

The story of Willowbrook and of Letchworth Village is a story of degradation . . . a real life horror story of lack of attention, of filth and of children living as animals live, an uncivilized and inhuman existence. But our intention is not just to horrify but also to demonstrate that it doesn't have to be that way.

This is Children's Hospital in Los Angeles. It houses the Regional Center for the Mentally Retarded. The Director of the program is Dr. Richard Koch. Last month, at the invitation of several parents' groups, he toured the Willowbrook facility.

Dr. KOCH. The conditions that I saw at Willowbrook are somewhat like this . . . When you enter the building I entered, the smell is so over-whelming, it's almost nauseating. I frankly don't understand how they have people who will work there, to be honest with you. And I think that's the first thing that hits you. Secondly, you find many patients in the same room, all milling about with nothing to do. Now, I may have seen an unusual situation but I don't believe so because I saw three different buildings and in those buildings I did not see any kind of program . . . I saw men sitting around masterbating . . . I saw boys and girls lying on the floor, some of them naked. In other words, it just was without program. That is the crucial thing. It's just simply too big.

Now you've got to get the clients out of there because they're becoming dehumanized in the conditions that I saw. They've got to come out where they can become part of society and become treated as an individual. I think the most important thing, though, about the Willowbrook situation, as I see it, is that the system is feeding on itself. In other words, there isn't any alternative for parents that need help. The State is only reaching out its hand primarily with residential care in mind and what parents want, by and large, are a rich variety of programs, primarily in the community. And the reason we've been able to get an expansion of our program in California, even with Mr. Reagan as Governor, is because this program is showing that it has cut the rate of institutionalized retarded persons in California to practically almost in half in just five years.

GERALDO RIVERA. Public pressure can apparently force change in California as well as it does here in New York. They had a system that resembled ours until 1965. . . That was when a prominent European expert on retardation said something that was widely publicized. After touring the California facilities he said, 'My God, you don't take care of your mentally retarded children as well as we, in Europe, take care of our cattle!' The remark eventually caused them to dramatically restructure their approach.

The heart and soul of the California system is now no longer the large institutions . . . it's the regional center. Children's Hospital is one of the 13 centers in the State. Various programs are administered in neighborhoods all over Los Angeles County and the San Fernando Valley from here. Suboffices provide whatever services a family with a retarded child needs . . . be it a day-care center, a sheltered workshop or medical care. The idea is to shift the care and training of the retarded children to their own communities . . . In other words, to help the parents keep their children at home.

Education for the retarded in California is as much a right as education for normal children . . . and they're working toward the development of a public school program for every child, no matter what the degree of retardation.

This is a developmental center for handicapped minors. . . All these children are severely or profoundly retarded.

Dr. KOCH. This is entirely a State supported program and provides tremendous relief to the parent in terms of day-care.

GERALDO RIVERA. Now these children would be parallel to the children at Willowbrook, for instance?

Dr. KOCH. O yes. All of these children would be in an institution for the retarded if we didn't have this kind of program for them. The fact is, in years past, I used to recommend institutional care myself for similar children. Now New York is doing some of this, but here again we've realized that the community programs should have top priority in terms of state dollars rather than last priority and I think your priorities are mixed up in New York in terms of serving the retarded. Your top investment is in institutions. . . Our top investment is in the Department of Education, in providing a program for the child while he's at home and in terms of day care, for example. These kids can go to school at age 3 years so they start it very young and that helps a great deal for parents. And when parents are actively encouraged to keep their child at home, they do so because they know they can have the help of the regional centers or public schools or the Health Department in terms of services, etc.

GERALDO RIVERA. For the mild to moderately retarded, over school age, the regional center assists in the finding of employment in one of the many sheltered workshops in the area.

Dr. KOCH. In the workshops you are seeing less severely retarded persons and the tremendous importance of this is that it gives the retarded person something to do during the daytime that gives them dignity and they earn a little money with it and do something useful. They become a contributor to society instead of a drag on society.

FRED GLAD. If you look around and see and just visualize all these people sitting home vegetating and here they are out in the stream of life, doing their own thing. They're earning their own way.

GERALDO RIVERA. Dr. Koch told me time and again that the importance of prevention could not be overemphasized. Families with histories of genetic retardation are counselled not to have more children. And if there's a great possibility that a pregnant woman is carrying a retarded child she's tested and if the fetus is found brain-damaged, the center recommends a therapeutic abortion. The center also runs an extensive program of community education and prenatal care, the lack of which is a prime cause of retardation.

Dr. KOCH. Now actually this child has Downes Syndrome and she's just as retarded as most of your patients at Willowbrook. And we're helping this family to keep her at home and the mother's doing a beautiful job on her and the important thing is we're also providing genetic counselling for the family. This is an inherited form of Downe's Syndrome and we have advised the mother that this is true and frankly have advised them not to have any more of their own children.

GERALDO RIVERA. How is this child being better serviced by being home rather than being in an institution like Willowbrook?

Dr. KOCH. Well, for example, she has access to one of the finest pediatric facilities in the world right here at Children's Hospital. If she were in a state hospital she wouldn't have access to this kind of a facility.

GERALDO RIVERA. How about prenatal care? Is that making a difference in this child?

Dr. KOCH. Parental care makes a difference in every child, even the very retarded person. If you could get that across to the people . . . that retarded people are more normal than they are abnormal . . . they have feelings—love, hate, etc.—just like normal people. The only thing is they simply don't think as fast as a normal person.

GERALDO RIVERA. How old is she?

Dr. KOCH. She's two years old.

GERALDO RIVERA. Two years old. What would be happening to her if she were in a place like Willowbrook?

Dr. KOCH. Well, frankly, probably nothing.

GERALDO RIVERA. But Dr. Koch admits that for some retarded, perhaps 1½% to 3%, 24-hour residential care will always be necessary and some California institutions, Fairview State and Orange County, for example, could be described in the most unflattering terms as smaller, cleaner Willowbrooks. But while Willowbrook has a large waiting list, the California institutions are being rapidly emptied. In five years the total population is down more than 14,000 to less than 10,000 and that number continues to go down. But even in the area of 24-hour residential care, they are moving to improve the quality of life.

This is the Spastic Children's Foundation, a private foundation that provides total care. It costs $14 a day for children to live here. It costs the State of New York $21 a day to house a child at Willowbrook and if the California parent can't afford the bill, the State contributes based on the family's ability to pay.

ANNE WENDT. This is an individualized program, each child has a prescription . . . for therapy, for academic training, for social adjustment, for feeding training, toilet training . . . every facet of his life that he needs help with. We sit down as a staff and we talk about his total needs, not just today, but where he is going to be in the future . . . and how does his family relate to him because all of these things are a part of the whole with this child. See, we see these people as very important human beings.

GERALDO RIVERA. It's a five day resident program so the children actually go home?

ANNE WENDT. Right, because we want the family to remain the controlling factor in this child's life presently.

GERALDO RIVERA. We started this series as a kind of an expose on the conditions at Willowbrook and one of the things that really struck me as barbaric were the toilet facilities. They are so awful, so filthy. Is this more money to keep it this way?

ANNE WENDT. It isn't one cent more . . . it doesn't cost any more to be clean . . . it doesn't cost any more to be cheerful and bright and colorful . . . It's a matter of interest and seeing that children are important people . . . It's how much status you give to them. And sometimes because they can't respond and say what they like and dislike, it's very easy for people to just sit back and think, "Oh, this is good enough" . . . But

it isn't good enough. They deserve everything that you and I want out of life. But they can't get it for themselves.

GERALDO RIVERA. Here the toothbrushes have the children's names on them . . . In Willowbrook there were no toothbrushes.

Hi, Richard. How you doing?

RICHARD. Fine.

GERALDO RIVERA. I see you're copying a Van Gogh there. You'd better watch it, you'll get in trouble.

RICHARD. Yes.

GERALDO RIVERA. How long did you live in the state school before you came here?

RICHARD. I was there for ten years.

GERALDO RIVERA. Do you like it better here?

RICHARD. Yes.

GERALDO RIVERA. The thing that impressed me most on the California trip was an apartment where retarded people live in semi-independence.

Irene, how do you like it living here?

IRENE. I love it.

GERALDO RIVERA. How come?

IRENE. I can do my own thing.

GERALDO RIVERA. I think the main difference between the approach of New York and that of California to the problem of caring for the mentally retarded is that they treat the retarded as people . . . we treat them as something less.

We haven't given the people who run the New York program equal time to give their side of the story, for as Edward R. Morrow once said, 'On some stories there is no other side'.

Perhaps the Governor can defend and explain away the budget cuts for the Department of Mental Hygiene . . . And perhaps Dr. Miller can explain and defend the filthy, dehumanizing conditions we found in this and other buildings. But they won't do it on this program.

What we found and documented here is a disgrace to all of us. This place isn't a school, it's a dark corner where we throw children who aren't pretty to look at. It's the "big town's leper colony."

How long have you been at Willowbrook?

BERNARD. Eighteen years.

GERALDO RIVERA. How long were you given physical therapy in school?

BERNARD. Five years.

GERALDO RIVERA. Are you still going to school?

BERNARD. No.

GERALDO RIVERA. Why.

BERNARD. Cause I'm over age.

GERALDO RIVERA. You're too old?

BERNARD. Yes.

GERALDO RIVERA. Would you like to go back to school?

BERNARD. Yes I would.

GERALDO RIVERA. What would you want to learn if you went back to school?

BERNARD. Learn how to read more.

GERALDO RIVERA. Learn how to read?

BERNARD. Yes.

GERALDO RIVERA. How is it living on the ward that you live.

BERNARD. Disgrace.

GERALDO RIVERA. It's a disgrace?

BERNARD. Yes.

GERALDO RIVERA. Why?

BERNARD. Because the conditions are getting worser every time they cut the budget more and more.

GERALDO RIVERA. But even Bernard with his tragically eloquent plea for help doesn't really understand that what Willowbrook needs isn't more money . . . more money would certainly help, at least the kids would have clothes and they'd be cleaner than they are now, but they'd still be basically human vegetables in a detention camp. What we need is a new approach . . . We have to change the way we care for our mentally retarded. We ask for change . . . We demand change. What you've seen here just doesn't have to be this way.

ANNOUNCER. This special report was brought to you as a public service by WABC–TV News.

## "UNSETTLED" NATIVE CLAIMS

## HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, during the closing days of the first session of the 92d Congress, the Alaska Native Lands Claims Settlement Act was passed into law as a final product of many different views and compromises. But even after final passage, many still failed to clearly understand the background, content, and overall importance of that legislation.

An example of this failure to understand the Native Claims bill was evidence in an editorial which appeared in the January 1972 issue of Field and Stream magazine. Mr. Leo Vocu, executive director of the National Congress of American Indians, brought this editorial to my attention as well as the NCAI's response to that editorial. I feel that the editorial and response merit the consideration of all my colleagues, and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert them into the RECORD today:

EDITORIAL BY CLARE CONLEY

How would you like to have 800 acres of land of your choice and $18,000 tax free? Sound like a crazy idea? Well think again. About 55,000 Americans have been handed just this very thing by a majority of our Congressmen and Senators not very long ago. Every Indian and Eskimo in Alaska from toddler to oldtimer has approximately this stake in the giving-back-to-the-Indians of Alaska that our elected representatives slid past us this fall. The figures for the giveaway will run approximately 40 million acres and $925 million to 55,000 Indians and Eskimos. The bill that perpetrated this fraud on the American public were literally "oiled" and "greased" through Congress. I talked with Senator Frank Church after the House version had passed, hoping to find there was some way to stop the giveaway in the Senate. But he was right when he said that he felt it would pass the Senate quickly. It did.

The astronomic size of the handout is hard for the mind to conceive. For example, 40,000,000 acres amounts to 62,500 square miles. Thirty, or 60 percent, of our fifty states are smaller in size than the amount of land given to the Alaskan natives. Some of the states that are smaller include Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan, Mississippi, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, and Wisconsin. By comparison, the giveaway is like handing over the State of Alabama to the residents of the city of Tuscaloosa. Or the State of Michigan to the residents of the city of Lincoln Park. It staggers the imagination.

Aside from the fact that Congress capriciously is giving away land that everyone could use up till now—including the Alaskan natives—plus a billion dollars of your and my hard earned tax money, what else is at stake? The Indians and Eskimos have the right with some exceptions to select 40 million acres of Alaska pretty much wherever they want from publically owned land. Most of the selection no doubt will be the valuable lowlands. But consider this. Alaska has only 80 million acres below 3,000 feet high. So half of that will be gone. The vast majority of the valuable fishing locations and a large amount of the quality hunting area will be taken up. Landing areas for boats and planes will be taken. And on all of this land, which was previously open to the public to use, you will probably be required to pay to hunt and fish in the future. Naturally the Indians will select the key quality areas and they will tap the hunters and fishermen for all they can get.

But there is more to this unforgivable bit of law-making. The Naval Oil Reserve near Point Barrow was not exempted from the land the Indians could grab up. There are a million acres up there that will be worth billions of dollars. This is the jackpot of all time. Seward's Folly has become Nixon's Folly, and we'll pay for it the rest of our lives.

If the Indians and Eskimos in Alaska now play their cards right, I predict that they will become the richest and most powerful group in Alaska. Giving only leases, not title, on the oil fields will bring them untold wealth which can be invested in all manner of business in Alaska and in the purchase of additional land. In two decades it may very well be that all of Alaska will be run by the Indians.

From what I have said, I am sure I will be labelled anti-Indian, which is not true. I am pro-public—for the good of America and that sort of thing. I do not believe it is right to give this much money and this much land to any group. The Alaska Indians and Eskimos are born Americans just as I am. I deny their right to make this claim on the treasury and land of our country.

Actually, the big corporations—largely oil—were strongly behind this Indian grab bag, because getting it settled take the big stumbling block out of the way of the Alaska pipeline, and because it will be easier to get at the oil and other resources if the land is privately owned. The oil companies could not drill from oil known to exist in the Naval Oil Reserves, which is right beside the Prudhoe Bay field. Friends, we are victims of the biggest hoax ever perpetrated in the name of the Noble Savage by any legislative body. After all, just why should we give all this land away to 55,000 citizens in addition to a billion dollars? I don't know about you, but my conscience doesn't hurt about the lot of the Alaskan Indians and Eskimos. They were never treated like the Indians in the Lower 48, and so I can't see why we should give Alaska back to them. The time is now before the land giveaway is a fact for the non-Indian citizens of Alaska and the citizens of the United States in general take a suit to the Supreme Court. We've got to band together now at save this land. Incidentally, see how your representatives voted on these bills. You'll be surprised. Give the Alaskan natives schools, hospitals, homes, and limited land around their villages, but don't give them Alaska.

---

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS,
*Washington, D.C., January 7, 1972.*

CLARE CONLEY,
*Editor, Field & Stream,*
*New York, N.Y.*

DEAR MR. CONLEY: Re your editorial in the January, 1972 issue of Field & Stream concerning the long overdue settlement of the land claims of the Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts of Alaska by the Congress. A fair assessment of that editorial is that, where you are not in apparent ignorance of the facts, you have intentionally misrepresented them. In addition, you either disregard or are abysmally ignorant of the American Native, the non-Indian settlement of this land, and the relationship between our people and the United States.

The United States has generally failed to live up to its treaty obligations to provide the Indian people with an adequate education. However, even with this shortcoming, perhaps we can instruct you in some history you should have learned in *your* schools.

It is said that Alaska was "discovered" in 1741 by some wandering Russians. In truth, Alaska was discovered by our ancestors when your ancestors were living in the chalk caves of southern France and hunting the mastodon with stone spearheads.

After "discovering" Alaska, the Russians established a few small settlements in the Aleutian chain and along a small part of the immense coast of mainland Alaska and, on that basis, claimed ownership of and dominion over the vast land mass of Alaska. That is tantamount to an Indian buying a copy of Field & Stream (Why he would do so, I do not know.) and, on that basis, claiming ownership of the entire publication (Why he would want to, I do not know.).

Somewhat akin to Ivory soap, the land mass of Alaska was 99 and 1/100 per cent pure of white settlement and exploration in 1867. Yet, in that year, the United States purchased Alaska from Russia for $7,200,000. Russia did not own Alaska, even the small part they were squatting on, and therefore did not have the right to sell it. The United States knowingly purchased property for which the seller had no title; in short, stolen property. But it is a known fact that concepts such as ownership, justice, and morality fly out the window when two thieves are engaged in a transfer of stolen property.

But even thieves have their moments of morality and conscience. In the thieves agreement between the United States and Russia—officially designated the Treaty of Cession of March 30, 1867 (15 Stat. 539), the parties agreed that:

"The inhabitants of the ceded territory, according to their choice, reserving their natural allegiance, may return to Russia within three years; but if they should prefer to remain in the ceded territory, they, with the exception of uncivilized native tribes, shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States, and shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion. The uncivilized tribes will be subject to such laws and regulations as the United States may from time to time, adopt in regard to aboriginal tribes of that country."

While this may sound like more of the racial immorality of the thieves, it should be noted that it does not confer the rights on a racial basis and admits that if there are "civilized tribes", they, too, are entitled to protection of their property under the law of the thieves. It was a small foot in the door granted by the thieves in a weak and foolish moment.

But worse was yet to come for the mighty white hunters and fishers of 1972. In the Act of May 17, 1884 (23 Stat. 24), organizing Alaska as a territory of the United States, the Congress recognized that:

". . . the Indians or other persons in said district shall not be disturbed in the possession of any lands actually in their use and occupation or now claimed by them but the terms under which such persons may acquire title to such lands is reserved for future legislation by Congress. . . ."

The Natives have used and occupied the Alaska peninsula for over 10,000 years. They claimed it then—they claimed it in 1867—they claimed it in 1884—they claimed it when Alaska was admitted to statehood—and they claimed it—all of it—prior to passage of the Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement Act of 1971.

What are they going to get?

The 1970 Census indicates that there are 52,062 Natives in Alaska which has a total population of 300,382. The Natives, the true owners of Alaska, represent approximately 15% of the total population.

Out of the greatness of the American heart, they are being awarded 40,000,000 acres of their own land. Alaska has a total acreage of 365,481,600 acres. So the Alaskan Native—the owner of Alaska from time immemorial—must accept less than 11% of the total 365,481,600 acres stolen from them.

Congress, of course, did make a payment on the 100 year use of the Native's land and for their loss of the remaining 325,481,600 acres. The payment is set at $962,500,000. Your editorial implies that this is fantastically outrageous compensation and a raid on the taxpayer's pocketbook. First, let us tell the truth about the compensation.

$462,500,000 is to be directly appropriated from the United States Treasury: $12.5 million in the first year; $50 million in the second year; $70 million in each of the third, fourth, and fifth year; $40 million in the sixth year; and $30 million in each of the next five years. These are, in effect, annuity payments and, as such, must be discounted to arrive at present worth. The discounted value figures out to be less than $350 million.

The Natives are then reluctantly permitted to have a 2% overriding royalty on all mineral revenues derived from leases of Alaska lands which are now public under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended and supplemented, up to a total of $500,000,000. The time needed to arrive at that total may be up to 50 years—or even more. That sum, too, must be discounted. It would probably wind up being around $300 million in current value. So, at discounted rates, they are receiving about $650 million.

For what?

During the hundred years the whites have illegally used Alaska, they have probably taken out untold billions of dollars worth of gold, various other minerals, timber, fish, and other wildlife without one cent of rent or lease being paid to the owners. Locked up in the 325 plus million acres of land the Natives have, in effect sold to the United States for a paltry sum are billions of dollars of oil deposits and trillions of dollars of other natural resources. If the United States got a bargain when they knowingly purchased stolen merchandise for $7,200,000, they are now getting a fantastic windfall to get it all from the real owners for a paltry billion dollars—nondiscounted, at that.

Now to your specific misrepresentations.

You state in the third paragraph of your editorial that the Natives are being given an almost unlimited right to select the 40 million acres anywhere they wish out of the 365 plus million acres available in Alaska. You state further that there are only 80 million acres of land in Alaska below the 3000 foot level and that the Natives will, quite naturally, select all their 40 million acre entitlement from this 80 million acres, leaving only (only?) 40 million acres for the use of the great white hunter and fisher.

Here again you show a total ignorance or disregard for the facts. Under the Act, the 40 million acres of land is to be divided between the 220 existing Native villages and 12 regional corporations. Each village will receive surface title to 18½ million acres on the following basis:

*Population and acreage entitlement*

| | |
|---|---|
| 25 to 99 | 69,120 |
| 100 to 199 | 92,160 |
| 200 to 399 | 115,200 |
| 400 to 599 | 138,240 |
| 600 or more | 161,280 |

In addition, the villages will receive surface title to an additional 3½ million acres to be divided among the villages by the regional corporations on some equitable basis, making a total of 22 milion acres for the villages.

The regional corporations, in addition to receiving the subsurface title in all lands selected within their region, will select an additional 16 million acres for their own use and development. A further 2 million acres is to be used for special purposes, such as retaining title to existing Native cemetaries and historical areas or for Natives who are not members of existing villages. This is a total of 40 million acres.

Had you read the Act, you would know that the Natives *do not* have an unrestricted right of selection. The 18½ million acres to be selected by the villages and the 16 million acres to be selected by the regional corporations must come from the 25 townships surrounding each of the 220 villages. For your information, a township is a survey unit of 36 sections of land at 640 acre per section for a total 23,040 acres per township. In addition, the Natives are precluded from selecting any land upon which there are currently existing valid rights or from any land now in the National Park system or withdrawn for national defense purposes, except the Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 4.

Your point, now shown to be almost totally inaccurate, was that the Natives (Those sly, shifty devils.) would select all the good lands, particularly those valuable for hunting and fishing and leave none for the white sportsmen. Quite obviously, the 40 million acres remaining below 3000 feet is not enough for the hunting and fishing crowd. Your editorial does not mention that a large part of the sports hunting and fishing activity in this country takes place above 3000 feet.

But suppose you were right. Suppose a choice had to be made between the white hunter and the Native people. Where does the equity lie?

The Alaskan Native has lived upon the peninsula of Alaska from time immemorial. They hunt and fish for their very existence. That activity provides them with their daily food, their housing, clothing, utensils and their trade goods, not to mention their recreation. Deprived of this right, their race might well become extinct. During the thousands of years they have lived in this fashion, they have not been the cause of the extinction of a single species of animal life—they have not killed or trapped an animal for which they did not have an immediate and pressing use or which they did not put to the most efficient use in sustaining their livelihood—nor have they polluted the rivers and streams, eroded the land, or destroyed the balance of the ecology. Rather, they have lived in, been a part of, and conserved and preserved their land and its resources.

And the great white hunter? What is his equity in the land?

Once or twice a year, he must prove manhood and emulate his chalk-cave ancestor. Instead of a spear with a stone head, he uses a high-powered repeating rifle equipped with a high-powered scope to make the killing easier. Having already destroyed the land, air, and game potential of his own evirons with fumes, chemicals, buildings, and people, he yearly treks into the virgin, unspoiled wilderness with his beer cans, whiskey bottles, gas fumes, and other mementos of his "civilization" for the brief pleasure of the chase and the momentary thrill of sending a 180 grain, 30-06 bullet crashing and tearing through the heart of some frightened, desperate bear or moose or deer. Why? So he can cut off the head and skin as visible, living-room proof of his manhood while the flesh, sinew, and bone of the animal rots and whitens in the wilderness sun—flesh, bone, and sinew that may well have supported a Native family for a month.

And now for the Big Lie. In your last tear-jerking paragraph, you state: "Friends, we are victims of the biggest hoax ever perpetrated in the name of the Noble Savage by any legislative body." What, allegedly, is the big hoax and fraud upon the American people? Let us quote your fourth paragraph:

"But there is more to this unforgiveable bit of law making. The Naval Oil Reserve near Point Barrow—

If you had read the Act carefully, which obviously you did not, you would know the official name for this area is Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 4.

was not exempted from the land the Indians could grab up. There are a million acres

up there that will be worth billions of dollars."

Back to your last paragraph:

"Actually, the big corporations—largely oil—were strongly behind this Indian grab bag, because getting it settled takes the big stumbling block out of the way of the Alaska pipeline, and because it will be easier to get at the oil and other resources if the land is privately owned. The oil companies could not drill for oil known to exist in the Naval Oil Reserve, which is right beside the Prudhoe Bay Field."

The Eskimos of the Arctic North Slope deserve every drop of oil below the surface of their land the whites call Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 4. But the truth—the mind-sickening, gut-twisting truth—is that the Natives have been cheated of their right to this resource under their land by the Act. I direct your attention to Section 12 (a) (1) of the Act which reads in the last proviso as follows:

" . . . when a Village Corporation selects the surface estate to lands within the National Wildlife Refuge System or Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 4, the Regional Corporation for that region may select the subsurface estate in an equal acreage from other lands withdrawn by subsection 11 (a) within the region, if possible."

And you can bet the Secretary of the Interior, whoever he may be, will determine that it is "possible" because the Senate-House Conference Report on H.R. 10367 as set out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 117, part 36, pages 46592–46593:

"No subsurface estate is granted in Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 4 or in the National Wildlife Refuge, but in lieu selection of subsurface estate in an equal amount of acreage *outside* (emphasis added) these areas is provided for the regional corporation."

Furthermore, the Natives will not be able to benefit from the oil under their lands through the revenue sharing provisions. The Conference Report states in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 117, part 36, page 46592:

"The Natives will be paid . . . an additional $500,000,000 from mineral revenues received from lands in Alaska hereafter conveyed to the State under the Statehood Act, and from the remaining Federal lands, *other than Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 4*, in Alaska." (Emphasis added)

In short, the Natives will not benefit at all from the oil reserves under their lands in Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 4.

If your magazine was devoted to the principles of professional journalism, you either knew or should have known the true facts as stated above and should have reported them in your editorial, regardless of the interpretation you chose to place upon them. That you did not means you either lied or distorted and twisted the truth beyond recognition or engaged in totally irresponsible journalism.

The rest of your untruths, half-truths, misrepresentations, and distortions in the editorial we will write off to emotional fervor with unfortunate racial overtones and unprofessional, irresponsible journalism.

Most people associated with the Indian cause in the United States regard the settlement of the Native land claim to be inadequate and a sell-out of their rights. A few, such as yourself and your readers, regard the settlement as a windfall for the Natives. Your readers, great white hunters all, would have been indignant enough with the truth. There was no reason to distort it as your editorial did.

We invite you to make such use of our letter as you deem appropriate.

Sincerely,

FRANKLIN DUCHENEAUX,
*Legislative Consultant.*
LEO W. VOCU,
*Executive Director.*

## FHA GOOD NEWS IN SOUTHERN INDIANA

### HON. ROGER H. ZION

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, we often become so involved in world and national problems confronting us that we overlook outstanding accomplishments taking place around us. This is exemplified in the services being rendered by the Farmers Home Administration, the supervised credit agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Under the leadership of Administrator James V. Smith and Indiana State FHA Director W. Robert Peterson, this agency is improving the quality of life for innumerable rural people throughout Indiana and the Nation.

The Eighth Congressional District in Indiana, which I represent, is one of widely varied resources. Coal, oil, sandstone, and limestone are produced there. Soil resources range from good to poor. A major problem is that much of the more productive farm land is subject to flooding by the Ohio and Wabash Rivers.

The Farmers Home Administration is contributing to a solution of this problem. Working in conjunction with the Soil Conservation Service, FHA has made five loans totaling $625,000 to local groups so they can meet their share of cost for improving watersheds to tame the wild waters. Four other such loans are in process. In addition, these watershed projects are making water reservoirs available to a number of communities as recreation centers, thus spurring the local economy.

Well water for domestic use is very limited throughout much of my district. This problem is being alleviated for many communities, also with the help of the Farmers Home Administration.

As of December 31, 1971, this agency had made 47 loans totaling $5.7 million to communities in our district for central water systems. Approximately 75 percent of the families in some counties now have pure, running water available to them, and the number is growing.

In housing, the FHA has made insured loans totaling $10.4 million to more than 1,000 families in the 13 counties I represent, enabling them to move from substandard into comfortable, adequate homes equipped with modern facilities. Two small communities, Wadesville and Westphalia, also have organized nonprofit corporations to obtain loans from the Farmers Home Administration to build low-rate rental apartment centers for their senior citizens. Several other projects of this kind are under consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud to learn recently that of all the farm families in Indiana, the Lawrence A. Vogel family from Spencer County of my congressional district has been selected as Indiana FHA Farm Family of the Year. Through financing provided by the FHA, this family has been able to buy their farm, and build one of the finest family-size farms in Indiana through their own hard work. The Vogels produce grain for sale, fatten cattle, and buy feed out pigs. They stand out as evidence that the family farm is still very much alive and thiriving in America, producing food and fiber in an ever ncreasing abundance.

Mr. Speaker, these are examples of what the Farmers Home Administration is contributing to a better way of life for rural people under the national leadership of Administrator James V. Smith, and a fine force of State and county staff in Indiana headed by State Director Bob Peterson.

These programs and services are needed by rural people who want to help themselves. They deserve our continued strong support.

## WIPING OUT SCHOOL DISTRICTS

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the complications and growing furor over lower court decisions affecting school districts, primarily the court ordered busing decisions, have become a major national issue.

A very timely and, in my opinion, reasonable commentary in the Life Newspapers, Berwyn, Ill., of Sunday, February 13, discussed the subject reaching a conclusion which I believe reflects nationwide public judgment.

The article follows:

WIPING OUT SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Federal courts, illegally usurping legislative authority, are moving inexorably toward a showdown on elimination of school districts and abrogation of state constitutions declaring it is the states' duties to provide for education of its people.

In a far-reaching decision on January 9 by a U.S. District Court judge, whose own children attend a private school, it was held that Richmond, Va., county schools must unite with two adjoining counties, Henrico and Chesterfield, to form a new administrative school district for the purpose of integration.

The decision, which swept away city, county and school district lines, removed any political boundaries as far as schooling was concerned and gave the new school divisional concept 30 days to implement the order.

Last Tuesday the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, its seven judges sitting en banc, delayed the effective date to implement the lower court's order but ordered the three counties to start planning "all phases of the operation in financing a merged school system."

Either the impact of the original decision in the Richmond case has purposely been avoided by the Chicago daily press or the news editors were incompetent to judge the impact of the delay.

The appeals court is willing to hear the matter but its pronouncements seem to indicate it has made up its mind before hearing any of the evidence.

Only the U.S. Supreme Court or Congress now stand in the way of this judicial legislation in a landmark case that will guide all future decisions in such matters.

Taking a cue from the Richmond case, a federal judge in Detroit made party-defendants several school districts outside of that city in a suit brought for a similar purpose.

How soon will our metropolitan area be the target of the pseudo-liberals in similar actions designed to integrate the school systems in Illinois? We can be assured that it won't be long in coming.

Imagine, if you will, that a federal judge orders the elimination of county lines for Cook, DuPage and Lake counties in Illinois and you have some idea of what's going on in the Richmond area.

And it wasn't only the merger of the metropolitan school division that was involved. The school districts in the three counties in the Richmond case were ordered to start a busing program until all schools came within a 60 per cent white and 40 per cent black enrollment.

Applied in this metropolitan area, it would mean suburban pupils would be bused into Chicago, while students from Chicago were bused into suburbia until some similar percentage arrangement was accomplished.

The unreasoning judicial legislator in Richmond sloughed off protests that it might mean an hour's ride each way for some of the students to be integrated. He wasn't concerned about this phase at all, brushing it aside lightly.

If three counties' schools can be integrated by such a sweeping order, then why couldn't all students in a state be subject to such a capricious ruling? There is no reason why it couldn't be.

The U.S. Supreme Court is the last judicial tribunal which can upset such specious nonsense. If it fails to do so, then Congress, which has the power to limit the courts' rulings, is the last resort of free men everywhere.

## WHO'S WHO: UNWHOED—REWHOED

### HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, when my father, Andrew Jacobs, Sr., was serving in the 81st Congress he was listed in "Who's Who." When he left the Congress to practice law in Indianapolis, he was promptly "unwhoed."

Then when I was elected to the 89th Congress, my father received by mail the following application from "Who's Who," looking to the happy prospect of his being "rewhoed." What follows are the questions on the application, together with my father's answer:

QUESTIONS ON APPLICATION

Biographee . . . Please give:

Name: Jacobs Andrew, Sr., 26.

Current or recent activity (new positions, accomplishments, honors, writings, etc.) not included in your listing as last published:

Answer:

Gentlemen: I do not know what was in my last biography because I never saw it. I have no positions, old or new, have accomplished nothing worthy of note, have deserved and received no honors and have written nothing that shouldn't be classed as drivel.

I am an old country lawyer, a graduate of a brief night law school and my admission to the bar was not in the public interest because I knew but little law and less about life on this planet. I have made a modest fortune. This was possible because I had enough horse sense to know my deficiencies.

As ridge runners in Southern Indiana we did a bit of hunting and trapping, not as a sport but for meat and hides. There were those who were better than I in trapping possums and ground hogs. But I excelled in trapping skunks. So in my exalted new profession which I did not understand, I decided to draw upon my boyhood skills, except that I went out after the two legged skunks which abound in these parts.

I was successful in trapping a few with rather valuable pelts. So I am now just a lazy old country lawyer who plays with his grandsons, reads trashy literature and saws a little wood.

## INDIANA UNIVERSITY SPEECH

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD an address I gave at Indiana University February 13 on the Middle East. In this speech, I briefly examined the status of negotiations for an interim settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict and aspects of the current situation in the area. I concluded this talk by outlining five specific ways in which the cause of peace might be strengthened in 1972. While there can never be a substitute for direct negotiations between the parties, we in the United States might usefully help the parties by considering the following: The revival of the Jarring Mission; the reexamination of the whole Sinai issue; the initiation of a new series of bilateral talks with the Soviet Union on the Middle East; addressing more clearly the Palestinian issue; and promoting an examination of the sensitive Jerusalem question.

The speech follows:

MOVING TOWARD PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST IN 1972

(By LEE H. HAMILTON)

(a) Introduction:

Peace has eluded us in the Mid East for the last 25 years. It is now almost five years since the 6 day war between Israel and its neighbors. That war was the third round of major hostilities in the Middle East since the United Nations established Israel just twenty-four years ago. Few problems in American Foreign policy have received such continuous and concentrated attention over the years as the Middle East. The crises pass but the problems remain unsolved.

The apparent intractability and insolubility of the Arab-Israeli conflict should not stop the United States from trying to seek a peace by the parties involved that is fair and seeks to remove the seeds of further conflict. It is in the U.S. national interest that there be a final peace agreement which would:

Incorporate recognition of the right of Israel and its Arab neighbors to exist.

Would settle such different questions as:

The extent of withdrawal from occupied territories;

How to settle the refugee problem; and

The status of Jerusalem.

If another war breaks out, it carries with it the high risk of great power involvement or confrontation. Thus, a settlement acceptable to both the Arab states and Israel in the near future is a matter of highest urgency.

In general, the year 1971 was a much more promising year for peace in the Middle East than much of 1970, and yet the major development of 1970—the August ceasefire along the Suez Canal—was not built upon in 1971. But what is significant about the year 1971 is that, in a time of neither war nor peace, the ceasefire gained credibility and was not really broken and the cause of peace was thereby strengthened.

Obviously, this does not suggest that the current situation is bearable indefinitely for some parties involved. It is highly likely that there will be some fighting in 1972 if there is no movement toward meaningful negotiations.

The present situation of neither war nor peace is probably preferred by the Soviet Union and enhances its interests in the area. The Israelis also find the present situation tolerable and see no need to rush to give up the status quo for the uncertainties of a partial peace arrived at through indirect negotiations. While the present situation is precarious to the interests of the United States in the Arab world, the status quo is least bearable for most Arab States.

(b) Post-1967 Diplomacy and the U.S. Peace Initiative:

Since the 1967 war, the United States has pursued its goal of promoting a Middle East peace in several ways.

U.N. RESOLUTION 242

Following the intense negotiations with our allies, with the Soviet Union and with the parties directly involved, the United Nations Security Council adopted U.N. Resolution 242 in November, 1967. This resolution, agreed to by all parties to the dispute, but variously interpreted, sets forth the basic principles of a peace settlement.

The main provisions of this resolution recommended:

"Withdrawal of Israeli Armed Forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict."

"Termination of all claims or states of belligerency."

"Freedom of navigation through international waterways in the area."

"A just settlement of the refugee problem."

"Guaranteeing the territorial inviolability and political independence of every state in the area."

This resolution contained deliberate ambiguities, and, not surprisingly, it has been subjected to varying interpretations. While the Soviet Union has stressed total withdrawal from all occupied territories as a precondition for implementation of the resolution, many Americans, including some of those who worked on the drafting of the resolution, consider the absence of words like "all" or "the" in the phrase "withdrawal from territories occupied" as intending that there will be certain rectifications to insure secure and recognized boundaries. This controversy over withdrawal and that concerning the relationship of the resolution to direct talks between parties are the two most significant. These and other differing interpretations of, and controversies over, the resolution have not facilitated movement toward a just and lasting peace.

DIPLOMATIC TALKS

Initially after 1967, the U.S. supported Israeli demands for direct talks between the parties, but when this proved fruitless the United States tried to promote understanding and create better conditions for a peace in various other ways, including:

Bilateral talks with the Soviet Union;

"Big-Four" talks involving Britain, France the Soviet Union, and the United States; and

Support of Dr. Gunnar Jarring's peace mission as Secretary-General U Thant's special Middle East Envoy.

Other missions, including a recent mission of African leaders, have also tried to promote a peace agreement.

JARRING MISSION

Dr. Jarring, who received his mandate in U.N. Resolution 242, established contact with the parties and his mediating efforts proceeded intermittently until the spring of 1971, when they were suspended following replies to a February 1971 aide memoire from Dr. Jarring.

In his aide memoire, Dr. Jarring called on

Egypt to give a commitment to enter into a peace agreement with Israel and asked Israel to give a commitment to withdraw its forces from Sinai, provided there were adequate provisions for the demilitarization on Sinai in general and a special arrangement for Sharm al-Shaykh in particular.

Egypt accepted Dr. Jarring's suggestions but Israel's response was less positive; Israel felt that aide memoire put forward specific proposals and preconditions of a peace agreement, an agreement which Israel felt could only be the subject of direct negotiations between Israel and Egypt. Although Israel felt Dr. Jarring had exceeded his authority, it appears that both Egypt and Israel are willing to resume indirect talks with Dr. Jarring without any prior conditions.

INTERIM SETTLEMENT

It was against this background of lack of movement of the Jarring mission and other approaches to peace that the United States undertook its peace initiative and sought:

First, a stable ceasefire to end the war of attrition along the Suez Canal, and

Later (after intense debates over supposed ceasefire violations), an interim agreement between Israel and Egypt, which would include a partial Israeli withdrawal across Sinai and the opening of the Suez Canal.

Until now, the Nixon administration has believed that such an interim agreement is a viable approach to a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute. As Secretary Rogers said in his October 4, 1971, speech before the United Nations General Assembly:

We intend to continue our determined effort to assist them (the Egyptians and Israelis) in arriving at an interim agreement. This effort, we believe is imperative. This is important to keep in mind, because there is no more realistic and hopeful alternative to pursue.

In 1971, this initiative was buttressed by several trips by American diplomats to the Middle East and, at times, strenuous talks concerning an interim settlement involving the opening of the Suez Canal.

However, since the beginning of 1972, United States diplomatic contacts, particularly with the Egyptians, have become less frequent, reflecting at least three factors: (1) Sadat's disappointment with the lack of progress in the talks, over the last several months; (2) the U.S. decisions in the recent months to supply Israel with more Phantoms and to license the Israeli manufacture of certain weapons, and (3) the intensity of the debate in Egypt over the proper course to follow.

An interim peace agreement between Egypt and Israel has advantages for both sides. The agreement, which would involve the opening of the Suez Canal and a partial Israeli withdrawal from the east bank of the canal to some point in Sinai, could be an important first step on the road to complete peace in the Middle East.

For the Egyptians, it would also permit a resumption of civilian life in the many large towns along the canal.

Both sides could benefit from a reduction in tensions which would come from an open canal, although the main economic benefit would accrue to Egypt.

The Current Situation:

Before examining possible ways of breaking out of the present deadlock in negotiations, I would like to examine briefly three aspects of the current situation in the Middle East. They are: the precise nature of the Sinai impasse; the nature of Soviet aims in the area; and the Palestinian refugees and guerrillas.

SINAI IMPASSE

The United States peace initiative in the Middle East involving talks on an interim settlement have reached an impasse on the question of the future of Sinai. Six issues, some of which could be resolved easily, are involved;

*First, length of ceasefire*—Israel wants an indefinite ceasefire and Egypt wants one of a short duration, perhaps 6 months to a year.

*Second, Distance of Israeli withdrawal from canal*—From public statements, Israel would seem to be willing to agree to a limited withdrawal while Egyptians want the initial withdrawal to around al-'Arish in central Sinai.

*Third, Egyptians allowed in pullback zone*—Israel refuses to allow any Egyptian military personnel into this zone while Egypt insists that the stationing of some Egyptian military personnel on the east bank of the canal is essential.

*Fourth, Security disposition in pullback zone*—Israel wants Israeli participation in any peace-keeping force and Egypt wants a buffer zone with a U.N. force of observers. These positions are not necessarily mutually exclusive; a peace-keeping force could have both Israeli and Egyptian participation.

*Fifth, Israeli right of passage through the Suez Canal*—Israel wants that right immediately and Egypt wants it deferred until after a final peace is signed and the Palestine refugee problem is solved.

*Sixth, Relationship between interim and final settlement*—Israel insists an interim settlement be a separate agreement which would state that it does not preclude further steps toward complete peace within the context of U.N. Resolution 242 and direct negotiations and that the new lines were neither final nor representing a new status quo. Egypt insists on an explicit statement that this interim agreement is an integral part of a full settlement and the first step in a timetable to the total withdrawal of Israeli troops to the international border existing between Israel and Egypt before the 1967 war.

INVOLVEMENT OF SOVIET UNION

A second extremely important and changing feature of the Middle East scene is the presence and involvement of the Soviet Union. While we know little with certainty about the nature of Soviet goals in the Middle East, several observations apparently have validity:

First: The Soviet Union prefers a state of controlled tension in the Middle East to a situation of either war or peace. A final settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict would, in Soviet eyes, remove the major factors that now draw Arab States to the Soviet Union:

The Arab quest for military supplies, and

For political support in the Arab-Israeli conflict.

War likewise presents an unsatisfactory alternative from the Soviet Union's point of view:

War is likely to be costly in terms of new demands for aid;

Another Arab defeat would be embarrassing; and

War would present a danger of an undesirable confrontation with the United States.

The Soviet Union, then, sees a degree of tension as a safeguard to its own influence. It would seem that while Marxists claim capitalism needs war to prosper, Soviet Middle East influence needs tension to survive.

Second, despite the success of the Soviet Union in the Middle East, its policy is fraught with problems:

Military and economic aid is expensive;

The volatility of Arab politics means regimes can fall quickly, as was the case in the Sudan;

The Soviets are not politically well liked by some in Arab countries although their aid is appreciated;

Communist parties are an anathema to all Arab socialist regimes;

And there is a basic Arab nationalist opposition to communism.

Moreover, the Soviets know they cannot respond in a crisis as the Arabs would like them to without risking the dangers of a confrontation with the United States and this situation could cause the Soviet Union to lose the approval of the Arab states.

Third, it is significant that the Soviet Union is aware of Israel's military superiority and seems to be counseling restraint in the Middle East, advising the Egyptians and its other clients not to go to war with Israel. In addition, the Soviet Union does support U.N. Resolution 242, but will reject any settlement Egypt does not find acceptable.

Fourth, the Soviet Union does have significant military and economic interests in the Middle East. The heavy amounts of military aid given the Arab States, some $2 billion between 1967 and 1971, and the presence of over 10,000 to 15,000 Soviet military technicians who train and supervise Arab Armies and care for Soviet equipment, raise justifiable questions concerning the ultimate political and strategic objectives of the Soviet Union.

Soviet economic interests and presence in the Middle East, while less significant than its military presence, are nonetheless formidable. Over $2 billion worth of economic credits, half of which have been drawn down, numerous large construction projects and extensive barter trading have led to a strong economic tie between some Arab countries and the Soviet Union. The terms of this credit are very favorable loans, usually being repayable in 50 years at 2 percent.

Finally, it appears that the Soviet Union has no timetable or blueprint in the Middle East but it has momentum. Its success is due, in large part, to its ability to take advantage of situations, in particular, political instability and the Arab-Israel conflict.

Soviet policy, then has been generally reactive and opportunistic. However, its long-range intentions in the Middle East beyond the maintenance of its current presence remain obscure.

REFUGEES

A third, significant feature of the present situation in the Middle East involves refugees. Ever since the 1940's Palestine has been alternately a haven for or a ghetto of refugees. In addition to the Jewish refugees coming from Europe following World War Two, Israel has accepted over a half a million Jewish refugees from Middle East and Asian lands.

More recently, Israel has become a haven for an increasing flow of Soviet Jews obtaining exit permits. Politically, socially and economically, Israel has the willingness and ability to cope with such refugees and try to integrate them into Israeli society.

More tragic, however, has been the dreadful, human plight of the Palestinian Arab Christian and Muslim refugees who now number close to a million and a half. Politically and socially, Arab States have not been willing or able to cope with this problem. For over twenty years now these refugees, living on about a ten cent per day international humanitarian effort, have been a pawn in the hands of all established Middle East states.

The basic facts of the Palestinian refugees and their recent activities are well known:

The United National Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees (UNRWA), with a staff of 14,000, is the main international agency caring for the relief and educational needs of Palestinian refugees. Despite the many difficulties in obtaining accurate lists of refugees, it is apparent that today, about 40 percent of the refugees live in camps and, of the 1.5 million refugees registered, about 60 percent receive rations. The 40 percent who do not receive rations are in one of two categories: (a) many children do not receive rations because of U.N. imposed ceilings on the numbers receiving rations in one particular area; or (b) the

refugees do not need aid either because of the size of their income or the fact that they are not living near the camps.

The United States contributes about 54 percent of UNRWA's nearly $50 million annual budget and education is the largest budgetary item. Unfortunately, some 25,000 out of 30,000 students who complete their basic education each year cannot attend vocational schools or college. It is among this large unskilled and unemployed group that most guerrilla recruiting has been done.

But even the dedicated guerrilla organizations have been unable both to mobilize the majority of Palestinians and to remain cohesive. Despite the apparent defeat of the guerrillas in Jordan and the further splintering of the guerrilla movement, their disruptive capabilities, particularly through assassinations and demonstrations in Lebanon and Jordan, remain high. Indeed, hundreds of defeats have not, and I suspect will not, erase the basic Palestinian desire for the right of self-determination.

D. New Approaches to Peace:

These three facts of the present Middle East situation—the impasse in negotiations, the Soviet role and the Palestine refugee issue—all indicate the dire need for new approaches to peace so that another Arab-Israeli war, with the possibility that holds for Soviet-American confrontation, can be avoided.

I suggest five concrete ways in which the United States might in 1972 help create a better atmosphere for peace in the Middle East so that the parties to the dispute can start to negotiate their differences.

RESUMPTION OF JARRING MISSION

First, if the United States efforts for peace have reached an impasse, the United States should call immediately for the resumption of the Jarring Mission without any prior conditions. That is, Dr. Jarring should start, not where he left off in March 1971, but with the shelving of his aide memoire. Israel would, I think, agree to a return to the Jarring Mission without what it considers the conditions of that aide memoire. Egypt has, it seems, lost all faith in the mediation efforts of the United States, so from its viewpoint, the Jarring Mission may be the only alternative.

If there are any deeper reasons for or need of the Jarring Mission now, they are two.

First, the Soviet Union must not be kept out of any diplomatic maneuvering. To keep the Soviet Union informed of, and concerned with, efforts to help the parties reach accommodation is only to recognize the Soviet Union's interests in the area and the fact that Moscow might be able to veto any peace agreement.

Second, it is a sad fact that the United Nations and the Arab-Israeli conflict which grew up together, have in the last three and a half years, contributed reciprocally to their mutual decline. It has almost become a truism: there will be no peace in the Middle East without the United Nations, and there will be no United Nations without peace in the Middle East.

U.N. Res. 242 which forms the basis for Dr. Jarring's efforts is the only starting point we have for creating a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

RETHINK SINAI

A second important role the United States could perform is to start the process of rethinking the Sinai issue so that this major stumbling block to further negotiations can be removed. I suggest two types of plans to be explored. Both operate from the assumption that Israel wants security and not territory in Sinai and Sinai should eventually be returned to Egyptian sovereignty.

First, the United States might consider a time-related, phased-withdrawal peace plan between Israel and Egypt. In such a time-related peace, Israel would concede the return of all of Sinai to Egyptian sovereignty the moment Egypt signs a formal peace with it. Israel would then proceed to withdraw by stages that would go hand in hand with a defined progression from formal peace to normal neighborly relations and be contingent upon such a progression. While it would be difficult to determine when one phase was completed, and another should start, such plans could help build peace, step by step, might be self-enforcing and would not demand single steps greater than the present capacity of States in the region to undertake at any given time.

Second, the United States might consider a similar plan which, instead of involving a time-related withdrawal, would create demilitarized zones in a Sinai under Egyptian sovereignty, conditioned on Israeli and Egyptian participation in the international policing effort. Under one variation, Israel would, along with others, police a zone next to its pre-1967 border with Egypt, a zone stretching from Gaza to Sharm al-Shaykh. Such a plan might create the kinds of international guarantees the parties can accept.

UNITED STATES-SOVIET TALKS

An extremely important third step the United States could undertake in 1972 would be to initiate bilateral talks with the Soviet Union, based on mutual respect of the other's legitimate interests in the area. Such talks should focus on trying to reach an agreement to control the flow of arms to the area and the manufacturing of them by both Israel and the Arab states. These talks might also usefully seek to narrow differences in interpretation on how to implement U.N. Resolution 242.

PALESTINIAN MOVEMENT

Fourth, the United States should concern itself with the Palestinian movement.

We should take note of a new, emerging political consciousness of Palestinians which has not yet jelled. While there is some sympathy for the guerrillas among Palestinians everywhere, there are many Palestinians who are committed to a peaceful, rather than military, settlement of the Arab-Israeli issue. We should watch closely Palestinian developments, be prepared to deal with them and support peaceful and viable ways to encourage expression of the Palestinians' right to have a greater voice in their own political future within the context of a peace settlement.

We might, for example, urge the parties to let an internationally supervised plebiscite of Palestinians be taken, perhaps on the West Bank, in which all Palestinians vote for, say:

A confederation with Israel or Jordan.

Return to Jordan.

Or independence within defined borders agreed to by all parties to the dispute.

The elections the Israelis plan to hold on the occupied West Bank this spring might be expanded to include all Palestinians and might be internationally supervised.

Also, the United States should work with all states of the area to make a greater number of meaningful job opportunities available to Palestinian refugees so that their lives will have more dignity and hope and less apathy, bitterness and despair.

JERUSALEM

Finally, we might explore with the parties, or independently, possible solutions to perhaps the most difficult problem in a dispute of many stumbling blocks—namely, the future status of Jerusalem. Specifically, the United States should explore ways of accommodating the interests of Jews, Christians, and Muslims in the city and ways of guaranteeing the right of access of all groups to their holy places. The United States might also begin a study of:

Extraterritorialities for the holy places.

Consider the possibility of a joint administration of the city.

And, in general, explore alternative international guarantees.

In the final analysis, however, the parties must negotiate the particulars of any settlement of this crucial issue. Our role can be one of examining the range of alternatives so that everyone is familiar with them.

E. CONCLUSION

None of these suggestions is to replace direct negotiations between the parties. Rather, they are to supplement such talks by the parties and to raise related issues which can help promote a lasting peace.

We have many interests in the Middle East. In particular, the United States has—

An interest in Israel's security and well-being which has cultural, political and moral overtones for many Americans.

An increasingly important and vital interest in Middle East oil whose pools contains 75 percent of the world's proven oil reserves. It is estimated that in 1980, the United States will have to get between 35 and 40 percent of its oil needs from the Middle East although it now gets less than 5 percent from this region.

A strategic interest in the entire Middle East as the crossroads of three continents and as an important link in global communications networks.

A general interest in the political, social and economic development of the entire area and all its peoples.

And an interest in avoiding further conflict in the area and any chance of a confrontation with the Soviet Union.

Peace in the Middle East secures these interests and war threatens them as does the present state of neither war nor peace. That is why peace in the Middle East is so important to us all.

We probably must learn to live with insecurity and hostility in the Middle East, and know that we simply are not able to solve its problems in any rapid and final fashion.

I am reminded of the remark "optimism is to the diplomat what courage is to the soldier." The U.S. has no formula for instant peace. But we must proceed with optimism, not overlooking any avenue toward settlement.

May it be said of us when the course has been run:

"How beautiful upon the mountain are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that proclaimeth peace, that publisheth salvation."

## LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked the 51st anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Most of us in this body are old enough to remember the brutal and abrupt manner in which Russia seized Lithuania and the neighboring Latvia and Estonia in 1940.

Many people, and many nations, preferred at that time not to notice, or not to acknowledge, the implication of the Russian action. After all, the Baltic nations were small nations and virtually powerless. The Western world was then in a precarious position for France was about to fall and Great Britain was entering its most critical days against the might of the German onslaught.

Among those Americans who knew of

the obliteration of freedom in Lithuania, there was either a sense of helplessness, or in some cases, a reluctance to speak harshly of the actions of the Soviet Union.

The plight of Lithuania still suffers from insufficient public attention. This is a particularly bitter fact as we observe new nation after new nation being admitted to the United Nations while having but a fraction of Lithuanian history and culture.

As I have observed in previous years, Lithuania is no make-believe nation. It has a long and distinguished history dating back to 1009 A.D. It was the first nation in Eastern Europe to embrace Christianity.

Lithuania has suffered under Russian occupation before only to emerge as a free and independent state. Thus, while the present situation seems bleak, the Lithuanian people do not forget their history and their hopes for salvation.

The continuing oppression of the Baltic States is forever a reminder of Soviet perfidy and a wound on the conscience of mankind. The United States of America is at its best when it proclaims and supports the concept of self-determination. It is to the credit of the Congress of our Nation, then, that we draw attention to Lithuanian Independence Day and express our hope that the Lithuanian people will ultimately gain national independence and personal liberty.

## SECRETARY CONNALLY AND THE ECONOMY

### HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, Treasury Secretary John Connally addressed the 1972 National Affairs Conference sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Mr. Connally made several observations regarding the economy and the role of the country's businessmen in helping to stem inflation.

On January 29, the Washington Post reported the reply of the National Chamber as stated by that organization's chief staff officer, Arch N. Booth, executive vice president.

In the interest of a full airing, I insert into the RECORD the Washington Post article, a transcript of the remarks of Secretary Connally and Arch Booth's letter, so Members can make a judgment of this interesting exchange:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 29, 1972]

BOOTH DEFENDS BUSINESS AGAINST CONNALLY ATTACK

Arch N. Booth, executive vice president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, wrote Treasury Secretary John B. Connally telling him that Connally's criticism of business for not using recently provided incentives to invest was premature.

At a Chamber meeting last week Connally told businessmen that the government had done all it could to stimulate the economy—and that business should stop complaining and start solving its own problems.

Connally cited studies estimating that business spending will increase only 9 per cent this year—which Connally said was not enough considering new depreciation laws.

Booth told Connally the business community "welcomed" the depreciation revisions, the tax credit and the international monetary realignment. "But it hardly seems necessary to point out that these developments have not been in effect long enough to produce the expected beneficial effects."

Booth also said he was puzzled that Connally spoke "of these measures as though they were gifts to business. We assumed the President supported them because he felt they would benefit the economy, and thus the entire country."

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE JOHN B. CONNALLY, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, TO THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES, JANUARY 20, 1972

Introduction by Arch Booth, Executive Vice President, The Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Mr. BOOTH. Ladies and gentlemen: The Secretary of the Treasury has arrived, direct from the Capitol. He will join us here for a very brief visit. He will comment on the State of the Union Message, and on the Nation's economic policies.

It is a great pleasure to present the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable John B. Connally.

(Applause.)

Secretary CONNALLY. Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. I am delighted to be here. It is a great pleasure to appear before such a distinguished audience under the auspices of the Chamber and, more particularly, I am delighted that I can appear as a substitute for Under-Secretary Charls Walker. I was not originally invited to speak to this distinguished gathering, but Charlie found that he had to make a speech in Denver today, and I agreed to substitute for him at this particular meeting. It is of some significance, I think, that he was substituting for me in Denver!

(Laughter.)

Jack, I wish I could have been here to hear all that you had to say to this distinguished gathering but, as things happen, occasionally, I had another commitment that I had to make. I was listening to another speech, so I missed yours.

But I heard a great speech. As you all know, I have just come from the Capitol where the President delivered his State of the Union address. I was tremendously impressed with his speech for a number of reasons.

I was tremendously impressed, first, by the tone and the spirit of the speech.

I was impressed because he did not lay forth a large list of actions for the Congress to consider in this particular year. He did not do so, largely, because there is a large amount of work they have yet to do. He knew full well we had a number of major matters pending before the Congress that they had not yet acted on.

I was impressed by the deep substance, and the feeling of the President, himself, that came through his speech; his concern for this Country; for its fundamental values for its basic thrust during the 1970's. I think, more than anything else, that is what he was trying to convey. He was not speaking, in any sense, in a partisan way. He was not trying to appeal to any particular group; nor was he trying to divide group against group. He was not trying to separate individuals, communities, or groups, within this Nation. He was speaking to the Nation, as a whole; appealing to the Nation as a whole for their help, for their cooperation.

He was, in a sense, asking this Nation, to pause and reflect, and to think and consider what kind of a Nation this is; what kind of a Nation do we want to be; and how much are we willing to contribute to building what we see as the road for this Nation in the 1970's.

This is largely the task upon which he has been embarked for the past several months. I don't want to, here, deal in superlatives, but I think it is fair to say that during the past several months, this Nation—under the President's leadership—has undertaken far reaching steps to set aright some of the difficulties that are plaguing this Country. Part of those actions is the reason you are here today. Part of those actions has imposed a freeze upon this Nation, followed by wage and price controls; the creation of the Pay Board, and the Price Commission, which are being manned by distinguished and dedicated Americans.

I want here to publicly express the profound gratitude of this Administration, from the President on down, to Judge Boldt; to Chairman Grayson; to the Members of their Respective Boards and Commissions, for their unselfish service in dealing with what has to be one of the most difficult problems that this Nation is confronted with today, and one of the most thankless. It is done in a very selfless fashion, and I think we are entitled to an accolade from everyone here, and everyone else in this Nation.

(Applause.)

If I may, I would like to say a few more things and then, if it is your wish, I will undertake to respond to questions that you have. Don't be lulled into thinking that I can answer them. I am just going to respond to them.

(Laughter.)

I cannot completely give all of my time to you to ask questions, because, frankly, there are a few things I want to say.

I have heard for a number of months—a number of months—about the uncertainty that prevails in the United States; uncertainty in the minds of people; criticisms in the tones of others; uncertainty about the domestic policy; concern about the International Monetary situation; the International economic picture.

This has been voiced over and over again. I recall early last year, when I first came to Washington, we were embroiled in trying to get through the Congress—well, we Administratively acted, then tried to assure the Nation and the Congress that the Treasury's actions with respect to Depreciation Schedules were the right thing to do and the right kind of stimulus for the Nation. The Business community kept saying, throughout the Country. "We need an Investment Tax Credit. We need an Investment Tax Credit," This is what we heard. "If we just had that, everything will be all right."

So we got it. So what have we done with it? Nothing.

We go up on the Hill time and again, and we are the ones—this Administration has defended the American business enterprise in this Nation far more than you have defended yourselves.

I did not come here to criticize you.

I did not come here to fuss at you.

Frankly, I came here to try to tell it to you as I see it, and to try to answer some of the questions that I know you are going to have.

We have done precisely that. We put into effect the Depreciation Schedule, and we felt that it probably was not doing the job. So we went back and, as a part of the Tax Plan, we advocated the Investment Tax Credit; that it be reinstated on a permanent basis.

Now, the question is: What happens?

Science made a 9 percent increase during 1972—that is, in plant purchases and commitments for plant equipment. That is much better than a 9-percent decrease. But I would not say that that is any great banner year, born of any great confidence in the future economy of this Country.

I don't think that 7 precent was too vital to any of you.

What else did we do?

We took a number of other actions on taxes.

We talked about profits, and what profits mean to this System, and to this Society. This Administration has not been one bit afraid to talk about profits, or to defend the System under which you make profits. We have said that profits of American business enterprises during the last year or two have been lower than they have been in many, many years; lower than at any time in the last 30 years.

We have pointed out that profits are what fuel this economy. That is what creates the jobs. That is what makes it possible to build these plants; to buy new equipment. We have done everything we know how to do, to stimulate this economy, through spending too much?

Wait until you see the deficit—if you are not already afraid! They say we are not stimulating it enough.

I, frankly, as Secretary of the Treasury, wish some of you would accompany me when I go up next week to defend our position and ask for an increase of the debt ceiling. It is going to be a very interesting hearing. (Laughter.)

If you have any idea of what I ought to say, I have a few days to get your mail. I would be delighted for any help that you can give me, I assure you.

We have time and again, time and again, said that the greatest fear we have is fear of ourselves, and fear of uncertainty.

As part of the Tax Program, we did everything that we knew how to do. The President suspended the convertibility of the dollar. For weeks and months we heard: "Well, this is what is holding all of the profit. If we could just get it settled, if we could just settle this Inter-Monetary thing, everything would be all right."

So we settled it.

Now, there is concern about other things.

The truth of the matter is that I know there is this uncertainty in your minds. There is uncertainty as to how long you are going to have wage and price controls. There is uncertainty in your minds about: What does this Administration intend to do?

I can tell you very quickly. The philosophy of this Administration basically is against wage and price controls. Conditions were reached in this Nation that made it imperative that we have them. You do have them. Now, you are asking: "How long are we going to have them?"

I can answer this one, too!

You are going to have them so long as it is necessary to bring inflation down to the goal we have set—of 2-to-3 percent. This is how long you are going to have them.

Now, when does that time come?

That time comes largely when you want it to come. That time is going to depend upon how cooperative you are, and how forceful you are, and how ambitious you are to end these controls.

We don't conceive the Government as an instrumentality designed to inflict onerous requirements upon American Free Enterprise.

We don't conceive that we can cure all the ills of this free enterprise system.

We conceive the Government, and what we can do, as an instrumentality to work cooperatively with you in trying to solve some of our common problems.

But I will say to you, in all candor—without any embarrassment whatsoever—that you cannot look to the Government for the complete answer to your problems. When we end wage and price controls is going to depend on you. It is going to depend on you and labor relations across the bargaining table. It depends upon labor.

When each of you makes up your mind that you can no longer negotiate and expect anybody to support unconscionable and unreasonable wage demands in this country; when you make up your mind that you have to increase your productivity; that you cannot continue to expect to raise your prices in unconscionable fashion; then we are going to stop inflation. We are going to try to stimulate the economy. We are going to try to provide the jobs that people in this country need. We are going to do all we can. We are going to do it in the most cooperative way we know how.

There is nothing uncertain about the future of this Country. Sure, there are problems. I cannot tell you the day, or the week, or the month that the Price Commission is going out of business, or the Pay Board is going out of business. They are going out of business when their job is done. It will depend upon you.

You employ the people. You affect the economy. The Government, really, is a small part of it. So make up your minds when you want to get it over with. That is the best answer I can give you.

But, if you are not in a hurry, maybe it will be on for some time. I will tell you that. They are on now. We put them on. It is a whole lot easier to take them off. As long as they are on, we are going to wait until they do the job. It may be summer; it may be fall; it may be this year, or four years from now. I don't know. What we say to you is: Some of the uncertainty stems from the fact that people—just like me—get up here and say to you: "We don't believe in controls."

The Cost of Living Council says we ought to exempt the controls on "Mom and Pop" establishments in this Country. There are well over a million of them; 75% of the business establishments in this Country—retail business establishements in this country—but they only do 14.8% of the volume. They are exempt. Everybody says, "If we will just hold tight a little bit, maybe we will get exempt." But you are not in that category! (Laughter.)

If you all want to be the "big boys" in the Industrial world—which you are; it is not everybody that gets into Tier I (Laughter)—you will get special treatment; I mean that. You are going to get very special treatment. (Laughter.)

So, how long that is, is going to depend on how good a job we all do. We recognize it; we don't have a perfect system.

We look at the 964,000 inquiries that we have had since November 15, through January 11. The Internal Revenue Service has had 964,000 of them! That is 24,000 inquiries a day! We look at the 30,000 complaints that the IRS, alone, has received during that period of time; of alleged violations, 19,000 of those have already been resolved. So we think we know a little something about what the people think; what they are concerned with. We are trying to answer them as fast as we can. Jack Grayson is trying; and his Commission is trying; and the Pay Board is trying. We are all trying. None of us are prepared to say that we are doing a good job, much less a superb job. All I can say to you is: We are doing the best we know how, with what we have. I am sure we are entitled to constructive criticism—even complaints. We don't mind these, but we also think, along with constructive criticism and complaints, goes a little cooperation. The three "C"s. If I had my way, I would put "Cooperation" first. If you all want to put it third. we will even take it that way!

So, we are not going to defend the system: It's not a "perfect" system. It is the "only" one we have. It is the only game in town, so to speak. So we are playing it. We are going to play it fairly; we are going to play it as hard, and as fairly, and as judiciously, and as expeditiously as we know how. We are going to try to meet the needs. You know what the objectives are. You know what the goals are. There is no mystery about that. There is no uncertainly about it.

We are trying to re-establish the free play, in the market place, of this economy—of all aspects of this economy. It has gotten out of kilter. We are trying to right it—to set it a-right—then turn it loose.

Is there uncertainty, any more, about the International Monetary situation? Or our relationship with our International Trading Partners? I think not.

We have some legislation we have yet to do. We have some negotiating we have still to do; with some of our partners.

We are always going to have some of these problems. The time is never going to come when you, as leading business men in this great Society—this great American System—can relax and sit back secure in the knowledge that everything is certain. I believe it was President Eisenhower who said. "There are only two certain things. One is Death; the other is: Taxes until you die".

Those are not very acceptable alternatives to what we have now.

If I know anything about the American spirit; if I know anything about American business; you don't want too much certainty because, when you get things so clearly defined, and so definitely established that it is certain, then you can be absolutely certain of one other thing. That is: We are not making progress, and we are going to lose the competitive position of American products and commodities in the World markets, because I am telling you: The rest of the world is at work while we are worrying. That is the Truth of the matter. They are outworking us; they are out-planning us, day after day. Those of you who are dealing in the International Markets; those of you who compete in the International Field know full well what I am talking about. Now, somehow, you have got to lead a resurgence of the American Spirit of Work. We have to return to our Puritanical system of work, if we are going to survive; if we are going to build; if we are going to grow; if we are going to expand.

I cannot promise you certainty—if I could, I wouldn't because what we have to do is to keep the incentive, the initiative, the genius of America at work in this Country, and in the World. That is your only hope.

I see other Countries around the world, and how they operate; how they manage. This Country does less to try to manage your affairs, I think, than any other Country—advanced Country—on the fact of the earth. But I don't think you want their Systems. I think our own System ought to give us ample evidence that we have gone further; we have produced more; we have done it better; we have created more; we have provided more, in a cheaper fashion, than any people, using any System, since the Creation of Time.

Why do we want to quit it?

We are not trying to quit it. We are not trying to revolutionize the System under which we function.

We are trying merely to make it function, in a period of stress, a little more efficiently to get is back in basic equilibrium.

So, frankly, I am somewhat at a loss to understand the uncertainty, that I come to hear about, that prevails in the minds of business leaders throughout the Country. At least, I hope that in the coming weeks and months, we can dispel the concern, and dispel the uncertainty. We will be trying. We will be doing everything we know how—both at home and abroad. You can be sure that, at home, we are going to try to give you as much running room as we possibly can so that you can use your own innovations; your own energy to build and create.

You can be sure our International leaders are going to try to protect your ability to compete on a fair and equitable basis in the markets of the world. Of that, you can be sure.

So, with no more assurance than that; with no greater definition of certainty than that, let me attempt to answer your questions.

Mr. BOOTH. All right. If you have a big, strong voice, stand up and let the Secretary hear it, please. I don't like to take the bloom off of that beautiful speech by asking questions, but he is ready!

Question. Is Business wasting its time under this Price Control Program, with the Federal Government going $40 billion in debt?

Secretary CONNALLY. Did you hear the question?

"Is Business wasting its time under this Price Control Program, with the Federal Government going $40 billion in debt?"

Well, in a short run, if you want to be pessimistic, if you want to be despondent, you can. I am not ready to concede that we are going $40 billion in debt—just for the sake of the Press here! (Laughter.)

I want to enter a little disclaimer. I am not going to tell you what the figure is.

Let's assume that, for the moment. (Laughter.)

The Government is on the horns of a dilemma. None of us like a $40 billion deficit, or a $35 billion deficit, or any kind of a deficit. What is your alternative? What position would this Administration, or the Government, be in, if we had a balanced budget, with over 5 million people unemployed?

Is that an acceptable alternative?

Is that an acceptable solution?

I think not!

We live in a political environment; we live in a political society. You cannot always do things in the pristine purety of a philosophy that you would like to go on. I am not a debt-sustaining man. When I was Governor of our Home State, we never had a deficit. We had a surplus. I passed three Tax Bills. In every Legislature for the past two years, we did have a surplus. I don't believe in debt-spending. But, occasionally, we have to have it. We are in a stagnation period. We are in a period of economic slackness. We have to have some physical stimulus. We have provided it. We have provided quite a bit of it. This ought to be encouraging to you.

Now, as a matter of Government philosophy, I can understand your concern but, as a matter of devising and restoring some vitality into this economy, you ought to be upholding it.

Mr. BOOTH. I will take just one more question.

Secretary CONNALLY. Let's take more!

Mr. BOOTH. Your people, and Dr. Grayson's people are here; they are eager to get out there.

Let's take one more question.

Question. Mr. Secretary, why don't you ask for a tax increase?

Secretary CONNALLY. Why don't we ask for a tax increase?

We just had a major tax decrease, for one thing. It would be a little bit inconsistent.

(Laughter.)

Secondly, we don't ask for a tax increase for the simple reason that we are trying to put money into the economy. We are trying to stimulate the Economy because all have said, "This is what is wrong with it. We don't have economic stimulus. We don't have the inventories. We don't have the purchase or plant equipment."

We tried to stimulate the economy further with tax cuts.

Now, I say again, to argue philosophically: When you consider the practical alternatives that face this Government, or any other Administration, you come out at different points. What we are trying to do is to stimulate the Economy so we can get these tax revenues; so that we can have a balanced budget. I think for the Government—like anybody else—it is a matter of Governmental philosophy: We want to operate on a balanced budget, just like any business has to do. We are no different, but there are exceptions. We are not in the profit-making business. As a general rule, we ought to be prepared to tax for what we spend. But there are times when economic conditions are such in the Country that, in my judgment, the Government is justified in deficit spending. And we have been in such a period.

Mr. BOOTH. Mr. Secretary, let us thank you, because these people are out here, waiting to tell us how to make your talk work, in practical action.

Jack Grayson's people are in the Work Shops out here.

So, give the Secretary a big hand.

(Applause.)

---

U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
*Washington, D.C., January 25, 1972.*

Hon. JOHN B. CONNALLY,
*Secretary of the Treasury,*
*Washington, D.C.*

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Please accept my warmest appreciation for your taking the time to address our National Affairs Conference last week.

Your complaint that business somehow hasn't responded adequately to economic incentives provided by new Administration policies deserves some explanation.

The business community welcomed the Asset Depreciation Range System, the job development tax credit and international monetary reform. But it hardly seems necessary to point out that these developments have not yet been in effect long enough to produce the expected beneficial effects.

The tax credit was signed into law December 10, and it was that same law that dispersed the cloud over accelerated depreciation. Surely you wouldn't anticipate results already.

We are puzzled, however, that you speak of these measures as though they were gifts to business. We assumed the President supported them because he felt they would benefit the economy, and thus the entire country. Obviously, we cannot prosper unless the general economic climate is healthy. And in that case, all sectors would be equally indebted for the "gift."

We fully agree that we should not "expect anybody to support unconscionable and unreasonable wage demands." And we wonder, sadly, why so many people *do* support them: The Congress. The NLRB. The unions. Even the Pay Board. Surely the Administration is familiar with the difficulty—if not the impossibility—of successfully opposing organized labor in today's legislature and regulatory climate.

It's easy to suggest that business must be tougher in resisting unreasonable wage demands. But when a strike results, who suffers? Not the strikers, who receive welfare checks, food stamps and other government aid. When strikers are subsidized by government, a company can't win—and neither can the public.

As for not continuing "to raise prices in an unconscionable fashion," I am not aware that anyone *has* continued to do so. The efficiency and rigor of the Price Commission have been the subject of much comment and admiration. Do you have any specific instances in mind?

Finally, as the President noted, "industrial production, consumer spending, retail sales and personal income all have been rising." We think they will continue to rise. We expect 1972 to be a good year. We *want* 1972 to be a good year. But while we can—and will—do our best to prepare for whatever demand arises, we unfortunately lack a magic wand capable of producing that demand. If we knew how to build one, we would.

Perhaps we would all benefit from the sense of perspective that led the President to advise rejection of "the narrow visions of those who would tell us that . . . all the sweat and toil and sacrifice that have gone into the building of America were for naught because the building is not yet done."

Sincerely yours,

ARCH N. BOOTH,
*Executive Vice President.*

---

## THE NIXON PLAN: PEACE, OR JUST POLITICS?

### HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the New Republic contained an article by Prof. George Kahin on President Nixon's latest "peace plan." The item takes what I consider to be the sound view that Mr. Nixon's insistence upon propping up the Thieu regime is an insurmountable barrier to any agreement regarding withdrawal of American military forces.

In Professor Kahin's words:

President Nixon's eight-point proposal departs so far from what our opponents might possibly accept, as to lend credence to the allegation that he is addressing himself to an American audience rather than to those with whom he says he wants to negotiate.

I hope that each of my colleagues will have an opportunity to read this article, and I insert it in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks:

NIXON'S PEACE PLAN

(By George McT. Kahin)

Any careful scrutiny of President Nixon's eight-point Vietnam peace plan leaves little hope that it will provide a basis for a negotiated settlement of the war. Most of its provisions have been incorporated in earlier American proposals—proposals which were not acceptable to Hanoi and the NLF. The President has stated his willingness to set a terminal date for the withdrawal of all American forces but has made this dependent upon a formidable set of conditions that go far beyond the simple release of prisoners and the safety of withdrawing American forces. The only hope one can entertain is that President Nixon will regard his proposal as simply a point of departure from which he is prepared to move a very long way toward the NLF-Hanoi position in an effort to find common ground upon which realistic negotiations can finally begin.

But if the President should actually intend to move toward the middle ground of genuine compromise some of the most fundamental components of his eight points will have to be drastically altered. Of central importance is the question of a cease-fire which, contrary to what Mr. Kissinger stated to the press, is very much a major issue and one where the positions are far apart. There are two very different kinds of cease-fire on the table: President Nixon's all-party, all-Indochina cease-fire; and the NLF's proposal for an initial bilateral cease-fire between just the NLF and Hanoi on the one side, and the U.S. and its Korean and other non-Vietnamese allies on the other, with the area covered limited to South Vietnam.

Thus the cease-fire that the NLF and Hanoi are prepared to enter into with us explicitly excludes General Thieu's armed forces. The reason for this is basic to their whole approach to a negotiated settlement: that as between them and Saigon any cease-fire must be preceded by a political agreement. Their experience with the U.S. and Ngo

Dinh Diem in the post-Geneva period has taught them that it is folly to trust to the mere promise of a political agreement later, in return for a prior armistice. They will not again give up their military leverage without first securing a firm agreement covering the political issues about which the war is being fought. It was with this consideration in mind that the NLF in its seven-point proposal of last July, separated out a cease-fire with the United States from the question of its own cease-fire with Saigon's forces. For unless such a separation is made there can be no possibility for a release of prisoners and the safe evacuation of remaining American forces until *after* a political agreement with Saigon has been secured—a matter which will take considerable time to work out.

However, President Nixon's proposed cease-fire is far more complicated and difficult of resolution than the bilateral arrangements proposed by the NLF and Hanoi. With respect to South Vietnam it is evident that it would have far-reaching and decisive political consequences that, quite apart from whatever electoral process is followed, would virtually assure the continuation of Thieu's regime in power. In other words, once President Nixon's kind of cease-fire was operative there would almost automatically ensue political consequences that would be decisive in the allocation of power in South Vietnam and would virtually assure paramountcy for Thieu and his regime. It is with this in mind that one must assess the "flexibility" with which Mr. Kissinger has credited President Nixon, particularly the President's statement that "we would be willing to begin implementing certain military aspects while negotiations continue on the implementation of other issues . . . [or] to settle only the military issues and leave the political issues to the Vietnamese alone." For the antecedent military issues, if solved along the lines called for by the President, would almost certainly ensure resolution of the political issues in accordance with his objectives.

First of all, President Nixon's cease-fire seeks to freeze the military balance at a point in time when the scales are still heavily weighted with US ground and air power (plus over two divisions of US-financed South Korean troops). Thus in terms of self-determination a freezing of the pattern of territory at present under control of the contending Vietnamese parties would be artificial and conducive to equally artificial political consequences. Such a cease-fire would register the enormous impact of American fire power on major areas of South Vietnam. It would not only reflect Saigon's garrisoning of territories won for it over the past years by American combat forces; it would also keep locked into Saigon's control several million refugees that our bombing and artillery fire have driven out of substantial areas, which were previously administered by the NLF.

Moreover, as any close reading of points 5, 6 and 7 of President Nixon's proposal makes clear, his cease-fire is intimately tied in with the requirement for a withdrawal of North Vietnamese forces. This Hanoi is not likely to accept prior to an acceptable political settlement in the South. Certainly Hanoi will not withdraw its troops unless assured that supporters of the NLF are protected against reprisal from the Saigon government. Nor will it accept an election in the South preceded by a disarmament of the NLF while the Saigon generals that support Thieu maintain their arms.

It has been widely noted that President Nixon is calling for a cease-fire at the beginning of the dry season when enemy forces are poised to undertake attacks that even our own military believe will be attended by some successes. Moreover, at the present time most NLF main force units are over the border in Cambodia either engaged in the fighting or resting up for subsequent operations there or in South Vietnam. Thus a cease-fire now would freeze the most important NLF units in position outside their own country.

In neither the President's eight points nor his January 25 speech is any mention made of the NLF's armed forces, and thus there is no reason to assume that the US and Thieu have changed their position with regard to them. This view—essentially that of the Johnson administration—insists that the NLF's armed forces must either go to North Vietnam or, if they elect to return to their homes; surrender their arms to the Saigon regime. With the NLF's armed forces so eliminated, and with Thieu's million-man army and 125,000 police keeping their won arms, it is unlikely that civilian political adherents of the NLF would risk exposing themselves by engaging in election activity or be tempted to serve on the electoral commission to which President Thieu and President Nixon have invited them.

There are other aspects of President Nixon's proposal that will undoubtedly give the NLF pause. He is silent on the question of political amnesty, a matter about which the NLF has repeatedly expressed its concern and which it has highlighted in its own proposal. (There it calls for "concrete measures with the required guarantees" to be taken 'so as to prohibit all acts of terror, reprisal and discrimination against persons having collaborated with one or the other party" and the release of "all persons jailed for political reasons.") Also likely to appear ominous to the NLF is the reference that President Nixon does make to civilian prisoners. Whereas the NLF's proposal calls for the release of "the totality" of the civilians captured in the war," his proposal provides only for the release of "*innocent* civilians." President Thieu's criteria for political "innocence" are hardly likely to provide assurance that this will include NLF supporters. If Truong Dinh Dzu, the non-Communist lawyer who with 17 percent of the votes ranked next to Thieu in the 1967 presidential election, is still doing hard labor in a concentration camp and if several thousand Buddhist leaders, students and teachers now in such camps or in jail, are considered as non-innocent by Thieu, what prospect is there that he will release the additional thousands of jailed political adherents of the NLF so that they can help organize and participate in the proposed election?

President Nixon's call for another presidential election in South Vietnam so soon after the American-endorsed election of last October may seem plausible to some Americans, but it will have little appeal in Vietnam, among either Communists or non-Communists. In appreciating this, one should recall not merely the farcical character of the last election in which even members of the Saigon military establishment were given no fair chance to compete against Thieu, and where the Nixon administration insisted that the United States was completely "neutral." One should also remember the earlier election of 1967, run under the aegis of Saigon's military establishment (where Thieu was then chief of state and chairman of the armed forces council) through which Thieu first became President. There, even after the main popular figures had been screened out of the running, the balloting fraud was so widespread that Saigon's Central Election Council voted 16–2 to invalidate it. It was only after intimidation by threats from the police and other agents of Thieu and Ky and after visible pressure from the American Embassy that a cowed national assembly overruled its decision and declared Thieu's election valid. In that election, too, Washington asserted that the US had been completely "neutral" and endorsed the process as having produced a legitimate, freely elected government representing the will of the South Vietnamese people.

In view of this history of American-promoted elections in Vietnam, it is perhaps understandable that the NLF might be skeptical about its chances in the exercise that President Nixon is now proposing, and why his invitation to membership in an electoral commission charged with overseeing the elections might not seem very attractive. Along with non-Communist opponents of the Thieu regime they recognize all too well that such a body, whether or not subject to international supervision, can have little effect on the course of elections run under the political and administrative aegis of a Saigon government controlled by Thieu and his lieutenants. The NLF has always argued that the central factor is who controls the administrative and political organization at the time that elections are held. It would regard a sharing of power on an electoral commission as futile unless it also shared power in the government and administration whose police and civil and military officials were in control at the time of elections.

The scenario suggested by President Nixon whereby Thieu steps out of the presidential palace a month before the elections in which he intends to run will only be viewed with derision in Vietnam. Absence from his office at that time would, of course, make no real difference. In the first place, the chairman of the senate, whom President Nixon has suggested could serve as "caretaker head of the government," is Thieu's man. But in any case the administration would be firmly in the hands of Thieu appointees from General Khiem, his Prime Minister, through the cabinet, all the way down to the 44 province chiefs and more numerous district heads, each of whom Thieu has appointed and each of whom is beholden to him for continuance in office. Unless this political machine of President Thieu yields place to a different, more representative administration one cannot expect anything like a "free and democratic" election, even if an independent electoral commission "representing all political forces in Vietnam" attempts to achieve this in conjunction with "international supervision."

The Vietnamese have already had experience with international supervision and they have not found it very effective. They recall that the three-nation International Control Commission (composed of members from India, Canada and Poland) that was set up by the 1954 Geneva Conference was quite unable to prepare the ground for the elections scheduled for two years later. It was unable either to halt political reprisals (with Diem finally obliging it to stop even its investigations of them) or to induce Saigon to enter into the negotiations with Hanoi necessary for planning the elections that the ICC was to supervise in 1956. Perhaps it would be possible to arrange for an international supervisory presence much stronger than the ICC; even so the NLF is unlikely to trust to elections prior to a change in the character of the government in Saigon under whose administration they would be held.

Whether taken as a whole or restricted to its most fundamental elements, President Nixon's eight-point proposal departs so far from what our opponents might possibly accept, as to lend credence to the allegation that he is addressing himself to an American audience rather than to those with whom he says he wants to negotiate. For he has made the setting of any terminal date for withdrawal of all American ground forces, and an end to the bombing, dependent upon the enemy's acceptance of conditions that in fact add up to virtual military capitulation and the NLF's political strangulation. He calls for the South Vietnamese people to decide their political future for themselves "free from outside interference," but his strategy is clearly calculated to register the present weightage of US ground and air power on the scales of Vietnamese self-deter-

mination. His policy advantages Thieu and his coterie and appears designed to keep them in power.

Despite the ambiguities of President Nixon's proposal the order of his priorities emerges with greater clarity. Certainly there can no longer be much doubt that in his view the release of prisoners and the safety of American troops still in Vietnam must yield precedence to preservation of the military and political position of the present Saigon regime.

## COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT NEEDS IN ARKANSAS

### HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 16, 1972*

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like, with the permission of the House, to continue making a part of the congressional testimony from my December 4, 1971, hearing in Marked Tree, Ark., on community development needs.

By now, we are familiar with the items in the catalog of "things required to inject new vitality into small town economies." The testimony I have presented since September has already given ample evidence of local interest in this work and the willingness to sacrifice to achieve a brighter future.

Today, I will begin the presentation of this testimony with a special paper. This was prepared by a man named Frank Gamec who had lived in Jonesboro, Ark., just a decade, but whose interest in his county of Craighead and the State of Arkansas is well documented by his record of public service. Unfortunately, though it became a part of the hearing record, this testimony was never publicly presented. The First Congressional District and the State of Arkansas were robbed of a talented mind, dedicated spirit, and a pair of willing hands by the untimely death of Frank Gamec shortly before the December 4 hearing.

The story he told of attempts to improve the lot of small towns and of a growth area which were frustrated by Federal programs supposedly designed to help but which were not usable by his area, underscores the complaint made by many witnesses. I feel it is important that the Members of Congress have access to it. Let me, with its publication, repeat my plea that while expanding, extending or enacting Federal programs of community development, we representatives of the people make them broadly usable by the whole range of communities—not just the major ones where the magnitude of the problem focuses most of the national attention.

Today's insertion in the RECORD also includes testimony by Mayor J. W. Waskom, Jr., of Marked Tree, and J. W. Crawford, representing Gosnell, who discuss specific needs of their municipalities; and Fred Ashcraft, an East Arkansas newspaper publisher and editor, who urges us to begin spending at least as much energy on developing solutions as we do on analyzing problems.

STATEMENT OF FRANK GAMEC

Congressman Alexander, I am Frank Gamec, Chairman of the Craighead County Development Council.

I appreciate the opportunity of being here to add my comments to others you are hearing today and to those I have read and you have heard in Brinkley and other cities you have visited.

As background information—I was reared in a big city. I have lived in big—medium and small cities.

In 1961 I came to Jonesboro as Manager of the General Electric Plant.

I have been a member of the Board of the State Chamber of Commerce, President of the Jonesboro Chamber of Commerce, and active in many of the community development activities in our area.

I have become familiar with some of the problems faced by the people in and around Jonesboro. I enjoy living here—I admire the progressive attitude of the people and have made many friends in and around our community.

The Craighead County Development Council was established from the realization that our small cities and communities lacked an organized approach, lacked sufficient personnel, and lacked funds to establish and carry out a comprehensive plan for community improvements and developments.

With the guidance of Herb Russell of our County Agricultural Extension Service we selected a fine group of people who were interested in and were representative of Agricultural, Educational, Social, Economic, and Cultural activities in our county.

These people came from nine different cities and towns: Bano, Black Oak, Caraway, Brookland, Monette, Lake City, Bay, Dryden, and Jonesboro. Eight of these nine have a population range of from 21 to 1,076 people.

Our objective was to identify projects on a priority basis—projects which would assist one or more of our communities to develop into the type that would help encourage our youth to grow up, develop, and stay in Arkansas.

Educational improvements, vocational schools, and work training were prime targets of discussion.

Recreational, social, economic, and health care activities were of major importance.

We were looking for ways of keeping our families closer to home, to keep them off the highways, to keep our youth from racing around the town square or hot-rodding to the bigger cities to have fun.

We delved into the areas of community improvements such as sewage and trash disposal, flood control, and drainage ditches.

Our enthusiasm was high, but it gradually dwindled away.

Whichever way we turned we could not raise the funds we needed for even a small project. We did not have personnel with the time to follow through. We had no one with the time or money to lobby for us or to unwind the red tape. We found that getting things done via bureaucracy is like trying to pick up a pin with mittens on.

The results was inevitable—we were voices in the wilderness. We ended up talking to ourselves and receiving no answers.

You are asking us what we need:

1. I see a need for obtaining community loans at low rates and terms which will allow small communities to take advantage of existing Federal programs.

2. I see a need for eliminating some of the red tape involved in securing federal assistance for community projects.

3. I see a need for the small towns of our county to be included in the redevelopment area just the same as Jonesboro.

4. I see a need for some better means of communication to make local leaders feel the need for concentrated effort on community development, the need to make them aware of the programs that are available.

5. I see the need for indoor and outdoor recreational facilities, better health care, improved housing, more emphasis on vocational and economic training and additional job opportunities.

If the federal government is sincere about developing rural America, it should concentrate more attention to improving the small communities, by helping them to grow instead of slowly deteriorating, having their youth moving to the big cities and increasing the problems the big cities are currently unable to cope with.

Yes, we need federal assistance—but we would like to have it available at a more local level, administered by people who are closer to our needs, people in a position to know where such assistance will do the most to provide the better way of living for which they are striving.

In closing, may I add that we appreciate what you are doing in trying to help us obtain our objectives.

F. T. GAMEC,
*Chairman, Craighead County Development Council.*

STATEMENT OF J. G. WASKOM, JR., DECEMBER 4, 1971

My name is J. G. Waskom, Jr., and I am Mayor of the City of Marked Tree.

The following testimony is expected to reflect local area needs, and pertinent information for the Community Development Proposal Hearing at Marked Tree, Arkansas, on December 4, 1971.

It is the opinion of knowledgeable citizens of Marked Tree that the most urgent needs of our town are:

Financial assistance
Housing
To stop the out-migration of our people
Street construction and repair
Extension of water and sewer lines
Community center
Solid waste disposal facilities
Adult education
A hospital

It is very obvious that our economic development status would be improved if these urgent needs, and/or projects, were satisfied wholly or in part.

The first and primary need for our town, and I believe for most towns, is financial assistance—and it will continue to be until our plight is finally recognized by state and federal governments.

Such assistance, of necessity, will be derived from taxation, whether it be a local specific tax or whether it originates at the state or federal level.

With financial assistance should come the solution to the major problems which have long beset the small towns.

Before our town can entertain constructive thinking as to satisfying the many urgent needs that have been mentioned, the everyday problems of paying everyday expenses must be solved.

I believe we can say that most small towns in Arkansas have only three major sources of revenue:

1. County and state turnback funds.
2. Revenue from fines.
3. Revenue from privilege license.

The proceeds from these three sources usually is depleted in the payment of current obligations—and in many instances the city occupies a debt position with the local bank at the end of the year.

I see little possibility of help from direct funding to cure the ill of too little money for operating expenses, and if the state and federal governments expect the small towns to survive—not to mention progress—then tax revenues must be more equitably divided to satisfy the urgent and pressing need existing at the small town level.

How can the town fathers direct their efforts to increase and improve economic development when they are in doubt of the

town's ability to pay current, or even past due bills!

If the state and federal governments will not share revenue equitably with the small towns, then why should they not assume all, or at least part, of the duties and responsibilities with which small towns are charged?

What can improve the economic development of our city more than additional housing to satisfy the workers at our three industrial plants, to satisfy the school teachers, Mr. and Mrs. Resident, the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker?

What can improve the economic development of our city more than to have good streets to drive on, creating a dust free atmosphere, inviting the stranger to settle in our midst, and raising property values for our citizens?

What can improve the economic development of our area more than to influence our citizens, and particularly our young people, not to leave our town for the questionable greener pastures that beckon for residency.

What can improve our economic development more than to be financially able to extend water and sewer lines to accommodate more residents and enhance the general profit status of our town?

And what can improve our economic development more than to have adequate hospital facilities to care for our sick; to have a community center for the entertainment of our young people, and to entice new residents to our town?

Obviously, the tool with which to accomplish this development is a source of money which becomes more pressing as time passes and needs increase.

How much money does our city need? This may be answered by asking these other questions.

What is the cost of several miles of asphalt streets?

What is the cost of several miles of water and sewer line construction?

What is the cost of solid waste disposal facilities for a city of more than 3,000 people?

What is the cost of a sorely needed hospital, properly equipped?

What is the cost of a community recreation center to aid in keeping our young folks off the street and out of parked cars?

What is the cost of a government housing project for many families—especially the elderly?

A cumulative total answering these questions would run into the millions of dollars and the city's over all need would still not be wholly satisfied.

Now, may I ask another question? What is the capability of the city to produce its share of needed revenue to assure the economic development so badly needed.

The answer is nil due to the fact that the city has exhausted all of its taxing ability, and bonding capacity, in the acquisition of projects which were basically necessary for its survival.

The city only has 10 mills with which to retire bonded indebtedness—5 mills for general bonded indebtedness, and 5 mills for specific. I'm sure that most of you know that in order to make additional millage available the constitution of the state must be amended. Our people now do not have the privilege of allowing themselves to be taxed in order to upgrade the town in which they live by providing much needed development.

Now, may I mention some of the problems facing the town in its endeavor to improve its economic status:

1. The high interest rate for bonds.

2. The general requirement that bonds be secured by an income of 1½ times the required payment.

3. That bonds usually are issued for only a short period—for 20 years—retired in about 12 years with the utilization of the 1½ times provision. This, because interest rates are less favorable on long term issues.

4. Insufficient taxing ability together with only minimal turnback from state and federal governments.

The attitude of the people, Mr. Average Taxpayer, of our town could be much improved because they have taxed themselves to the very fullest extent to improve their streets, and water and sewer system, yet much still remains to be accomplished to achieve anything like total improvement—not to mention the other many and varied improvements needed—mentioned elsewhere in this testimony.

Out migration of our people—a loss in count, over the last 10 years, does nothing to alleviate the situation. Our young people, who leave seeking their fortunes in the large cities, leave a gap never to be filled and others who leaves seeking a better community in which to live retard the growth of our town.

In regard to the salability of bonds for public works projects—if new sources of financing at more favorable rates on long terms is not developed—may I say that under present laws there could be additional financing if there was a source of funds at a lower rate, on longer terms, and with less stringent requirements. It appears that present bonding sources are unable or unwilling to help us solve our problems.

Of course, the obvious answer to the financing ills would be a sure, steady source of revenue, on a long term basis, at interest rates small towns could afford to pay. It's as simple as that.

Over the years the City of Marked Tree, with federal assistance, has been able to build some public housing, construct a municipal airport, acquire its water system, and construct a sewer system. We feel that we have utilized the depth of the federal programs—yet so much still needs to be done—and it appears that no longer will assistance be extended to us.

Hopefully, someday in the future the plight of the small towns will be recognized to the end that a fair share of tax revenue will be made available to them and, when necessary, for economic development, a lending agency will offer a helping hand.

I don't think that it was in the design—the scheme of things—for the small town, the birth place of this great nation, to suffer and die for want of financial respect, and I don't believe that just men in a just land will force our small towns to beg for their rightful opportunity to stand proud and straight in the quest for the prosperity they so richly deserve.

Respectfully submitted,

J. G. WASKOM, Jr.,
*Mayor, City of Marked Tree, Ark.*

---

CITY OF GOSNELL, ARK.—BRIEF SITUATION AND REPORT

I. Funding requirement estimate by project:

| | |
|---|---|
| Water—project completed | $243,000 |
| Sewerage—project processing | 550,000 |
| Fire Prevention—project completed | 42,000 |
| Streets—progressing | 165,000 |
| Community Center—planning | 55,000 |
| Garbage Disposal—planning | 50,000 |
| Industrial Park—planning | 100,000 |
| Library—planning | 20,000 |
| Recreation Park—planning | 250,000 |
| Law Enforcement—planning | 25,000 |
| Total | 1,500,000 |

II. Situation report:

A few years ago the town of Gosnell was a community with a Church, School, and some 200 families. A health official who was acting on a water and sewerage complaint in Gosnell, concluded: We can test the drinking water and prove that it is contaminated, and test the water seeping from the ground and prove that it is sewerage; but the people still have the right to live with it or move out. Thus, he had analyzed the frustration of those who stayed and the provocative outmigration pattern of the people in this small town in very few words. The situation is a national disgrace to a civilized nation where billions of dollars are loaned and given away without a sense of priority. I have documented proof of the gross inefficiency of government administered funding programs, but I think that this is an accepted fact by any modern concept of management.

In attempting to solve some of the problems of Gosnell, I observed that these small town people had hope in their hearts, confidence in government workers, trust in elected officials, and a patriotic spirit of improvement that other people have given up hope on long ago. As an example they accepted their problems as their very own and recognized that they would have to work without government hand outs as read about in the newspapers, and that they would have to accomplish their objectives within their own resourcefulness. Gosnell is probably the only town in the United States where the Mayor and City Council serve without pay. What must a man offer to this Nation other than his taxes and his work free while others are being paid? Can we afford to let these people become pacified to the extent that they do not care anymore?

The following comments by project may provide some insight into the success and frustration:

*Water.* There were no funds to pay for an economic feasibility report. Grant money was out of the question as Gosnell did not have any priority regardless of economically depressed status. The Farm Home Administration did approve a loan of $243,000. Water revenues were pledged to secure the bonds which the Government bought. This project did not cost the government one dime and they made money on the project as they collected taxes from the contractors and wage earners. It was necessary to avoid improvement district and taxation to make it acceptable to the people. This is because the local property taxes are so high by assessment that the poor, sick, and elderly end up losing their homes before they die. The small town people are crushed by taxes as they do not have the economic advantage of the larger city while taxes are assessed at the same rate or in some instances higher.

*Sewage system.* The cost estimate is $550,000 and involves a $171,000 grant from HUD and a $19,000 grant from pollution control. Problem after problem has been encountered. The first was an argument between government agencies (FHA and HUD) as to who would fund the program. Next was the imposing "ifs" by government workers, such as, we don't know if this project will be successful twenty years from now. Another favorite trick is to plead ignorance by saying: "we don't know as it is under review." The next great expression of a government worker is to rest on indecision by saying: "we haven't decided", next expression: "the other agencies have it." We are sympathetic toward the government employing the little learned and poor, but surely they can employ one man who can make a decision. After many years the City of Gosnell signed a loan and grant agreement with Housing and Urban Development after the office was moved to Little Rock to fund the project. The very indication that the City of Gosnell is Getting Sewerage in addition to water has had its economic impact. FHA loans on housing are now available and bankers are more generous on loans. Approximately 200 additional homes are in the City and the population has jumped from 1380 to 1780 in about one year. At $15,000 per home this totals $3,000,000 additional investment by private enterprise. This economic factor adds to the big City economy from the lumber business in California to the hard-

ware manufacturer in the East. Even the Chase Manhattan Bank in New York will likely feel a few green backs as a result of this little town trying to survive and help itself.

In fact, both the state and federal government will likely take in more taxes than the $171,000 and $19,000 grant that is involved in this project. This should be ample proof that economic prosperity begins in the small town and causes an economic chain reaction throughout the nation. Gosnell is a prime example and willing to pay in excess of one half million in loan money to help this nation as well as its self. What has actually happened to cause the economic chain reaction is that water and sewerage qualifies Gosnell to be taken into a giant national financial combine consisting of Bank loans, FHA loans, etc. In turn this means building, remodeling, and the purchase of appliances and fixtures. This situation can be substantiated by the new homes, telephones, water meters, gas meters, and utility records as well as population growth.

I think that it is only fair to state that some small towns may have certain stabilizing factors such as availability of land that does not permit a sudden economic chain reaction but the population stabilizing factor would still be there. It is well to mention also that the big towns and cities can not expect this economic chain reaction by similar expenditures because they are already in the national financial combine; and when they are deteriorating financially—propping up the structure merely prolongs the usefulness of the structure without creating a chain economic reaction. The small towns are economic pots of gold to be tapped by the government and shared by the whole nation. The government must first recognize the situation and devise a new process of justice and procedures. A final item on our sewerage project will explain what I mean. Pollution Control took the Gosnell application for a participating grant of some $19,000, but insisted that HUD sign a loan and grant agreement with Gosnell before they made the grant money available. In spite of the fact that Gosnell has signed a loan and grant agreement with HUD, and in spite of the fact that Banks and Loan Agencies have already taken Gosnell into the national financial combine; a Pollution Control official has informally notified me not to expect the $19,000 grant very soon. Where did a Pollution Control official get the power that would put a Roman Emperor to shame whereby he can make one decision that will bankrupt the town, kick it out of the national financial combine, violate a trust in government, and sentence the town people to live in pollution and poverty. A documented agreement with Housing and Urban Development that provides for cooperative participation by Pollution Control or nothing makes this situation a reality.

I do not believe that congress or the president gave the officials this power, but we must face the fact that they have it right here in the United States. It appears that both the people of the United States and Congress have become victims of a system that they can not control or refuse to take the time to do so. Any modern concept of the application of the principals of management; based on economy and efficiency of operation, and consistent with the objective to be accomplished, would eliminate this great injustice to our people. I hesitate to class my remarks as criticism of the government worker as the great majority of them are honest and sincere people who are also victims of a system that only congress can correct. I have accumulated many documents on this matter to support this conclusion.

In conclusion, I contend that the Honorable Bill Alexander has the right idea on how to help this nation with his Community Development Program. It is viewed as the program that can lead us through a decade of progress and possibly save us from a dictatorship because this nation is in turmoil. The people can look to this program as improvement and a better way through a just and democratic procedure.

III. Addendum (additional material submitted).

*Fire prevention.* The small town is ravaged by high insurance rates as compared to the big town. In looking after the best interest of the property owners some $42,000 has been spent from the general fund to provide a fire station and truck which is manned by volunteers. This resulted in a reduction of the insurance rates which helped the people, thus a high priority was given on this expenditure which consumed most of the general fund over a period of two years. Many of the poor, sick, and elderly are subject to total material loss in case of fire as they can not afford the high cost of insurance.

*Streets.* There are sufficient street funds so designated by the state to hard surface and maintain all the streets, however, it must be projected over a long period of time, thus a long term loan is most desirable with street funds pledged for repayment. There are state laws and opinions against such projected expenditures, therefore, it is a necessity that any venture into the loan structure by the federal government take precedence over state laws. Streets may be considered revenue producing since the state law designates funds for this purpose.

*Garbage disposition.* Sanitary land fill offers the maximum solution. This is a revenue producing item and a long term loan secured by land, equipment, and revenue pledge is sufficient to eliminate this problem over-night.

*Community center.* Community participation and leadership are key factors in any community and utilization of a community center for these purposes alone can greatly aid our democratic society. It must be realized that we must combat confusion and false rumors and plan and grow together. I feel that the City of Gosnell is more fortunate than most towns as the Mayor, Andy S. Bevill, has dedicated himself to making the right decisions on behalf of the people as opposed to special interest which invariably wrecks the financial structure of a town.

*Industrial park.* The City of Gosnell has had a standing agreement with utility companies to provide everything necessary for an industrial park except the land, but when assistance was requested from EDA, it was stated that in order to get any of their assistance that the city would have to have some industry. The answer was accepted as the law, but I can not believe that congress wrote a law that states such. There was one apparent factor, and that is that any small economically depressed town could not participate in funds provided by congress whether it was a decision or law.

*Library.* The library should be combined with the community center. A library has the purpose of recording available knowledge to provide information, but a new concept must be devised as much of the present system is out-dated when considering modern needs of a community.

*Recreational park.* This is a critical item to plan and it can be made attractive only with good planning and sufficient funds. A planned package deal should be offered by the government.

*Law enforcement.* This is the last item on the list because there are no funds available to properly do the job. The criminal element in a small town generally consists of petty thievery, destruction of property, drunkenness, unaddicted dopes, small hoodlum gangs, recruiters to the cause, and bad check bouncers; however, they out-migrate to the bright lights of big towns when they feel that they are ready to graduate into major crimes. This is why the people of a little town think that crime prevention is the answer to our problem while the big town people think that jails and prisons are the answer. One example of prevention is that a small industry is placed on a small town industrial park and employes some 300 people. About 80% of these have an education up to the 8th grade and their attention is diverted from the petty crimes in the small town and the major crimes in the big town. Having served as personnel manager in such a factory in a small town and interviewed thousands of applicants; I can assure you that it works. The only out-migration problem you have is to better jobs in the big town instead of bigger crimes. This preventive crime action also has a stablizing effect on relatives of the workers that is almost unbelievable. as an example a man will stick with a working woman to hold the family together or vice versa and about 3 children are held together for the same reason and schooled.

*Recommendation.* 1. There are many adverse state laws and legal opinions, yet to be written which can block or stall the program, therefore, the small town should be permitted to participate in an economically feasible plan regardless of the state law. 2. A City financial prospectus should be made with the view of diverting present revenues from short term use to long term projects. 3. The City should be permitted by the government to accomplish the projects themselves under bonded guidance to assure proper structure. The pledge of revenues from revenue producing projects should be accepted in lieu of taxes and improvement districts. 4. The government should offer a planned packaged deal and let the city select based on their available revenues. In other words guidance but not dictatorship as long as logic is used. 5. Eliminate all administrative work except simple plan, estimate, and loan papers, which should be in final format.

J. W. CRAWFORD,
*Project Coordinator.*

---

STATEMENT BY FRED ASHCRAFT

I feel that efforts of social and economic upgrading in North Arkansas have been overly preoccupied with a wide-angle approach and directed more toward analyzing cases than focusing on solutions.

I do not wish to appear to denigrate an overview approach. It is necessary that we develop the data and draft board conclusions from which we may better consider the comprehensive nature of the problems of smaller communities. It is incumbent to suggest solutions in a conceptual character.

At the same time, we need to realize the immediacy of the personal needs in terms of human beings. We are, after all, addressing ourselves to providing liveable income, desirable housing and a satisfying, hopeful and rewarding style of living to the people of the small cities and lightly populated rural areas of north Arkansas.

What we are dealing with, essentially, is people living in various stages of deprivation, from tarpaper shacks to educational and social inability to keep pace with current society . . . people living without dignity, existing on welfare handouts and food stamps, with their will to produce eroded until we approach a point where they are lost to productive society, no matter what opportunities we may win for them.

When we discuss the accounterments of a better society—roads and tax sharing and waste disposal systems—I find my innermost considerations returning repeatedly to the source of needs for all these services—that is, the people of Poinsett County themselves.

I find it intolerable, personally and ideologically, to witness this stultifying economic stagnation in the heart of a rich, inordinately affluent nation.

In the musical, Auntie Mame, Mame said

it very well: "Life is a banquet . . . and most poor sons of bitches are starving to death!"

It shouldn't be that way. I believe the kind of effort exemplified here today is a firm step toward seeing it will not continue to be so.

In dealing with what amounts to an economic and sociological overhaul of small communities, we must direct some purposeful thought along pragmatic lines.

We must, in effect, find a loose thread someplace and start yanking.

Where do we start?

There are striking differences of opinion about this.

In my view, admittedly a binocular one influenced by my proclivity for reducing matters to the direct personal terms of people, the number one objective is providing jobs.

Put people to work.

From this, the other things follow in logical sequence.

The second priority is housing. This area, particularly Marked Tree and Lepanto, with which I am better acquainted, needs housing of every nature.

In both instances—employment and housing—there are federal programs either operative or on the drawing boards.

I am very hopeful about some version of welfare reform containing work provisions being enacted. However, it appears probable this may be some time in becoming an actuality.

The Farmers Home Administration low income housing program has led to the construction of a number of new homes in this area. The program, however, is hampered by red tape, inconsistencies and inhibiting stipulations. These have undoubtedly have kept the Farmers Home housing program from achieving maximum benefits.

As an example of what's hampering this program, I would like to cite the case of a man who bought a home with Farmers Home Administration financing late in 1970.

Total payments on the house were $103 per month. On the basis of this man's adjusted income under the FHA formula he paid $60 per month on the house and the government paid the other $43.

The purchaser was informed he would be re-checked every two years. Actually, he was re-checked in 1971, on the contention that it was the "second" year—although he had occupied the house less than a year.

During this time, the man had received a raise of 17½ cents per hour.

This additional income put him over the income cutoff point, which for his income and family situation was $5,900 per year.

His FHA subsidy was cancelled. His house payments went from $60 to $103 per month on the basis of a raise of about $30 per month—not counting withholding and a year's increase in the cost of living.

He couldn't keep up the house payments and lost his home. Since there was no suitable rental housing available, he will very likely be forced to move out of Lepanto.

I offer this isolated example as an example of the lack of responsiveness in a program that's supposed to make it possible for poor but productive people to have a home.

I am no authority on the complexities of federal home financing. I do believe he might have bought a home under Act 235 of the Federal Housing Administration but the same house could have cost him as much as $1,500 more because of discounts. And, also, he would have faced higher closing costs than he would going Farmers Home.

Even so, despite the possibility of penalizing home buyers, the Farmers Home Administration program has much merit. It may need a careful look from the standpoint of implementation and the interests of both builders and home purchasers.

Despite the vital need for housing, I still consider employment opportunity the paramount consideration in Poinsett County.

I am not inclined to base my hopes for employment on securing industry to locate or re-locate here.

There are a formidable number of reasons working against this desirable eventuality. They range from a leadership void to education, from the need for facilities discussed here today to the very size of the communities themselves, a built-in drawback in competing for industry.

I think our economic, employmental salvation should begin at home.

I feel we can do something on our own, through federal programs either existing or potential.

Through some device, most likely a group formed within this county with the help of outside consultation, we should find an industrial need, a product, something which we can produce here in Poinsett County.

It must be something for which a market exists. I talked about this with somebody yesterday and he suggested a distillery. I had to agree there probably was a market and that we could probably flush some experienced distiller out of the floodway bottoms.

Once we've picked a product, let's build a plant right here to produce it. Let us recruit and train a work force of Poinsett County people to man the plant. Let's make it a sizable enough enterprise to employ at least 100 persons—hopefully more but that as a minimum.

I think a profit motive must be built into the structure of this industry. I've even gone so far as to pick the site: such a communal enterprise could be advantageously located at Payneway. This would give it a desirable relationship with Harrisburg, Marked Tree and Trumann.

The big difference between this concept and others discussed is the arbitrary starting point—the prior decision to sit down with purpose to say we ARE going to have a community-created industry and now that that's settled, let's decide what industry.

This communal industrial endeavor should be reinforced with a legalistic status so that director would be in a position to take actions such as land condemnation or whatever was just and proper in carrying out the project in the public interest.

These are hurried over-simplifications of a difficult undertaking but I think it is both feasible and justified. For those who can offer good and proper reasons why this might not be undertaken, I can offer even more reasons why I believe it should.

I wish to thank Congressman Alexander and his staff and all concerned with this hearing for their time and attention. I want to pledge my cooperation toward doing whatever I can to make Poinsett County and all of northeast Arkansas a better place in which we all may be privileged to rear our families and do business. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, this is the 15th insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of testimony and other materials which I have gathered during my research into ways to assist community development in nonmetropolitan areas. Other materials on this subject appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, volume 117, part 25, pages 32740–32741; part 26, pages 34505–34506; part 27, pages 35409–35410, 36133–36135; part 28, pages 37358–37360; part 29, 38121–38123; part 30, pages 39156–39158; part 31, pages 40813–40817; part 32, pages 41882–41884; part 34, pages 44697–44699; part 35, pages 45963–45966; December 15, pages 47309–47312; January 25, pages 1225–1226; February 9, pages 3882–3886.

## WALL STREET JOURNAL AGAIN SPOTLIGHTS NEED FOR COSMETIC SAFETY LEGISLATION—THIS TIME TO PROTECT MEN

---

### HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, when I testified before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the last occasion on which that committee held hearings on my cosmetics safety legislation—10 years ago this June—one of the members of that all-male committee asked me with some concern, "Are you against women being beautiful?"

He had received a deluge of mail from beauty parlor operators in his district, and petitions signed by hundreds of customers of those shops, protesting what cosmetic industry lobbyists had convinced them was a provision of my bill prohibiting the use of hair coloring. Of course my bill would do no such thing; what it would do, however, is to prohibit the use of unsafe hair dyes, or of ingredients in any cosmetics products which are not proved safe for the purposes intended. The cosmetics industry has successfully blocked such legislation for 34 years.

Although the House committee finally did move in 1962 to enact into law many of the important drug provisions contained at that time in H.R. 1235, my omnibus bill to rewrite the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938, it passed over the cosmetic section entirely, and it has not taken up H.R. 1235 since then. There is, perhaps, still a lingering fear among some of the Members that the cosmetic section is intended to prevent women from being beautiful.

SOME 60,000 INSURANCE CLAIMS A YEAR FROM COSMETIC INJURIES

I tried to point out to the committee in 1962 that women are not the only people hurt by unsafe cosmetics—that a multitude of products legally defined as cosmetics is used by men also, and by children. All Americans deserve to be protected against unsafe cosmetic products, which, according to the National Commission on Product Safety, cause about 60,000 injuries a year leading to insurance claims.

The dangers from unsafe cosmetics, and the agonies caused by the inability of allergic individuals to find out what is in the cosmetic products they use, are among the best-kept secrets in magazines aimed at the so-called women's market. Writers from all of those magazines have interviewed me from time to time for articles on this subject but, for some mysterious reason, the articles never appear in the women's magazines, perhaps because the cosmetics ads take up so much room there is no space left for an article on cosmetics safety. Several producers of commercial network television shows have also spent endless hours with me in researching the same story, but there never seems to be network air time available for it.

NEWSPAPERS AND SOME MAGAZINES HAVE DESCRIBED PROBLEM

On the other hand, the Reader's Digest has, from time to time, found room for important articles on this subject, and so has the AMA's Today's Health magazine. So have many newspapers, including the Globe-Democrat and Post-Dispatch in St. Louis, the New York Times, the Los Angeles Times syndicate, the Detroit News, the Chicago Daily News, the three Washington newspapers and numerous others. Over the years, I have placed many of these articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Wall Street Journal carried an excellent article last June 10 by Ronald G. Shafer which was one of the best on the subject. This week, the same newspaper printed a further piece on cosmetics, by Richard D. James, which should make every man who uses deodorant soap or after-shave lotion sit up and take notice.

DEVELOPING ALLERGY TO SUNLIGHT

Are these products making men photosensitive—allergic to sunlight? Are users of after-shave lotion risking having to stay indoors in summer? According to the Wall Street Journal article, this is a serious enough problem to worry allergists, who are seeing an increasing number of cases of skin photosensitivity resulting from the use of deodorant soaps and after-shave lotions.

The Food and Drug Administration, according to the James article, "says it has received a small number of complaints of photoallergy, as it is called, connected with the soaps and lotions and is keeping an eye on the situation, but it does not plan any immediate action."

The fact is that the FDA's freedom of action in the cosmetics field is severely limited by the 1938 Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. The Government must ferret out on its own what is contained in any cosmetic product, and even when it has reason to believe a product is not safe it cannot do anything about it—except ask the industry voluntarily to change its formula—unless the FDA can establish legal proof that the product is dangerous.

COSMETIC SAFETY PROVISIONS OF H.R. 1235

The cosmetic section of H.R. 1235, on the other hand, would require the manufacturer to establish the safety of any ingredient before it can be used, would prohibit the use of any carcinogens in cosmetics, would open up the manufacturers' complaint files to FDA inspectors, and would require a listing on the label of all ingredients so that an allergic individual could determine at the point of sale whether a particular product was safe for him or her to use, and could thus stay away from those ingredients the consumer knows will cause a reaction.

At present, the customer is the unwilling guinea pig for the industry; if there are enough insurance claims, the firm may then change its formula. But the customer has no way of knowing what the manufacturer has substituted for the ingredient which caused the problem, or even whether the formula has in fact been changed. The allergists do not know either. Hence, in millions of homes, one finds partly used containers of cosmetic products which have been purchased in good faith but which cannot comfortably or safely be used. The economic waste is tremendous, but the pain and suffering are worse.

If anyone still thinks this is a problem only for women, he should read the article which appeared in Monday's Wall Street Journal, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 14, 1972]

COMING CLEAN—SKIN DOCTORS COMPLAIN SOME INGREDIENTS IN SOAPS, SHAVE LOTIONS CAUSE USERS TO BE ALLERGIC TO SUN

(By Richard D. James)

CHICAGO.—The cosmetics industry, already under fire because of potential health hazards from the widely used germ-killer hexachlorophene, is coming under attack from a new direction.

A number of physicians specializing in skin disorders report that they are seeing an appreciable number of people who have been made allergic to sunlight by some of the big-selling after-shave lotions and by the deodorant toilet soaps that contain germ-killing chemicals other than hexachlorophene. The doctors aren't certain what ingredients in the lotions cause the allergy, but with the soaps they claim that a chemical known as tribromosalicylanilide (TBS) is the main offender.

Most people who use the products aren't bothered by them, but those who are bothered developed scaly, itchy sores on their faces, hands and other parts of the body when exposed to sunlight, the doctors say. The reaction, similar to that caused by poison oak, usually stops when the patients stop using the soaps and lotions, but some sufferers remain allergic to sunlight for years afterward and have to remain indoors virtually all the time. In a few cases they can't even sit near a closed window because light coming through the glass will trigger the reaction. Sometimes light from a fluorescent lamp is enough to cause trouble.

MANY CASES IN HAWAII

The allergy occurs most frequently in parts of the country that receive a lot of sunlight. "Not a week goes by that I don't see one new patient with this problem, and on the average I probably see two new cases a week," says Dr. Harry L. Arnold, a Honolulu dermatologist.

In other areas the number of new cases follows a seasonal pattern, swinging up in warm-weather months and down in the winter, except that there is an upturn around Christmas, the time when people go south for vacations and receive new after-shave lotions as gifts. The allergy also seems to hit men over 40 more frequently than others. The doctors don't understand why.

Some dermatologists have stopped using the soaps and lotions and are recommending that their patients follow suit. They maintain that antibacterial agents in soaps aren't needed. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration says it has received a small number of complaints of photoallergy, as it's called, connected with the soaps and lotions and is keeping an eye on the situation, but it doesn't plan any immediate action.

Companies that manufacture the products generally say they are aware that the products have caused some people to develop the allergy, but they contend that considering the millions of users, the problem is so rare that they consider their products safe and useful. "We take the view that the risk is small and that there are many people who want such a product, so we make it available. My conscience doesn't bother me," says J. David Justice, assistant research director at Lever Brothers Co., a deodorant soap maker.

NOT MONSTROUS, BUT SIGNIFICANT

Doctors agree that the number may be small, but they argue that even a small number is unneeded and unacceptable. "I understand that the companies believe they really aren't harming many people, but who are they helping?" asks Dr. John Epstein, a dermatologist at the University of California medical school.

No count of the number of persons afflicted is available, but the dermatologists estimate that nationally they see between 500 and 1,000 new cases a year, and some say perhaps four times that number never come to doctors' attention. "We really don't know how big the problem is. It can't be monstrous, but it is significant," says Dr. Frederick Urbach, head of the dermatology department at Temple University.

The problem could become worse, some experts believe. They point out that the troublesome chemical in the soaps soon may be used even more widely than it is now because it is a logical substitute for hexachlorophene. The federal government recently proposed restrictions regarding use of hexachlorophene. The proposed restrictions resulted from research showing that hexachlorophene—used widely in shampoos and deodorants—can cause brain damage under certain circumstances.

About half of the two billion bars of toilet soap sold annually contain an antibacterial agent, and there are some 115 million bottles of after-shave lotion sold each year, trade sources estimate.

The deodorant soaps that cause the most trouble, the doctors say, are Lifebuoy and Phase III, made by Lever Brothers Co.; Zest and Safeguard, made by Procter and Gamble Co., and Cuticura, made by Purex Corp. After-shave lotions cited by doctors are Hai Karate, made by Pfizer Inc.; English Leather by Mem Co.; Swank Inc.'s Jade East, and Brut by Faberge Inc.

LIME OIL SUSPECTED

Although the doctors aren't certain what ingredients in the lotions cause the trouble—mainly because the companies generally refuse to disclose the products' contents, even for medical research—they believe the trouble lies with the various oils that are used to give the lotions their fragrance. "We know, for instance, that in the oil of limes there is a powerful photo-sensitizing agent, and I suspect it is lime oil that causes the trouble in lotions such as Hai Karate," says Dr. Harvey Blank, dermatology professor at the University of Miami in Florida.

The doctors say synthetically produced fragrances, which don't utilize the natural oils, don't produce the allergy; the doctors recommend that their patients use cheaper lotions, which generally contain the synthetics.

Most of the companies that make lotions containing natural fragrances say they are unaware of any photoallergy problems with their products. But at least one lotion-maker, Faberge, tends to confirm the doctors' suspicion. "We think the agent (that causes the allergy) might be one of the oils in it," says Phillip Brass, executive vice president. "We've been working on that oil, attempting to find a substitute for it." In the meantime, he says, the company is reducing the amount of that oil in the lotion. Mr. Brass didn't identify the oil.

In the case of soaps, the manufacturers say they are unaware of any current problem. They say that the few photoallergy cases of which they are aware occurred several years ago when TBS—the ingredient doctors believe causes the problem—contained impurities and that it was the impurities that caused the trouble. Today, they say, the TBS used in soaps is almost 100% pure and presents no problem. They go on to argue that if cases of the allergy are still occurring, they are among a tiny number of people who were once sensitized by the old impure TBS and now also react to the pure chemical.

Lifebuoy, Safeguard, Zest, Phase III and a new toilet soap, Irish Spring, being test-

marketed by Colgate-Palmolive Co., all contain TBS. It is included in the soaps to kill skin bacteria that produce body odors.

Most of the dermatologists believe that the germ-killing soaps aren't needed by the general public. "They're probably a good idea for prison chain gangs, soldiers and others who have a high risk of contracting skin infections, but most people aren't in that category," says a New York City dermatologist.

The doctors also point out that there's growing evidence that normal skin bacteria, which every person has and which are the type killed by the deodorant soaps, probably play a protective role in fighting off disease-causing bacteria. "Those of us who are studying the skin bacteriology have stopped using them (deodorant soaps). I once used them myself, but I've stopped, and I discourage their use among our staff," says Dr. Blank from Miami University medical school.

Some, but not all, doctors think that TBS should be removed from soaps. "I think it is dangerous. It's not fair to say that percentagewise the risk is small. If you've got a thing like this, you shouldn't expose anybody to it," says Dr. Arnold of Honolulu.

Dr. Urbach of Temple University adds: "It's a question of relative worth. If you're going to save someone's life by using a poisonous chemical, you can take a higher risk. But if you simply want someone's armpit to smell good, you have less of a trade-off."

Some doctors also point out that a few years ago Denmark ordered TBS withdrawn from soaps after a large number of people developed reactions to the chemical. U.S. soap companies, however, respond that the amount of TBS used in Denmark was more than double the amount being used in U.S. soaps.

Doctors who don't favor banning the chemical say that at least it should be listed on the package. Some deodorant soaps do presently list their contents, but not all.

## BICYCLING

### HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH) recently spoke before the Bicycle Institute of America, Inc., at their annual convention in Boca Raton, Fla.

In his speech Mr. KOCH discusses the need for facilities for cycling and points to the obvious benefits of cycling—better health, cleaner air due to fewer cars, recreation, and so forth. Mr. KOCH introduced the Bicycle Transportation Act of 1971, which I cosponsored, to authorize construction of exclusive or preferential bicycle lanes, and has spoken out in the Congress many times on the necessity of providing proper bicycle facilities for the 70 million Americans now bicycling.

But, Mr. KOCH sees bicycling as part of the total transportation picture and I agree with him. In his speech he says :

I believe we must have a single transportation trust fund to support the total transportation needs of the country in the 1970's and beyond.

In this regard, Mr. KOCH has introduced legislation for a unified transportation trust fund utilizing the already existing billions in the highway trust fund for use in both mass transit and highways. I have cosponsored this legislation and believe that the concept is one we must accept if we are ever to solve our chaotic transportation problems.

As Mr. KOCH said:

Indefinite continuation of the self-feeding Highway Trust Fund, along with a continuing policy of holding those funds inviolate is folly.

Bicycling is a very popular means of transportation now, and a total transportation system is a necessity. I am pleased therefore to insert in the RECORD at this time a copy of Congressman KOCH's informative and interesting speech.

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN EDWARD I. KOCH

Thank you, Mr. Snyder, and good morning ladies and gentlemen. It is a distinct pleasure and an honor to be with you this morning, and to be part of the annual meeting of what is so obviously a vital and robust industry.

I must say in response to the very kind introduction of your President, Bill Snyder, that if, as he says, I am known for being interested in "people-oriented" legislation, that is high honor indeed.

I'm afraid, however, that I am also rapidly getting a reputation and becoming even better known for something that may not be quite so high an honor . . . and that is that I am probably the world's worst bicycle rider. I know that's a terrible admission to make to this audience, and I assure you that I am working valiantly to learn. But as I make my faltering, wobbly way around Central Park on a Sunday morning, I'm sure that any of my constituents who see and recognize me wonder if we need federally subsidized bike paths as much as we need federally subsidized cycling lessons for Ed Koch. In fact, I am considered only slightly less a hazard to other cyclists than barking dogs, broken glass and potholes.

Fortunately for cycling, an idea is not always held responsible for the actions of those who espouse it . . . and I do, very much espouse it. For you don't have to be an expert cyclist to appreciate the wondrous potential inherent in this relatively simple machine of yours. You really only have to be able to see and hear and smell and think . . . to see the good health and obvious pleasure radiating from the faces of passing bike riders of all ages . . . and then—

To see the traffic-choked streets and know how much better it would be to have more bikes and fewer cars on those streets . . .

To smell the fresh cut grass and spring flowers as you pedal along, and then to smell the noxious fumes of a half-million cars too many, of a thousand busses too old and inefficient . . .

To hear the happy laughter of children on bikes and then hear the raucous cacophony of blasting horns, screeching brakes, exploding backfires and swearing drivers . . .

No . . . the comparison is all too obvious to a thinking individual, and the bike wins hands down, whether you know how to ride one or not. That's why I am such an ardent supporter of cycling and of the need for prompt legislative action to provide the much needed facilities for cycling.

I live in Manhattan, and if I were the most expert cyclist in the world, I would hesitate to ride my bike to work. Given the state of traffic in New York City, and the disposition of city drivers, I think it can be terribly dangerous. And I believe Mayor Lindsay's action in marking Park Avenue and a few other major thoroughfares with signs and calling them Bikeways is dangerous tokenism. It's too bad New York is lagging so far behind.

I rather think that William F. Buckley had the right idea when, during his unsuccessful campaign for mayor, he proposed an elevated Bikeway over Second Avenue. I have proposed a similar concept—which might make one think that if politics makes strange bedfellows, bicycles make even stranger ones. My idea is to have a special bike lane down Fifth Avenue and another special bike lane up Madison Avenue.

After all, why shouldn't there be facilities so that the bicycle can be used for transportation. Its values for health, fitness, recreation, and improving the environment are too well known to enumerate. Bikes *have* arrived and cyclists have become a force to be reckoned with in the America of 1972.

Why shouldn't there be more of the kind of thing done by State Senator James Mills in California. There *should* be access for cyclists across the Golden Gate Bridge, the Oakland Bay Bridge, and the Verrazano Bridge and Triboro Bridge or any other bridge . . . buses and trails and commuter cycling routes and anything that will help people get out on their bikes without being hemmed in by broad ribbons of concrete which they can neither ride on, cross, or get around.

I know Senator Mills. He's a good legislator and a clear-thinking man. If he's in your corner you have an able ally.

I don't know Assemblyman Stathos in Oregon, but, of course, I salute him. The Oregon bike trail bill is really a major breakthrough, and will surely set the pattern for much legislation to follow.

Getting back to California for a moment, I find it is even possible for me to say a few kind words about Governor Ronald Reagan, even though he vetoed Senator Mills' Bikeways bill, he did appropriate $75,000 for a study to see how bikes fit into a statewide master plan for transportation and he can't be all bad. Quite frankly, I believe that unified transportation planning is an absolute necessity.

Beyond that, I believe we must have a single transportation trust fund to support the total transportation needs of the country in the 1970's and beyond. That is why on July 7, 1971, I introduced a bill which would create such a unified fund, cutting across the rigid modal patterns that today restrict the development of a balanced transportation system, and which results in distorted and inefficient uses of our transportation resources. I believe a unified transportation trust fund is a vital step in achieving our national goals for safe and efficient transportation for everyone.

My bill would create centralized administration of transportation resources that can put the money where the needs are, and a reorganization of transportation authority and operations within the government that will make balanced and effective transportation planning possible.

My bill, H.R. 4571, and the idea behind it, are not without support, both in the Congress and out. Let me read you part of an ad which appeared recently on the Op Ed page of the *New York Times*.

"Instead of dealing with highway construction, railroad needs, urban transit, airport improvement and maritime requirements in separate pieces of legislation, we should approach them as part of an overall transportation plan. This would tie all forms of transportation together to move people and goods fast, safely, comfortably, on time, and at a reasonable cost."

This ad was sponsored by the Mobil Oil Corporation, and called for the creation by Congress of a National Master Transportation Program to be funded by direct Congressional appropriation based on clear and rational priorities.

"In the process," the Mobil ad continues, "Congress should review all special earmarked funds, *including the Highway Trust Fund.*"

And on January 6 of this year, a page one story in the *New York Times* quotes Henry Ford as recommending not only diverting some of the 5 to 6 billion dollar a year High-

way Trust Fund money into mass transit, but also as calling for the creation of a unified transportation planning and funding system.

The latest development in this area came only a few days ago, and represents a major breakthrough; General Motors, Ford, Chrysler and American Motors—the Big Four of the automobile industry—formally announced support of Michigan legislation that would divert part of the state's fuel tax revenues to support mass transit facilities for that states' major cities.

This is a major reversal for Detroit, and will probably signal similar legislative drives by mass transit proponents in other states.

Indefinite continuation of the self-feeding Highway Trust Fund, along with a continuing policy of holding those funds inviolate is folly. The idea of salting away $5 billion a year to build more superhighways has outlived its usefulness, particularly when subway, bus and commuter railroad service around our great urban centers deteriorates every day.

The creation of a unified transportation planning and funding system such as I have proposed, and Mr. Ford, the Mobil Oil Company and many others have endorsed, would make it possible to develop more planned cities like Columbia, Maryland, where cars, buses and bicycles were all planned to be part of the system that provides for the transportation needs of *all* the citizens of that city.

It can provide commuter cycling lanes like those in Davis, California for nearly every city in the country.

It can provide for bike racks at the stations of new, high-speed subway systems, bus lines and commuter railroads.

It can mean less traffic, less noise, less air pollution, and a more efficient use of natural and human resources. It can mean significant environmental improvement and a better, healthier and more pleasant way of life for anyone who wants to travel by car, train, bus, bike or plane.

A single transportation trust fund may not come in the current session of Congress, or the next or the one after that. But it will surely come in the not too distant future, for, like bike riding itself, it is an idea whose time has come.

There are already 51 cosponsors of the Bicycle Transportation Act in the House, and 12 cosponsors of the Cranston-Tunney companion bill in the Senate, with more legislators agreeing to be "on" the bill, as we say, every week. Support is coming in from around the country . . . editorials in prominent newspapers and on television news programs, and countless letters from people, all urging passage of the Bicycle Transportation Act.

And frankly, I don't think the Highway Lobby will oppose us. In fact, it may even support us in a quiet way, for it is concerned about its image as a perpetuator of pollution, noise, traffic and roadside junkyards. It sees itself being held to blame for half of what is wrong with America today and at least suspect about the other half. Rightly or wrongly, the Highway Lobby is beginning to get a guilty conscience. It doesn't want to let the mass transit people get their hands on the highway trust fund, but it has to do *something* . . . and here we come with that something, soft-pedaling our Bicycle Transportation Act out for everybody to see.

"Why not?" the highway lobby thinks. "Everybody likes bikes. Here is a chance for us to line up with the good guys . . . an opportunity for us to stop being the 'heavy', a chance to do something for the people."

I may be over simplifying a bit, but I believe that is exactly what is going to happen. I am convinced that the Bicycle Transportation Act is going to pass in both houses of Congress, and I believe action on the bill is going to begin very soon.

What this will mean to the bikeways movement is nearly impossible to calculate. It will mean not 2 miles or 5 miles or 20 miles, but literally thousands and thousands of miles of paved bike paths lacing the country, running alongside new highways, along abandoned railroad rights of way, in towns, cities and suburbs. It will do on a federal level what the Oregon bill has done on a state level. It will mean special commuter cycling routes in and near our major urban centers. It will, in short, mean a massive step forward in making cycling for transportation, fun, recreation and good health safe and more pleasant for millions of Americans.

As has already been pointed out here this morning . . . this is *people* legislation, and today nobody dares be against it very much. To oppose cycling these days marks one as some kind of a subversive. Who would risk offending the 70 million Americans who ride bikes . . . there are too many of them.

Certainly this industry is to be commended for seeing the need and the potential for bikeways back in 1963, and working as hard, as consistently and as effectively as you have to bring the program along this far.

And while I am talking about effectiveness, I would be remiss in not tipping my hat to your trade association, The Bicycle Institute of America. The B.I.A. has excellent credentials, and is well known and much appreciated by any of us who know or care anything about bicycles, whether we are in the Congress or any of the agencies of the administration.

While doing research for the Bicycle Transportation Act, no matter which direction I or my staff looked for information, whether at the Department of Transportation, Commerce or Interior, everything that was helpful seemed to have originated at the Bicycle Institute.

Your newsletter, which I receive every quarter, and other source materials help make my job easier, mine and others who are trying to do something for cycling. Undeniably, your programs are helping make friends for bikes, for cycling and for the industry.

I must also say that I think your convention theme is right on target. That there is a bike boom going on is obvious; I see evidence of it in New York, in Washington and in the many other cities that I have visited during the last year or so. But obviously there are many challenges to your continued growth.

As has been so well articulated by John Auerbach this morning, one of the biggest challenges you face is making sure that you don't run out of growing room.

In Washington, the District traffic department put up several hundred colorful signs last spring. The signs said: "Bikes Have Equal Rights." Washington knows that, and you and I know it. You must make sure that the rest of the country knows it and accepts it.

But more than equal rights, bikes have an important role to play in a unified transportation system for America.

In his message to the Congress on natural beauty in February of 1967, President Lyndon Johnson said: "I see an America where bicycle paths, running through the hearts of our great cities provide pleasant, healthful recreation for millions of our families."

While I don't place myself on a par with the President of the United States, I too have a vision for America. It is a vision of a country that *moves*, swiftly, efficiently, and freely . . . a country that moves by car, bus, rail, air, bicycle or by foot. We must have that freedom of movement or traffic will choke us to death.

I see an America where legislation will be passed for a unified, integrated transportation system, in which all modes of transportation will be used effectively for the betterment of human existence.

I see an America where there will not be one park, one airport, one suburb, or one part of any city of which it must be ruefully said, "you can't *get* there from here." It will be an America where all forms of transportation will be made part of a smooth-functioning system, whether it be luxury air travel, urban mass transit, or personal systems of transportation like the bicycle.

Since we are living in an age where people and what they want and need are beginning to count and be more important than enlarging the establishment or further expanding institutions, I expect to live long enough to see that vision become a reality.

Thank you for your kind attention this morning, and for inviting me to be with you. When it comes time to arouse public support for the Bicycle Transportation Act, I know I can count on you.

Goodbye and good luck.

---

## THE SPACE SHUTTLE: A DOD PROJECT IN NASA CLOTHING?

**HON. BELLA S. ABZUG**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the space shuttle, which promises to be the most wasteful boondoggle since the SST and the C–5A, is being presented to us as a space exploration and development project and is listed in the budget of the National Aeronautics and Space Agency. However, there is mounting evidence to the effect that it is primarily designed and intended for military use. I recognize that our defense budget is extremely swollen, but I do not think that the way to reduce it is to list military projects in the budgets of other agencies.

Yesterday's New York Times carried an illuminating article on this subject by Brian O'Leary, an astronomy professor at San Francisco State College. I think that it is well worth reading, and I include it in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks:

DO WE REALLY WANT A SPACE SHUTTLE?

(By Brian O'Leary)

OAKLAND, CALIF.—President Nixon's recent authorization of a $10-to-$14-billion space shuttle has finally brought this budding program to public attention. More than $200 million has already been quietly appropriated for shuttle development. The $10-to-$14-billion total required to purchase and run the system through the nineteen-eighties represents a Federal outlay about twenty times that requested for the supersonic transport (SST) that was defeated by the Senate.

As in the case of the SST, Congressional debates are certain to occur and fundamental questions be raised about the shuttle's role in national priorities. Senator Walter F. Mondale considers the program "a colossal waste" and promises a vigorous effort to defeat the shuttle in the Senate this spring. Senator Edmund Muskie has also declared his opposition to the shuttle. It is likely that this will become a key issue during this year's Presidential campaign.

Undoubtedly a large factor in the Administration's decision to proceed with the shuttle—which the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has been promoting for the last two years—is to provide employment

relief for a slumping aerospace industry during an election year.

Politics aside, the important question should be, do we really want a space shuttle? Is it compatible with our goals and priorities? If so, is it more economical than existing space transportation systems?

During the last year NASA contracted $1.9 million to three companies to perform a cost benefit analysis of the space shuttle. They concluded that the shuttle would be more economical than existing space transportation systems after a few years of operation. Because these conclusions conflicted with an earlier study performed for the Air Force by the Rand Corporation, the economy of the space shuttle has caused considerable controversy.

Yet a balanced presentation to decisionmakers of technical information bearing on the costs and benefits of the shuttle cannot be accomplished without some degree of effort outside the perimeter of NASA and its contractors. Such effort is now almost entirely missing and is badly needed before a national decision can be made.

I believe NASA must answer in detail the following questions:

First, what is the shuttle and what will it do? Time and time again configurations have been shifted or obfuscated. The original concept linked the shuttle with a permanent manned space station as a stepping stone for manned flight to the planets. When this approach appeared unpopular, the shuttle became an end in itself—a $12.8-billion two-stage fully reusable system which could hoist more than two million pounds of manned and unmanned payloads into earth orbit each year.

This can be compared to the present rate of about 10,000 pounds per year of unmanned nondefense payload, barely sufficient to comprise 20 per cent of the capacity of one shuttle flight (one shuttle is thus capable of carrying four adult elephants into earth orbit). But when that price seemed too high, we are given a $5.5-billion-plus configuration which can perform essentially the same tasks as the $12.8-billion version, the only major difference being the booster is now expendable rather than reusable. And now the President's budget discloses that $5.5 billion is in fact an underestimate; it will actually cost us $7 to $11 billion to start with and an additional $3 billion to operate during the nineteen-eighties. What next?

Second, what precisely are NASA's goals for shuttle use? Because the present unmanned traffic rate into earth orbit is low and relatively inexpensive it is hard to avoid the conclusion that the shuttle will be used for manned stunts of little intrinsic value. Yet even in unmanned operations it is claimed that satellite retrieval and/or refurbishment can save enough to pay for the shuttle investment. Is such a claim valid for the space traffic rates of these days? I am doubtful.

Third, will the shuttle be primarily a workhorse for the Department of Defense? Assuming present traffic rates and expenditures on unmanned payloads launched into earth orbit, the answer would certainly be yes. Moreover, the enormous engine thrust and wings projected for the shuttle respond largely to an Air Force request for sufficient cross range to pass over the Soviet Union; the shuttle cost could be reduced considerably by removing these constraints. Otherwise it would seem that the Air Force should purchase, administer and operate the shuttle. The defense emphasis of an ostensibly NASA shuttle would also deter international participation.

Wouldn't this be an auspicious time for the Administration to set a goal, more in tune with human values, which would make good use of the talents offered by aerospace workers?

## THE 54TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

### HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, as one studies the history of what are now the Baltic Republics of the Soviet Union, one cannot help but be impressed by two themes which have recurred through the centuries. One is the seemingly endless lust for domination by the big powers who have had occasion to make their influence felt in that unhappy area. The other is the undying courage and resistance of the native inhabitants of the area to the overwhelming forces which have held them in bondage. As we commemorate the 54th anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence, which took place on February 16, 1918, it is fitting that we make note of these inexorable historical cycles and ponder their implications for the existence of small nations which desire nothing more than self-determination.

The bearers of a uniquely Baltic culture and of one of the most ancient Indo-European languages, the Lithuanians had by the 14th century established a powerful independent state which extended far beyond the Baltic area and was united with Poland until 1795. During this early period Lithuania was indeed a crossroads country which alternately rebuffed attempts by the Germans to dominate Russia and by the Mongols and Tartars to dominate Europe. The third partition of Poland resulted in the period of Russian rule which was repeatedly rebelled against by the Lithuanian people. The 19th-century czarist policies of forced russification and political and economic repression did not succeed, for the Lithuanians remained true to their religion, their language, and their traditions.

The tragedy which was World War I turned out to be a blessing in disguise for the beleaguered peoples of the Baltic. With their land thoroughly ravaged by the Russian and later the German troops, their fields and houses burnt, their economy in ruins, nevertheless the Lithuanians assembled a congress of delegates who took advantage of the chaos produced by the war and the revolution in Russia to declare the independence of their nation. With the aid of friendly forces, the Lithuanians drove out the newly attacking Red army and embarked on a period of reconstruction and unprecedented prosperity.

For 20 years the people of Lithuania were once again free to speak their own language and develop their own culture. But this freedom was tragically short lived, as once again the machinations and intrigues of Germany and Russia leading up to World War II made pawns of the Baltic nations in the game of big power politics. After periods of Russian and then Nazi occupation, Lithuania was finally incorporated into the Soviet Union in 1944.

Since that time, the tsarist policies of forced russification and political repression have been resurrected, with the greatly augmenting factor of Soviet ruthlessness and efficiency. Although the Baltic republics remain the most tightly sealed-off parts of the Soviet Union, enough news manages to filter out to give us a painfully vivid picture of a people languishing under a highly authoritarian and repressive regime. Use of the Lithuanian language is discouraged in every conceivable way; the Catholic religion is forcibly suppressed; large population transfers have moved Lithuanians to the eastern parts of the Soviet Union, replacing them with Russians and other nationalities; the government and administrative organs are composed of nonnative personnel; expressions of nationalism and assertions of the inviolability of human rights are rewarded with harassment, banishment, and imprisonment. And yet the Lithuanian people persevere.

Perhaps the most dramatic example of this perseverance and desire for human freedom is the attempted defection to the United States by the Lithuanian sailor, Simas Kudirka. Without going into the complexities of how his case was handled by the people directly involved, I would like to quote from one of the pieces of writing which were found among his personal effects after he had been returned to the Soviet ship. He had copied down the following words:

> A man born in a cave cannot appreciate what freedom is. A man who has been hungry all his life cannot be fed. To die for freedom is worth the risk.

We can only hope that more Lithuanians will not have to be imprisoned or die for the freedom which they so richly deserve.

## KEEP FOOD PRICES DOWN

### HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today renewing my call for the President to extend phase II price controls to raw agricultural products in order to head off a 4-percent food price rise predicted for this year by the Agriculture Department.

The American consumer is already overburdened and overcharged, and for the President to ignore the galloping inflation of food prices—especially meat—is irresponsible.

The USDA-predicted increase in food prices would considerably exceed the 25-percent annual overall guideline set by the Price Commission. I believe it was a mistake to exempt raw agricultural products from phase II economic controls and permit retailers to pass along to consumers any cost increases.

The sad thing about this food price increase is that the individual farmer will probably see very little of the money because it will be going to the big agribusiness corporations, including the packers and processors.

This exemption of the most important item on any family's budget must end. The administration must overcome its fear of giant agribusiness and begin protecting the consumer.

Another way it can do this is by permitting increased meat imports. The high cost of the meat is not a result of consumer bidding prices up, as Agriculture Secretary Butz would have us believe; that argument is just another example of the probusiness, anticonsumer bias of the Nixon administration. It is the result of forces well out of the reach of consumers—and Dr. Butz knows it, even if he will not admit it.

I am inserting in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the New York Post, which should be of interest to anyone who wants to keep food prices reasonable.

The editorial follows:

MR. BUTZ TELLS OFF THE HOUSEWIVES

Although many helpful menu-planning suggestions have been offered to homemakers by the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, few compare with the latest from Secretary Earl L. Butz. He advises the housewife faced with spiraling beef, lamb, pork and poultry prices to take a meat-ax to her food budget and "not eat quite so much."

Indeed, the Secretary maintains that "Mrs. Housewife" is personally to blame in the matter. "These prices," he has informed the Congressional Joint Economic Committee, "aren't set by farmers. They are set by consumers."

The theory that the consumer or customer is always wrong is unquestionably popular in some areas of the Nixon Administration and Butz is circulating it freely on his fence-mending visits to the farm states.

It is a fact that meat is increasingly in demand and that supply is lagging. It is also true that the costs of middlemen—packagers and processors—have been going up. But that does not constitute evidence of consumer responsibility for higher meat prices—especially not when Butz is simultaneously predicting a $2 billion increase in farmers' receipts from livestock sales this year.

Many informed Americans think that one practical short-term solution would be to increase meat imports, but Butz considers that a "negligble" kind of price relief. How can he be so sure? Last year, imports ran 30 million pounds below established quotas. In the meantime, domestic beef raisers are continuing to fatten stock in the hope of further fattening profits.

The essential objectives of Butz' blitz are clearly 1) to forestall price controls on raw agricultural products—however much they may appeal to Washington's price stabilizers—and 2) to round up as many cattlemen's votes as possible at a time when many seem inclined to stray. It does not follow that either is in the economic interest of the American consumer or that Butz can make scapegoat an appetizing meat dish.

## THIRTY-TWO YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE YMCA

### HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues Mrs. Mayme Gregory of Janesville, Wis., who has faithfully and loyally served the YMCA in that city for 32 years.

She has worked as secretary, receptionist, bookkeeper, friend, and girl-Friday to thousands of men and boys from Janesville for these 32 years. The Janesville YMCA has been very fortunate to have Mrs. Gregory working there and I know that she is going to be sorely missed.

As a token of their affection and respect, the friends and supporters of the Janesville YMCA are having a testimonial dinner for Mrs. Gregory on February 29. I can think of no other person who has so richly deserved such an honor.

## GERMANY'S MOVE TO THE EAST

### HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the Ostpolitik carried out by West German Socialist Chancellor Willy Brandt has not brought any advantages to the West and to West Germany, but only concessions to the East German, Polish, and Soviet Communists. In fact, one can hardly understand how it is possible that the West German Government could have signed treaties legitimizing the Communist rule over a great part of the German people and over so many Central and Eastern European nations.

The excuse of the authors of the Ostpolitik has been the all too familiar illusion that communism is mellowing, changing, and melting away; that Communist armies, especially the Soviet Army, are becoming instruments of peace instead of instruments of aggression which they have always been. This deadly illusion is spread by West German Socialists, many of whom seem to be sympathetic with communism, and it may well bring Germany to a neutral status without the protection of other nations. Not too much later, the results of this illusion could be to bring West Germany into a Communist system—into a unified but Communist Germany, and later Europe.

The West German Ostpolitik is based on this enormous error in judging Communist intentions, which the Bonn government has been presenting to the free world. The truth is that the Communist armies have increased, not diminished their strength, that the Communist aim is not any improvement of the fate of the people under its rule and European security but the domination of Germany, Europe, and the world. There is no excuse for the West German Socialists doing anything to further these aims.

Last month a former American Ambassador, Mr. Phelps Phelps sent a letter to the New York Times pointing out how the so-called Berlin Agreement has been a poor deal for the West and especially for West Germany.

The letter follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 12, 1972]

BERLIN'S WALL REMAINS

TO THE EDITOR: In order to be able to ratify the Bonn-Moscow Treaty for economic and technical aid to the Soviet Union, West Germany had to await a quadripartite agreement on Berlin, acceptable to the four powers, and an access accord. The former, approved Sept. 3, 1971, merely confirms the original regulations as drafted after World War II. The latter, relative to access of goods and persons, was adopted Dec. 11, 1971.

Goods may move between both Germanys if they are sealed by proper officials and accompanied by proper documents. Regarding persons, the stipulations represent meager concessions, grudgingly ounced out, indicative of the brutish constrictions typical of East Germany. The West Germans are required to go through humiliating and frustrating experiences, and the East Germans may not go west at all unless 65 or over if on pension or over 60 if very ill.

To visit someone in East Germany or East Berlin, the West Berliner must have a certificate, called an invitation, obtained from the person in the East, who must apply for it at the Mayor's office. When received by the visitor named therein, he must carry a passport and obtain a visa or road privilege at the border, valid only for the place specified. A telegram can substitute for a certificate only if the Eastern relative is extremely ill or dying.

Until Dec. 31, 1971, the West German going east had to exchange hard currency for somewhat under $2 for the visa and a similar amount if the visit was for one day or about $3.50 for each day if longer. The maximum stay was thirty days annually unless the person visited was extremely ill or dying.

On Jan. 1, 1972, West Germany undertook to pay for its citizens' visas. The total is estimated at about 204.9 million West marks annually for three years. Excluded from visits are those who left East Germany "illegally since 13 August 1961" and West Germans who committed crimes recognizable by the East Germans.

This is a far cry from Chancellor Brandt's dream of a unified Germany. The Berlin wall remains. Yet President Nixon hailed the agreement as satisfactory during Willy Brandt's last visit to Washington.

PHELPS PHELPS.

New York, Jan. 29, 1972.

## THE FREDERICK DOUGLASS HOME

### HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, February 17, 1972*

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, when the Frederick Douglass Home was dedicated on February 14, 1972, I had the opportunity to be present and hear the comments of the Secretary of the Interior. For those who were not able to be present, I am pleased to insert the text of the remarks of Secretary Morton at the dedication for it not only tells us a little about Cedar Hill, but something about Frederick Douglass:

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR ROGERS C. B. MORTON AT DEDICATION CEREMONIES OF FREDERICK DOUGLASS HOME

When I was sworn in as Secretary of the Interior, the President charged me with two great responsibilities. He said I must lead the way in the conservation of the beauty of our land and its vast resources and tirelessly pursue the preservation of those things important to our American heritage and cultural life.

This shrine which we dedicate today is a great example of preserving something of value that will be enjoyed and revered by all

those who visit it and even those who casually pass by.

How fortunate we are to have our great National Park System with all its skills and competence. Not only to bring back to life those important areas and structures that have laid dormant so long, but also, to manage them, display them and artfully make them available to all Americans.

We are excited about bringing the Frederick Douglass Home into the Department of the Interior during this, the centennial year of the National Parks.

One hundred years ago . . . Yellowstone National Park . . . far in the West . . . was brought into being out of the wonderland of the frontier.

I dare say that few here today have had the opportunity to see this magnificent monument of nature so very far away.

But the President, understanding this, has directed that the Parks . . . in the second century of their history . . . be brought to the people. His legacy of Parks program assures this will be done.

Today is a very special day. As today, in the spirit of conservation and preservation:

In the spirit of this Administration.

In the spirit of our great National Capitol Park System and

In the spirit of of Frederick Douglass, who devoted his life to the highest American principles, we are joining together, to dedicate this his home.

Frederick Douglass leaves for America's history a dramatic reminiscence of a great and moral man. A man whose powerful voice still rings with lessons for our own time.

In the knowledge that the Frederick Douglass Legacy stands for the benefit of all Americans, it is significant that Congress has marked this, his home, as a National Shrine.

President Nixon allocated over $400,000 for Cedar Hill's restoration but the high privilege of bringing it to life is your's and mine today.

The American poet, Walt Whitman, was a contemporary of Douglass. Both felt the country's vigor. Whitman wrote after the Civil War:

"Political democracy, as it exists and practically works in America, with all its threatening evils, supplies a training school for making first-class men. It is life's gymnasium, not of good only, but of all."

He gloried in the fact that the American contest for life was open to all men. Douglass proved Whitman right.

For Douglass both life and freedom began at age 17 when he over-powered a professional slave broker, and fled from a plantation where his birth had only vaguely been recorded as to time and place.

Believing justice was too often in jeopardy, Douglass always eloquently stood in its defense.

It wasn't easy, it occupied every year of his life; and when Douglass died in 1895, the task was still not completed.

Douglass added volumes to the understanding of what it meant to be a *free and dignified man.*

He hammered away at Southern slavery and Northern hypocrisy when he said:

"You degrade us, and then ask why we are degraded—Douglass said—"You shut our mouths and then ask why we don't speak—You close your colleges and seminaries against us, and then ask why we don't know more."

Douglass continued his fight for equal rights after the Civil War.

Three grateful post-War administrations placed him in high office. Douglass spent the last 15 years of his life here at Cedar Hill and he always remained the crusading defender of justice in jeopardy.

The inspiration of Frederick Douglass raises a dignity in all men. Today, we dedicate his home knowing that future generations will find this inspiration; this greatness, this decency that made Frederick Douglass an outstanding American.

Thank you for inviting me to share with you, the honor of bringing new life to the Frederick Douglass Memorial Home.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, February 21, 1972*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Preserve me, O God: For in Thee do I put my trust.*—Psalm 16: 1.

God of our fathers and our God, to Thee we come praying that our land may be forever bright with freedom's holy light. For this we thank Thee: for the contribution of our Founding Fathers and particularly for the contribution of our first President, whose birthday we celebrate today. May the spirit which was in him become the spirit which shall be in us as we face the experiences of these challenging times.

Bless Thou our President as he talks with the leaders of China. Grant him courage, faith, and wisdom that he may play his full part in ushering in a new day of peace on earth and good will among men.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 8699. An act to provide an Administrative Assistant to the Chief Justice of the United States; and

H.R. 9180. An act to provide for the temporary assignment of a U.S. magistrate from one judicial district to another.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 166) entitled "An act to designate the Stratified Primitive Area as a part of the Washakie Wilderness, heretofore known to the South Absaroka Wilderness, Shoshone National Forest, in the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. METCALF, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. HATFIELD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1394. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act to abolish the referees' salary and expense fund, to provide that fees and charges collected by the clerk of a court of bankruptcy in bankruptcy proceedings be paid into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States, to provide salaries and expenses of referees be paid from the general fund of the Treasury, and to eliminate the statutory criteria presently required to be considered by the Judicial Conference in fixing salaries of full-time referees;

S. 1395. An act to amend section 48 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 76) to increase the maximum compensation allowable to receivers and trustees;

S. 1396. An act to amend section 35 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 63) and section 631 and 634 of title 28, United States Code, to permit full-time referees in bankruptcy to perform the duties of a U.S. magistrate;

S. 2359. An act for the relief of Willard O. Brown;

S.J. Res. 169. Joint resolution to pay tribute to law enforcement officers of this country on Law Day, May 1, 1972.

S.J. Res. 189. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning, March 26, 1972, as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action" and to designate Sunday, March 26, 1972, as a national day of prayer for these Americans; and

S.J. Res. 190. Joint resolution to provide for an extension of the term of the Commission on the Bankruptcy Laws of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that Mr. STENNIS be appointed a conferee on the bill (H.R. 12067) entitled "An act making appropriations for Foreign Assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes" in lieu of Mr. MCCLELLAN, excused.

## GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 16, 1972, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MAZZOLI) to read George Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. MAZZOLI read the Farewell Address, as follows:

*To the people of the United States.*

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds