

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am ranking minority member, and detailed organizational questions put to all witnesses by the subcommittee chairman and me—which will enable us to take a comprehensive approach to the development and funding of HMO's.

I share the expressed concern by the President that we "capitalize on existing strengths," provide "equal access for all to health care," assure "balanced supply and demand," and bring "efficient organization" to our health care system, and I will continue to work to achieve these objectives.

The President's stated interest in heart disease, cancer, alcoholism, drug abuse, sickle cell disease, and venereal disease, are most gratifying. I am pleased to have had an active role in authorizing and supporting these legislative initiatives, some of which have been enacted into law.

I will soon join in the introduction of a National Heart, Blood Vessel, Lung and Blood Act of 1972—which I believe should have administration support—which will allow us to achieve for America's No. 1 killer, heart disease, what was done for cancer.

The initiatives the President suggests, to apply science and technology in a new Federal partnership with the private sector of our economy, can, I feel, have their foundation in provisions in legislation I authored in Public Law 91-296 and Public Law 92-157; and also in legislation now pending before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee which I support.

The President chose to emphasize the bipartisan efforts of the administration and the Congress to attain better health care for all Americans. I strongly agree with the President's closing words, which bear repeating:

If the Administration and the Congress continue to act together—then the 1970's will be remembered as an era in which the United States took the historic step of making the health of the entire population not only a great goal but a practical objective.

Mr. President, I think there is more ground for optimism than for a long time in this statement.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PEARSON ON MONDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday after the two leaders have been recognized under the standing order, the distinguished Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROVISION FOR THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS ON MONDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON) on Monday, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business of not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PUBLIC DEBT LIMITATION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for the record, what is the pending question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FANNIN). The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

H.R. 12910, an act to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer.

PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the program for Monday is as follows:

The Senate will convene at 10 a.m.

After the two leaders have been recognized under the standing order, the senior Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON)

will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business of not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

On Monday the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the various committee funding resolutions, and if past experience is to be a lamp unto our feet, we may be absolutely sure that there will be rollcall votes on Monday.

Further consideration of H.R. 12910, the debt limit bill, will be deferred until Tuesday.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and at 4:02 p.m. the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 6, 1972, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 3, 1972:

JOINT FEDERAL-STATE LAND USE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR ALASKA

Jack O. Horton, of Wyoming, to be a member of the Joint Federal-State Land Use Planning Commission for Alaska; new position.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION BOARD

O. Louis Olsson, of Connecticut, to be a member of the National Credit Union Board for a term expiring December 31, 1977, vice John J. Hutchinson, term expired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 3, 1972:

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The following-named persons to be members of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for terms expiring March 31, 1978:

Melvin E. Sims, of Illinois.

E. Riddle Lage, of Oregon.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DRUG COUNSELING AIDS YOUTH AND PARENTS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as a coauthor of the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969, which is now Public Law 91-528, I have long felt that educating our youth on the problems and dangers of drugs was a necessary complement to other programs designed to curb drug abuse.

South Gate, Calif., has taken the lead in proving the efficacy of such programs to educate our children on the effects of drugs.

On the recommendation of the mayor of South Gate, Frank Gafkowski, Jr., the city council approved a counseling program for first offenders under the auspices of the South Gate Police Department.

The program, conducted by law enforcement officer Ron George, has been a success, not only in informing the children about drugs and drug abuse, but also in educating the parents.

Officer George, a recognized expert on drugs, considers himself a "counselor," not a teacher, and the results of his consultations speak for themselves: Of the 27 youths who have attended the "rap sessions," none have been convicted of a second offense.

In order to encourage other cities to follow the excellent example set by South Gate, I ask unanimous consent to

place at this point in the RECORD an article which appeared in the February 5, 1972, South Gate Press, written by Ann Gaff, describing the drug counseling program.

The article follows:

DRUG COUNSELING AIDS YOUTH AND PARENTS
(By Ann Gaff)

"Everything You've Always Wanted to Know About Drugs and Drug Abuse and Were Afraid to Ask" might well be a sub-title for juvenile counseling initiated Dec. 4 by South Gate City Council to aid first time offenders.

Although 27 youths have been scheduled to appear for Saturday counseling, 107 young persons and their parents have attended sessions which are conducted by Officer Ron George.

George, with South Gate Police Dept. for five years, has worked in the narcotics division with Sgt. Al Knox and Sgt. Jim Reed,

now a police lieutenant. He is recognized by the courts as an expert on drugs. Twenty-six years of age, George and his wife have five children, two sons and three daughters, ranging in age from two to seven years.

"Each counseling session lasts from three to three and a half hours, depending on the feedback and response," says George, who conducts the sessions in street clothes, rather than police uniform.

Each youth referred for counseling by the juvenile bureau is a first offender. One prerequisite is that a parent or parents also attend. Average age for referral has been 14 to 15 years but there was one nine-year-old, two age 16 and one 17 years. Two girls have been referred to date from the total of 27.

Most interesting is the number of young persons—and parents who repeat the counseling—although their presence is not required by the juvenile bureau.

Three were supposed to attend week before last at a counseling session but 27 showed up for the discussion and films. Seven had been referred for counseling the week before but, again, there were 27 present.

"Both parents and juveniles become very honest with one another," George said. "I'm not there as a teacher and they are not there as students having to listen to a lecture. I encourage open and frank discussion. And it's been pretty effective; serving a dual purpose: educating juveniles, who pretty much know about drugs and drug abuse, and educating parents, who don't know."

Those referred are required to attend a minimum of two Saturday counseling sessions. If George feels more time is needed, he asks them to return. However, some young people have returned with their parents, on their own, as many as seven and eight times.

George may show one or two films at a session but he feels there is more impact from open discussion. The five films available are all contemporary and last from 15 to 20 minutes each. Dealing with heroin, LSD, amphetamines, marijuana and barbiturates, they are produced by American Educational Films.

On recommendation of Mayor Frank Gafkowsky, Jr., city council approved juvenile counseling for first offenders who live in South Gate or attend a school in this community. Of the total 27, 90 per cent have been South Gate residents, Officer George reports.

"Everything You've Always Wanted to Know About Drugs and Drug Abuse and Were Afraid to Ask" is available to every parent—and every young person—in South Gate. If you have a problem, or there is a problem within your family, contact South Gate Police Dept., LO 7-2222, and ask to attend a Saturday counseling session. The life you save may be your own, or the life of a loved one.

SECRETARIES WEEK

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, last year at this time I was pleased to bring to my colleagues' attention the week set aside as Secretaries Week. Today I am happy to remind my colleagues that the week of April 23 through April 29 has been designated Secretaries Week for 1972, and April 26 as Secretaries Day.

We have a fine opportunity during this time to pay special tribute to the men and women who work with us day by day and whose services are so invaluable

to us for the accomplishment of a smooth-flowing and effective operation.

Since 1952 the last full week in April has been celebrated as Secretaries Week, and employers in every field join together in recognizing the vital role played by secretaries in the various walks of life, and secretaries participate in emphasizing the responsibility which they hold to their profession.

Traditionally during this time, chapters of the National Secretaries Association sponsor educational workshops and seminars, and NSA members will address various meetings of civic, educational, and professional groups, stressing the professional objectives of their own organization.

I hope my colleagues will join with me next month in observance of Secretaries Week and in recognizing the important contribution made by our own secretaries in helping us to handle the Nation's business.

VIETNAM'S ECOLOGY IS BEING DESTROYED

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, not only has the Vietnam war resulted in the death of tens of thousands of young Americans and hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese, but it has also practically destroyed the ecological balance of South Vietnam. Mr. E. W. Pfeiffer and Arthur H. Westing recently wrote three extremely informative and important articles for *Environment* magazine. Both men have studied the environmental impact of the war. Mr. Pfeiffer addresses himself to the specific problem of ecological damage caused by bombing and Mr. Westing examines the destruction resulting from American land operations and damage caused by a new 15,000-pound American bomb.

Both these gentlemen recently appeared at a counterbriefing sponsored by the Indochina Research Center and Project Airwar. That briefing explored the true extent of the massive destruction of South Vietnam's land and society.

I commend these articles to my colleagues for their careful study.

The articles follow:

LAND WAR

The following three reports on Vietnam were prepared for *Environment* by two U.S. scientists who have had considerable experience in that country. They are Dr. E. W. Pfeiffer, zoologist from the University of Montana, and Dr. Arthur H. Westing, botanist from Windham College, Putney, Vermont. Both scientists had previously traveled to Vietnam to investigate the effects of wartime use of herbicides (see *Environment*, March 1971, p. 34). In August, they visited Vietnam on behalf of the Scientists' Institute for Public Information and *Environment*; their trip was supported in part by the Fund for Investigative Journalism and the D. J. B. Foundation. They explored, among other things, ways in which the landscape has been drastically altered by high explosives, including 7.5-ton bombs, and spe-

cial bulldozers. (Previous reports dealt with the effects of herbicide spraying.)

In summary, the investigations reveal that military operations in Vietnam have disrupted the economy and cultural life of the people, as did saturation bombing and mechanized armies in Europe in World War II. For the most part, the high explosives used in the Indochina War have devastated the land rather than major cities, but the destruction has seriously damaged forests and soil on which the Vietnamese depend. For example, bulldozers equipped to clear jungles to the forest floor and thus deny cover to the opposing soldiers have already destroyed more than \$40 million worth of timber and rubber trees. Timber not destroyed outright frequently contains shrapnel that either breaks saw blades or promotes disease that weakens the wood. In the wake of jungle-clearing operations come soil erosion, flash floods, and invasion by economically useless weeds. The estimated ten million or more bomb craters in South Vietnam disrupt rice farming and fill with water to become breeding places for disease-bearing mosquitoes. Special blockbuster bombs—the largest aerial weapons available short of nuclear weapons—uproot all vegetation in football-field-size areas and kill or injure all animal life for almost a mile in every direction. An as yet undetermined cost of the war will be the long-term ecological effects of this devastation.

I. CRATERS

(By E. W. Pfeiffer)

During the Indochina War the U.S. has dropped more than two times the tonnage of bombs that was dropped in Europe, Asia, and Africa during World War II, most of it in Vietnam, a country about the size of New England or one-half the size of the state of Montana. Rockets, artillery shells, and mines have been exploded on a vast scale in many areas in Vietnam, in addition to explosives dropped from aircraft. This ordnance has been used principally in free-fire zones or special strike zones, which all people except the National Liberation Front and its North Vietnamese allies have supposedly vacated. Data on the extent of the free-fire zones of South Vietnam would permit calculation of the percent of Vietnamese land surface that has been intensively subjected to these weapons. These data are not, however, presently available.

Although few details have been released regarding expenditures or target locations for the various types of munitions, the following summary figures for all of Indochina have been made available by the Department of Defense:

MUNITIONS USED IN INDOCHINA WAR

(In millions of pounds)

Year	Air munitions	Surface munitions	Total
1965.....	630	7	630
1966.....	1,024	1,164	2,188
1967.....	1,866	2,413	4,278
1968.....	2,863	3,003	5,866
1969.....	2,774	2,808	5,583
1970.....	1,955	2,389	4,344
Total.....	11,112	11,777	22,889

We do not know what fraction of the 23 billion pounds of munitions expended during these six years was small arms and other ordnance that would not produce craters (nor do we know what the distribution is among South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos). To make some wild assumptions, if half the munitions (by weight) were of the sort that produce craters (bombs, shells, etc.) and if each was a 500-pound bomb, then Indochina's landscape would now be

more or less permanently rearranged by more than twenty million craters. Using an estimated average diameter of 30 feet, the holes alone would cover a combined area of about 325,000 acres. Although occasional, scattered craters can be found almost anywhere in rural South Vietnam, we have observed large areas of severe craterization in the provinces of Tay Ninh, Long Khanh, Gia Dinh, Hau Nghia, Binh Duong, Qang Ngai, Quang Tin, and Quang Nam. We have been told about similar areas in Kien Giang, An Xuyen, and Quang Tri. No type of habitat seems to be spared, including forests and swamps, fields and paddies. Many severely craterized areas such as the so-called free-fire zones, freebomb zones, or specified strike zones—were formerly inhabited and farmed. Such regions of important military activity as War Zones C and D, the Iron Triangle, the Rung Sat and U Minh Special War Zones, the Demilitarized Zone, and the Ho Chi Minh Trail are among these regions that have been subjected to repeated saturation or pattern bombing.

What is this unprecedented bombardment doing to Vietnam and its people? In order to make a preliminary assessment of the effects of these explosives, Arthur H. Westing and I visited Vietnam in August 1971. In preparation for our trip we had sought information from many sources on effects of bomb craters resulting from military activities, but were unable to find any significant information.

We flew over bombed areas in helicopters and rode in armored personnel carriers to observe at first hand craters from B-52 strikes. We interviewed in the field Vietnamese farmers who were trying to reclaim bombed land, Vietnamese loggers who were operating in bombed and shelled areas, and several Vietnamese and American officials.

In order to judge the magnitude of the problem it is necessary to have some idea of the number of bombs dropped and the amount of territory affected. Earlier studies have presented data which suggest that some 7.5 million craters have been formed as a result of the massive bombardment. Although we estimate that the current figure for South Vietnam is in excess of 10 million, we are currently awaiting Department of Defense data to verify this figure.

The standard weapon of the B-52s is a 500-pound bomb; each B-52 carries 108 five-hundred pound bombs. Each bomb produces a hole 20 to 50 feet wide and 5 to 20 feet deep, depending on soil conditions. The bombs are usually dropped from over 30,000 feet by the B-52 aircraft and can have sufficient force on impact to penetrate deeply into certain types of soil.

Severely bombed areas observed on our trip included the following land types: heavily cultivated areas of the Mekong Delta, intensively cultivated mountain valleys in the northern region of Vietnam, mangrove forests, evergreen hardwood forests of the flat terraces northwest of Saigon, and evergreen hardwood forests of the precipitous mountain areas in the Da Nang-Quang Ngai area.

Because of the war situation at the time of our visit, we were unable to fly over, even at high altitude, the most intensively bombed regions of South Vietnam which lie in the northwest corner of the country and along the Demilitarized Zone. We were also very disappointed to find that security problems made it very difficult to visit on foot bombed areas in all of the regions that we attempted to study. It is important to note that there are areas of South Vietnam, particularly in the delta region, that do not reveal, at least from the air at 3,000 feet, much evidence of war damage. Large areas, however, have been hit very intensively by several types of ecologically devastating weapons.

What are the effects of the massive bom-

bardments on cultivated areas such as the Mekong Delta? Our observations made both in wet and (on previous visits) dry seasons show that in the delta the B-52 craters and those caused by large artillery shells are permanently filled with water, probably because the craters penetrate the water table. In many areas waters of different colors fill adjacent craters. Some of the waters in the craters are aquamarine while others have a more bluish to greenish tint, and many are simply a muddy brown. These differences in coloration are apparently due to growths of varying types of algae. It is interesting that different growths occurred in contiguous craters.

I was able to visit on foot three such craters in an agricultural area about 30 miles south of My Tho in the heart of the Mekong Delta. The area, near the hamlet of Hol Son, had been a free-fire zone until fairly recently, but farmers were now being resettled on their land because senior officials considered the region relatively secure. The degree of security became evident: During my stay in the area U.S. aircraft were rocketing and strafing only a few miles away. I interviewed some families who had left the area eleven years ago because of the fighting. They took me to three craters made in 1967. I would estimate that they were caused by 500-pound bombs dropped by fighter bombers. Each crater was about 30 feet in diameter, filled with water and, at the time of my visit, about 5 feet deep in the center, as proven by one of my guides. He waded into the center of the crater where he could just manage to keep his nose above water while standing. The entire immediate vicinity has been a rice paddy; the rice had been replaced by a very tall reed (6 to 8 feet), genus *Phragmites*, which surrounded the craters at a distance of 10 to 20 feet. Growing from the rim of the craters and into the reeds was a species of relatively short grass, genus *Brachiaria*. A taller grass, *Scirpus*, was also prevalent. The whole area was inundated by very shallow water, as it was the middle of the wet season. The farmers were growing seed rice near the craters and were plowing under the reeds and grasses in preparation for planting rice. It was obvious that they could not use the cratered areas for rice cultivation, because the water was much too deep. One solution to the problem is to bring in soil from elsewhere. Although I could not confirm it, one farmer said that the craters I observed yielded exceptionally good fish catches. The fish presumably had moved into the craters during the monsoon flooding. Surrounding the area that had been cultivated in rice were banana, coconut, and jackfruit trees. The jackfruit was dead as a result of herbicides; the coconut trees were destroyed by the bombing, leaving only bare stumps.

In our conversations with these and other farmers who were trying to resettle their fought-over land, it became obvious that their main problem was the presence of unexploded munitions in the areas. The Hol Son people stated that within the last few weeks three women had been killed and one badly wounded when plows detonated unexploded weapons. We learned that mines in some resettled area have been cleared, but the problem of locating and neutralizing unexploded ordnance before land is resettled is an urgent one. On several occasions we encountered the fear of unexploded munitions, which probably accounts for a phenomenon we often observed from the air: fields with craters were usually not being cultivated although nearby fields were. One farmer whom we interviewed stated that the people do not like to plow in the bomber areas because the shrapnel in the dirt cuts the buffaloes' hoofs, resulting in infection.

According to science spokesmen of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and the Military Assistance Com-

mand, Vietnam (MACV), bomb crates are sometimes used as sources of fresh water for irrigation. In much of the southern Mekong Delta, brackish (salty) water floods cultivated lands at high tides if it is not kept back by dikes. Thus, irrigation is necessary and freshwater in the crates could be useful.

Presumably the permanently water-filled crater areas of the delta region are excellent breeding grounds for certain species of mosquitoes and other carriers (vectors) of disease. Those craters not invaded by predators of mosquito larvae provide conditions for greatly accelerated reproduction of mosquitoes and other vectors. According to MACV Command Information pamphlet 6-70, February 1970, "malaria has been causing increasing concern in Vietnam. . . . Up until recently it (*Plasmodium falciparum*) only affected regions of I and II Corps but has now spread to other areas throughout the country." We discussed with several scientists the possible relationship between craterization and this increase in malaria, but no studies have yet been made of this problem as far as we could determine. A USAID specialist in public health with headquarters in Saigon stated that the current alarming increase in hemorrhagic (dengue) fever seen in the Vietnamese was not related to craterization because the mosquito vector for this disease, *Aedes aegypti*, lives only in and around houses and would thus not be affected by ecological changes such as craterization. (We do not know of any field research which supports this view.) We flew a mosquito-control spray mission in a C-123 aircraft from which malathion was being sprayed (one-half pound per acre) over and around an Australian military base. There are only two aircraft now carrying out this program, and, as far as we were able to determine, there is no spray program involving treatment of cratered areas.

We observed many craters in isolated mountain valleys near Da Nang. They were in small clusters in mountain rice fields and thus were probably caused either by artillery or fighter-bomber strikes and not by B-52s. In these valleys the craters were generally filled with water as in the delta, but they probably are without water in the dry season and thus cannot be used for fish culture. The paddies that had been cratered were not being cultivated. During our visit we flew over many rice paddies with ponds in the centers almost comparable in size (about ten feet across) to the bomb craters, but these were fish ponds and apparently did not interfere with the cultivation of the rice surrounding the ponds. It is thus unlikely that scattered craters could create changes in soil moisture or other conditions that would make cratered paddies uncultivable.

We observed from the air large areas of the mangrove swamps of the Rung Sat Zone which had been subjected to very heavy B-52 strikes. These are all permanently water-filled and obviously would make transportation into the area very difficult. This could be of some significance because the mangrove forests have been regularly used as sources of wood for charcoal and for fishing grounds.

We observed many craters at first hand in the Boi Loi woods area. This had been an evergreen hardwood forest on the flat terrace northwest of Saigon. Most mature trees were dead from defoliation (herbicide spraying) but there was a very thick understory of useless broadleaved brush, vines, bamboo, and *Imperata* grass reaching a height of 15 to 20 feet. Craters were very numerous in this area and were scattered at least every 100 feet or so. Each crater was 20 to 30 feet across and 5 to 10 or more feet deep. They were all in a grey podzolic soil (a poor soil often formed in cool, humid climates) with poorly defined horizons (layers). There were many generations of craters. The most recent ones were bare of vegetation but contained a little rain water at the bottom. In the older ones a few

sprigs of grass, probably *Imperata*, were sprouting in the center. (We also noted the beginning of plant growth in the center of some of the water-filled craters in the delta.) As the craters age the grass grows radially, covering the bottom, and finally grows up the sides to meet vines growing down from the peripheral vegetation. There is some filling of old craters with soil washed down from the sides, but this is limited because old craters completely covered with grass were still 5 to 10 feet deep. We did not observe any broad-leaved plants invading these holes.

We were able to learn something of the effects of saturation bombing and artillery fire upon forest timber resources through interviews with loggers and saw mill operators and by inspection of damaged logs, mainly in the Ben Cat and Chon Thanh areas. We also interviewed South Vietnam forestry officials about the problems of utilizing bombed forest areas. These officials indicated that loggers do not like to operate in bombed timber because the trees have metal fragments in them which greatly reduce the value of the logs. (One logger estimated that the price of logs containing metal is reduced by 30 percent.)

We could understand the reason for the reduced value when we observed piles of saws with teeth ripped out and examined discarded logs from which we dug pieces of metal. In some logs there were dead areas about twelve inches in diameter and six inches deep from which we recovered bomb fragments. We learned that when mature timber is punctured by metals such as steel shards or bullets, entry is provided for disease organisms, probably fungi, which result in dead areas that increase in size as the wound ages. Thus, largely unlike trees in temperate zones, the trees of Vietnam are susceptible to rot when penetrated by metal. This greatly decreases the value of the timber and also weakens trees so that they are much more subject to being blown down. An official of a French rubber plantation told us that he had lost many rubber trees on his plantation because the trees had been weakened by fungous infection following bomb damage and then blown down in one of the frequent violent wind storms that occur in the area. The loggers whom we interviewed said that the craters in the forest made passage very difficult for trucks and loaders, a situation that necessitated cutting much shorter logs than desirable in such areas. (We saw 90 foot logs coming out of undamaged forests.)

We were able to observe from a high-flying helicopter the craters caused in a mountain forest near Da Nang by a B-52 strike about one and one-half years earlier. The craters were still obvious on the mountainside and along the ridges. The large burned areas in these forests appeared to be even more significant; they had apparently resulted from fires started by various types of ordnance such as white phosphorus, napalm, and flares.

We tentatively conclude that those cultivated areas hit heavily with conventional high explosives will be very difficult, if not impossible, to recultivate. They can perhaps be used as fish-rearing ponds or, in certain situations, as sources of freshwater for irrigation. They may provide additional breeding areas or insect vectors of disease. In the forested areas that have not been killed by chemical defoliation, the bombing has created problems that are probably just as great as those caused by defoliation. However, the immediate problem of greatest concern is the vast number of unexploded mines, bombs, rockets, and so forth, that must be removed if the land is to be resettled. Since the Department of Defense reports that approximately 1 to 2 percent of our air and ground munitions fail to explode, there are several hundred thousand

of these randomly buried throughout Indochina.

We recommend studies to determine the relationship of water-filled craters to the spread of certain diseases, and to determine how cratered areas can best be rehabilitated. We also recommend that greatly expanded operations be initiated to locate and neutralize unexploded ordnance in agriculturally useful areas.

II. LEVELING THE JUNGLE

(By Arthur H. Westing)

Despite the lavish application of great wealth and superior technology, the U.S. has made surprisingly little headway over the years against the National Liberation Front and its North Vietnamese allies. With the growing realization that the forest functions as a key ally of guerilla fighters by providing cover and sanctuary, more and more effort has been directed toward its obliteration. For a number of years reliance was placed primarily on chemical destruction. This approach reached its peak in 1967, but largely because of pressure exerted by the scientific community, it now not only has been reduced to a low level (see *Environment*, July/August 1970, p. 16) but also has been entirely "Vietnamized." The herbicidal assault has left South Vietnam with a legacy of many millions of dead, now rotting trees, and with locally debilitated ecosystems. A second approach that has been employed through the years to make the forest less hospitable to the other side is a bombing and shelling program of incredible magnitude. The 23 billion pounds of total munitions expended in Indochina between 1965 and 1970 alone are more than double those used by us throughout World War II in all theaters.

In recent years, however, a new technique has emerged. Born about 1965, developing into major proportions in 1968, and growing ever since, a vast program of systematic forest bulldozing now exists. The U.S. Engineer Command in Vietnam is daily putting Hercules and his twelve labors to shame. This report outlines the methods, scope, and magnitude of this "jungle eating" program and speculates on its economic and ecological impacts.

The basic tool of the landclearing operations in Vietnam is the 20-ton D-7E Caterpillar tractor fitted with a massive 11-foot wide, 2.5-ton "Rome plow" blade equipped with a special 3-foot splitting lance or "stinger," and with 14 tons of added armor. A very limited number of the even more immense D-9 tractors are also in use. More than twice the size and weight of the D-7, each of these machines is said to be the operational equal of several. The tractors are presently organized into five companies of three platoons each, each company operating 30 or more tractors. Unofficially, the companies go under such names as Rome Runners, Land Barons, and Jungle Eaters. These outfits bulldoze continuously from dawn to dusk, seven days a week under what can only be described as spine-twisting and gut-wrenching (to say nothing of dangerous) conditions. No tree appears to be too large and no jungle too dense to escape these powerful machines in what must certainly be the most intense land-clearing program known to history.

The bulldozing began on a very small scale in 1965 and was devoted primarily to the clearing of roadsides and other lines of communication in order to discourage enemy ambushes. It was not until mid-1967 that the tractors were organized into small units. By the beginning of 1968, most of the major road systems in the central half of South Vietnam (Military Regions II and III) had already been cleared. Although this mission still continues, virtually all major roads in the country have now been cleared for 300 to 600 feet or more on each side. These swaths throughout forest and plantation are

now a conspicuous feature of the Vietnamese landscape. In some instances chemical herbicide treatment has helped to maintain these strips in a treeless condition.

The employment of massed tractors organized into companies for extensive forest clearing began in 1968, and the program has expanded ever since. In its primary mission of denying forest cover and sanctuary, the "Rome plow" appears to be without equal. Effectiveness of the tractors is clearly superior to that of aerial application of chemical antiplant agents. The devices are considered, for example, to be playing an instrumental role in the attempt to "secure" the region centered around Saigon (Military Region III). They are also of considerable importance in the northern half of the country (Military Regions I and II). The U.S. has outfitted and is training two Vietnamese landclearing companies as one of the facets of "Vietnamization."

We are able to spend one day in action with the 984th Landclearing Company, which at the time was operating in the southeastern corner of Tay Ninh province. During our stay, the company was in the final stages of obliterating the Boi Loi woods. More accurately, it was supplying the *coup de grace* to this longtime enemy stronghold that previously had been treated at least once with herbicides, had been subjected to saturation bombing from B-52 stratofortresses, and had also been shelled by artillery.

We joined the outfit on its twenty-seventh day in the Boi Loi woods. During the past 26 it had already scraped clean 6,037 acres. Several days more and this job would be finished, permitting the 984th to move on to greener pastures. Before this job, the men had eliminated the 9,000-acre Ho Bo woods in nearby west-central Dinh Duong province.

The Boi Loi woods was enemy territory and we were dropped in by helicopter. We accompanied one of the platoon commanders in his armored personnel carrier and were flanked by several Sheridan tanks of the Eleventh Armored Cavalry. Although we had no contact with the enemy that day and hit no landmines, we were informed that both were regular occurrences. In the past 26 days, for example, several enemy attacks had been repulsed and the tractors had set off no less than 37 mines in the course of their work. (Seven casualties from landmines had been sustained during this period.)

In operation, the tractors were strung out in a long staggered formation, the lead tractor being directed for much of the time by the company commander circling overhead in a small helicopter. The large number of bomb craters made the job of maneuvering the large tracked vehicles most difficult. The heat was oppressive (hovering around 130 degrees F. in the tractor cabs) and the work was truly arduous. But the morale of the men seemed very high, despite their fifteen-hour work days, seven days a week, wet season and dry. The company was proud of its abilities and accomplishments and, we are told, was among the rare units in Vietnam without a drug problem.

At the time of our visit, the unbulldozed terrain was covered largely by a tangle of head-high, broad-leaved brushy plants and vines intermingled with *Imperata* grass and shrubby bamboos. Of the scattered trees, more than half were dead. The low blades were set to skim the surface, each tractor scraping bare almost an acre per hour. The big trees came crashing to the ground with great regularity. Most were simply pushed over, but the really large ones were first split by the stinger.

The terrain was flat and the soil a heavy grey podzolic, so that neither erosion nor laterization (hardening of soils to a brick-like substance) are likely to be problems here. In view of available seed (or other re-

productive plant parts) and shadeless condition, this area is likely to be quickly dominated by a combination of *Imperata* grass and shrubby bamboos, thereby largely precluding reforestation for years (perhaps decades) to come. In other areas we inspected in Binh Duong province that had been bulldozed two or three years previously, by far the most prevalent vegetation was the worthless and pernicious weed *Imperata*. Indeed, of the thousands of acres of formerly bulldozed areas that we were able to see on this and our previous visits, there was only one area where forest trees (a commercially low-grade species of *Dipterocarpus*) were recolonizing naturally. Where bulldozing is done in more hilly terrain, erosion can become a severe liability. Moreover, with the elimination of the enormous water-holding capacity of an extant forest, the heavy rains characteristic of Vietnam can produce severe flood damage. We learned of one devastating flash flood in a recently bulldozed area in Khanh Hoa province.

It cannot be denied that there are advantages to the bulldozing, given the conditions of this grim war. First, bulldozing largely clears areas of landmines, an ever-present horror throughout much of Vietnam to all who attempt to neutralize a war-visited area. (One Vietnamese whom we came to know has so far lost six relatives to mines left behind by one side or the other.) Secondly, some of the timber can subsequently be salvaged, particularly for firewood and charcoal manufacture. Thirdly, some of the bulldozed lands in "secure" areas have been taken over for agricultural pursuits, although this is often not feasible even in such areas because of extensive craterization by explosives. Farming is particularly evident in the roadside strips near population centers. A small fraction of the clearing by bulldozers is actually said to be done with subsequent resettlement or agricultural pursuits in mind (see, for example, *New York Times*, July 15, 1971, p. 3).

Bulldozing has, according to official military sources, leveled over 750,000 acres to date. I estimate that clearing continues at a rate of more than 1,000 acres per day. Because I was unable to obtain a breakdown of land and land use categories that have fallen to the relentless bulldozers, it is difficult to estimate the overall economic loss that can be attributed to these operations. However, some partial indications can be presented. With respect to the timber resource, the South Vietnamese forest service has determined that at least 126,000 acres of prime timber lands accessible to lumber operations have been destroyed through 1970, together with an estimated twenty million board feet of marketable tropical hardwood timber. At recent Saigon market values, averaging about \$72 per thousand board feet, this amounts to a loss of \$14.7 million. To this sum must be added a future loss due to destruction of growing stock. With respect to the rubber resource, the French rubber interests in South Vietnam has determined that substantially more than 2,500 acres of producing rubber trees (representing just over 1 percent of South Vietnam's total rubber) have so far been destroyed by bulldozers. There are about 120 rubber trees per acre, with an average value of \$88 per tree. Total loss here can thus be estimated to exceed \$26.4 million. (I might add that to the consternation of the French owners, they have received no compensation.)

There are, of course, many other losses attributable to the bulldozer program, most of which are impossible to quantify. Among them can be listed site degradation, erosion, weed invasion, destruction of wildlife habitat, flood damage, and miscellaneous property loss. One recent press report from western Hau Nghia province tells of the obliteration by bulldozers of a still partially inhabited farming region and the consequent

disruptive impact (*New York Times*, May 7, 1971, p. 5). Even whole villages have been obliterated (*Nation*, Oct. 23, 1967, p. 397). Discussions with professional Vietnamese foresters revealed yet another headache connected with the landclearing operations. In its nationwide forest conservation program, the South Vietnamese forest service issues timber-cutting permits on a judiciously restricted basis. However, corrupt province chiefs have, during the past year or so, come to realize that a denied local cutting permit can often be circumvented by turning to the Vietnamese Defense Department and, for pretended reasons of military necessity, request that the area be designated for bulldozing. If the request is granted, the chiefs can then cut the timber for personal profit. Finally, another use of the bulldozers results in a small amount of additional and unnecessary damage. In their lighter moments the engineers occasionally turn to carving up the landscape for the sheer hell of it. Thus one can now find a U.S. First Infantry Division emblem, covering some 1,500 acres, carved into the landscape about 25 miles northwest of Saigon (*New York Times*, Apr. 5, 1970, p. 7); a giant peace symbol is similarly engraved near Hue (*Life* magazine, July 2, 1971, p. 72).

In conclusion, the question is raised—although not answered—of how much forest loss can be sustained by an area before the regional ecology is adversely affected to a substantial extent. Before the war, more than 25 million acres of South Vietnam were covered by forest, representing about 60 percent of the country's total area of 43 million acres. So far, the war has claimed at the very least 3 million acres of the forest cover. The herbicide program has accounted for somewhat more than a third of this, the bulldozing somewhat less than a third, and the bomb, rocket, and shell craters (plus damage from other munitions) the remainder. Although the estimated 12 percent reduction in forest cover may not have a dramatic influence on the overall ecology of South Vietnam, detailed investigation will elucidate the magnitude of the subtle changes that have resulted. In the numerous local areas of severe damage, often covering several thousands of contiguous acres, the repercussions—both ecological and sociological—will be profound.

III. THE BIG BOMB

(By Arthur H. Westing)

In this report I summarize our findings about a new bomb in the U.S. arsenal, a bomb unique to the Second Indochina War. Owing to the paucity of information domestically available, I describe in some detail the bomb's general characteristics and employment.

The BLU-82/B general-purpose high-explosive concussion bomb turns out to be one of the most awesome and least publicized weapons to have been spawned by the war. It is a bomb with record-breaking dimensions: It is 4.5 feet in diameter, over 11 feet long, and weighs 15,000 pounds. Within its thin steel case are 12,600 pounds of a special, dense blasting agent (DBA-22M) consisting of a gelled aqueous slurry of ammonium nitrate and aluminum powder (plus a binding agent). This formulation provides a concussive blast surpassed only by that of a nuclear bomb.

Often referred to in Vietnam as the "Daisy Cutter" and sometimes as the "Cheeseburger," this super bomb is delivered by C-130E aircraft (of the 463rd Wing of the Seventh Air Force flying out of Cam Ranh Bay air base). Even though the bomb is floated to the ground by parachute from altitudes of 7,000 to 10,000 feet and occasionally even over 20,000 feet, the Seventh Air Force claims that the point of impact seldom is more than 300 feet off target and usually less than 150 feet. Timing of the drop is determined by ground radar.

The Daisy Cutter was developed primarily for the instant creation of clearings in dense jungle. Such clearings can then be used immediately as a landing zone by assault helicopters in locations inaccessible to conventional land-clearing equipment and techniques. The progenitor of this unique bomb was the 10,000 pound "blockbuster" bomb of World War II. Several dozen or more of these bombs were left over from that conflict. These were used in Indochina on an experimental basis, apparently beginning in 1967. The presently used BLU-82/B was developed and became operational in early 1970.

The bomb is detonated by an impact fuse at the end of an attached three-foot probe which sets off the main charge simultaneously at both ends of the bomb just above the ground. If all goes well, the resulting radial blast leaves no crater, but rather uproots and blows away all trees and other obstructions—even in heavy jungle—to create a virtually perfect clearing about the size of a football field. Although the size of each clearing differs, of course, according to local conditions of terrain and vegetation, the average radius of the opening, according to the Air Force, is about 160 feet, and its area thus about two acres. No fires are reported to have been set by these bombs and only minimal charring occurs. The blast is spectacular: A mushroom cloud rises some 6,000 feet into the air, and light aircraft flying more than two miles from the explosion are badly shaken by the shockwave. The landing zone, suitable for landing within minutes of the blast, can accommodate one to several assault helicopters at a time. The military code name for such an operation is "Commando Vault."

According to the Seventh Air Force, the average rate of use of the Daisy Cutters in South Vietnam has been one to two per week in recent months. (We were made aware of five drops during a one-week period in mid-August.) Although the total number of drops to date is classified information, an official spokesman for the U.S. Military Assistance Command in Vietnam (MACV) informed me that it is well in excess of 100. One press report claims that 160 drops occurred prior to June of 1970 (*Los Angeles Times*, June 1, 1970, p. 20). Most of the drops in South Vietnam have occurred in the northern half of the country and in the delta region to the south (Military Regions I, II, and IV). Information on the drops in Cambodia and Laos was not made available to us.

In the briefing we received on the Commando Vault operations, an official spokesman for the Seventh Air Force stressed and restressed that use of the Daisy Cutters was restricted to the creation of landing zones and that they were nothing more than "explosive bulldozers." He went into some detail on how the local populace is always alerted prior to a drop. On the other hand, we learned from another local Air Force source that exceedingly strict security is always maintained before a drop to avoid alerting the enemy; the flight crew does not even receive the target location or drop time until just before takeoff.

The Daisy Cutter is officially designated as a general-purpose bomb and has been used in a number of ways in Indochina beyond the creation of landing zones. One Air Force report explains that the bomb can be used for road interdiction by triggering landslides. In the Hanoi press this past spring (in an otherwise unconfirmed report) there is a description of the obliteration of an entire hamlet in Laos by this means. We also learned from three independent sources (two military and one embassy) that the Daisy Cutter has been and is being employed against enemy or suspected enemy troop concentrations. Moreover, in one of the Commando Vault missions we inspected from the air, the bomb had been dropped, according to our official military guide, onto a suspected enemy rocket emplacement. This mis-

sion had been carried out in June of this year in Quang Nam province nineteen miles southwest of Da Nang. The antipersonnel use of this bomb has also been reported in the press (for example, *New York Times*, Apr. 13, 1971, p. 1; Apr. 15, 1971, p. 5; Apr. 18, 1971, p. E2). Press reports describe one additional use for the bomb, that of removing the thick jungle canopy above suspected enemy storage areas (*New York Times*, Apr. 15, 1971, p. 5).

What is the environmental impact of a Daisy Cutter? Here I am chagrined to report that of the scores of Commando Vault missions, old and new, no site could be found by MACV in an area secure enough for us to visit. U.S. citizens are generally not aware that the National Liberation Front and its North Vietnamese allies control virtually all of the forest and other wild lands of South Vietnam. Moreover, we could find no one who had examined or even thought about these sites with ecology in mind, not even the MACV science advisor or his staff. Although the immediate overt impact is easy to surmise, the more subtle and long-term effects must await further study.

According to an official Seventh Air Force source, the blast of a Daisy Cutter is of such intensity that all terrestrial and arboreal wildlife (as well as any luckless humans) within a radius of approximately 3,280 feet are killed outright by the concussive shock-wave. The lethal zone from one such bomb thus covers an area of about 776 acres. Beyond this circle of death, concussion injury diminishes to insignificance radially outward for a distance of another 1,640 feet or so. This larger area of both death and injury to wildlife thus encompasses about 1,746 acres per bomb. Assuming that the total number of bomb drops to date has been 150, the forest area totally eliminated by this means has been only about 300 acres. Of much greater concern, all the wildlife occupying 116,400 acres or more have been killed. The wildlife on again as much area have sustained injuries. The Daisy Cutter thus adds significantly to the already severe stress imposed by the war on Vietnam's wildlife.

With respect to the vegetation, my information on damage is less complete. The innermost circles of two acres is, of course, totally annihilated. (One press report claims that even the worms in the ground are killed in this zone [*Life* magazine, May 21, 1971, p. 41].) I suspect that damage to the flora beyond the central, cleared area becomes negligible within a modest distance, but actual extent of damage will require on-site investigation. Recolonization by plants in the central, cleared zone seems to be fairly rapid, at least in the delta region. An Air Force officer familiar with the delta told us that a Commando Vault landing zone blasted out in that region looks green from the air within several weeks; it often becomes unusable within several months because of the regrowth of brush. Past experience suggests that the upland clearings will be quickly invaded primarily by *Imperata* grass and/or a variety of low-growing, brushy bamboo species, all tenacious and worthless weeds.

The Daisy Cutter is, in the words of one military officer we met in Vietnam, "a super bomb with super punch." MACV has been using these bombs on a steady basis for more than a year and a half now, apparently with no mention of them in the official daily, weekly, or monthly war news summaries. One senior Seventh Air Force officer explained to us, "they have such a devastating effect that we hate to give them much publicity."

The Commando Vault 7.5 ton bombs provide just one more means by which we casually rearrange the environment of Indochina with little if any concern about either the immediate or the long-term impact on the ecology of the area. I am painfully aware of how little in the way of biological data this report contains, but in providing the first

detailed account of this new, indiscriminately wide-area weapon for the open literature, I hope that it will stimulate the necessary wildlife and other ecological studies as conditions permit.

REVITALIZING RURAL AMERICA

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. ARENDS, Mr. Speaker, President Nixon mentioned in his state of the Union message that this administration is dedicated to revitalizing rural America. He also has presented a major proposal to expand significantly the credit authorities of the Farmers Home Administration, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, to help carry out this revitalization.

With the leadership of Administrator James V. Smith, the impact of new and improved services through Farmers Home Administration has been highly effective throughout the country. Add to that the unmatched support of President Nixon and the new vitality given by Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz, and there is no question but that even more new records will be set for effective service to our farmers and the people of open countryside and eligible small towns. I would like to cite some help that has been given to my congressional district.

There is one particular family which literally received a new lease on life from assistance that was provided them. It is a young family—the husband being 35 years of age. There are four children. It is a deserving, hard-working family, but unfortunately one with a low income as measured by today's standards. This family was renting substandard housing—the kind one looks at and wonders why we cannot do better than that in America. But with their meager income, there was not a chance of credit from conventional sources to secure for themselves a better house. Then entered the Farmers Home Administration.

The family applied to this agency for a housing loan. The local FHA personnel worked with them very patiently. They were able to work out for this family a \$17,400 loan, enabling them to buy an adequate, though not elaborate home, equipped with modern facilities. So now for this rural family there is hope—something to work for and look forward to. And, most important Mr. Speaker, they have learned someone cares about the rural American of modest income back in the small towns and byways.

The Farmers Home Administration also makes loans to help those who wish to enter or remain in farming; and regardless of what we read and hear today, the family farm is still alive and making its valuable contribution to the abundance that we take so much for granted, and to rural community life. One young man helping make this contribution is a 32-year-old farmer from Iroquois County. He has three children. To him the distant city was not attractive—he wanted

to remain at home, farm for his livelihood and be active in rural community affairs. To do this he needed help financing for an adequate farm setup, and he found it through the Farmers Home Administration. This young man received a \$48,000 loan for a farm and modern farm buildings. His major production enterprise is feeder cattle and he is doing a splendid job.

One of the finest services being provided by the Farmers Home Administration is to help small rural communities finance modern water and sewer systems. The Bismarck Community Water District was formed a few years ago and developed plans to provide the town of Bismarck, Ill., and surrounding area with a central water system to serve approximately 170 families. The Farmers Home Administration supplied a \$168,000 loan. The system is now a reality. While it was planned for 170 users, it now has over 200—and it has kicked off progress. This is measured in terms of 25 new homes being built in the Bismarck water system areas, and the establishment of a 50-unit trailer park. This park now has 20 families, and it is expected to be filled within a year.

Mr. Speaker, I cite these cases as examples of the Farmers Home Administration in its three broad program areas of service to rural people—housing, farming and community facilities. I could have selected others because there are many. In fiscal year 1971, 193 loans in the amount of \$2.4 million were made to farmers of my district. As of December 31, 1971, the total outstanding for housing loans in the district reached \$13.5 million in loans to 1,266 rural families of the area to secure decent housing. Six communities have received loans to build their first central water systems, and other projects are in the making.

Mr. Speaker, it is services such as these, so close to the needs of the rural family and rural community throughout the Nation, that warrant our high regard for the work of the Farmers Home Administration. The President is well advised to place his confidence in the Farmers Home Administration as an agency capable of the important work of rural development. I commend Administrator James V. Smith and my former colleague in the House of Representatives for his effective leadership and Mr. Charles W. Shuman, our State director who leads the Farmers Home Administration program in Illinois.

TAX REFORM

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago when Congress was debating the Tax Reform Act of 1969, high administration officials predicted a "taxpayer's revolt" unless meaningful tax reform was enacted by Congress.

The 1969 act did make some minor

changes in the inequities of the tax system, apparently enough to postpone the threatened "revolt." But, as we all know, the Federal tax structure is still riddled with gross inequities which account for billions of dollars in lost revenue to the Treasury each year.

The loopholes and inequities have been there for a long time; the public's awareness of them, however, is a relatively new phenomenon. For years, the general public had no idea that millionaires were getting away with paying no income tax at all, or that giant corporations were paying a lower percentage of tax on their billion dollar incomes than the \$10,000 a year wage earner.

But the Tax Reform Act of 1969 was page 1 news, and helped to educate many people to the inequities of our tax system. And in recent years the increasing pressures of other taxes on the low and middle-income workers—local property taxes, State sales taxes, and the social security payroll tax—have brought an awareness to almost all people that our so-called "progressive" tax system is not very progressive at all.

If my own district, and the feelings of my constituents are any indication of public opinion around the country, the issue of tax reform is No. 1 on the minds of most people.

A dramatic indication of the level of concern in Akron, Ohio, is the immediate success of a tax reform organizer named Robert L. Loitz, of Rootstown, Ohio, who is leading a nationwide campaign to reform the Federal tax structure.

Loitz, owner of a small upholstery company in Akron, is working almost full time gathering signatures on petitions demanding comprehensive tax reform. The petition reads:

We believe it to be immoral for a large percentage of our population to be underfed, ill-clothed and underhoused at the same time the ultra rich avoid paying taxes because of built-in loopholes in our tax laws.

The petition cites a number of specific tax reforms, and declares that—

We are dedicated to these changes and to the defeat of any and all congressmen that do not fully support and vote for such changes.

Mr. Loitz hopes to gain 1 million signatures by this spring, and plans to come to Washington to lobby for tax reform.

I, for one, welcome his assistance, and hope he succeeds. For my feeling is, from watching the response to Bob Loitz' campaign, that the taxpayers revolt predicted in 1969 may very well take place in 1972 if Congress and this administration do not act.

The Akron Beacon Journal has carried several stories about Bob Loitz' tax reform campaign which I insert in the RECORD at this point for the information of my colleagues:

[From the Akron Beacon Journal, Feb. 12, 1972]

TAX "COMPLAINER" IS A "FIGHTER" NOW
(By James Toms)

Working methodically and without fanfare, a soft-spoken Rootstown man in undertaking what he hopes will become a nationwide campaign to disprove that old American saying:

"Everyone complains about taxes, but no one can do anything about them."

Robert L. Loitz, 48, who describes himself as a typical American worker, claims that he—with others—has been griping about unfair taxes for 20 years.

Now he's prepared to fight.

He thinks something can be done about so-called inequities in the country's tax structure, and through a petition campaign is asking Americans from coast to coast for support.

Loitz, owner of the small Heminger Upholstery Co. in Akron, has 2,000 petitions and letters ready to mail around the country.

Each petition contains space for 40 signatures, and Loitz said if the campaign catches fire his printer is ready to "run off enough petitions so that we can collect a million names a day."

It is Loitz's conviction that tax reform is possible if enough citizens put pressure on Congress by signing the petitions.

"I think that most people will agree that Congress responds not because its members see the light, but because they feel the heat," his letter explains. "Multitudes of signatures on these petitions will help apply that heat."

While Loitz's letter describes the general goals of the campaign, the petitions get down to specifics—calling for immediate changes in the federal tax structure.

The petitions, to be mailed to congressmen over the U.S. declare:

"We the undersigned believe the time has come when we must change our entire tax structure. The obvious place to start is with the federal income tax.

"We believe it to be immoral for a large percentage of our population to be underfed, ill-clothed and underhoused while the ultra-rich avoid paying taxes because of built-in loopholes in our tax laws.

"We want the laws changed now. We want the standard exemption to be increased to \$2,000 for a single person, to \$4,000 for a married couple, and to \$1,200 for each minor child.

"We further want all exemptions eliminated on personal income in excess of \$50,000 annually. We want the tax loopholes in the 'non-profit' foundations closed. We want the farm subsidies changed to benefit the small farmer instead of the rich.

"We want all income received by residents of the United States from foreign investments taxed at the highest income tax rate.

"We are dedicated to these changes and to the defeat of any and all congressmen that do not fully support and vote for such changes."

Loitz said only 150 of the petitions are out so far—all in the Akron area.

But he said his daughter, Angela, a 19-year-old Kent State sophomore, and several of her friends have volunteered their time to see that the petitions get wide circulation.

Loitz said he's collecting addresses so that the petitions can be mailed to leaders of campus organizations, senior citizens' group, labor groups, "and anyone that wants them."

Loitz, who lives with his wife and two daughters at 4220 Tallmadge rd., said he's never been a crusader for anything in his life. Born in Akron, he graduated from East High School, became an upholsterer and never left home.

"I just think the time for such a campaign is here, and I think when people read this petition they'll be for it," Loitz said.

"I just got fed up all of a sudden. And me and a lot of people like me have been complaining and not doing anything for too long.

"These petitions are nonpartisan—they're for Democrats, Republicans, independents... everybody. I have no political ax to grind and nothing to gain from this," Loitz said.

"I just think when the common man reads this petition he'll sign it. He has to."

Loitz said his income ranges between \$12,000 and \$15,000 yearly. His wife is a teacher at Rootstown Middle School.

Loitz's letter explains some of his other feelings pertaining to the drive. It says in part:

"It is obscene for J. Paul Getty to earn more every half hour than the average American earns per year—and he (Getty) avoids paying taxes.

"It seems indecent for a United States senator (unnamed), and actor John Wayne to receive hundreds of thousands of dollars for not planting crops at the same time the small farmer is struggling to exist."

Expenses have come out of Loitz's pocket so far, but he hopes for contributions. The campaign is being run from Box 3518, Akron, 44310.

[From the Akron Beacon Journal, Feb. 17, 1972]

HIS TAX REFORM DRIVE GAINING MOMENTUM
(By James Toms)

By his own definition, Robert L. Loitz is a "flabbergasted American" today.

Loitz, 48, is the Rootstown man who last week launched a nationwide campaign to reform the federal tax structure—single-handedly.

Before, he was a mere complainer.

Now, he and hundreds of others are becoming "doers"—and it's all because of Loitz and his tax reform petition drive.

Loitz's plan was reported in Saturday's Beacon Journal.

And already, he said, he has received more than 300 telephone calls and letters requesting campaign petitions.

"This thing is reaching proportions beyond my wildest dreams," he said Wednesday. "And I love every minute of it."

"People have called from as far away as Rochester, N.Y., and others are mailing petitions to relatives in California, Texas, Tennessee, Illinois and Virginia," Loitz said.

"I've never been so elated over anything in my life. It's really a great feeling to have something like this work."

"People really do care about this problem (of inequitable taxation) and I'm just tickled to provide them with a means of voicing their complaints," he said.

Loitz, owner of the small Heminger Upholstery Co. in Akron, already has circulated half of the 2,000 petitions and letters he had printed when the drive was launched.

"That alone is enough for 40,000 signatures, and I have plenty more available," Loitz said. "I'll never run out."

Loitz believes tax reform is possible if enough citizens put pressure on Congress by signing the petitions.

The petitions attack the tax structure which allegedly allows "a large percentage of our population to be underfed, ill-clothed and underhoused while the ultra-rich avoid paying taxes because of built-in loopholes in our tax laws."

The petitions ask for increased exemptions for individuals, and elimination of exemptions "on personal income in excess of \$50,000."

They ask that all "loopholes" in the tax laws be closed, and that farm subsidies be "changed to benefit the small farmer instead of the rich."

The petition declares: "We are dedicated to these changes and to the defeat of any and all congressmen who do not fully support and vote for such changes."

Signers must be 18 years old and eligible to vote in the general election next November.

Loitz said he is filing requests for petitions as fast as they come in, and is organizing volunteers to help in mailing.

"I had one Akron church request 30 petitions, and a union committeeman at one of the rubber plants asked for enough for 1,000 members," Loitz said.

"Teachers are asking for the petitions. senior citizens groups are asking for the petitions. . . I've even had truck drivers take them down to Florida."

Although Loitz is financing much of the campaign himself, he said contributions are trickling in.

Loitz, the father of five, lives at 4220 Tailmadge rd., Rootstown.

"The letters I'm getting are absolutely amazing. They say some of the nicest things you'd ever want to read."

"So far I haven't had one negative response," Loitz said.

The campaign is being run from Box 3518, Akron, 44310.

[From the Akron Beacon Journal,
Feb. 24, 1972]

TAX REFORMER PREDICTS MILLION PETITION NAMES

(By James Toms)

If everything goes as planned, tax reform organizer Robert L. Loitz said he expects to dump more than a million signatures on congressional leaders April 1.

And he said that's just a preliminary goal. Loitz, 48, is the Rootstown man who is leading a nationwide campaign to reform the federal tax structure.

He's asking Americans across the country to sign petitions demanding changes in so-called inequitable tax laws.

He believes current standards offer loopholes in taxation favoring the rich and penalizing the poor.

And he feels reform is possible if enough citizens put pressure on Congress by signing the petitions he's making available.

"We're taking this thing one step at a time, and I'm not setting any limits on time or signatures," Loitz explained.

"But I predict we're going to hit one million signatures by April 1."

"The way things are going there's really no question about it," he said.

Loitz said he will begin today mailing 18,000 of the tax reform petitions to union committeemen across the country. Each petition can hold 40 signatures.

Volunteers at Loitz's Heminger Upholstery Co. in Akron are handling the bulk of the work now. And although contributions are "trickling in" for the drive, most of the financing is coming out of Loitz's pocket.

"I'm not worried about the money. We'll raise that somehow. More than anything we're in need of some space from which to run this thing," he said.

Loitz said he is "still overwhelmed at the response" to the campaign, adding that he is now receiving petition requests from as far away as Minnesota.

"Plans call for someone to make a trip to Washington shortly after the first of April to deliver the signatures in person," Loitz said.

"And it's our intention to deliver them directly to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to Chairman Wilbur Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee."

Loitz said the April 1 target of 1 million names is the first target in a campaign he envisions could "reach proportions I've never even imagined."

The campaign is being run from Box 3518, Akron, 44310.

CALCIUM AND HEART DISEASE

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I suppose it should not be sur-

prising in this age in which it is fashionable to question, criticize and attack all which is cherished and sacred that even nature's most perfect food—milk—has come under attack in some quarters as being injurious to the health. I suspect that if we were to take seriously all the warnings which have been issued on the dangers of various foods and liquids, we would be soon hard put to find anything with which to sustain ourselves. But I am especially troubled by the curdling conclusions being drawn by the lactic iconoclasts on the relation between calcium and heart disease. I think it is important at this point to put this issue in proper perspective by drawing attention to the fact that there is considerable evidence to the contrary, that is, evidence which shows that ingestion of calcium above the daily nutritional requirement actually reduces the incidence of atherosclerosis or heart disease.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include an editorial from Hoard's Dairyman of February 10, 1972, which calls attention to some important experimental work being done on this question. I call it to the attention of my colleagues and others and suggest that they thoroughly digest it before precipitately jumping on the antimilk wagon. The editorial follows:

[From Hoard's Dairyman, Feb. 10, 1972]
MILK'S CALCIUM MAY ACT TO PREVENT HEART DISEASE

The marvel of milk as a major contributor to the health of man continues to receive documentation with each succeeding year. As scientists probe the mystery of human nutrition, milk's reputation as man's most nearly perfect food is further verified.

In the November issue of Medical Counterpoint, it is reported that the ingestion of calcium above the daily nutritional requirement reduces atherosclerosis in experimental animals. The author wryly comments at the end of his report, "The chief source of food calcium in this country is dairy products, which some physicians believe to be atherogenic."

In another publication, from the National Dairy Council, a Cornell researcher reported recently that preliminary work indicated calcium was not as well absorbed and retained in the body when hydrogenated oils (oleomargarines) were fed. There was no such depression when butterfat or safflower oil was taken.

We do not intend to discuss the many facets of this question because it is impractical to do so and many of the results are preliminary. And, in some instances, there is conflicting research. But we have been following nutrition research for over three decades and milk always seems to survive the attacks of its critics with flying colors.

We become irritated and discouraged from time to time when some nutritional ignoramus grabs a coveted headline by attacking milk. But, over the long haul, such temporary setbacks are overwhelmed by the mass of evidence further confirming milk's unmatched contribution to man's welfare.

Dr. Joseph Lee III, a North Carolina reader, sent us the Medical Counterpoint report and summarized his opinion, "It is my feeling that dairy products have been a basis of good nutrition for many years, and to dismiss their use without more concrete evidence that they may be harmful would serve no good purpose." Thank you, Doctor, and our hope is that men of good judgment in your profession will continue to exercise it.

CONGRESSMAN NORM LENT REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I recently sent the residents of my Fifth Congressional District a newsletter. I am including the contents of that newsletter in the RECORD at this point:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN, NORM LENT—REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

NATION ON A BUSING BINGE: CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT GROWS FOR LENT AMENDMENT

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Many Long Islanders will recall the furor that took place in New York State several years ago over the question of forced busing of schoolchildren to achieve racial quotas in the schools.

Many New York parents and taxpayers were opposed to involuntary busing schemes ordered by the State Department of Education. In 1949, I was successful in getting a "neighborhood schools" law passed in the New York State legislature and signed by Governor Rockefeller. The Lent-Kunzman "neighborhood school" law, which barred the assignment of pupils on the basis of race, creed, or color, served as a model for the Nation. It stood until May, 1971, when it was stricken down by the U.S. Supreme Court as unconstitutional.

As a result, courts across the country are ordering massive forced busing of children to achieve racial balances. In the most sweeping court decision to date, a Federal judge in Richmond, Virginia, ruled recently that all of the school districts in three counties must consolidate into one district.

The Richmond decision will mandate bus rides for 78,000 Richmond-area pupils. Some students will spend two hours per day on buses, trekking across county lines to get to their new schools.

HEARINGS BEGIN MARCH FIRST

Once again, I have been called upon to lead the fight against this discriminatory practice—this time by my colleagues in the Congress. The Lent "neighborhood school" Constitutional amendment is now gathering growing support in the Congress, and hearings on the resolution will begin March 1.

Congressman Emanuel Celler, Chairman of the powerful House Judiciary Committee, has asked me to be the leadoff witness at these busing hearings.

I firmly believe that busing of pupils has not proven to be a valid educational tool. There are, to be sure, many educationally-deprived youngsters who need help. But instead of wasting millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money on busing schemes and the hiring of thousands of additional bus drivers I say let's spend those dollars on improved teaching techniques and enriched educational programs in the reading, writing and vocabulary skills that will truly boost the quality of education.

"YOUTH INPUT" OFF TO ACTIVE START

"Youth Input", the group of outstanding high school students chosen last October to serve as my student "sounding board" in the 5th Congressional District, is off to a fine start.

Thirty-four "Youth Input" representatives, two from each 5th C.D. high school, have already met several times in my Rockville Centre Congressional Office and in area high schools to discuss current National issues.

I have also addressed high school student bodies at Calhoun, St. Agnes, Baldwin and MacArthur on topics of current National interest. High on the list of student concerns is the threat of oil drilling off Long Island shores.

"Youth Input" representatives are also putting together a high school questionnaire on current National issues.

YOUR LETTERS IMPORTANT—ENVIRONMENTAL LEGISLATION HIGH ON PRIORITY LIST

In the nearly two years I have been serving as your Representative in Congress, I have made environmental legislation one of my highest priorities. Four bills I have sponsored dealing with the environment have already been signed into law by the President, and I am continuing to press for more effective measures to enhance the quality of our natural surroundings.

Too often we lose sight of the fact that our land, air and water are the only irreplaceable resources we have.

The huge amount of mail I receive each day on environmental matters reflects the fact that you in the 5th Congressional District share my concern about the deterioration of our natural resources and want to make your views known to me.

Time says—They may never get a chance to drill. Bills have been put forward in both the House and the Senate to declare the East Coast offshore area a marine preserve and tightly regulate oil and mineral exploration. Massachusetts Senator Edward Kennedy is one of the sponsors of the Senate bill; Maryland Congressman Edward A. Garmatz, powerful chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee is co-sponsoring the House bill, which was introduced by Long Island Congressman Norman Lent.

And in February's Field & Stream: Twenty-five East Coast Congressmen, led by Representative Norman Lent, of New York, are sponsoring legislation to establish a National Marine Mineral Resources Trust, to protect air, water, and submerged lands of Outer Continental Shelf. Ask your Congressman to check into it, then you may want to urge his support.

THE 35 ACADEMY FINALISTS ARE OUTSTANDING L.I. STUDENTS

One of the most pleasurable duties I have as your voice in Congress is the nomination of young men from the 5th Congressional District to the Nation's four Service Academies.

Last year, I appointed a group of outstanding 5th C.D. educators, businessmen, clergymen and civic leaders to interview prospective academy attendees and recommend to me the names of finalists which I will forward to the respective academy for final selection. The following 5th C. D. young men have been chosen by the Selection Committee as finalists:

U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.—John Coffey, David Flinn, Michael Golden, Lee Licata, Ray Mazza, Frederick Morlock, Steve Rohrsen, Theoren Smith, Dewey Yee and Lane Napoli.

U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y.—James Connell, Richard Friedman, Arthur J. Campbell, Francis Valentino, and Denis Morgan.

U.S. Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs Colorado—David Redlefsen, Scott Lustig, William Brickenstein, Paul Nunnenkamp, Steven Sconfienza, Robert Scott Bartlett, William Seiffert, William Carolan, Lee Killbourn, and Jerome Macken.

U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N. Y.—John Barrett, Joseph Barrett, Thomas Couti, Donald Farmer, Kevin Lawless, William Madden, Robert Murray, James McGowan, Michael Pinto and Kevin Dick.

NORMAN F. LENT,
Member of Congress.

A WORTHY TESTIMONIAL

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, Frank Manning has been a tireless and determined advocate of the elderly citizens of Massachusetts, and his work indeed deserves national recognition. The senior citizens of this Nation have special problems concerning housing, transportation, and health benefits, and Frank Manning has done an outstanding and exemplary job of making those needs known to the Members of Congress. Recently, a testimonial dinner was given honoring Frank for his years of service to the elderly of the Commonwealth and the response to the dinner was overwhelming. I am placing in the Record an article which appeared in the Boston Herald Traveler on February 29, 1972, which chronicles that testimonial and the work which Frank Manning has done. I ask that all interested Members read this fitting tribute to a man who has championed the cause of the elderly, and who remains an articulate and sensible spokesman for those of our citizens over 65 years of age.

The article follows:

A WORTHY TESTIMONIAL

(By Wendell Coltin)

It's pleasing to attend such a testimonial as that given recently for Frank J. Manning, honoring him for his many years of service to the elderly of Massachusetts, when you know the people are there because they know him, admire him for his work and are proud of his friendship.

How different this is from so many other testimonials where persons in public life "arrange" to have themselves honored and often "the arm is put on others"—groups, business firms and individuals—to assure a good turnout; and, more particularly, a "good take" for the honored one. Of course, the "take" is sometimes disappointing.

We have often recalled a largely attended testimonial some years ago for a state representative who retired from office to accept a gubernatorial appointment to a job in public life. We attended his testimonial on a hot night in a large auditorium, sat through a lot of speeches and presentations. About 1200 persons were present; the cost of a ticket was, if memory is correct, \$7. Imagine our surprise when we heard sometime after the event the guest of honor had received a check of \$12. Terrific!

It is very common, also, to find persons attending testimonials who don't know the guest of honor, or even the reason for his being honored.

On the other hand, one of the nicest testimonials we can recall in the recent past occurred last year when patients and other friends of Dr. Daniel Lyons Leary, a Newburyport general practitioner and Essex County medical examiner, gathered at a Haverhill restaurant to express appreciation of his long service to the community. He was not retiring; but it was a wonderful gesture and the thing that made it so nice was that everyone there knew the guest of honor and wanted to be there.

So, too, with Frank Manning. Many who have benefitted from his leadership as president of the Massachusetts Legislative Council for Older Americans came from different parts of the state. Others were there from

organizations concerned about the elderly and working to help make a better life for them.

One of the amusing things was his telling the 400 persons present at the luncheon testimonial in the Dorothy Quincy Suite of the John Hancock Building:

"One of my friends in here said, 'Where the hell is everybody?' He was used to meeting at Suffolk Downs."

The past couple of years more than 12,000 persons have been bussed into the East Boston race track each year to attend rallies sponsored by the Legislative Council to promote the cause of the elderly.

As always, Mannings' talk to his audience was interesting; and in accepting the laurels heaped upon him, he said a number of quotable things. We liked this one particularly:

"I envision a world where no older person will live in want, insecurity, or fear and no child will ever suffer brain damage from malnutrition."

Whether the candidate is a Democrat or Republican, he said, should not be the criteria for his election to office. Manning stated: "I have no patience with public officials who forget the army of people who elect them and find refuge in the homes and dens of the wealthy."

Stating there are children in some southern states, even in Massachusetts, who have never had a good, nutritious meal, he declared: "If people are hungry, it is not because there is not enough, but because of people being too careless, too greedy, to distribute it properly."

And what a deep satisfaction it must have been to recently-retired state Sen. Samuel Harmon, a head table guest and speaker, to hear Manning say he "was the most accessible senator I have ever known."

Harmon is now general counsel to the new state Department of Elder Affairs, which Manning served for a short while and was credited by Secretary Jack Leff with playing a very important role in the organizational phase.

VIVE MME. NIXON

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished First Lady, Mrs. Pat Nixon, is rapidly being recognized as one of America's most successful emissaries abroad. The American people via satellite television have seen her in action in the People's Republic of China, adding a new dimension to her husband's historic trip to that nation.

During her tenure in the White House, Mrs. Nixon has been actively involved in a number of the great issues which have been of concern in the country these past 3 years. She has enhanced the role of First Lady by giving it a more activist, participatory dimension. Her accomplishments in these areas are especially important as she travels around the world. Her ability to establish an instant rapport as she reaches out to people on a human level, has brought her acclaim from the four corners of the globe.

Mrs. Nixon recently returned from a trip to Africa where she represented the United States at the inauguration of William R. Tolbert, Jr. as President of Liberia. During her travels, the First Lady was greeted warmly by local citi-

zens who cheered "Vive Mme. Nixon." There people, like our own American citizens, responded immediately to a woman who has come to represent the very essence of human understanding.

I include an article from the New York Times as evidence of Pat Nixon's recent triumphs. As a woman member of this distinguished House, I am especially proud of our First Lady's unique accomplishments.

The article follows:

A MEDAL FOR MME. NIXON

They loved her in Monrovia.

Mrs. Richard M. Nixon was in the capital of the Republic of Liberia—founded 150 years ago by freed American slaves—for the inauguration of William R. Tolbert Jr. as the nation's 19th President. And Mr. Tolbert, 58, a Baptist minister, calling Mrs. Nixon a woman of "courage, strength of character and fortitude of spirit," presented her with the Grand Cordon of the Most Venerable Order of Knighthood of the Pioneers of the Republic of Liberia. The next day she was treated to a special entertainment at Monrovia's Executive Mansion. For the occasion, Mrs. Nixon was garbed in native dress with a bouffant head scarf and tapped her feet to tribal drums while dancing girls, their bodies painted blue, pranced by.

They loved her in Accra, too.

As Mrs. Nixon arrived in Ghana's capital on Wednesday for the second stop of her African tour she was met at the airport by hundreds of Ghanaians singing and playing drums. Later she addressed a high-spirited meeting of the National Assembly and told the delegates, "Your assembly is a little bit different from ours. There they don't have half as much fun."

Her final stopover was the Ivory Coast capital, Abidjan. Despite intermittent rain, on her arrival there Friday, she was greeted by a crowd of 75,000. They included men wearing feathers and fierceley painted tribal masks, women shaking gourds that rattled, neat rows of uniformed school children waving and giggling and even a few of the French who dominate life in the steamy West African country. Along the eight-mile route from the airport well-wishers cheered and chanted: "Vive Mme. Nixon!"

TRANSPO 72

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, Transpo 72 will be a great event for the Nation's Capital as well as the rest of our great country. It will be bigger and better than the Paris Air Show and provide our great aerospace industry with an opportunity to display their great technology in the field of aviation. Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we have good transportation facilities between downtown Washington and Dulles Airport for the event that is to be held. Under previous order granted me, I would like to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the president of the Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., to the Honorable John A. Volpe, Secretary of the Department of Transportation, indicating their willingness to provide helicopters for this event. However, it is essential that we have accessible downtown helistop locations for

this 1-week event. I am indeed hopeful that the Federal Aviation Administration can provide these locations.

The letter is as follows:

AEROSPACE INDUSTRIES
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC.,
Washington, D.C., February 17, 1972.

Hon. JOHN A. VOLPE,
Secretary, Department of Transportation,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Although your able staff has both planning and preparation well under control at this point in time, it occurs to me that one modern mode of transportation could serve a valuable functional service as well as a practical demonstration of capability in direct support of TRANSP-72.

I refer to the helicopter and its unique capability that could be utilized to move dignitaries, important government and businessman guests and news media representatives between downtown Washington and the TRANSP-72 site at Dulles International Airport. Such a service would eliminate, for many of these U.S. and foreign visitors, and the working press, the prospect of a long round trip surface ride along arteries that at times may well be extremely congested.

Tentative discussions with the AIA corporate members that produce helicopters leads me to believe that they would be willing to sponsor a demonstration shuttle service, under your direction, starting before and continuing through the exposition.

All this service needs is one or more quickly installed, relatively inexpensive landing sites, such as those at the White House and the Pentagon. One of any number of possible sites on downtown Federal Park Service land could be established quickly in this national capital, thus making available the kind of service the French provide for their biennial air show at Paris.

If my thinking duplicates an action you already have well under way, no harm done.

If it has some use in avoiding what I suspect will be an otherwise irritating transportation problem, well and good.

STUART AWBREY HONORED AS 1972 KANSAS EDITOR OF THE YEAR

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the William Allen White Foundation at the University of Kansas recently honored Mr. Stuart Awbrey, a distinguished constituent of mine and editor of the Hutchinson, Kans., News with its award as 1972 Kansas Editor of the Year.

This is a significant recognition, and a most deserved one, for Stu Awbrey. It constitutes entry into a virtual Hall of Fame for the giants of Kansas journalism.

Although we are not always in agreement on editorial positions, I have profound respect for Stu Awbrey and his integrity and independence as a newspaperman and editor.

He worked for the late William Allen White on the Emporia Gazette which is an excellent credential by itself. He has been editor of the Hutchinson News since 1965. Before that he worked as a reporter, columnist, and editorial writer. He also has served as editor of the Garden City,

Kans., Telegram and the Burlington, Iowa, Hawkeye.

Stu Awbrey has won several prizes for his editorials, and he is a Pulitzer Prize juror.

In presenting the William Allen White award to Mr. Awbrey, Whitley Austin, editor of the Salina Journal, stated:

Mr. White's fame rested on his ability to pick the brains of the world, noble and dumb cluck alike and translate them into the ribald, wart-plain and sometimes loving patois of the prairie. Ditto Stu Awbrey. Mr. White also had an abiding faith in the people—of all sizes, shapes, orneriness and colors. Ditto again Stu Awbrey.

It is a pleasure to advise my colleagues in the House of this outstanding honor which has been earned by Stu Awbrey of the Hutchinson News, and to publicly extend warmest congratulations and best wishes to him.

MILTON MANDEL, CLU, RECEIVES HIGHEST AWARD OF THE ELOY ALFARO INTERNATIONAL FOUNDATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to learn that Milton Mandel, CLU, head of a leading insurance agency in my constituency, has been awarded the highest honor of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama. If I may respectfully add, I, too, received this high honor and award several years ago.

This foundation, named after the great Latin American statesman, Gen. Eloy Alfaro of Ecuador, has awarded its coveted Grand Cross to outstanding Americans from all walks of life, including our President Nixon and six former Presidents.

I am gratified that Mr. Mandel, an outstanding insurance man and humanitarian, has been included in this distinguished group and I congratulate him on receiving this high honor. The ceremony took place on Wednesday, the 16th day of February 1972, at the Roosevelt Hotel in New York.

Mr. Speaker, I am also particularly happy to make note of this occasion, since it gives me the additional opportunity of giving recognition to another great humanitarian, Dr. Herman A. Bayern, the American provost of this foundation.

Among the many worthwhile projects to which he has devoted his life, time, and energy, Dr. Bayern was instrumental in the growth of the Institute of Applied Psychotherapy, a leading drug abuse prevention program for young adults, which has centers in New York and other cities in several States. Walter Mandel, director of public relations of the institute, represented the I.A.P. at this investiture.

I would like to call attention to the highlights of the proceedings during

which Mr. Mandel was so highly honored. The master of ceremonies was Dr. Ralph K. Keesing, international provost of the foundation and an international lawyer.

The invocation, as well as the benediction, was delivered by Dr. L. Lester Beacher, deputy provost, chancellor of Philathea College of London, Ontario, Canada, honored by many colleges in recognition of his dedication to the field of education, and an eminent eye doctor who, 45 years ago, pioneered in the development of contact lenses.

The formal presentation address was delivered by Dr. Herman A. Bayern, American provost of the foundation. The Grand Cross was presented by Count Voultsos Vourtzis, Prince Grand Master of the Sovereign Greek Order of Saint Dennis of Zante.

The translation of the diploma was made by Col. Robert A. L. Bentley, deputy provost. Dr. Rene Shapshak, deputy provost and secretary of the Eloy Alfaro Association, Inc., an eminent sculptor, presented the membership scroll of the Eloy Alfaro Association.

At this point I insert the principal speeches and the translation into the RECORD:

DR. BAYERN'S PRESENTATION ADDRESS

We are assembled here this evening in the Roosevelt Hotel to honor Milton Mandel, Chartered Life Underwriter, head of a leading insurance agency, who has been elected, by unanimous vote of the Board of Dignitaries of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama, to receive its highest award—the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma.

Mr. Mandel was awarded this high honor "in recognition of his distinguished service as a public spirited citizen in his field of endeavor, his dedication to his many clients and industry, his activities in humanitarian causes and his good work in behalf of international peace; in keeping with the aims, ideals, principles and purposes of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation."

We are here this evening to honor you, Mr. Mandel, in testimony; first, of our faith in the ideals of American democracy; secondly, in our devotion to the cause of universal education as the bulwark of these ideals; and thirdly, because of our confidence in the cooperation of all the people of the Western Hemisphere in the preservation of human freedom and peace of all the peoples of the world.

Such was the pattern of the life of our standard bearer, the immortal Eloy Alfaro, the great Democrat of Ecuador. As President of Ecuador at the turn of the century, he expanded and furthered educational institutions of his own country. He appealed to the Spanish Monarch to establish peace, and to grant the people of Cuba the freedom for which they yearned and bled. Now, these same people of Cuba pray that, once more somehow, perhaps by Divine Guidance, they will again see their freedom restored—the freedom which Dr. Castro and the Soviet Union wrested from them, in direct violation of the Monroe Doctrine. Today the Soviet Union has a strong foothold just 90 miles from Florida; and this is a great menace to the peace of the world.

The Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama gathers and encourages the permanent political and moral values of the Americas. Eloy Alfaro was the most outstanding Ecuadorean in the Western Hemisphere. The action and thought, which he placed at the service of his country,

were instrument and agency of the highest aspiration of half the globe. He worked for a broad land; he strove to raise the social level of the Indians; to spread education among his countrymen; to banish the exploitation of man by man; to act for the defense of liberty, regardless of frontiers; to create American public laws; and to free the flesh and the spirits from their chains.

Eloy Alfaro was a citizen, not only of his native Ecuador, but of all the Americas. His personal integrity, his unswerving defence of the principles of truth, justice and friendship among nations; his self-control and self-sacrifice which marked about one-quarter of a century of unflinching service to his fellow man, extended far beyond the confines of his own country, Ecuador.

He was a rebel and a conspirator, but his rebellion and conspiracy were directed against hatred, injustice, discord and tyranny. He was the leader of a generation fired with the hope and desire that responsible political action would enhance the prosperity of their country and the welfare of their people. The philosophy of Gen. Alfaro was based principally on services to his fellow human beings, to education, and to the cause of international peace.

It is most fitting, therefore, for us this evening, that we of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation have selected to honor, and give this highest award, to a great American and humanitarian. None can ever doubt the limitless faith of Mr. Mandel to the ideals of democracy and in the belief of our guest of honor that it was not from human hands, but from the Great Creator, that every man, woman, and child inherits the inherent right of life, human liberty, learning, happiness and equal opportunity, and, with such opportunity, the priceless possession of truth, which alone can make man free.

None can be aware of the indefatigable and unstinting service of Mr. Mandel to the cause of the United States and the United Nations, to his clients and to his industry, to his friends and to his fellow man, and of his humane efforts and accomplishments in the interest of all people, in order to try to bring peace and understanding and well-being to the people of this hemisphere and all over the world.

You know, my dear Mr. Mandel, that you now join a very select and elite group of Americans who have been similarly honored in the past. They include Pres. Richard M. Nixon and Vice-Pres. Spiro Agnew, former Presidents Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson; Senators Javits, Muskie, Humphrey, Buckley, Mansfield and other Senators; Congressmen Albert, Ford, Celler, Wydler and other members of the House; Gen. Douglas MacArthur; Adm. Chester W. Nimitz; F.B.I. Director J. Edgar Hoover; Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller; Hon. James A. Farley; Dr. Marie L. Fetsch; Hon. Stanley Fuld, Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals; all of whom typify the calibre of the outstanding individuals who have heretofore been honored by this Foundation.

It now gives me great personal pleasure, and it is an honor and a privilege for me, to call upon an outstanding gentleman, one who has served many worthy causes, a renowned educator, a member of this Foundation, a close personal friend of the late Capt. Colon Eloy Alfaro. Not only has this gentleman been honored but so has his wife, who is here with him tonight. I now call upon Dr. Pericles Voultsos, Prince Grand Master of the Sovereign Greek Order of Saint Dennis of Zante, and a Deputy Provost of this Foundation, to carry out the determination of the Board of Dignitaries of this Foundation, and to invest you, Mr. Mandel, with the coveted Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma.

THE INVESTITURE SPEECH OF COUNT VOULTSOS

As a former recipient of this high honor, it pleases me very much to be here tonight to honor Mr. Milton Mandel, who is also a Mason and a Shriner.

I would like to call your attention to the fact that Gen. Eloy Alfaro, former President of Ecuador, was one of the founders of Masonry in Latin America; an honorary 33° Mason; and Commander-in-Chief in that area. I was a personal friend of Capt. Colon Eloy Alfaro, his son, who was Ambassador to the United States from the Republic of Ecuador and who rendered great service to Pres. Franklin Delano Roosevelt during the war. Capt. and Ambassador Colon Eloy Alfaro was also a Mason and a Shriner. He was coroneted an honorary 33° Mason in Washington, D.C., in the same ceremony at which former Pres. Harry S. Truman and Gen. Douglas MacArthur was so honored. It is also interesting to note that Capt. and Ambassador Colon Eloy Alfaro and his three sons, grandsons of Gen. Eloy Alfaro, were all graduates of West Point Academy. So you see, you are in good company.

Since we are both Masons and Shriners, I am happy to bring you greetings from the Masonic fraternity of the State of New York. We welcome you to our ranks. God bless you.

And now, my dear Mr. Mandel, it gives me great pleasure, and it is an honor, to carry out the determination of the Board of Dignitaries to invest you with the top honor of this Foundation—the Grand Cross and Diploma of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama—in recognition of your humanitarianism.

TRANSLATION OF THE DIPLOMA FROM SPANISH TO ENGLISH BY COL. ROBERT A. L. BENTLEY

As a former recipient of this honor, I will now translate from Spanish to English, the Diploma granted to you by this Foundation.

"THUS ONE GOES TO THE STARS"

"Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, recognizing the special value of the services rendered by Milton Mandel, in support of the objectives of this institution, he has been awarded the Cross of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation. In witness whereof, this Diploma, with the seal of the Foundation, is presented in the City of Panama, Republic of Panama, on the 25th day of June, 1971."

Signed by the President, Director General and Secretary of the Foundation.

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH OF MILTON MANDEL

Dr. Bayern, Dr. Keesing, Dr. Beacher, Count Voultsos, Col. Bentley, Dr. Shapshak, Honored Guests:

I am overwhelmed and grateful for the honor which has this evening been bestowed upon me—thereby including my name among a select list of distinguished Americans who have preceded me to this award.

I am deeply moved by all the gracious remarks that were made and by the presence of all these people who have taken their time from their duties to assist in the investiture tonight.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation and thanks to all of you who came here and for the compliment you paid me by your presence.

For this honor, and for bringing me to this occasion, I extend my gratitude to Dr. Herman A. Bayern, the American Provost, to his Deputy Provosts and to the Board of Dignitaries of the Foundation.

I'd like to close with words which, in many languages and in many religions, have brought comfort and strength—"May the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, be with us, and remain with us, always."

Thank you all for coming here tonight.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. CHARLES THONE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1972

Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, two important dates in the life of Lithuanian people are observed in February. This month is the 721st anniversary of the founding of Lithuania. For more than 500 years, Lithuania served as a model for justice and freedom to the world; until about the time the United States was being founded, Lithuania was divided up among three conquering powers. Lithuanians maintained a deep desire for independence. They achieved it again in 1918, and this month marks the 54th anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania. Although Lithuania has been occupied by the U.S.S.R. for more than 30 years, its people still yearn to control their own destiny. We salute their spirit of independence. We also salute the more than 1 million U.S. citizens of Lithuanian descent. They have not only contributed much to America themselves, but have set an example for others as citizens. As a people, they may be classed as industrious, diligent, and possessed of a keen sense of responsibility. In Nebraska as in the Nation, we are thankful for the Lithuanians who have helped build better communities.

I am pleased to include in the RECORD a recent editorial from the Omaha World-Herald:

THIRTY-TWO YEARS UNDER THE HEEL

We are asked by V. P. Volertas, on behalf of the Lithuanian American Community of the United States, to say a few words in recognition of the historical significance the month of February holds for Lithuanians.

It is the 721st anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian state. Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom in 1251.

And February is the 54th anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania.

For Volertas and his compatriots, there is pride in these anniversaries. Unhappily, this pride is overshadowed by the fact that Lithuanians also are observing the 32d year of the domination of their homeland by the Soviet Union.

Not much is said these days about the "captive nations" behind the Iron Curtain.

It is not widely remarked that since June 15, 1940, the Baltic nations of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia have lost more than one-fourth of their combined populations to the ethnically genocidal deportation and resettlement programs of the Soviet Union.

It is not widely recognized that in the period between 1940 and 1952, some 30,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters lost their lives in an organized resistance movement against the Soviet conquerors.

Every president since Franklin D. Roosevelt has formally stated the policy of the United States to be nonrecognition of the legitimacy of the Soviet Union's domination of the Baltic states.

However, as Volertas stated with regret, the United States has done very little to help the Baltic peoples get out from under the Communist regimes in their countries.

As a practical matter, there is very little the United States can do, beyond offering

regular reminders in the forums of the world that the Soviet Union was and is guilty of the most brutal imperialism in its subjugation of these countries.

The conquest of the Baltic states, first by the Nazis and then by the Communists, took place a long time ago, by the standards of today's telescoping history. Awareness of the inhuman wrongness of it is kept alive today mainly through the efforts of organizations such as Volteras'. It is too bad that more voices are not raised in protest.

PAYING TAXES AND LOSING A JOB

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I have come upon a case involving an employee of the U.S. Postal Service in Los Angeles which has given me great concern.

Apparently this employee was suspended and threatened with loss of his job, because of failure to pay his State taxes.

This action was taken despite an arrangement between the employee and the State of California for monthly payment to satisfy the State's tax claims.

It would appear, Mr. Speaker, as if the Postal Service took a punitive and hasty action, one which could cost the employee his job and his means to pay his back taxes.

I would at this time, Mr. Speaker, insert in the RECORD a letter on this case from Mr. Glenn O. Givens, president of the clerk craft division of the Los Angeles local of the American Postal Workers Union, which outlines this matter in some detail:

FEBRUARY 18, 1972.

Re Appeal to violation of Articles: XV, XVI, VI, and IX

Director of Employees Relations,
C/O Western Postmaster General,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR SIR: The Los Angeles Local of the American Postal Workers Union appealed a grievance, which was filed on February 11, 1972, in behalf of Regular Full Time Letter Sorting Machine Operator, Mr. _____ to the Postmaster of this office on the violation of the above Articles, but as of the date of this letter, this Union has not received any reply from the Postmaster.

Accordingly, we are filing an appeal, pursuant to Article XV, Section 1, Step (b) of the National Working Agreement; and requesting that a hearing above the level of the installation head be held.

We are at this time, naming Mr. Robert L. Soule, National Vice President, of the Clerk Craft, or his designee, to be the representative in behalf of this Union in the hearing.

For your reference, we would like to point out that Mr. _____ was first charged on January 24, 1972, with an advance notice of discharge. But this union appealed this to the Postmaster, who sent a letter to this office acknowledging our appeal, and cancelled the charge against Mr. _____.

On February 10, 1972, Mr. _____ was issued another letter on the same charge, but with a notice of disciplinary action (suspension of two days); and we appealed this on the grounds that he had been resolved of the charge, based on the information the union

submitted in its initial appeal to the Postmaster.

An investigation on the second letter of disciplinary action against Mr. _____ the union learned that he, Mr. _____ had made arrangements with the State of California Franchise Tax Board to liquidate any balance he owed to the State by making a monthly payment to them. This was completed on February 9, 1972. And one day before the letter for suspension was imposed on him.

A further investigation by the union revealed that the California State Franchise Tax Board had hand delivered on the same date (February 9, 1972) to the Personnel Office of this Post Office that Mr. _____ did in fact make these arrangements with them. And on February 14, 1972, Mr. _____ made a payment to the Franchise Tax Board the total sum of \$69.80 on Account No. _____.

Additionally, this Union is contesting the action on the part of this Post Office to violate the code of the United States Constitution, which relates to double jeopardy, since he had been cleared of the charge in a previous letter.

But we would like to bring to your attention the fact that this Local has declined to make any statement to the news media, who have been inquiring into cases like this (particularly since so many employees have been charged with the same disciplinary action); however, this Local realizes that in the near future it is likely that we will be a party to a legal suit filed to determine if the State of California can in effect submit a letter to the United States Postal Service which will cause a suspension and the loss of pay, or the loss of his livelihood, and the well-being of his or her family, without due process of the law to determine the employee is actually owing the State in taxes.

The Union further realizes that many employees and other feel that the manner in which the Franchise Tax Board is seeking to gain payment of taxes is to some degree political. And we note that only those persons who are members of race minorities are being subjected to this kind of pressure, and being disciplined for allegedly not paying their taxes.

Moreover, we continue to recognize that the Governor of the State of California has been accused with failure to pay his State Income Taxes, but his employer (the people of the State of California) did not take any disciplinary action against him to the extent that they caused him to lose pay from a suspension or removed from his job. And if this is the case, then certainly, a citizen who is paying his salary is entitled to the same consideration.

Furthermore, this Union is appalled at the fact that the United States Postal Service can be and is party to an action that is contrary to the Law, that law which indicated in the past that an alleged debtor must use the process of the law in securing the payment of a debt.

It seems to this local that we are going back in time, the time when a man was beaten or placed in confinement because he either didn't pay his debts or was unable to pay them. But in this case, it seems that the Postal Service is either going to fine the employee or discharge him. Again without the due process of law.

In this reference information this Local is hopeful that we have given to you the necessary facts that the Articles cited have been violated, we only regret that we were not able to give to you the code of the United States Constitution, which relates to double jeopardy, or the Law relating to due process. Additionally, we regret that we cannot supply the information concerning the statement made about the Governor of the State not paying his State Income Tax. But we have that information, and either the in-

formation that most of the employees who are being disciplined or discharged because of the question of taxation are mostly members of the minority races or religions.

We are hopeful, again that this reference information is sufficient to warrant a hearing, and if not so, we are positive, we can supply this information.

Sincerely yours,

GLENN O. GIVENS,
President, Clerk Craft Division.

COMBATING DRUG ABUSE IN WILMINGTON

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the current issue of the "FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin" features an interesting article by John T. McCool, chief of police in Wilmington, Del.

Entitled "Combating Drug Abuse To Reduce Major Crime," the article details the efforts the Wilmington Police Department is making not only to deter drug abuse, but to stem drug-related crime.

Chief McCool is a native of Wilmington who entered the bureau of police in 1957 and rose swiftly through the ranks. He graduated from the FBI National Academy in 1967 and 2 years later was named chief of police.

I believe he and his colleagues are to be congratulated on their work in this vitally important area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Chief McCool's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

COMBATING DRUG ABUSE TO REDUCE MAJOR CRIME

(By John T. McCool)

To say that drug abuse has become an epidemic in our city and an enigma in our community would be an overstatement at the least. Wilmington, Del., is certainly not experiencing unique drug problems; however, we do have a drug abuse problem, and I would like to relate some of the steps that the Wilmington Bureau of Police has taken to combat it. We are making an effort not only to deter drug abuse, but to stem drug-related crime, which is accounting for approximately 60 percent of our major crime statistics.

In October 1970 our department obtained a \$150,000 discretionary Federal grant to help us combat our ever-increasing problem of major crime. An autonomous unit, consisting of 25 uniform and plainclothes officers, was formed. The prime goal of this unit is to reduce street crime.

In addition to furnishing visible preventive patrol, the unit performs stake-out assignments and investigations. It is also trained as a civil disturbance unit with special emphasis on the handling of tense situations.

Liaison officers from the narcotics and the intelligence squads were assigned to the unit to assure that the entire spectrum of patrol, investigation, vice, and other vital areas was properly covered. A 1-hour briefing session is held before the unit is sent out on assignment to acquaint the officers with the latest information on investigations begun

by the previous shifts. A ½-hour debriefing is held upon completion of their tour of duty for discussion of developments during the shift and why certain decisions were made.

DRUGS AND CRIME

Crime statistics and other data processed by the planning and research division for the street crimes unit began to show that drug abuse was related to a significant percentage of the major crimes, especially robberies and burglaries. Other research revealed that some experts in the field of law enforcement were stating that 50 to 60 percent of the major crimes in big cities are related directly to the illicit use of drugs.

We felt that any program for reducing crime must, in fact, concentrate directly on the drug problem if it is to be successful. Therefore, 14 men from our street crimes unit were temporarily assigned to the drug control unit, which, until this time, had been composed of only six men.

The procedure followed is somewhat different from the usual narcotics squad operations. This expanded unit of 20 men not only concentrates on drug enforcement but also specializes in drug-related crimes, such as robberies and burglaries, that are being committed by many of the same persons investigated for drug violations. One member of this unit is assigned to interview every person arrested on a felony charge to obtain as much information as possible about the individual's involvement with drugs and knowledge of local drug traffic.

We are finding that many drug users become anxious to talk about their involvement with drugs when they are arrested on other serious offenses. They often relate not only how drug abuse has led them into a life of criminal activity but also some excellent information that assists us in other current investigations.

Another member of the drug control unit is assigned to work specifically with pharmacies and other medical outlets for drugs to see that local and Federal guidelines on the dispensing of same are being followed. This measure came as a result of several investigations which revealed that a significant number of drug users were obtaining their supply through such channels.

One of the major goals of our program is to make it difficult for the drug user to get his illicit supply. We hope that, as a result of our efforts, the user will be forced to seek out a formalized drug rehabilitation program and thereby reduce his need to commit other crimes to support his habit.

Members of the drug control unit, operating under our current procedure, have made arrests for burglaries, robberies in progress, and other serious crimes. Stolen merchandise is consistently being recovered during drug raids. Many violent crimes are being cleared as a result of evidence seized from drug users or pushers that either connects them with such offenses or opens up investigative leads that eventually result in the arrest of other suspects.

In one recent drug raid on a pusher, among other currency in his possession, an unusual \$5 silver certificate was seized. Subsequent investigation revealed this silver certificate was part of property stolen from a 78-year-old victim who had been severely beaten and left alone in his home, with his throat cut. Fortunately, one of our drug control unit's informers reported seeing two of his acquaintances display a large amount of money and hearing them brag about the beating and robbery of the victim in question. Officers rushed to the location and found the elderly victim unconscious on his bedroom floor. He was admitted to the hospital in critical condition and probably would have died had our department not received this information and responded in time. Two suspects were later arrested as a result of an investigation.

DRUG ADDICTS

Both suspects were drug addicts and had used part of the money taken from the victim to purchase drugs from the pusher caught in our raid. He identified them as the persons who had passed the silver certificate to him in exchange for drugs.

The following points account for the initiation of our current program:

1. Any successful effort to reduce the major crime rate in our city must take into consideration that drug abuse is directly related to a high percentage of major crime. We must therefore concentrate on the drug problem if an impact is to be made on the crime rate itself.

2. Drug control officers should not limit the scope of their operations to narcotics enforcement but should be constantly investigating other crimes committed by drug users.

3. The drug control unit must maintain close liaison with the detective, patrol, and youth aid divisions to assure a constant exchange of pertinent information.

4. By making a concentrated effort to reduce the availability of drugs, we hope to force the drug user into a formalized rehabilitative program and thereby reduce the need for him to commit other crimes.

5. To establish community support of our effort, we are bringing together the various elements responsible for dealing with the drug problem—the police, the courts, the rehabilitative people, and those responsible for the education of the public. We hope this will help to reduce the fragmentation of effort against drug abuse and better utilize everyone's time and energy.

This basically is our program in Wilmington. We are trying new concepts because past efforts were not working effectively. Education alone is not the answer in combating drug abuse and related major crime, nor is enforcement, rehabilitation, or punishment; but combining these, with each area working to complement the other within the same framework, we hope to achieve results.

PRESS FREEDOM ONE BASIC FOUNDATION OF OUR SYSTEM

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, freedom of the press is one of the basic foundations of our democratic system. Throughout our history the press has frequently served as an added check in the checks and balances system. For this reason, I was disturbed to note the exclusion of Newsday's regular White House correspondent from the press delegation which accompanied the President to China. I would hope that an adequate explanation of this matter will be forthcoming from the White House. Newsday's editorial on this matter follows my remarks:

WORKING OUT

Newsday's Martin Schram is not reporting to Long Islanders from Peking this week.

The whereabouts of our White House correspondent would not ordinarily be an item worth commenting about. But CBS over the weekend cited reports that the White House had excluded Schram from covering President Nixon's China trip, and noted that Newsday had reported in depth last fall about the financial dealings of Charles G. (Bebe) Rebozo, the President's friend.

When the list of reporters scheduled to go to China was announced two weeks ago, we

asked President Nixon's staff why Schram was not on the list, since he had met the White House's own criteria for going on the journey.

We were assured that the Rebozo articles had nothing to do with the selection process. But we received no adequate explanation, particularly in light of the fact that Schram was the only regular White House correspondent whose newspaper was not represented.

Right now, it is no big thing as far as the readers of Newsday are concerned, since we are carrying complete reports on the trip through the several news services to which we subscribe. But in the long run, when the White House determines who can cover the news, all of us—journalists, Presidents and the people—are the losers.

SCHOOL BUSING

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker it is a shame that the schools in the South are in such disarray all in the name of social progress.

A good Georgian, Mrs. Philip H. Hopkins, has expressed the concern of many parents in a letter to me. I include appropriate parts of that letter in the RECORD at this point, for her letter is typical of the concern, frustration, and yet determination of parents to see that their children receive a good education.

Mrs. Hopkins wrote:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Never before have I written anyone, about anything, but as a wife and mother preparing to send her first child into the public school system, I must now become involved. We were thinking our child, who is going in first grade next year, to a private school, but someone has to say: "No, we are going to support the public school system and fight this mess". We cannot run from problems anymore nor bury our heads—nor, just discuss our feelings to friends over coffee or cocktails. We have mostly sat, and through apathy, let ourselves be "done in" so to speak. So, in some ways we have ourselves to blame. But, we have been pushed, pulled, told and commanded until I am tired of it—MY rights and those of my family are being taken away and now I say "halt".

First, I feel busing should be abolished. It is accomplishing nothing, except frustration, emotional upset and more bitterness and prejudice. No one seems to be considering the children—what it is doing to them—the long hours on buses and the things to which they are being subjected. It is doing more harm to our educational system, than good. The white children are being held back because the blacks are not up to their level. This is unfair to both races. It seems the "judges" are not concerned with improving education for blacks or whites; just invade the white domain—send the blacks to the white neighborhoods and vice versa. It is accomplishing nothing. You cannot make a white black nor a black white and I cannot believe this is desired by either race. So, I hope, sincerely, that the bill before Congress will pass, and busing will be abolished, forever.

Second, I feel a bill should be passed, making it mandatory for all judges and public officials on every level, to send their children to the public schools—instead of placing them in private schools, safe and

snug—while they make these "asinine" laws for my children. If they say this is denying them their constitutional rights—freedom to choose where to send their children—then I tell them they are denying me my rights by saying my children will be bused; they cannot go to the school by their home.

Also, if we want this great country of ours to survive, we must restore law and order—put discipline back. Police cannot enforce the law without someone yelling "Police Brutality". Criminals, murderers, and rapists all have rights. They either go free because some smooth lawyer declares he didn't get a fair trial due to publicity, or if he is convicted, he is soon paroled, and turned loose again on society to repeat his crimes. Schools cannot discipline children any longer; it violates the child's rights. Some parents and new teaching methods advocate a child doing his "own thing." Then, when these children must face real life, they aren't prepared for it—they cannot adjust to not being able to do exactly what they want to, as before. You and I both know our lives are governed by rules and regulations. Discipline is vital in order to help our future generations face the problems and responsibilities they will encounter during their life—and not "cop out."

I have spoken my piece. I am going to fight for MY rights and those of my family and hope you will continue to help us—the middle American.

Thank you for listening.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. PHILIP H. "FRAN" HOPKINS.

THE AMERICAN LEGION

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1972

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in extending a most sincere welcome to the members of the American Legion who are in Washington this week for their annual conference. It is a privilege for me to pay honor to the members of this fine organization and to the work they are doing.

The American Legion has been a rallying force in our communities for over 50 years. As a service organization, it has demonstrated its sensitivity to the needs of these local communities as well as to the needs of all veterans throughout the Nation. With its 2.7 million members in 16,000 posts, the Legion has sponsored many civic activities, including baseball teams, volunteer hospital groups, fund raisers for local projects and patriotic celebrations. These are activities for which the American Legion can be proud as they have offered so much to our towns scattered across the Nation.

As a force in our Nation's Capital, the Legion has worked undauntedly for benefits for veterans. Rehabilitation issues, pensions, compensation, medical care programs, and educational assistance programs head the list of priorities for the Legion. I commend the national commander, John H. Geiger, for his superb presentation of these goals.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the work of the American Legion for it is indeed a fine organization.

CHINA AND THE LAW

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's recent "Journey for Peace" to mainland China was an unqualified success. Thanks to the excellent press coverage of the events of the President's historic trip, many Americans saw more and learned more about China and the Chinese people than they had seen or learned during more than two decades. The President's visit has aroused in all of us a desire to increase our knowledge and understanding of a country that contains one-fourth of the population of the world.

In a recent address to the Rotary Club of Washington, one of the world's foremost legal scholars has made a timely and important contribution to our knowledge of the Chinese legal structure and China's acceptance of international law. Charles S. Rhyne is a distinguished past president of the American Bar Association and he is current president of the World Peace Through Law Center. His leadership in the movement to win acceptance of the rule of law as a means of settling international disputes is known and applauded throughout the world. Few individuals have contributed so much to the cause of world peace.

Mr. Speaker, in order that my colleagues may have the opportunity to read Mr. Rhyne's address, I include it with my remarks.

CHINA AND THE LAW: INTERNALLY AND INTERNATIONALLY

(Address by Charles S. Rhyne)

Dramatic changes in relationships among the world-wide human family created by President Nixon's precedent-shattering China visit are many and important. The stage is set for sudden movement and tremendous change in the world power structure. There are enormous effects on every nation, every person and the whole future of mankind.

The theme last year of your great Rotary President, Bill Walk, was "Bridging the Gaps." By this he meant bridging the gaps to create understanding and friendship among people. Certain it is that "bridging the gaps" between the people of China and the peoples of the world, not limited to the United States, is one of the most needed "great leaps forward" of our day. And you in Rotary, with your world-wide organization can indeed make a major contribution as all the world's peoples are helped by such increased friendships, such "bridging" of one of the great gaps which exist today among the peoples of the world.

You may well wonder why I should stress the impact of China on the law, when comment to date has dealt almost exclusively with the impact of the welcoming of China into the active world community on such concepts as world balance of power distribution, American and Soviet foreign policy, and impact on other nations. However, power and policy, nationally and internationally, must exist within a framework of law. And China's entry into the world community of law will change both China and the world's law system.

China's internal law and her acceptance of international law, provide one of the best and

most meaningful "weather vanes" of the future.

We cannot understand China unless we understand the system under which China rules its 800,000,000 people. That system is a law system. The Chinese legal structure is perhaps the most important part of China's development against which we may test the probably future relationships which can be developed.

Of all the disciplines, and areas of concern in developing mutual interests, the law is one of the most important, as it does, or will, lay out the rules for new relationships between China and its peoples and other nations and their peoples. What those rules are, and what they may become, is an all important part of our future and the future of all humankind. China's internal law will govern future business and other relations among her people and other peoples and other nations. Her acceptance of international law will govern the extent to which China is ready to play a role in world affairs. The rules she will follow in her dealings with other peoples and other nations in all areas of transnational interest will be found in the law she accepts.

In the law rules of China one will find the rules which will govern and guide—which encourage or repulse—contacts and relations.

Every nation has laws. A nation's law system distills and crystallizes its most significant attitudes, values, and beliefs. The status of everyone: the individual, the government, and other institutions is spelled out in its law or lack of law. A people's law within their nation is in fact a rather reliable mirror reflecting the status of their civilization. To put it another way, in the world of today, the human rights and the individual liberties provided by a nation's law for her people is a true measure of that nation's civilization. I believe the glimpse of Chinese law which I give you today is at least one meaningful evaluation of China's current social, cultural and economic status.

While no one can be sure China is ready to enter the modern world or ready for great power status, a look at her domestic law and her acceptance of international law is one test of such readiness.

Without law anarchy prevails within or among nations. The concept which brings stability into the affairs of nations and the people is the rule of law.

Let me caution at the outset, the rule of law as we understand it is not the law which exists in China. They use law differently and they define law differently than we do. But none-the-less their law is an area which will govern how far and how fast they move into the affairs of the human family on a world-wide scale.

Today, when I use the term China, I speak only of Mainland China, the Peoples Republic of China. I have visited General and Madame Chiang Kai-shek on Taiwan and am most familiar with the Republic of China and its views. I have many friends among the lawyers and judges there. They are a great people. I was there last in 1969 just after President Nixon began to unveil his new foreign policies at Guam limiting our role in Asia and as world policeman. At our meeting, General Chiang Kai-shek expressed his vigorous disagreement with that policy. But neither the General or anyone else, at that time, foresaw the current situation. And it is to that current situation to which I address my remarks today.

In the broadest view, there is hardly a nation or a person in the world who is unaffected by President Nixon's China initiative. Recently, I met His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie in Addis Ababa. He spoke at great length about the effect on Ethiopia of this initiative and of his own recent visit to Peking. His was a most revealing story of China's interest in Ethiopia, their economic aid to Ethiopia and China's interest in world

affairs. When I met President Tito of Yugoslavia last summer, his interest in China was a major subject of discussion. I am sure these heads of state reflect the world-wide interest in this subject. And so it is in nation after nation. Each is analyzing the trip's widespread repercussions. Their leaders and their people are watching the President's journey with special interest and anxious eyes as to its effects on them.

Recorded history of the government of China begins with the Shang or Yin Dynasty in about 1500 B.C. Down through the centuries, the most notable Dynasties were the Han, Ming and Ch'ing or Manchu—the last, which ended in 1912. Each Dynasty developed its law and some rather complete codes of law were promulgated. But today I pass over this law heritage of China and the period of unrest after the overthrow of the last, the Manchu Dynasty, and even the law of the Nationalist Republic which was created in 1941 and go directly to the law of the People's Republic of China which has governed China since 1949—The comments herein are based on research of the World Peace Through Law Center for its soon to be republished volume covering domestic law of 135 nations.

The Individual in China has traditionally been subordinated to the family and other social groups. The unity which held Chinese civilization together for more than 4 millennia is the family system. In many of its aspects the family system filled roles we traditionally assign to the law so the Chinese traditionally have relied less on the law than we have. The family system permeated every aspect of Chinese society and economy and political life. It is the cornerstone of Confucian teaching.

When viewed in the light of China's long history the centralization of government and control of the people is very little different today than under the Han, the Tang, the Ming or Manchu Dynasties. One noted China scholar, Professor John K. Fairbank has said: "Dynastic absolutism has been replaced by Party Dictatorship."

Under the Peoples Republic of China a three part governmental structure exists composed of the Communist Party, the Governmental and the Army.

When they came into power in 1949, the Communists through a convocation called the Chinese Peoples Consultative Conference adopted as Supreme law a provisional Constitution containing three basic documents: (1) The Common Program of General Principles, (2) The Organic Law of the Central Peoples Republic to establish a central government, and (3) The Organic Law of the Chinese Peoples Consultative Conference. These gave a legal basis to the communist military conquest. It is interesting that they first provided this legal foundation by their adoption of this interim constitution on October 1, 1949, before they proclaimed the Chinese Peoples Republic. From that date until now there is great emphasis on the law and legality.

The National Peoples Congress in September 1954, adopted a new Constitution embodying an updated version of the substance of these 1949 documents. This Constitution marked the beginning of a more orderly development of the law system which today governs China.

While China has in recent years moved away from its Russian ties, her Constitution is clearly patterned after Russia's. In fact, the Preamble to the 1954 Constitution states: "China has already built an indestructible friendship with the great Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

The Constitution contains four chapters of 106 articles covering four parts: (1) General Principles, (2) The State Structure, (3) The Fundamental Rights and Duties of Citizens, and (4) the National Flag, National Emblem and Capital.

The General Principles are the usual provisions of a Socialist state with many references to workers and peasants. They require everyone to "observe the Constitution and the law."

The State Structure is composed of an elected National People's Congress whose approximately 1000 members serve four year terms. It meets once per year. The Congress exercises all power including that of amending the Constitution. There is a Standing Committee headed by the Chairman Mao Tse tung, which exercises power when the Congress is not in session. A State Council, headed by the Premier Chou En lai exercises the administrative functions of the Nation "according to provision of Law."

The Constitution provides for Local People's Congresses, Local People's Councils and Organs of Self-Government of National Autonomous Areas which "adopt and issue decisions within the limits of the authority prescribed by law."

There is a Supreme People's Court, some 200 intermediate courts, and over 2000 Local People's Courts and Special People's Courts. The Chief Justice, Yang Hsiu-feng, (they call him President and some think that Yang was purged during the recent cultural revolution) of each Court is elected for a term of four years. The Supreme People's Court reviews all death sentences and exercises supervisory powers over the other courts. Two lay jurors, called assessors, sit in the local and special peoples courts, their vote being equal to that of the judge on both facts and law. These jurors, or assessors, also are elected for four year terms and there are an estimated 250,000 of them.

There is a national prosecutor who prosecutes or supervises the prosecution of all crimes, and the observance of all law. He participates in civil cases which are of interest to the government and has an ill defined and evidently controversial supervisory role as to judges. The Supreme People's Procurator is elected by the National People's Congress for a four year term. There are over 1200 Procurator offices and probably two to ten prosecutors in each local procurator office. Article 78 of the Constitution guarantees the "independence" of the Courts but the Communist Party seems to be very much in the picture on all decisions.

At one time there was a Ministry of Justice headed by Miss Shih Liang, who reported often to the National People's Congress on the courts and law. That Ministry has been abolished and its functions evidently assigned to the Supreme People's Court or the Procurator organization.

The Police system is national in direction and the police possess very drastic powers to arrest and detain those suspected of committing a crime. The police seemingly can, without court trials, send "undesirables" who cause trouble to labor camps for periods of several years, subject only to review of such cases by special local committees set up for that purpose.

The procuratorates, courts, and police are expected to cooperate and coordinate their activities and to follow Party leadership in fighting against counterrevolutionary and criminal forces sabotaging socialist construction. During the past few years, the procuratorates have implemented the mass line by going to the people, working, living, and eating with them, and conducting investigations and prosecutions on the spot. The Procuracy's major duty is to prosecute and suppress counterrevolutionaries.

Of interest is a report of The Chief Procurator of Canton who has stated that due to improved procedures:

"Now, on the average only three hours are needed to dispose of a case, involving all procedures for affecting arrest, examination of findings, and prosecution at the Court."

Mao Tse tung in 1957 made a speech on "Correct handling of contradictions among

the People" which is much used as "law" in deciding cases. The laws of China are heavily weighted with political ideology and directed against enemies of socialism. Evidently the Chinese adhere to Lenin's definition of law: "Law is a political instrument. It is politics." The Courts are expected to educate the people on the values of the socialist system in their conduct of cases. The emphasis in the courts is on crimes not on civil disputes. The emphasis in civil disputes is on settlement by conciliation, mediation and informal discussion rather than court trial.

The traditional Chinese view is that law is an instrument to protect the political and social order rather than a guardian of private rights and interests. That view prevails today under the Communists. There is much reliance upon moral persuasion and social sanction.

The law emphasis is upon suppression of crimes rather than upon resolution of individual disputes.

There is no code of criminal law or criminal procedure and no code of civil procedure.

Civil lawsuits are not in favor in China. The courts are used chiefly for criminal cases.

Despite the Constitution's "independence" guarantee, the courts are dominated and controlled by the Party as instruments of Communist political education, ideology and socialism. Education—propaganda functions have been carried out at trials, especially the highly publicized mass trials.

Among the Fundamental Rights and Duties of Citizens in the 1954 Constitution is "freedom of religious belief" and women "enjoy equal rights with men."

The legal profession of China has never been very numerous or very important. The Communists in the early days of their rule in fact abolished it entirely as apparently too much a part of the Nationalist Government system they were supplanting. Law offices were closed and lawyers prohibited from practicing. But the Communist regime soon recognized a defendants right to a "defense." And the 1954 Constitution provides: "The accused has the right to defense" which is interpreted as meaning a lawyer although due to scarcity of lawyers it often means that a friend or member of the accused's family performs this task.

Gradually, there has grown in China chiefly after 1954 a group known as "peoples lawyers" who practice in Lawyers' Associations and work in Lawyers' Advisory Offices. These peoples lawyers write agreements, give legal opinions and serve as defense counsel in criminal cases. The lawyer is independent at the trial and need not carry out the desires of the defendant.

It is estimated that there are some 5,000 of these "people's lawyers" chiefly practicing in the major cities. The major universities have law faculties in which there are now over 4,000 students. If one adds law trained procurators, judges and other government lawyers there are perhaps as many as 35,000 lawyers in China to serve her 800,000,000 people. This compares to 350,000 members of the legal profession for our 200,000,000 people. The differing emphasis on law is clear.

The Government has been issued "Regulations for Lawyers" and "Provisional Rules for Lawyers Fees." There is apparently rising concern because China does not apparently have complete criminal or civil law codes or codes of criminal and civil procedure. The prosecutors and judges are said not to be too happy over the growth of the services of the "people's lawyers." The only apparent national organization of the legal profession is the Association of Political Science and Law of which the last announced President is Wu Teh feng.

When the communists came into power in 1949 China had been torn apart by half a century of war and it was one of the most backward nations in the world. They pro-

ceeded to unify China by the constitutional organization just described. By this unification they have sought to create the foundation for a modern industry, science, and technology.

From the best available sources—and never forget that even today China is to a major extent a "closed" society—it appears that China's law system has gradually improved since 1949. Her use of mass trials where such objectors as landlords were condemned to death and exterminated before upward of 2,000 persons seem to be no longer in use. Her law, her judges and courts, her legal profession and law faculties are improving. For example, reference to the law history of China and the law of other nations seems to be allowed in China today.

Law is undoubtedly important in China as there is constant reiteration of the duty of every person to observe the law. But the law they refer to is not law interpreted and administered as is our law even where the words are similar. They refer to their law and their law's content and administration which are used as major tools for control of the Chinese people. All the beautiful phrases in the 1954 Constitution are interpreted to give the Communist Party control of the prosecutors, the courts, the police and the "people's lawyers." Freedom under law as we know it does not exist in China. The rule of law meaning the rule of right reason and the law as ruler, and above the individual ruler, is not the law system of China today. Lenin's definition of law as "a political instrument" is clearly the view which prevails.

I believe the evidence is still too sparse for any correct judgment as to whether the trend toward law improvement has reached the stage wherein there is meaningful movement toward individual freedom under law. I look forward to a visit to China and hopefully the acquisition of data upon which a more realistic analysis can be made.

In my judgment, China's law system is today in about the status as Russia's law system in 1958 when I first visited Russia. Russia's law system today is a vast improvement over the 1958 version. And Russia's law system is still a far cry from providing that individual freedom under law which twentieth century humans expect as their rightful lot even where that freedom does not exist.

Let us now take a look at China's acceptance of international law as evidenced by her signed agreements and treaties with other nations. And while facts with respect to the administration of domestic law are difficult to secure, the full story of China's international agreements and treaties can be developed with good accuracy from the records of the other nations who are signatories to such agreements and treaties. In fact, two able legal scholars, Douglas M. Johnston and Hungdah Chiu have prepared a list, or calendar, of over 2000 such agreements and treaties covering the period from October 1, 1949 when the People's Republic of China assumed governmental control of Mainland China up to September 30, 1967. Their list as published by Harvard describes treaties and agreements by subject matter, nations who are parties, and date signed. From September 1967 to date it is estimated that the Peoples Republic of China may have signed another 1000 international agreements.

The agreements and treaties with 77 other nations cover over 100 subjects such as aid (technical and economic), air service, banking, boundaries, cultural cooperation, diplomatic and consular relations, fisheries, friendship and mutual assistance, military subjects such as aid and war prisoner treatment, navigation, postal services and telecommunications, railway service, scientific and technical cooperation, trade of goods and payment therefor (there are over 500 of these, by far the largest number) and water conservation.

The only agreement between the United

States and the Peoples Republic of China was signed October 10, 1955 in Geneva by the Peoples Republic of China Ambassador Wang Ping-nan and U.S. Ambassador U. Alexis Johnson. It covered mutual repatriation of citizens of the United States and citizens of China.

Analysis also indicates that China has entered into some 70 multilateral treaties and conventions, the others being bilateral agreements between China and one other of the 76 nations.

As of today I am advised that 73 nations or about one half of the world's countries, have formally recognized China. President Nixon's visit has provided China a new legitimacy and respectability and nations who in the past held off are now moving quickly to establish diplomatic relations with China.

Recognition brings into play the acceptance of much international law such as the law of diplomatic immunity.

China has apparently kept all of her international agreement and paid for all goods purchased from foreigners. She has purchased a \$150,000,000 steel mill from West Germany, chemical plants from England. Although recently accused of treaty and agreement violations by Russia and others Chou En-lai has constantly announced that China owes no one and has paid everyone including Russia for all goods received. In her external relations China has emphasized "reciprocity" as the key to trade and to other agreements with her.

On November 15, 1971, China took its place in the UN with the head of their delegation Chiao Kuan-hua giving a wide-ranging opening speech. He condemned both the United States and Russia as super-powers using the UN for their aggressive purposes against other countries. He compared China with the so-called "Third World" of developing nations. He said China is "determined to liberate Taiwan." The Chinese delegation entered quickly into the work of the UN by attending committee meetings. Obviously, they will be extremely active UN members. The presence of China should strengthen the UN as a forum for arriving at meaningful world agreements.

China's acceptance of the UN Charter and the law contained therein, China's membership in ILO, UNESCO and other UN specialized agencies all create law obligations which affect her relations with all nations. How China acts and reacts as to these law obligations will have major impact on China's entry into the peace work of the family of nations. It is clear that many great problems of the world which could not be settled by UN without China's participation may now be confronted.

There is an old Chinese proverb "every journey begins with the first step." A new order in the world has come into being due to President Nixon's initiative. He has taken the first step. Exciting possibilities and challenges lie ahead. If this journey is to lead to a meaningful world peace structure, I believe it must be built out of law rules and law institutions and UN can pull itself up by its bootstraps by taking the lead, now that China is a member.

China's international law record is already extensive and growing rapidly. That record provides an excellent background of precedents upon which to base a rapid build-up of United States relations with China and her people. Certain it is that this record proves China has not been as isolated from the rest of the world as she has been from the United States. China's experience with these other nations forms a good foundation for an expansion of her international relations with all nations.

We in the United States especially must learn about all aspects of life in China as for 22 years we have been living largely in ignorance of China due to mutual isolation, animosity, and suspicion. Due to this mu-

tual isolation of the past 22 years, we as a people are largely unaware of what has been happening in China and many of her main characteristics. China with its mystery, complexity, and magnitude is hard to analyze, hard to comprehend. But it is very important to us in the United States that we try to learn about the strange and fascinating Chinese nation, its past and present. We need to make a concentrated effort to understand the Chinese people, their aspirations, and their leaders.

Absorbing all the knowledge we can is an essential education for each of us as I believe that our relationships with the Chinese people—and the peoples of all other nations—cannot be left to mere governmental contacts. We each have a role to play. Each of us can in the words of Bill Walk help "bridge the gap."

Beyond governmental contracts, there are many meaningful relationships which the President's historic journey should open up for contacts between lawyers, judges, doctors, engineers and others. In the period ahead we will learn a lot about China and medicine. Acupuncture is already widely discussed. We will also learn about China and science, China and engineering, China and care for the aged, children and working wives, and China and air travel as she is even now beginning a new international airline. We will in fact learn about China and a wide variety of interests and businesses as China enters the mainstream of life in the world community. All these areas of knowledge will prove tremendously helpful in understanding the complex life of China as we adjust ourselves to the impact on us of 800,000,000 Chinese and their aspirations.

As is true in relations with other nations, there will be many more contacts among individuals of other nations and Chinese people than contacts among government officials of other nations and Chinese governmental officials in the days, months and years ahead. There will probably be a flooding into China of many business and other groups, professions and tourists. I understand some 30,000 Americans have already asked for visas. Those who get visas will—like the President—see the Great Wall, the Forbidden City and other tourist attractions. But beyond mere sightseeing they will be a part of the gradually growing system of relationships upon which permanent relations must be founded. "Ignorance breeds fear" and as knowledge grows, meaningful friendships will grow.

President Nixon has indicated his hope of creating the framework for creating closer "on-going" relations with China at the Summit meeting for the United States. And while he is naturally reluctant to be too optimistic we can hope and pray that another result of the Summit will be a new framework for peace, which really brings peace. Above all the visit is a breaking out of the grip of the past where no workable framework has been developed. It is not reasonable to expect that a peace framework could be developed and agreed upon and released from the Peking Summit and sprung full blown upon an anxious world in a flash like a space rocket take off. But the Summit dialogue may develop a framework for future negotiation of solutions of world problems. If that framework is to have world-wide appeal, acceptance, prestige and permanence, it must be created out of concepts which all humankind both universally comprehend and universally support. There is no concept more universally comprehended by all peoples and no concept more universally supported and accepted than the principles, procedures and institutions of the rule of law.

Beyond what governments can do or should do, I believe that there is a major role for we of the law in China's advent into the work for peace of the world-wide human family.

Before I close therefore, let me capsule in a few words the mission of The World Peace Through Law Center. The peace process is a law process. Our major role is to persuade nations to accept more and more law, and more and more law institutions so as to strengthen the world's law system into a peace structure that will work to prevent war. Beginning our effort in 1957 under the challenge of Winston Churchill to do more than talk about a "law-full" world, and using as a foundation a report by the late Thomas E. Dewey, we are now working with lawyers and judges in 135 nations.

We have proceeded on the basis that each nation's legal profession can best persuade its leaders to accept more law. There are world-wide some 1,000,000 judges and lawyers. They have been persuaded to work individually, or through their organizations, to help expand the law and law institutions of the world community into this world law system we seek which is strong enough to provide a meaningful world peace structure. A structure so acceptable, nations will take their differences to courthouses rather than seek decision by human deaths in battle. We are doing our work through assembling the law of the world, and through research, conferences and publications to expand that law. We have created a world-wide dialogue to educate the public, as well as the legal profession, on existing law and on needed law and the law's relation to a peaceful world order with justice.

I presented this law for peace program to some 20,000 Rotarians in Sydney, Australia last year. That was a thrilling and most worthwhile experience. I shall never forget it and the results are still coming in as Rotarians all over the world have joined in to help build a peace edifice for the world out of law.

There is an enormous amount of law in effect in the world and more law is coming into existence almost daily as internationalization of life, business, economics and society increases rapidly. In fact, a recent study indicates that more international law has come into existence in the past 25 years than came into existence in all prior history. And on the domestic level, a recent survey by the Center of the law of 135 nations reveals that nearly every nation on Earth is updating its laws to meet modern demands. In our day there is a world-wide turn to the law of unprecedented proportions, nationally and internationally. We are witnessing the unfolding of a ferment which is transforming the world. A historic transition is in progress.

It is against this accelerating world-wide turn to the law, this increasing use of the law, this growth of law, and above all an increasing respect for law, that I urge we do all we can to encourage China to improve her internal law system and to accept more and more international law.

As we search out the meaning behind the TV spectacular, as we seek to evaluate the small glimpses thus provided of life behind the bamboo curtain, and connect the unknown with the familiar, I urge that we test China constantly on her acceptance of the universal concepts of the rule of law.

The concept of the rule of law means peace to all mankind. Our task is to translate the concept into reality. My report is that we in The Center are well underway in that task. We ask you of the Rotary to join us in this great crusade for peace through an ever strengthened law system for nations and among nations.

The United States and the people of the world need a great common cause to which they can devote themselves so as to lift their hopes and their hearts. The most common interest of humankind is peaceful world order with justice. There is no cause greater than the cause of world peace. Let us put the common cause and the common interest

together and together move forward to translate this dream, mankind's most ancient dream, from dream into reality.

If our future relationships with China and the whole world, are built on the rule of law and that rule truly prevails throughout the globe, then can any man, woman or child live or work or travel any place on the face of the earth in freedom, in dignity and in peace.

COLLECTIVE OR PERSONAL RULE IN THE U.S.S.R.?

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress are always interested in the foreign policy decisions of our chief rival, the Soviet Union. Because of the importance of those decisions, we ought to know more about the Soviet policy-making process and the people that run it.

For this reason, I recommend an article by David Cattell from the October 1971, issue of Current History. Mr. Cattell argues that:

As pervasive as the arguments for continued collective rule may be, the evidence points to a personal power struggle . . . and to the gradual emergence of Brezhnev in first place.

Mr. Cattell was acting director of the International Securities Studies project at UCLA at the time he wrote the article, which follows:

COLLECTIVE OR PERSONAL RULE IN THE U.S.S.R.?

(By David T. Cattell)

Is the power struggle for a successor to Nikita Khrushchev in the last act? Is the doctrine of collective rule about to be filed away again? Is Party Secretary Leonid Brezhnev emerging as the new personal ruler of the Soviet empire? Collective rule by an oligarchy of Soviet leaders has lasted six years, much longer than usual. Or has the situation changed in spite of Brezhnev and is oligarchy becoming institutionalized? Is it now accepted that the complex Soviet society and economy cannot be successfully run according to the whims of one man? Did Khrushchev's "hare-brained schemes" show the folly and dangers of personal rule?

Beginning with Brezhnev, the contenders for power are 64 years or older. The only young contender, Aleksander Shelepin, who is 52, seems to have been effectively removed from the struggle. What kind of long term stability can an old leader provide? As persuasive as the arguments for continued collective rule may be, however, the evidence points to a personal power struggle (although at a less dramatic pace than previously) and to the gradual emergence of Brezhnev in first place. The recently published Khrushchev memoirs, genuine or contrived by the K.G.B., revealed little that was new but again emphasized how personal intrigues dominate the life of the Soviet court.¹

As in a Byzantine court, the scheming of the last couple of years in the Kremlin has been hidden as much as possible from the public eyes. During the last year even the second echelon of the hierarchy, represented by the Central Committee of the party, is being kept out of the contest. After the embarrassing uncertainties during the Decem-

Footnotes at end of article.

ber, 1969, and July, 1970, plenums of the Central Committee, when the lack of unanimity in the Politbureau became the subject of debate, the more recent meetings of the Central Committee have been curtailed to a few hours duration. The 24th Congress, delayed until the end of March and early April, 1971, was also carefully planned as a model of control and unanimity.²

The evidence of Brezhnev's bid for personal rule has been the rise of his cult of personality, his predominant power in the party and the party's growing ascendancy over the bureaucracy. Brezhnev began by assuming the title of General Secretary rather than First Secretary of the Party in 1966. He packed the Party Secretariat with his supporters and tried to raise the Secretariat to a position coequal with the Politbureau. Thus, following in the steps of his predecessors, he has tried to gain control of the party as the key political institution. At the same time, Brezhnev's name is openly being pushed to the forefront in every way by his followers. The publication of his collected speeches and articles in August, 1970, was greeted with a fanfare in all the leading journals and newspapers. At celebrations such as the fiftieth anniversaries of the Azerbaijan and Armenian Republics and at the various congresses and plenums of the Communist parties throughout the Soviet empire, Brezhnev's speeches are given great prominence, broadcast and published nationwide.

Thus, in the last two years, Brezhnev has managed to launch himself publicly as the primary leader, not just the first among equals in the Politbureau. But despite a two-year campaign, the evidence would indicate that his bid within the Politbureau has not yet succeeded; he still does not have absolute control; and he has yet to try to purge his opponents from that body. The confusion in announcing a postponement of the Party Congress during the July, 1970, Plenum of the Central Committee just a few days after Brezhnev had promised that the Congress would meet in 1970, and the long delay until February, 1971, in publishing the goals of the ninth five year plan (1971-1975) seem to indicate continued disagreement at the top level. There is nothing radical in the nature of the targets or the organization of the new five year plan to explain why it was announced many months late.

It is also clear that Brezhnev has not been able to pack the party cadres with his own men, at least until the meeting of the 24th Party Congress. Surveying the shifts of important party secretaries at the republic and provincial level during the last year, it appears that in Kazakhstan, which has been in dispute, Brezhnev's position has been strengthened but not completely secured. He also seems to have lost out in Leningrad, long a crucial and vital party center. Furthermore, his position in the second largest republic, the Ukraine, seems in doubt. His shutting off of the Central Committee from the debates and giving it only formal power may be a further indication that his control is not yet secure. The advances he made at the 24th Party Congress by adding his supporters to the Central Committee and Politbureau and advancing the control of the party over the government apparatus has still to show its effect. A tentative appraisal suggests that he may still be just short of his goal.

The composition and structure of the opposing factions in the Politbureau and their support in the second echelons of the party and government are not clear. The leaders of the opposition appear to be President Nikolai Podgorny and Mikhail Suslov. It has been rumored that Premier Aleksei Kosygin would like to retire from politics. There is also some evidence that the opposition may fluctuate, depending on the issue, and may be able to prevent Brezhnev from acting on his own on certain issues.

Although personal rivalry dominates the power struggle and will determine the outcome, some policy and ideological issues also seem to be in dispute. It is not always clear which faction supports which position, but knowing this relationship is perhaps not so important as understanding the nature of the issues and the range of differences, since positions taken by leaders during the power struggle are purely tactical. Regardless of which faction they head or support, none of the old men in the Politbureau has shown any desire to stray far from traditional policies and all, at least at the moment, agree to resist a return of a powerful secret police.

AREAS OF DISAGREEMENT

Four major areas of disagreement have come to the surface: (1) Should the party play an increasing role in the control and direction of the economy and society? As traditionally conceived, the party is supposed to issue overall directives to all parts of Soviet life and to check on their fulfillment, but it is not intended to administer directly either the economy or government. Its only direct administrative task is in the area of political indoctrination. For tactical reasons of power and out of fear of the growing government and economic hierarchy, Brezhnev, like Stalin and Khrushchev before him, is pushing for direct party interference in all affairs. Obviously Podgorny, Kosygin and others not predominantly associated with the party apparatus are resisting this. For the moment, Brezhnev seems to have made significant gains by upgrading the technical qualifications of the party cadres and expanding the party rules.

(2) Will the transition to communism bring about a fundamental shift in the social structure in the direction of an "all people's state" as advocated by Khrushchev? The implications of this issue could be radical indeed and, in fact, the intellectual underground in the Soviet Union favors going as far in the direction of a real democracy as an "all people's state" would suggest. But as a force in numbers or influence the underground is too weak to affect the debate, except adversely, i.e., those who oppose any restructuring of society point to the demands of the underground and the experience in Czechoslovakia in 1968 as the horrible example.

Within the party "establishment" the debate is very much more restricted. Most of the debate is theoretical, but it does affect the practical issues of expanded mass organizations, limited autonomy for economic enterprises and greater stress on local government. On the theoretical level, against the more conservative party journals, the party newspaper, *Pravda*, apparently led by Podgorny in the Politbureau, supports the immediate introduction of some Communist-type features in the system. On the practical issues, at least, Brezhnev seems to be the arbitrator, although his compromises seem to have favored the conservative side. The mass public organs stressed by Khrushchev are still given lip service, but have significantly declined practice.

There has also been a conscious effort to increase the power and resources of local governments as purveyors to the masses. But the great economic reform beginning in 1965, which among other things was to advance the autonomy of enterprises, has been sabotaged by the bureaucracy, and the economy is increasingly run by decrees from Moscow. Even the idea of a new constitution seems to have been shelved indefinitely, despite the appointment of a new constitutional commission after Khrushchev's ouster in December, 1966.

(3) Should the traditional emphasis on capital development and defense be shifted in favor of consumer-oriented production? This is an old issue, the current debate for which began in the power struggle after

Stalin's death. In the last few years, neither side has won more than modest advances. In spite of the rhetoric about the great consumer advances to be expected in the ninth five year plan, a careful study of the goals and cautious pledges indicates that only a minor shift in favor of the consumer can be expected. Furthermore, if previous practice is any indication, these promises will be sacrificed to meet any crisis.

(4) Closely associated with increasing consumer production is the question as to how the population can be mobilized to strengthen its active support of the system and improve labor discipline. On the one hand, the supporters of greater consumer output argue that the primary answer is material incentives. On the other hand, the conservatives, who seem to include Brezhnev, argue for indoctrination, increased discipline of the population and perhaps even greater repression. The conservative position has tended to dominate over the last two or three years. With the strong emphasis on law and order, the police and legal system has been brought back under tight central control. In September, 1970, the Ministry of Justice (abolished by Khrushchev in 1956) was restored.

The legal and extra-legal campaign against deviant intellectuals and artists continues to mount. While the sterility of Soviet writing and literary criticism is deplored (*Pravda*, June 15, 1971), ideological control is tightened. All liberals have been removed as editors, and only a few moderates keep the literary scene from being completely dominated by the rigidly orthodox. Even after Alexander Solzhenitsyn's removal from the writers' union, he has continued to be the focus of bitter attack, although he is rarely mentioned by name. The press did, however, confine itself to short denunciations in December, 1970, when Solzhenitsyn received the Nobel Peace Prize (*Pravda*, December 17). The writers' congress in June-July, 1971, was without debate and was dominated by the ideologues condemning the deviants and praising guidance by the party. In a new campaign, the regime has extended its criticism to scientific institutes for their ideological laxness, and the party has been ordered to tighten its surveillance of their activities.

Next to ideological laxness, the regime seems to regard alcoholism as a major cause of poor labor discipline and hooliganism. The press is full of editorials on the subject and suggestions on ways to curb it. In practice, however, the regime has moved cautiously, reducing slightly the availability of vodka and increasing the social and legal pressure against alcoholics.

Other facets of the crusade for better labor discipline include condemnation of the chicanery and illegal methods used by many parents and students to get students into institutes of higher learning. In contrast, the propaganda stresses, the true Soviet man loves all kinds of work, including technical and manual labor. Looking to the future, the campaign deplores the decline of the Soviet birthrate and presses for an increase in the size of urban families. This issue is likely to become increasingly important. Finally, as part of the program of developing discipline and in order to please the military, the regime has placed new emphasis on military training as part of the curriculum at all levels of schooling.

For all the disagreement and seriousness of the issues, the solutions proposed by factions in the Kremlin amount to nothing more than tinkering with the organizational structure. The Kremlin has avoided real reforms, such as a flexible pricing system to make the incentive system work or increased rents for housing to provide the income necessary for improving domestic services and better quality housing. At the beginning of 1965 the economic reforms seemed to indicate a small

step toward fundamental reform, but they have been effectively sabotaged. No serious efforts have been made since.

It is not surprising that the changes which have been made by the collective leadership have often been minor and vacillating. The need to compromise does not make for clear, decisive policies. This is perhaps the major argument being used for a return to personal rule. The Communist leadership has a deep fear of indecisiveness. Certainly a resolution of the power struggle could resolve the division of resources among consumer goods, capital development and defense. However, an analysis of some of the wavering and unsettled policies suggests causes other than a divided leadership. Take, for example, the policy of curtailing dissent with refraining from using all the police powers of the state. While many opposition intellectuals have been condemned to work camps and insane asylums, other well known dissenters like Solzhenitsyn, the musician Mstislav Rostropovich, the biologist Zhores A. Medvedev and the physicist and academician Andrei Sakharov have thus far escaped.³ The underground press (*samizdat*) also continues to flourish and regularly publishes a newsletter (*The Chronicle*). There is also the ambivalent treatment of Jews: persecuting and discriminating against them for their alleged support of international Zionism, and yet backing down in response to international pressure by commuting the death sentences of Jewish hijackers and allowing more and more Jews to emigrate to Israel.

The dilemma presented by these policies seems not to arise from the power struggle alone. In each case, the basis for not using maximum force seems to come from fear that the mobilization of such authority could only be effected by expanding the role of the secret police and might give rise to a new reign of terror. From the underground there is already evidence that the K.G.B. has been expanding its files.

The campaign for greater labor discipline without drastically increasing the penalties for violating discipline also illustrates the timidity of the regime. In this case, there is not only the danger of encouraging the secret police, but the fear of a mass reaction. The lesson of the widespread riots of the Polish workers in December, 1970, against unpopular restrictions and price increases has undoubtedly been taken to heart.

Hesitation in solving the needs for educational reform and the pusillanimous attitude toward allowing industrial managers and scientists more autonomy point up still another dilemma. It is widely recognized that managers need to make more decisions as production becomes more complex and that the Soviet Union needs a broader, more creative educational system in place of the rote, narrowly technical training of today. But logic seems to give way to fear—based on experience in East Europe—that any relaxation of strict controls and any encouragement of individual creativity may get out of control and be dangerous.

Finally, there is one set of vacillating policies which cannot easily be explained by the fears of the leadership or their differences. In the past five years, two organizational changes at the lowest level of the party have been suggested. First, it was proposed (and seemingly accepted) several years ago that the system of political agitators directed by the party be turned into a system of *politinformators*. Traditionally, agitators were recruited as much as possible from the masses and through seminars and handbooks were trained to inform, mobilize and report on a small group of fellow workers. But with the higher level of education of the masses it was felt that they needed political informants with more comprehensive training. The new *politinformators*, as a result, are more carefully trained and generally specialize in one

area of politics. They work together in teams with a much larger group of citizens.

The second reform, of more recent origin, proposed that the bureau elected by the members to head the primary organization of the party be enlarged from 9-15 members to as many as 50, depending on the size of the primary organization. Both reforms were apparently being implemented, but in the last two years there have been growing signs of disagreement and even of retreat. If Brezhnev is in complete control of the party apparatus, why this uncertainty? Is it because of Brezhnev's own indecision, the resistance of the lower echelons of the party, or opposition by Brezhnev's rivals, who still are able to exercise some influence in the party?

Vacillation is usually a symptom of weakness, but in the short run the indecisiveness and the hesitancy to change characteristic of current Soviet internal policies may not be signs of weakness. The cautiousness of the Kremlin leadership must be analyzed against the background of the continued growth of the Soviet economy. Except for an occasional bad crop year as in 1969, overall production has grown at a respectable, if not a spectacular rate; real wages and living standards have continued their slow advance; and the defense of the country has not been sacrificed. There are no signs of real mass discontent and the last two good years of harvest should help ease food supplies again. The intellectual dissidents are only an annoyance.

Thus wariness about change during a stable, prosperous period is not sufficient evidence that the system cannot respond to a real threat. In fact, a serious threat from any quarter might resolve most of the differences, doubts and even the competition for personal leadership in the Kremlin. As long as the system of central authority is still intact the road to quick mobilization is available to meet a crisis. But in the long run, resistance to change and uncertainty could bring weakness. And short of a crisis, reforms are not likely under the present leaders, individually or collectively, and will have to wait for a new generation of leaders.

FOOTNOTES

¹ *Khrushchev Remembers* was published in the West, and a dispute immediately arose as to its authenticity. Khrushchev issued a statement denying he had sent any memoirs abroad for publication (*Pravda* and *Izvestia*, November 17, 1970). Most authorities feel that the memoirs are at least partially authentic but have probably been cut and tampered with by the K.G.B.

² See also the article by Adam Ulam in this issue.

³ On November 4, 1970, Sakharov and two other physicists announced the formation of a Human Rights Committee.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 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?

ANTIBUSING LEGISLATION

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include the text of my statement before the House Judiciary Committee on antibusing legislation, as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

For the record, let me say that my name is Olin E. Teague, and I represents the Sixth District of Texas in the Congress. I have had the privilege of representing the Sixth District of Texas for the past twenty-six years.

I want to express my appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the Committee, for permitting me to appear here today to share with you some of the thoughts I have, and some of the thoughts my constituents have, about compulsory massive busing of school children.

It has been my observation over the years, Mr. Chairman, that some of the most terrible injustices and some of the most revolting inhumanities in our history have been perpetrated by simple men of good will who held blindly and rigidly to a dogmatic and theoretic principle while ignoring the practical damage their rigidity was causing in terms of human values. The wars of religion, stretching over many centuries of human misery, provide innumerable examples of this blind inhumanity of man to man.

During the last century, in the late 1840's, when the potato famine struck Ireland, the British Government refused to permit food to be sent across the Irish Channel because this would violate the economic principle of *laissez faire*. As a result, while the economists talked philosophy, between three and four million Irishmen starved to death.

I think the same can be said about the determination of some persons to force massive school busing down the throats of America, whether our citizens want it or not.

The whole idea of massive busing was conceived in a wave of idealism by a cadre of nice-thinking liberals who didn't know what in the devil they were talking about. The entire concept came into being when certain reports on school conditions seemed to indicate that black youngsters performed, or "achieved", more satisfactorily when they went to school with white youngsters than they did when they went to all-black schools. The nice-thinking liberals, therefore, got the bright idea of transporting youngsters all the way across town—or all the way across the county—or, as is true in my district, all the way cross several counties—to achieve racial balance. There is no indication that the massive busing is having the slightest effect on grades of the achievements of the youngsters, black or white. If anything, for reasons we shall discuss later, the bused children, deprived of their security, do worse than they did before.

It is also apparent that the program was decided upon hastily, without a proper analysis of the factual data. It seems that no one in authority realized that, by and large, the black youngsters who—in many parts of America, in the North and in the South—attended integrated schools, came from middle class and upper class negro families, professional and business type families, where literacy and concern for scholastic achievement are a way of life and have been for several generations. People like this, no matter what their color, almost invariably do better in school than do those who come from broken homes and low income families,

where literacy, if it exists at all, is not broad or deep or even considered much of a virtue.

In my opinion, the decision to provide compulsory massive busing was made without any proper scholarly evaluation of the population "mix" upon which the various original reports were based.

The proponents of massive busing say that racial segregation is psychologically destructive. I agree. Ghettos are dreadful places and always have been over the centuries, no matter what race or what religion or what nationality was forced to crouch and crawl—by law or by economic circumstances—within the confines of a ruined slum.

But I also say that enforced, artificial integration is also psychologically destructive. What kind of a psychological effect do you think it has on black youngsters to send them chasing across several counties after white children just so they can go to school with them? The whole proposal is scandalous. It reinforces the poisonous myth that white children are inherently better and smarter than black children and that black children are automatically improved simply by being given the privilege of being with their white contemporaries!

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to have to say this, but that is one of the most viciously racist proposals I have ever heard, and I say it has absolutely no place in the comparative racial enlightenment of twentieth century America. The Congress, in all good conscience, for its own good name and for the good of the nation, must reject such blatant and dangerous racism. I do not say that the sponsors of massive school busing were conscious racists. Far from it. But I do say the program they have embraced has been, unconsciously, I am sure, wickedly racist.

As usual, nice thinking but hazy-thinking people have picked up the wrong end of the stick. They are looking at the educational problem from entirely the wrong vantage point. They are so entranced with the prospect of achieving even a phony kind of integration that they lost sight of the principal and only objective we have in this case, that of improving the level of education for all school children—of making the standards of education uniform so that no one will get a better education solely because he is white and no one will get an inferior education solely because he is black.

If half the money that is being spent today for compulsory busing were spent for improving the quality and the standards of education in inferior schools, the problem could be solved efficiently and happily, without pain and without resistance and resentment.

The fact of the matter is that the compulsory busing program was a theoretic dream and it has been translated into a practical nightmare. The best thing we can do for the children and for ourselves is to admit that we, as a nation, have made a terrible mistake and abandon the whole idea for more practical and positive ways of improving the standards of education everywhere in the nation.

The compulsory busing problem is not achieving anything significant in the way of educational progress. But whom is it hurting? It is hurting the youngsters, black and white and yellow and brown, whom it was designed to help.

In the Sixth District of Texas, Mr. Chairman, and I am certain my district is not unique in the nation—many youngsters who used to go to school in their own neighborhood are now being transported an hour or more in each direction, solely to get an acceptable racial mix in the schools. That's two unnecessary, useless hours out of their lives, every school day of the year! This is time that could be spent studying, or reading or researching, or even playing healthy games. Instead it must be spent on a dreary bus ride, where the big thrill of the journey

is waving to the busload of youngsters being transported all the way back in the opposite direction.

Quite honestly, I don't know anyone actually involved in the busing program who approves of it. Most of those involved, detest it. The only ones who approve seem to be the theoretic planners who don't ride the buses themselves and whose children don't ride them. And, of course, I am talking about all races, not just the white race. The Negro, if he is involved personally in the program, hates it as much as does the Caucasian. We have had a very interesting demonstration in Washington, D.C., during the last month of black people who were furious at what the busing program was doing to their children and to their family life.

In San Francisco, an attempt to bus Chinese children away from their own fine public school and scatter them around the city turned out to be an embarrassing fiasco. The Chinese children just refused to go; the parents went on strike. The authorities barely saved face with an embarrassing compromise. Like all others, the Chinese citizens and their children saw what compulsory busing was going to do to their home life and their family solidarity, and they would have nothing to do with it.

I am a passionate believer in the integrity of the home—in the importance of the home in shaping the character of the child and the adult that is to be. I am also a passionate believer in the importance of roots. Humans need roots just as much as trees need them. Roots involve not only one's family but one's neighborhood and one's local school. Most Americans grow up in the certain and sure knowledge that their closest friends are those with whom they grew up, those with whom they went to school. These are the people they can call upon in an emergency. The people they turn to instinctively in times of sorrow, in times of joy.

In the smaller communities of America the local public high school is usually the social center of the area. It is the center for the youngsters, and it is the center for the adults, who, as parents, go through life with an abiding loyalty to their local high school. In most cases, loyalty to the old high school supersedes loyalty to their college. I know all of this sounds corny and provincial to the high-brow element in our midst, but that is the way the minds and the desires of small-town and rural America run, and this is the way of life that has turned out generations of splendid, God-fearing, God-loving citizens who have been the backbone of the nation in good times and in bad, in war and in peace.

If a questionnaire were circulated among the population today asking for the principal cause of the unsatisfactory conduct on the part of certain segments of our youth today, I believe one of the answers that would receive the most support would be rootlessness. Family life—neighborhood life—has broken down in many areas of the country, particularly in the large urban areas in the north, and our young people have lost their roots and their interest in roots. They, and the nation, are much the worse for this loss. But, Mr. Chairman, why in the name of all that is holy are we going out of our way to encourage this disastrous rootlessness through thoughtless theoretic legislation?

Let me quote Rabbi Jacob J. Hecht, executive vice president of the National Committee for Furtherance of Jewish Education. The rabbi, who knows more than a little about the grim horrors of ghetto life, is still unalterably opposed to compulsory massive busing. "Busing a child daily many miles to school could hardly be conducive to providing him with a favorable educational environment," the rabbi says. "Busing in reality creates new tensions and anxiety at a time when he is already beset with the multiplicity of problems coincident with growing

up and adolescence. Busing removes from a child one of his most powerful sources of security—his neighborhood. It places him smack into an alien atmosphere he could only react to with anxiety." I couldn't agree with the rabbi more.

Mr. Chairman, we are today crucifying hundreds of thousands of our youngsters on a cross of blind ideological dogmatism. We are sacrificing the youth of our young by making them conform to an unworkable philosophical theory. We are destroying the best years of our children by herding them up a pedagogical blind alley in the name of an untenable sociological doctrine.

We must stop this cruel and senseless course of action. We must stop damaging our youngsters to satisfy the blind prejudices of their elders. Only we can do it, and we must have the courage and the morality to admit the mistakes of the past and act legislatively to rectify them. We must prevent compulsory massive busing from becoming a permanent part of our way of life.

Thank you very much.

STATE SENATOR GEORGIA M. DAVIS OF KENTUCKY URGES CONTINUED FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR PARK-DUVALLE HEALTH CENTER AMBULANCE SERVICE

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, a matter of urgent concern, affecting the health and welfare of a great many of my constituents, is the impending cutoff of funds by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the ambulance service operated by the Park-DuValle Neighborhood Health Center.

The magnitude of this problem has been recognized by an able State senator from Kentucky, with whom I formerly had the honor of serving, Mrs. Georgia Montgomery Davis.

I insert the following resolution introduced by Senator Davis in the Kentucky State Senate be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

A concurrent resolution affirming support for ambulance service provided by the Park Duvalle Health Center and requesting that the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare continue the grant of funds to support this worthwhile program.

Whereas, Park Duvalle Health Center Ambulance Service will be discontinued June 30, 1972 because of a lapse of funds, and

Whereas, this program has provided invaluable service to the people of the community, and

Whereas, the operation of this ambulance service has relieved the police department of this duty so that they may devote more time to the provision of law enforcement services for the people of the community.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, the House of Representatives concurring therein:

1. That the Secretary of the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare be and is hereby requested to continue the grant of funds to the Park Duvalle Health Center for the ambulance service for its community.

2. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Wel-

fare, to the two Senators and to all the members of the House of Representatives representing Kentucky in the Congress of the United States.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT NEEDS

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to make a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the final insertion of testimony which I received during the four hearings in the First Congressional District of Arkansas on community development needs. This series of statements, including witness' comments, from the hearings, began September 22, 1971.

It has been my intention, in sharing this material with my colleagues, to stir interest, where none may have existed, in the plight of nonmetropolitan areas and to provide those who have active interests in this area new data for their efforts in behalf of these regions.

The list of needs which the witnesses at the hearings enumerated were very similar to those which their counterparts in the Nation's metropolitan areas have made banner headline concerns for newspapers and special documentary material for radio and television stations. These smalltown and city mayors, the county judges, and the people in general of the nonmetropolitan areas ask only for the same opportunities to have: better highways, a wider variety of educational opportunities, more financing avenues for new businesses and homes, improved health care services, facilities for housing their public agencies and for use in recreational endeavors, more job opportunities, and assistance in solving their waste disposal problems.

The persons who provided the testimony, which I would make a part of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD represent a variety of areas. Mayor Lona Ackerman's town of Mountain View, Ark., is one of the developing tourist center areas. John Purtle, of Batesville, speaks as attorney for towns ranging in character from growth center to village. Bill Murdock is mayor of the town of Moorefield, and his list of needs typify the problems of municipalities located in close proximity to a rapidly growing city.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY BY MAYOR LONA ACKERMAN OF
MOUNTAIN VIEW, ARK.

The people of Stone County wish to commend you on your very dedicated efforts to revitalize the economic climate of the rural areas of Arkansas. We feel that your efforts will not only benefit the people of the rural areas, but it will also have a definite impact upon conditions throughout this nation.

Stone County is fortunate in that we have two federally funded projects now underway that will undoubtedly make our area one of the tourist centers of the southern part of the United States. The two projects being, The Blanchard Springs Caverns, which is scheduled to open in July, 1973, and The Arkansas Folk Cultural Center, which is also scheduled to open in early 1973. However,

in order for Stone County to realize its full potential, there are certain problems that must be met and must be handled properly in order for the local people to benefit themselves and their families from these two large developments. These problems are listed below:

1. *Highways.* These two large federal projects will increase the traffic into our area at an almost unbelievable amount. In order to safely and adequately transport people into our county and throughout our county, we must have systems from all levels of government in highway and street construction. At the present time, we have a 3 mill road tax, which is not sufficient for maintenance of present roads and replacement of equipment with the present traffic load. There is no way that it can reasonably be expected to take care of the traffic load in the future under the present financial conditions. We need federal funds set aside for highway construction into and throughout this county.

2. *Educational facilities and finance.* With people moving back into the area at a very rapid rate, there is being a burden placed upon the already inferior educational facilities throughout our county. If our young people are to get the quality education they so richly deserve and need, and, also, get the training so that they will be able to participate in the future development of Stone County, we must have legislative help in the area of education.

3. *Financing for small business and individual homes.* We feel that in Stone County there are many young people who have the ability and the desire to participate in the developments that will come to this county very shortly. However, at the present time, he is limited as to what he can do because of lack of financing available. If our local people are to participate and grow with the county, they must have access to more capital for investment purposes.

4. *Public buildings.* We especially need assistance here for a county wide library so that literature can be made available to people of all ages. We also need help in providing a museum that will take care of and preserve articles that have been so important to the development of our county for future generations. We also need assistance in constructing and improvement of the Stone County Courthouse.

5. *Airport improvement.* In the very near future more and more people will seek to come into our area by air. We need financial assistance in improvement and maintenance of the air strip which is now in use in Mountain View.

6. *Industrial Park.* With the tourist industry coming into Stone County, we believe that closely following behind this would be the potential of other industry seeking to move into our area. The county needs financial assistance in acquiring an industrial park so that adequate space and locations for future industry could be located rapidly.

7. *Community Center.* There is a need in our area for recreational facilities for both the youth and adults. We feel that this type of center would also encourage industry as well as individuals to move into our county.

As clearly stated in our problems here in Stone County, directly relates to money. We feel that if funds were available to assist the local governments in meeting these problems, then our country would experience a great economic growth, and would stop this migration from our county into the urban areas.

We also feel that in time the local tax base would grow at a rate that the local government could maintain and broaden these projects.

For your information and consideration, listed below is a list of problems and opportunities for development in Stone County that was formulated by the County Development Council in a recent meeting in Mountain View:

- A. Youth Development and Education.
- B. Shortage of Private Capital.
- C. Transportation.
- D. Lack of understanding of the local people for an orderly systematic development plan for the area.
- E. Waste Disposal.
- F. Low wage scale in tourist industry.
- G. High risk and low returns to new tourist industries.
- H. Large segment of population has substandard housing.
- I. Shortage of motel and restaurant facilities.
- J. Expanded medical facilities.
- K. Need for additional public educational opportunities for youth.
- L. A need for lay citizen involvement in rural development.
- M. Improvement to county courthouse.

Also, listed below is a list of opportunities for U.S.D.A. to work on development in Stone County:

1. Work with authorities for getting loan money made available for some of this work.
 2. State committee could get rural housing liberalized (F.H.A. and V.A. make only 9% of home loans in Ozarks).
 3. County group could do educational program among rural people to help them understand comprehensive planning.
 4. State could furnish materials and county committee could hold meetings.
 5. Help people develop a waste disposal system.
 6. Support from state, district, and county committee for local development group.
- Again, Congressman, we commend you on your efforts on behalf of the small towns and communities in the first congressional district. We look forward to successful legislation submitted by your office that will alleviate some of the problems of the rural areas which will consequently relieve some of the problems nationwide.

BATESVILLE, ARK.

HON. WILLIAM ALEXANDER,
Congressman, First District of Arkansas,
House of Representatives, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We write this statement at the request of the Mayor of Moorefield, Arkansas. We are the town attorney for Moorefield (pop. 122 approx.). However, what we say is equally true of other communities for which we are also town attorney (Cushman, Oil Trough and Batesville).

Small communities in our area have held their own and in some instances near Batesville began to grow. Favorable factors have contributed to this. One is low interest loans made available by the Farmers Home Administration. High lot costs have caused young couples to seek more moderate land cost in semi-rural and rural areas and small towns.

These areas cannot cope with increased demands on the water table, sewer disposal, trash removal, roads, the school system nor provide the necessary police protection.

You asked for a listing of the five or so most urgent needs for economic development. My list may be different from some, but here it is:

- (1) Water—no industry, no person wants to be in an area where the water supply is uncertain or unhealthful.
 - (2) Roads—paved roads are a necessity. The dirt road with only an occasional pickup truck no longer exists in most of our county. Higher traffic counts are experienced each year. A paved road encourages development of housing and industry.
 - (3) Education—our school system depends largely on local property taxes. It is assessed at about all that our people can pay. It's a dangerous thing to say, but federal help—no strings attached—is needed.
 - (4) Sewer and trash disposal—these become more critical as housing density grows.
- The funding of these projects is beyond the private purse. Government help is needed.

Revenue bonds have been used widely in this area and the market appears good from the sellers standpoint. The raising of taxes for projects is out of the question because federal and state income taxes, property taxes and sales taxes have occupied the field.

Federal revenue sharing (again, no strings attached) holds promise as I see it. The matter should receive full and thoughtful consideration and not be dismissed as too novel to be explored.

Also requested was an analysis of problems encountered. Dismay and disgust with continual delays, repeated paper work, additional requirements, additional delays and still no action create a critical attitude on the part of local people. Completed projects however are a source of pride in the community.

If I had to say only one thing I would encourage the completion of the Rock-Moore Water Assn. Hundreds of people are waiting on this and have been for more than three years (some people reckon 7 years). All money has been collected and all requirements are in hands of the federal officials and yet no funding is coming forth. Independence County just went through its third driest year on record. Many haul water all summer. Sulphur water underlies most of the area and even hogs are reluctant to wallow in it.

We also urge passage of legislation to prevent the President from freezing federal funds that congress has appropriated for public projects without congressional approval. We are told by informed sources that 60 million in FHA water funds are tied up because of this.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN PURTLE.

JANUARY 7, 1972.

HON. WILLIAM ALEXANDER,
Congressman, First District of Arkansas,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Most of us who are involved in local governments are encouraged by your efforts to find solutions to the problems of the rural areas.

The most urgent needs of rural development in our area include:

1. A public water system.
2. A public sewer.
3. Road and street improvement (extension and paving).
4. Adequate police protection.
5. Adequate fire fighting capability.
6. Regional medical facilities.

Local funding for these projects is out of the question. Federal income tax, state income tax, county maintenance tax, school district tax and inflation have dried up all sources of any revenue.

The Rock Moore Water Association has three hundred twenty five families as members and we have been trying to secure federal help for several years but have not succeeded. On 28 June, 1971 we signed the financial papers required by the Farmers Home Administration to commit funds, but as of this date no further information has been received except from your office. (Your office has been very helpful.)

Young high school graduates are not going to stay in this area if the basic facilities such as bathrooms are not available.

The current status of federal help in our area is not too good. We subscribed to all federal requirements in trying to get the Rock Moore Water Association funded and also the White River Medical Center is waiting for federal action.

Unless federal funds are made available for such projects as the Rock Moore Water Association rural Arkansas cannot contribute to the progress of our nation.

Sincerely yours,

BILL MURDOCK,
Mayor of Moorfield.

SUGGESTED PROGRAMS FOR CONGRESSMAN ALEXANDER REGIONAL MEETING IN BATESVILLE, ARK.

1. The question concerning equal educational opportunities for all students in public school, grades one through twelve.

If some program could be devised whereby the State and Federal government, in a cooperative effort would take over the entire cost of public education, and removing the property tax entirely as the financial base for public education.

This one program in my opinion would open up a whole new field in economic growth for Arkansas and the entire Nation.

(A) It would relieve the real and personal property taxpayer of approximately 70% of their local tax bill.

Let me give you one example. If my local property tax bill is \$100.00, and I was relieved on 70% that would mean that I would have \$70.00 to pay for additional services or additional goods for my family. This would be a great stimulus to the economy in Arkansas.

2. Local County Government, and Municipal Government, is hard pressed to find enough money to operate efficiently. The work load and the demands for additional services are increasing each day. All of us in County and Municipal government would like to be able to move forward with some worth while public projects, and at the same time be able to give the people the services that they demand.

(A) We are hearing a lot about revenue sharing. A great number of County, Municipal and State Officials are saying that President Nixon's revenue sharing program, with no strings attached is the right way to help local government. After a great deal of thought and study, it is my opinion that Chairman Mills is doing the right thing in opposing this type of program. Chairman Mills has come forward with his own program for revenue sharing. I have not studied his program enough yet to comment on it, however I am sure that the tax payers money will be protected a great deal better if the Mills program is adopted.

Congressman Alexander, I want to go back a few years and review the history of a great President, and a great Democrat Congress. What did President Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Congress do to stimulate the economy, and to get this country moving forward again? One of the greatest programs that was or has ever been devised was the Public Works Program (or, sometimes called the W. P. A. program).

This program was a type of revenue sharing, with local government. This one program began to move local government forward and they could provide the services that the people needed. There were school buildings, court houses, municipal buildings, county roads, city streets, storm sewers, parks, swimming pools, and many other type projects completed, and we are still using and enjoying these facilities, they are in every County and City in this State.

My second proposal on the subject of revenue sharing, is simply this.

If the Congress would devise a Public Works Program, whereby, a Mayor and City Council of a city or municipality and the County Judge and the Quorum Court of a county could make an application for all types of public improvement facilities, such as we mentioned above, with the Federal Government paying 80 or 90% of the cost, and allowing the city or county sponsoring the project to pay their share by the rental of equipment or by rendering service on the project.

This type of program would furnish jobs for all types of people that are out of work. If the program is so devised that, the

Welfare Department would have to certify all able-bodied people, that they have on there rolls, and all new applicants, that are able to work, to the Employment Security office for a work card and send them to the Mayor or County Judge for work on these Public Projects.

This type of program will do the following:

1. Reduce the unemployment.
2. Reduce the Welfare rolls.
3. Stimulate the economy.
4. By the building of new Black-top Highways and County Roads, the construction of new City streets, with sewer and water improvements, this will help to stimulate the Tourist Industry in the small communities of this country.

5. The most important of all, we will be cleaning up, and making America beautiful.

3. Interest rates for the working people. In order for the working people of this country to build new homes they must have long term loans at a low rate of interest.

In my opinion his would stimulate the building Industry more than any one thing that could be done.

We believe that these suggestions would have the approval of approximately 75% of the people in Arkansas.

Thank you,

JESSE B. CARPENTER,
County Clerk.

Mr. Speaker, this is the 18th insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of testimony and other materials which I have gathered during my research into ways to assist community development in non-metropolitan areas. Other materials on this subject appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 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, pages 38121-38123; part 30, pages 39156-39158; part 31, pages 40813-40817; part 32, pages 41882-41884; part 34, pages 44696-44699; part 35, pages 45963-45966; part 36, pages 47310-47312; and volume 118, part 1, pages 1225-1226; part 3, pages 3583-3586; part 4, pages 4739-4743, and 4824-4828; and part 5, pages 5355-5358.

CALVERT SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT'S OUTSTANDING CONSERVATION FARMER, CALVERT COUNTY, MD.

HON. WILLIAM O. MILLS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. MILLS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully insert in the RECORD a letter describing a man who has worked diligently to achieve a high degree of success in the conservation farming area. I am proud to have him as one of my constituents.

The letter follows:

PRINCE FREDERICK, MD.,

February 16, 1972.

Mr. MALCOLM G. GRAHAME,
Sunderland, Md.

DEAR GORDON: It is with the greatest of pleasure that I inform you of your having been chosen as the Calvert Soil Conservation

District's Outstanding Conservation Farmer for 1971.

This award is made in conjunction with the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company, who provides a certificate to the winning farmer of each participating conservation district throughout the United States. The formal presentation of this award is usually made at the annual Farm Bureau Banquet and we will be in touch with you again early next fall.

The results on your conservation farm have been very gratifying to both the Board of District Supervisors and the local Soil Conservation Service, and we want to take this opportunity to thank you for a job well done.

Sincerely,

WILBUR F. WARD, JR.,
Chairman, Calvert Soil Conservation District.

AMERICAN LEGION

HON. JOHN Y. McCOLLISTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1972

Mr. McCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion is visiting Washington this week for their 12th annual conference. I have had the opportunity to meet with members from Nebraska three times this week, and I would like to take a few minutes now to pay tribute to these men on a formal basis.

No one can refute the influence the American Legion has had on behalf of the veteran and his family. The veteran's assimilation into society, legislation on his behalf, the comfort provided to widows and family members—all of these things have made the American Legion a significant force in the lives of those who have served in our Nation's wars.

But the point I want to emphasize today is that the American Legion, valuable as it is to its members, can never be described as only a special interest group with limited concerns. The Legion has served our country over the last 53 years as if its basic purpose was to boost patriotism, to strengthen moral fiber, to insure that the freedom we enjoy as Americans today is the freedom we will continue to enjoy tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, in Nebraska we enjoy a particularly strong group of Legionnaires. Our State membership is now about 58,000. Some 25 of these men attended the conference in Washington this week, including three from the Second District—Ed Chizek and John Kiriakides of Omaha, and Bob Corn of Papillion. Our Nebraska members have done some particularly outstanding work on the jobs for veterans project and on the POW problem—working with the petitions, lending encouragement and counseling to POW families, and helping keep the issue alive before the public.

And it is not just Nebraska. American Legion members everywhere are focusing their attentions on their communities and on looking to the future to see in which ways they can best serve.

In short, Mr. Speaker, I can think of no organization in this country that can claim more man-hours of dedication to

patriotism, to work toward the increased defense needs of this country and freedom of people everywhere. And I can think of no time in history when this has been more important.

Patriotic love of one's country by its citizens is the top priority natural resource needed by a nation. There is no substitute for it. When a potential enemy assesses the possible strength of a country, it looks first to its people. And nothing is more of a deterrent than a nation united with a spirit and love of its country so strong it cannot be punctured. We are living in a time when overt signs of this patriotism are few and far between. Yet by the same token, a time when our Nation's defense posture is seriously in question and when an impenetrable spirit has never been more strongly needed.

Bernard Baruch once said that within the American Legion thrives the greatest corps of Americanism alive in the world today. I cannot put it any better than that. I am proud to be a member of the American Legion and today salute the men who work so hard to make the words "For God and Country" a meaningful heritage. I am grateful to them.

IMPROPER USE OF ARREST RECORDS AS AN INVASION OF PRIVACY

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the year 1984 is still more than a decade away, but few of us realize how close we have come to the situation so graphically depicted by George Orwell. In the February 27, 1972, Washington Post there appeared an excellent article entitled "An Information Monster That Threatens Our Privacy," in which author Roger Wilkins outlined in a compelling manner the way collection of information by the Government is stifling dissent and invading individuals' privacy. I wish to commend this article to my colleagues and insert it in the RECORD at this point. I also wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that Judiciary Subcommittee No. 4, of which I am chairman, will on March 15, 1972, begin hearings on H.R. 13315, which deals with the use of records of arrest on which there has been no conviction—a subject discussed by Mr. Wilkins in the article to which I have referred.

The article follows:

THE REVOLUTION IN LAW ENFORCEMENT TECHNOLOGY HAS PRODUCED AN INFORMATION MONSTER THAT THREATENS OUR PRIVACY
(By Roger Wilkins)

A silent creeping—one might even say creepy—revolution is taking place in the technology of law enforcement data collection and dissemination. The computers have entered the field and their potential for severely denting—if not destroying—the individual's right to privacy is growing by leaps and bounds.

Last year in a privacy case in the U.S. District Court in the District of Columbia, Judge Gerhard Gesell wrote:

"A heavy burden is placed on all branches

of government to maintain a proper equilibrium between the acquisition of information and the necessity to safeguard privacy. Systematic recordation and dissemination of information about individual citizens is a form of surveillance and control which may easily inhibit freedom to speak, to work, and to move about in this land. If information available to government is misused to publicize past incidents in the lives of its citizens the pressures for conformity will be irresistible. Initiative and individuality can be suffocated and a resulting dullness of mind and conduct will become the norm."

Judge Gesell went on to decide that while the arrest record of a person who had been convicted of no crime could be maintained for federal employment and "strictly law enforcement purposes," the FBI is "without authority to disseminate arrest records outside the federal government for employment, licensing or related purposes."

Unfortunately, this lucid principle is being eroded by a voracious computer industry, two powerful and competing federal bureaucracies, hardware-loving police departments around the country and by a Congress which seems not to have the sensitivity, the will or the capacity to do anything to arrest or reverse the trend.

Late in the 60s, the first tendrils of what is fast becoming a patchwork—but nonetheless enveloping—information giant were beginning to emerge in the form of the FBI's National Crime Information Center system (NCIC). That system was designed to provide simple computerized information to law enforcement people on wanted persons, and identifiable stolen property such as license plates, securities, boats and guns. At the same time, from 1966 through 1968, the Justice Department's Office of Law Enforcement Assistance was providing various police jurisdictions about one million dollars a year to develop electronic data retrieval systems.

Then came the deluge. Since 1968, the Law Enforcement Assistant Administration, the much better funded successor to OLEA, has dispensed more than \$46 million for a variety of such projects all over the nation. Some went to states for development of a greater organized crime intelligence collection capacity. Other states began using LEAA funds to develop systems related to civil disorders. Whereas earlier efforts had been fairly clearly directed toward information useful in crime detection and prevention, the guidelines began to become murky in the civil disorders field. One state, for example, indicated in its grant application that it would collect the names and information about people who "actively pursue their constitutional rights."

The most significant of the LEAA funded projects, however, was Project Search, which began as a cooperative effort among six states to standardize and computerize personal criminal history records and tie them into a central index and switching center in order to provide each participating state with quick number of states in the project had grown to 20 and the problems had grown proportionately.

The first strains emerged when Project Search's Committee on Security and Privacy issued a study which attempted to formulate procedural guidelines safeguarding the public. Among the committee's recommendations were limitations on the type of data to be collected, periodic re-evaluation of the data in order to ensure accuracy, the development of procedures for an individual to have access to his file and stringent security precautions to prevent unauthorized individuals from obtaining access to the stored information. The head of the FBI's NCIC system argued that if such guidelines were needed at all, Project Search was the wrong organization to develop them and that in any event, it was too early to conduct such studies.

Shortly thereafter, it became clear that the FBI hoped that Search would be controlled, not by the states, out by the FBI and that its electronic systems would be tied to the Bureau's National Crime Information Center System. LEAA and the states balked. They argued that the original concept of Search was a bulky central index of criminal activity—like a telephone book—with the basic records being retained in the states rather than the creation of a federally controlled national criminal information and intelligence data bank.

As the dispute raged, Search oozed beyond its original confines into areas never envisaged by the original concept. Under the rules developed by LEAA, such charges as juvenile and public order offenses, drunkenness and vagrancy would be excluded, but serious crimes would be recorded. Those might include bigamy, cruelty to animals, failure to provide support to one's family and adultery as well as the traditionally serious crimes of murder, assault, burglary and robbery.

Meanwhile, the FBI won its fierce bureaucratic battle within the Department of Justice with LEAA. On Dec. 10, 1970, the Attorney General transferred Search to the FBI. A year later, the Senate included in the FBI's appropriations bill language which appeared to restore to the FBI authority to share its information with certain classes of banks and also, in appropriate circumstances, with state agencies for employment and licensing purposes. In all the hurry and growth, the model codes for protection of citizens' privacy and the code of ethics drawn up by Project Search's Committee on Security and Privacy got buried.

At this point the situation remains cloudy, but ominous. LEAA still makes the grants for the acquisition of computers and is pressing for expansion of the system. The FBI is tightening its control while also pressing for ever greater membership. The states, having warned the Attorney General prior to the transfer of Project Search to the FBI that "no matter what the Feds do, the states will continue to develop their own system or systems," are presumably doing just that. And any state or locality may, on its own initiative, store additional information in a system that later may be "interfaced," to use a term of the trade, with the federal data bank. For example, the Kansas City, Mo., police department has stored, among other things, information on outstanding parking tickets, college students known to have participated in disturbances and "area dignitaries."

While this information-gathering monster grows and spreads, there is really no effective federal or state regulation of the whole system. Senator Ervin's Constitutional Rights Subcommittee heard some testimony on the subject from both administration proponents and from concerned and frightened citizens. Senator Mathias slipped an amendment into Title I of the Omnibus Crime and Safe Streets Act requiring LEAA to develop legislation regulating the activity. In response in September, 1971, Senator Hruska introduced the Criminal Justice Information Systems Security and Privacy Act of 1971. To date, no hearings have been held on the Hruska bill.

Without debating the details of the Hruska bill, it is fair to say that it assumes that computerized dossiers collected by state and federal police organizations are part of our national life, that they are useful and that they are here to stay. And that it just the point. We apparently are off on another technological toot that leads God knows where without giving it a second thought. Nobody knew when Henry Ford rolled out his first Model A that the internal combustion engine would someday foul our cities. But now we ought to be sophisticated enough to know that a ride on the tiger's

back is sure to cost at least a healthy nip on the nose, if not a great deal more.

This issues raised require urgent analysis and broad national debate before the information monster entirely devours our privacy. Because of the complex interstate nature of the system and the federal government's deep involvement in its development, there is only one place where the debate can appropriately take place—in the Congress of the United States. And the first question that needs to be taken up is whether the public wants or needs this system. If Congress' answer is yes, then there is a pressing need for it to define a citizen's right of privacy and the limits which must be placed on the machines' almost unlimited capacity to pry, to store, and to regurgitate indiscriminately, mindlessly and on command.

Right now only the Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights under the Law, aided by the National Urban Coalition, is monitoring the growth of the beast and, laudable as that effort may be, it is not enough.

VICE ADMIRAL RICKOVER WARNS OF TAXPAYERS' REVOLT, URGES TAX REFORM

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with other members of the House, including the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, WILBUR MILLS, in expressing the hope that the President will demonstrate some commitment to meaningful tax reform. Recent statements from the White House give us little cause to hope that any such commitment will be forthcoming.

I was, therefore, heartened to read that at least one voice from within the administration has joined in calling for tax reform—Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, Deputy Commander for Nuclear Propulsion—USN—and Director of the Atomic Energy Commission's Division of Naval Reactors.

Vice Admiral Rickover warned an executive session of the House Appropriations Committee last May of the dangers inherent in foisting the tax burden onto the low- and middle-income sectors of the economy, while maintaining privileged status for the wealthy in the form of a variety of tax advantages. He admitted that closing the loopholes will not be easy, but he said it was one of the most pressing tasks before Congress.

I would like to take this opportunity to insert in the Record an article from the January 16, 1972, edition of the Sacramento Bee, reporting on the vice admiral's testimony:

TAX REFORM—RICKOVER SAW NO EASY SOLUTION

(By Leo Rennett)

WASHINGTON.—"The events that led to the French Revolution can teach us a lesson," the witness told the House Appropriations Committee behind closed doors.

"In Louis XVI's time, the only way ordinary people could exert any control over their government was by refusing to provide the money the king needed.

"The parallel with our own situation today seems clear to me.

"I am not sure but that it is going to take some form of revolt by the majority of Americans to bring us more equitable taxation."

If the speaker had been Jerry Rubin or even Ralph Nader, this would be familiar radical rhetoric.

But addressing some of the most powerful men in Congress last May 11 was an esteemed friend of the Capitol Hill establishment, Vice Adm. Hyman Rickover.

Once a year, the committee invites his views on defense topics and other matters he deems important.

This time, however, his hosts seemed unprepared for what turned out to be a slashing indictment of their own role in maintaining a privileged class through special tax favors.

MIDDLE-CLASS REVOLT

Warning that public "frustration and disillusionment" are reaching dangerous levels, Rickover recalled the French monarchy was overthrown when the middle class felt similarly helpless and aggrieved over money matters.

To replenish his treasury, Louis XVI convened a meeting of noblemen, clergy and popular representatives—only to be confronted by an ultimatum for radical reforms. Royal resistance sparked a revolt in which the king and Marie Antoinette eventually lost their heads to the guillotine.

"I mention these well-known facts because I believe they remain relevant today," Rickover remarked.

America, he said, may not have noblemen with fancy titles. But it does have "privileged segments of the population" who enjoy great wealth while bearing only a "small share of the burdens of citizenship."

Those in the top 1 per cent bracket, he noted, still have an income higher than those in the bottom 20 per cent—a pattern unchanged for the last 25 years. The top 5 per cent still make more than the bottom 40 per cent.

"Capital gains, depletion allowances and tax-free bonds provide loopholes for the upper-class taxpayer who is able to take advantage of them," Rickover declared. "The middle classes rarely can."

Warming up to his topic, he called tax reforms one of the most urgent tasks before Congress.

"No man who has an income of several million dollars a year should be allowed to pay little or no income tax," he said.

At stake, he stressed, is the durability of the American system itself.

NO EASY WAY

"Our officials should bear in mind that by this failure to carry out their responsibilities they are undermining the very system which has made it possible for them to attain to high position," he remarked.

As a realist, Rickover sees no easy path to tax reform.

"Those who benefit most from present tax laws are also those best able to make large campaign contributions," he observed.

His assessment was correct. A few months later, Congress enacted a tax bill with virtually no reforms but plenty of new benefits for business and the affluent.

The new measure will mean an income tax reduction over a three-year period of \$872 million for those in the \$20,000-and-up bracket.

Taxpayers in the \$100,000-and-up category will enjoy a \$95 million windfall during the same interval.

True, low- and middle-income groups also were given reductions.

But failure to close major loopholes coupled with new benefits for the rich assure a continuation of whopping budget deficits in the next few years. In turn, this income drain is bound to intensify White House and congressional resistance to the funding of many domestic programs.

And when the day of reckoning finally arrives and taxes have to be raised, it is a safe bet that those who already bear a disproportionate share of the burden will be asked again to cough up some more.

Trial balloons now emanating from the Nixon administration about a value-added levy—a form of national sales tax—follow a predictable pattern.

Under the guise of relieving pressure from local property taxes for financing of public schools, Washington would come to the rescue with a new sales tax which could bring the range of \$20 billion a year.

The new levy, of course, would not disturb those benefiting from tax loopholes. Their merry ride would continue without interruption.

Interestingly, there would be no need for a national sales tax if many special tax breaks were eliminated. That kind of reform would be just as effective a revenue raiser—also in the range of \$20 billion a year.

At this stage, it appears unlikely that Congress will pass any significant tax legislation in an election year.

UNDESIRABLE TREND

A year hence, however, the prospects again will be strong that under the pressure of some fiscal crisis, reforms will be shelved and additional taxes imposed on those who already pay more than their fair share.

As Rep. Sam Gibbons, D-Fla., a maverick member of the House Ways and Means Committee, points out:

"We are in the process of chipping away at our best tax, the income tax, both individual and corporate, and moving toward greater reliance on the Social Security tax and possibly a federal sales tax."

"This is an undesirable trend." Gibbons estimates the last two tax bills approved by Congress will mean a revenue loss of \$170 billion during the period 1969-1980 and wonders who will end up paying the piper.

Rep. Henry Reuss, D-Wisc., another in a small band of reformers, warns:

"We are faced with a fiscal situation where revenues are going to be drastically too low for needs, or budgetary deficits too high for a sound economy, or both."

Yet, he notes, more than 100 taxpayers with incomes of more than \$200,000 paid no federal income taxes in 1970—a year after passage of the 1969 Tax "Reform" Act!

Three persons in the \$1 million-and-up bracket, he adds, also managed a free tax ride in 1970.

Reuss estimates a "sensible" loophole-plugging reform bill could raise \$20 to \$30 billion a year.

MOSS COSPONSORS BILL

"Ever since 1954 the federal revenue system's progressiveness has been progressively impaired," he complains.

To reverse the trend, California Rep. James C. Corman, D-Los Angeles County, is pushing legislation to close up to \$20 billion a year in loopholes.

Rep. John Moss, D-Sacramento, an opponent of the value-added tax who voted against the 1969 and 1971 tax bills, is a cosponsor.

But there is no sign of any interest on the part of House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Wilbur Mills, D-Ark., who usually controls the fate of tax legislation on Capitol Hill.

Mills converted the 1969 tax "reform" bill into a tax reduction bill and readily went along with the White House last year, in pushing through more tax cuts. Like President Nixon, he thinks economic and social gains should be achieved primarily by stimulating the private sector of the economy.

This leaves the Democratic presidential ticket in 1972 as the only potential source for any momentum on tax reform.

Economist John Kenneth Galbraith suggests that liberals evaluate Democratic con-

tenders in upcoming primaries largely on the basis of their readiness to seek elimination of tax loopholes.

Like Rickover, he thinks the problem is urgent, the present system a scandal and time a dwindling commodity.

When the admiral testified before the Appropriations Committee, Rep. Daniel Flood, D-Pa., sought to soften his warning about a burgeoning taxpayers' revolt.

"You are using the term in a philosophical sense," he suggested.

"Yes, sir," Rickover replied. Then he added: "But in a few years it may be a fact."

CIVIL LIBERTIES VIOLATIONS IN THE UKRAINE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter and petition from the Ukrainian Students Club at the University of Minnesota. It details several civil liberties violations by the Soviet Government. The Soviet Government is sensitive to foreign statements dealing with human rights violations occurring within the U.S.S.R. Perhaps publication of the following letter will help stimulate Soviet adherence to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The letter follows:

UKRAINIAN STUDENTS CLUB,
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,

Minneapolis, Minn., February 1, 1972.

HON. DONALD M. FRASER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We would like to direct your attention to the events which are taking place in Ukraine. In the last few years a strong voice of protest could be heard in Ukraine resulting in a wave of arrests and confinements in the Mordovian concentration camps. Hundreds of individuals, such as university professors, students, journalists, writers, poets and artists, all of them young people who were reared under the Soviet system, were detained, many of them secretly tried and sentenced to the long terms of imprisonment. According to the Russian political analyst Andrey Almarik, 70 of all political prisoners in the USSR are Ukrainians.

Recent dispatches by Reuters and Associated Press from Moscow report new arrests of 19 Ukrainian intellectuals. Among the arrested, there are several individuals who were previously persecuted and imprisoned by the KGB for alleged "nationalist activities." These dissenters are well known not only in the USSR but also beyond its confines. The young journalist Vyacheslav M. Chornovil has already served the term in the Mordovian concentration camp when in 1965 he protested against the illegal secret trials of Ukrainian intellectuals. He also prepared a manuscript in which he gave the account of fifteen such trials and indicted the investigating and judiciary agencies in several regions of Ukraine for their serious crimes against justice. Copies of this document with supporting evidence were sent to several Soviet leaders and also passed abroad. This extraordinary collection of documents were translated into English and published in 1968 by McGraw-Hill Co. under the title "The Chornovil Papers", with the introduction written by Prof. Frederic Barghorn of Yale University.

Among the arrested is also a prominent literary figure of younger generation, Ivan

Dzyuba, known for his memorandum "Internationalism or Russification" prepared in the wake of the 1965 arrests and presented to the Soviet authorities. In this document Dzyuba examined the Soviet nationality policy, stressed national discrimination and russification of Ukrainian culture and demanded restoration of all rights for the Ukrainian people. This memorandum was also passed to the West, translated into English and published in 1968 in London, by Camelot Press Ltd., with the introductory remarks by Peter Archer of the House of Commons.

Other prominent figures are Ivan Switlychny and Yevhen Swerstiuk. The first one is well known in the Ukrainian literary circles, who in the past was persecuted for passing to the West the diary and poetic works of the late young poet Vasyl Symonenko. The second one, an author and literary critic, is a known dissident for his signatures on various memoranda and protests to the Soviet authorities and for his literary work entitled "Cathedral in Scaffold" which could not be published in the Ukraine but was published in France.

Still another voice of dissent is that of Valentyn Moroz, a young Ukrainian historian, who was recently sentenced for the second time to nine years at hard labor. His three manuscripts which reached the West "From the Beria Preserve", "The Chronicle of Resistance" and "Amidst the Snows", decry russification of the Ukrainian culture and the treatment of those who speak against these violations.

All these individuals did not break the Soviet law. Their only crime is that they demand application of all rights guaranteed Ukrainians by the constitution of the USSR and Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

We, the undersigned, students of the University of Minnesota, feel that the struggle of these people should not be ignored because the time might be near that these forces of dissent will not only contribute to the liberalization of the present dictatorial system, but they might also precipitate the collapse of the last remaining colonial empire.

Calling your attention to this cruel persecution of Ukrainian intellectuals, we respectfully urge you to bring this problem to the attention of the United States House of Representatives in hope that the public opinion will prevail upon the Soviet government to adhere to the principles proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to which the Soviet Union is a signatory.

Appreciating your help and cooperation, we remain,

Respectfully yours,

(Miss) LUBA LEWYTKYJ,
President, Ukrainian Students Club, University of Minnesota.

ALL CITY EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION OF LOS ANGELES CELEBRATES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the golden anniversary of the All City Employees Association of Los Angeles. Today I take this opportunity to congratulate them in their 50th year as the voice of city employees. Only last July this dynamic group of some 12,000 members drawn from all departments in the

Los Angeles city service, except police and fire personnel, affiliated with the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, United, these two groups will lead the way in expanding and protecting public employee rights.

On behalf of their many friends, I am honored to extend congratulations to President Don Meyer and his fellow officers of ACEA, and the ACEA-AFSCME joint council for this important and outstanding achievement. I am certain we can all look forward to even greater success and achievement at the time of their diamond anniversary.

CALIFORNIA'S "CRUEL AND UNUSUAL" DECISION

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Washington Evening Star of March 1 examines the implications of the vote in California's Supreme Court on the death penalty in California in some depth calling attention to the implications of that decision upon the whole framework of decent society. At this point in the RECORD I commend the editorial, which is by Smith Hempstone, to the attention of my colleagues:

CALIFORNIA'S "CRUEL AND UNUSUAL" DECISION (By Smith Hempstone)

By a 6-1 vote, the Supreme Court of California has declared the death penalty to be unconstitutional in that state. The immediate effect of the decision is to give (literally) a new lease on life to 107 death row inmates, including such luminaries as Sirhan B. Sirhan, the assassin of Robert F. Kennedy, and mass murderer Charles Manson.

A side effect has been the release on bail of Angela Davis, who is charged with murder, kidnapping and conspiracy in connection with the Marin County Civic Center shoot-out in which four people lost their lives. It is earnestly to be hoped that the authorities lay eyes on Miss Davis again.

The death penalty is still permissible in 40 states, although the U.S. Supreme Court is expected to rule soon whether executions violate the Constitution's 8th Amendment prohibition against "cruel and unusual punishment." There have been no executions in the United States since June 1967 and 588 men and 2 women convicted of capital offenses await the decision of the high court.

However the U.S. Supreme Court may rule, the California verdict will stand in that state barring an amendment to the California Constitution. The state court's ruling was in contravention of the frequently expressed will of the elected representatives of the people of California, who on several occasions in recent years have defeated in the state legislature bills which would have abolished capital punishment.

The California court's ruling was based on a clause in the State Constitution virtually identical to the federal charter's 8th Amendment. Chief Justice Donald R. Wright, speaking for the majority, partially based his finding that execution is "cruel" on the long time-lag between conviction and implementation. The obvious reply to that is that the appeal process ought to be speeded up.

Judge Wright held that the death penalty is "unusual" largely because of the declining

number of executions in the United States (down from a high of 199 in 1935 to 2 in 1967) and the fact that there is a trend toward abolition throughout the world. To which one might reply that the imposition of the death penalty in this country has remained relatively stable (averaging about 100 annually for the past decade) and that the problems of Britain (for example) are not those of the United States.

Stanford University law professor Anthony G. Amsterdam argued the case for abolition before both the U.S. Supreme Court and the California Supreme Court. One of his arguments was that the only people who suffer the death penalty are "the poor, black, personally ugly and socially unacceptable."

All right. Forget Sirhan and Manson; their cases may be so emotive that it is impossible for any of us to render a balanced judgment. Take instead the case of Ernest J. Aikens Jr. whom Amsterdam represented before the national and state high courts.

Does anybody really believe that Aikens was sentenced to death because he was "poor, black, personally ugly and socially unacceptable?" I do not know (or care) whether he was black or white, but I rather imagine that the severity of his sentence had something to do with the fact that he beat, raped and stabbed to death two women, one of them five months pregnant, and shot to death the driver of a car who gave him a lift.

In his opinion, Wright stated that the California court's decision was "not grounded in sympathy for those who would commit crimes of violence but in concern for the society that diminishes itself whenever it takes the life of one of its members." A noble sentiment. But would the society of San Quentin, let alone that of the United States as a whole, truly be diminished by the execution of Ernest J. Aikens Jr.? More importantly, can society afford to turn men like Aikens free after they have served 8 to 10 years, which is what a life sentence frequently amounts to.

There's the rub. What is the alternative? To keep them caged for the remainder of their natural lives? In Wright's eyes would that not, perhaps correctly, constitute "cruel and unusual punishment?"

Abolitionists like to claim that those who favor the retention of the death penalty do so largely out of an atavistic thirst for vengeance. There may be something in that but not much. What law-abiding people want—and have a right to expect from their government—is that men like Sirhan and Manson and Aikens should never walk the street again.

The U.S. Supreme Court's decision may not echo that of the California court. But if it does, Congress and the state legislatures are going to have to frame legislation which provides decent folk with the protection to which they are entitled in an imperfect society which has its share of depraved psychopaths.

JUDICIAL SEMANTICS ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, if anyone is looking for a concrete example of why the public mistrusts courts it is easy to find in the semantics of the California Supreme Court decision holding capital punishment unconstitutional under the California Constitution as cruel and unusual punishment.

Wholly aside from whether the Man-

son slayings, for example, including deliberately stabbing to death an 8-month pregnant girl pleading for her baby's life, warrant assurance that one who does such a thing will pay for it with his life, the Federal Constitution itself, in express terms, recognizes capital punishment and the power of the States to impose it with due process of law. So does the California Constitution in article 1, section 6.

The only valid application of the concept of cruel and unusual punishment to capital punishment is whether a particular method used by a State is cruel or unusual, such as hanging, the gas chamber, the electric chair, and so forth. Beyond that, it is an utterly specious exercise in judicial semantics that the California court has engaged in to the obvious confusion of the general public and with demonstrable harm to the public safety.

Judges had better get off these incursions into these fields patently reserved to the discretion of a separate but equal branch of the Government—in this instance the legislative branch—lest Congress and State legislatures be forced to legislate to protect the public against continuing judicial maudlin sentimentality while burglars rape and slay children in the presence of terrified parents and worse.

It is beyond dispute that there are some cases of horrible, deliberate, planned murder that warrant capital punishment. It is impossible to state that the existence of capital punishment is not a deterrent, even though the extent of the deterrent is difficult to assess.

The States have the constitutional right to impose capital punishment and it is no business of courts, State or Federal, to deny this right as long as the sentence is arrived at with due process of law.

In this connection I commend to the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues—especially those on the Judiciary Committee—a recent column by James Kilpatrick appearing in the Washington Star of February 24, 1972.

CALIFORNIA COURT CONFUSED POLICY WITH LAW

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Last week's decision of the California Supreme Court, banning death sentences in that state, raises anew some old questions of law and public policy. In my own view, the decision was clearly wrong.

The California court construed California's own state Constitution. The decision is therefore final and not subject to further appeal. It applies solely to California, and serves to nullify only those death sentences that had been imposed by California courts upon more than 100 prisoners awaiting execution.

Yet the action of the California court cannot be viewed so narrowly. On Jan. 17 the U.S. Supreme Court heard arguments in four cases (the most heinous of them, ironically, from California) that directly challenge the concept of capital punishment as a violation of the 8th Amendment. The Amendment says that "cruel and unusual punishments" shall not be inflicted.

The problem presents two separate questions. The first is: Is capital punishment unconstitutional? The second is: Is it immoral, unwise, or ineffective? The questions have nothing to do with one another.

I do not see, for the life of me, how capital punishment, as such, possibly could be held unconstitutional. The 5th Amendment implicitly sanctions it. "No person shall be held to answer for a capital . . . crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury." Both the 5th and the 14th Amendments give further sanctions in terms of due process of law.

Justice Potter Stewart made the point during oral argument last month: "One of the things that bothers me about the 14th Amendment," he said, "is that the deprivation of life is expressly prohibited without due process of law—and therefore by implication is approved when there is due process. And this is why I say that to me it is more than just a semantic problem. Now we're not talking about the express wording of the Constitution."

Precisely. Even if one embraces every activist theory ever advanced about our "living," or "flexible," or "evolving" Constitution, only the two adjectives of the 8th Amendment would be subject to judicial interpretation: Is a particular method of execution "cruel and unusual"? Disemboweling a prisoner, or boiling him in oil, might thus be unconstitutional. But unless the legislative judgment of 41 states is to be discarded altogether, the electric chair and the gas chamber cannot be regarded, at law, as constitutionally impermissible.

The California court confused the two questions. The majority declared that capital punishment, as such, "degrades and dehumanizes all who participate in its processes." Such punishment is "incompatible with the dignity of man." Very well. But these are not arguments of law; they are arguments of policy; they are arguments of a legislative committee room.

We ought to keep these things straight. It simply does not follow that a given practice is unconstitutional because it is viewed by some judges as degrading, dehumanizing, or "incompatible with the dignity of man." Human slavery exhibited all those evils; yet human slavery was expressly sanctioned by the Constitution and was ended, as a matter of law, only by the 13th Amendment. By the same token, to deny women a right to vote is unfair; but it was not constitutional prior to the 19th Amendment.

If capital punishment is to be abolished, it ought not to be abolished by judicial decree. This is to vest in judges the power effectively to amend the Constitution. It ought to be abolished by the Congress, as to federal crimes, and by the individual states, as to state crimes. Or it ought to be abolished by outright amendment of the Constitution.

Reasonably minded men may well disagree on the wisdom of capital punishment. As a public policy, perhaps it ought to be abandoned. But "the express wording of the Constitution," in Stewart's phrase, has to be upheld.

BELOIT, WIS.: ALL-AMERICAN CITY

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure and great privilege to call to the attention of my colleagues the city of Beloit located in my congressional district in Wisconsin. It has recently received the honor and distinction of being designated one of the All-American Cities of 1972. It is an honor and recognition that Beloit richly deserves.

Beloit has a reputation for being a city populated with people willing to cooperate and work with each other in trying to solve problems affecting all groups in the community. Beloit has devised a highly sophisticated system of interlocking action groups that have been able to come up with possible solutions to many community concerns, including race relations and pollution.

I think it would be fair to say that Beloit citizens have found that no community mission is impossible to solve as long as it is understood that everyone connected with a problem has a chance to participate in the formulation of a solution. The city and citizens of Beloit are a classic example of what concerned citizens can do to reverse a downward spiral of the fortunes of a city.

Beloit is very fortunate to have as many citizens as it does concerned about the future of its city, and fortunate also to have citizens who can work well with each other. The team effort concept is very much a vital part of Beloit and has contributed substantially to the generally optimistic feeling in the city. Particular recognition and thanks go to Mr. Gus Nelson, the leader of the committee that has pulled together what has been done in Beloit and presented it to the reviewing committee for the All-American award in Atlanta.

A prime example of citizen cooperation that I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues is the affiliate artist program that was started in Beloit more than 4 years ago. It was designed to support young artists in the development of their own careers. In 1971, more than 30 artists spent a week moving through Beloit giving concerts—or "Non-certs" as they are called by citizens—everywhere there was a small crowd. The week was brought to a climax at the Beloit Festival which drew 5,000 listeners. Out of a community of 36,000 a crowd of 5,000 is truly outstanding. This program promises to continue to grow and to bring a touch of culture and music to the many citizens of the Beloit community.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I point to Beloit, Wis., as one of the "All-American Cities."

CAMPAIGN BUTTON NO LICENSE TO ARGUE MORALITY OF VIETNAM

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, John P. Roche has written an unusual and excellent column on a seldom-discussed matter. It follows:

CAMPAIGN BUTTON NO LICENSE TO ARGUE MORALITY OF VIETNAM

(By John P. Roche)

As presidential candidates multiply arithmetically, it seems that campaign rhetoric increases geometrically. Only a lunatic perfectionist would expect politicians to be wholly logical or totally consistent, but there is one problem that requires special treatment: the morality of the Vietnamese war.

For some years now, characters who couldn't distinguish a moral principle from a railroad tie have been wandering around the United States sounding like the prophet Isaiah, condemning the war as "immoral, obscene, etc." In past months this has been compounded by the suggestion that we should confer amnesty on draft-dodgers because they took the truly moral course.

The net consequence of this moralistic orchestration has been to indicate to more than 2 million young Americans who fought in Vietnam that they were evil men engaged in a wicked enterprise, that if they had any spiritual foundations, they would have skipped off to Canada and joined the band of saints.

Like medieval lepers, veterans of Vietnam are supposed to go around in sackcloth, ringing a bell, and announcing themselves as "unclean." Or they can find instant redemption by joining the Vietnam Veterans Against the War, confessing to war crimes and throwing their medals away.

Only a handful have in fact joined the anti-war group. The rest (and their families) are smoldering at what they instinctively consider the injustice of the indictment, waiting for someone to stand up in defense of their honor and decency.

Since politicians, intimidated by left-wing dervishes, seem reluctant to undertake this job, I will volunteer. For openers I submit that the war in Vietnam was as moral a cause as Americans have ever fought for, that our armed forces did their job with courage and dedication, and finally that by comparison with World War II the atrocity level in Vietnam was remarkably low, particularly given the context of guerrilla warfare.

To begin with the character of the war, there are two grounds, and two grounds only, for the argument that our intervention in Vietnam was "immoral."

First, those who say all wars are immoral, religious or philosophical pacifists, are quite within their rights to apply the designation to Vietnam. These, however, are people with no favorite wars: they condemn Arabs, Israelis, Communists, anti-Communists with complete impartiality. For them, there are no "just wars."

The second group with standing to question the morality of the war comprises those who believe it is wrong because we are shooting the wrong way, that is, they believe that Hanoi is right, that we are supporting a "reactionary, comprador clique" in Saigon against the "progressive" forces of Communist righteousness. For them, the war is "just" and Hanoi is the instrument of justice.

All the other arguments against the war are prudential or pragmatic in nature. You can, for example, argue that it was a mistake to get mixed up in Southeast Asia, that the game wasn't worth the candle, that we should have fought a different kind of war . . . all eminently debatable questions. But not moral questions.

Let me make the point differently: in my judgment, an American armed response to the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968, would have been perfectly moral—there is nothing immoral about resisting totalitarianism. But in prudential terms it would have been a mistake.

Or, to shift to Africa, there would in my judgment be nothing immoral about supporting a black liberation movement in the Republic of South Africa. But given the power realities on the ground, it would be an act of irresponsible, bloody adventurism.

If the presidential candidates want to argue the wisdom of our commitment to Vietnam, they are free to do so, even though it is a waste of time. However, before they start throwing moral thunderbolts, they would be wise to consider the fact that,

unless they are pacifists or Hanoi hawks, they have no standing as prophets. And furthermore, that 2 million Americans understandably resent being excommunicated by bogus messiahs.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of February 29, 1972, carried an editorial relating to the reservation of lands in Alaska for national parks, wilderness, and wildlife refuges. I would like to share this editorial with my colleagues and, therefore, I include its text at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD

A beautifully illustrated pamphlet issued by the Department of Interior entitled "To Have and To Hold" tells the story of Alaska's migratory birds. Few Americans realize that Alaska is the nesting area each year for ducks, geese, swans and other water fowl—more than twelve million in all—which migrate throughout this country.

Birds from three continents fly to Alaska on journeys of 10,000 miles or more which may originate in Argentina, Australia or South China. The beautiful whistling swans seen each year in Maryland's Chesapeake Bay come from Alaska's remote Arctic Slope. The world's entire population of black brant and most of its emperor geese pass through Alaska's Izembek Bay.

The waters of Alaska defy imagination in their extent and variety. The state has a million ponds. It has shallow seas, miles of sheltered lagoons and bays, and huge lakes. These waters make Alaska uniquely important for the birds not only of this nation but of half the world. If they did not have Alaska for nesting and raising their young, cycles of bird life which have developed over thousands of years would be broken and mankind impoverished beyond measure.

The flight of the migratory water fowl symbolizes the interdependence of Alaska's physical resources and the quality of life of all Americans. If oil spills and industrial wastes contaminate the waters of Alaska, the results may be a silent Spring half a continent away. If economic developers despoil the wilderness, endanger the habitat of increasingly rare animals, or intrude upon its scenery, the ecological balance of an already threatened planet will be further deranged and opportunities for diverse recreation further constricted.

The same Department of Interior which has so well described the significance of Alaska for migratory birds has a critical decision to make concerning the state's future. Under the Native Claims Settlement Act, Secretary of the Interior Morton has until the middle of March to make a preliminary withdrawal of lands for public protection before the state government and the natives begin selecting parcels of land for development and other use. By next September, he has to choose up to 80 million acres for recommendation to Congress as national parks, wilderness and wildlife refuges. Upon the character of these preliminary and final decisions depends the future of Alaska and its many resources.

It is for Secretary Morton to choose what the American people are to have and to hold in Alaska. He needs to be mindful of the

trust which is imposed in his office and which he must exercise in behalf of citizens everywhere, of their posterity and of nature itself.

NO FREEDOM OF RELIGION BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, even before embarking upon my trip into the U.S.S.R. as a member of the Select Subcommittee on Education I had strong feelings that religion was not free behind the Iron Curtain, information from our State Department to the contrary notwithstanding. A 2-hour detention by Soviet police for the crime of leaving two booklets containing the Gospel of St. Matthew in the entranceway to a theater confirmed my suspicions. However, the following translation of an editorial that appeared in the Pravda Vostoka newspaper on January 7, 1972, makes crystal clear to every freedom-loving American exactly what the Communist oppressor's attitude is toward religion:

[Translation from the Pravda Vostoka newspaper]

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST RELIGION

At the present stage of Soviet social development, when tremendous tasks in the building of communism are being carried out, the party is attaching particular attention to ideological work. It is trying to instill in workers a spirit of conscious responsibility, to strengthen their ideological convictions, to teach them to overcome survivals of the past, and to resist all forms of bourgeois influence. The most important factor in this complex effort is scholarly, scientific atheistic propaganda.

"We must fight against religion", wrote V. I. Lenin. "This is the basic tenet of ALL materialism, and consequently of Marxism. However, Marxism does not stop at principle. It goes further. It states that we must know HOW to counteract religion. Explanation of the origin of faith and religion among the masses must rest on materialism."

Lenin's credo of atheist education states that we must proceed from principle to action in our struggle for the new man, who must not only repudiate religious superstition, but engage firmly in aggressive, uncompromising atheism.

The majority of the people in this republic [Uzbekistan] believe in the materialistic concept of life. But it is wrong and dangerous to assume that religion will "die out" of its own accord. The formation of a communist philosophy of life is impossible without an active struggle against religious ideology, and without positive scholarly atheistic education.

If we don't keep this in mind, and the attitude toward religion is conciliatory and permissive, it will continue to exist and exert its harmful influence on the people.

Communist party, trade union, soviet, and komsomol organizations must not take a passive attitude toward religion, which clouds the thinking of certain sectors of the population. The guarantee provided by the Soviet constitution for the freedom of conscience and religion also guarantees the freedom of anti-religious propaganda.

The program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union states that the party will

exert ideological pressure to educate people in the spirit of scientific materialism, in order to overcome religious prejudices, without, however, offending the sensibilities of the faithful. Experience has demonstrated that the greater the appeal to sentiment as well as intellect, the higher the ideological level of anti-religious education, and the stronger the emotional impact, the greater is the effectiveness of our work in combating religion.

Thorough and thoughtful ideological work is being carried on by the communists of the collective farm "Kommunizm" in the Andizhan oblast [province], where particular attention is paid to atheistic propaganda. A sociologic survey of the collective farm showed that there were some believers, but that these were mostly people over fifty, who had received only an elementary education. Some of them neither read newspapers nor attend movies or lectures. This prompted the communists at the collective farm to organize general educational courses at the village school. Later, a one-year course was organized especially for the older people, with lectures in human anatomy and natural phenomena.

The collective farm radio often carries programs on the harmful effects of religious observances and ritual. Two physicians, Mamadali Abdullayev and Rakhim Ibragimov, have given lectures in which they told how in several cases illness had been aggravated by religious practices.

There are over one hundred people's universities* in the Andizhan oblast, specializing in scientific atheism, social anthropology, and pedagogy. Over eight thousand people attend these universities. Atheist propaganda is conducted by some of the best minds, by party, soviet, trade union, komsomol, cultural, industrial, agricultural and other organizations.

The cities of Tashkent, Fergana, Navoi, and Bekabad, and several districts in the Khorezm, Surkhan-Dar'ya, and Fergana oblasts have all had considerable experience in organizing atheistic education.

Anti-religious propaganda is effective only when conducted consistently and systematically. Nevertheless, it is not always given enough attention. Some party organizations and ideological institutions engage in atheistic education only sporadically. Laxity in such a complex and demanding task as education is inexcusable.

Not enough atheistic literature, reviewing the theory and practice of anti-religious work and revealing the accommodative activities of the clergy, is published in the republic (Uzbekistan). Scholars engaged in the study of theoretical atheism are often removed from the reality of atheistic education. Yet the assistance they could provide to thousands in their every-day work with the masses in teaching atheism could be indeed great.

V. I. Lenin stressed the necessity of knowing HOW to combat religion. To know how—is above all to demonstrate conclusively the untenability of religion and its estrangement from life, its desire to lead man away from his struggle for high ideals into a world of illusion.

Knowing how to combat religion, means arming oneself with a carefully thought out program of scholarly, scientific information on atheism, avoiding stereotypes, oversimplifications, pat answers, and above all to continuously expound and propagandize the positive nature of atheism. The republican [Uzbek] House of Scholarly—Scientific Atheism with its various branches, and the society "Znaniye" ["Knowledge"] play an

* Translator's note: Popular courses for the masses at lower than university level—not universities in our sense of the word.

important part in propagandizing all that is newest and best in atheistic education.

Knowing how to combat religion, is to employ all available means: to tell a scientist's story of technological achievements, to draw on books truthfully portraying our Soviet way of life, to exhibit paintings glorifying nature, to present well prepared television programs, to generally broaden horizons, and to instill moral convictions which reject outdated past beliefs.

Knowing how to combat religion, means to begin teaching atheism in school. It is difficult to over-estimate the importance of schools, both special intermediary and advanced, in teaching atheism. It is especially in school that the young form their scientifically founded atheistic concepts of life. The duty of the teacher is to continuously and systematically instruct school children and students on the unlimited possibilities of man the worker, the builder of communist society.

Atheism is inconceivable without thoughtful, consistent and assiduous educational work. Party organizations and ideological institutions should never relax their ideological struggle against religion, but continuously improve their methods of combating religious influence and steadfastly put into practice Lenin's principles of atheistic education.

Arming Soviet citizens with a materialistic philosophy of life means increasing the capability of the masses to fulfill the objectives of the Twenty-Fourth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in achieving greater success in the building of communism.—Translated by Sheila Penners.

VITAL ISSUES IN FLORIDA PRIMARY

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the Nation will be on Florida March 14 when the people of my home State vote in an exciting presidential preference primary and also express their views on two of the most important issues of our times—issues involving the education of our children.

Floridians will vote in a straw ballot on the vital questions of forced busing to create a racial balance in the schools, and of returning voluntary prayer and Bible reading to our public schools.

Both of these issues, in various forms, are now before the Congress and I am certain my colleagues will follow the results of the Florida primary election as closely as I. Proposed constitutional amendments are pending before the Congress in an effort to correct the damage done by some Federal court decisions.

Floridians will be asked to vote on three questions:

1. "Do you favor an amendment to the U.S. Constitution that would prohibit forced busing and guarantee the right of each student to attend the appropriate public school nearest his home?"
2. "Do you favor providing an equal opportunity for quality education for all children regardless of race, creed, color, or place of residence and oppose a return to a dual system of public schools?"
3. "Do you favor an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to allow prayer in the public schools?"

Now, with this straw ballot, the people of Florida, who represent every section of the United States, will have an opportunity to speak out—and we, their elected representatives, should pay close attention.

TRIBUTE TO MR. EARL RHODE AND OTHER PHASE II STAFFERS

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, late last year 40 members of the Dayton Area Chamber of Commerce Public Affairs Committee came to Washington at my invitation to attend a briefing by high-ranking Government officials on the Nation's economic problems and prospects.

Leading the discussion of wage-price freeze policies was Mr. Earl Rhode, director of the executive secretariat of the Cost of Living Council. Prior to becoming right hand to CLC Executive Director, Presidential Counselor Donald Rumsfeld, Mr. Rhode had been special assistant to Mr. Arnold Weber at the Office of Management and Budget and at the CLC. After his presentation to the Dayton committee, there was no doubt in the minds of those present why this young man had risen so rapidly in his profession. The Dayton Chamber members and I agreed that he was one of the most cogent speakers we had ever heard.

The February 19 issue of Business Week magazine contained an article on the "real experts" in phase II. Mr. Rhode was cited with two other CLC staffers for his outstanding work. Unfortunately, after the magazine had gone to press, Mr. Rhode died tragically. From all the facts available, it seems that Mr. Rhode's death was attributable to the great sacrifices he made for our country. I am sure that all my House colleagues join me in extending our condolences to Mr. Rhode's children and his parents.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the Business Week article in the RECORD.

The article follows:

WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS—PHASE II'S BACKROOM BOYS

Up to Aug. 15, no one knew very much about wage-price controls. Hardly anyone does now. But those who know most are not necessarily the members of the Pay Board, Price Commission, and Cost of Living Council.

The real experts are found one notch down. They are in a small but powerful cadre of professionals who are staffing the Phase II control groups. If the system manages to curtail inflation, these key staffers will deserve much of the credit; if it fails, they will not escape the blame.

The veteran member of the group is Earl Rhode, who at 28 is also the youngest person in a Phase II key spot. When President Nixon announced controls last summer, there was a staff of one on board—and Rhode was it. The pipe-smoking ex-budget examiner had been special assistant to Arnold Weber at the Office of Management and Budget; when Weber took over the new-born CLC in August, Rhode went with him. Rhode recalls: "We didn't have a thing when we started out.

All the staff work in the first week of CLC meetings was done by yours truly. Weber made decisions and charged ahead—no room for excuses. It was great."

What can he show for six months of six-day weeks and 14-hour days? Rhode says he and two other OMB staffers helped develop the freeze as an option in early August and "fleshed it out" at the request of George Shultz in time for the meeting at Camp David, where the New Economic Program was adopted. The young analyst—who has a bachelor's degree in economics and "almost a master's" in public affairs—also helped devise the three-board organizational setup used for Phase II. The Price Commission's 72-hour decision rule after the freeze was called the "Rhode compromise."

STAYING IN THE SADDLE

Of course, Rhode's job changed as the CLC switched bosses from Weber to the new executive director, Donald Rumsfeld, and as the staff grew to some 90 people. But Rhode—who is a GS-14 at \$21,960 a year—has managed to keep on top. Says one of his co-workers, "Rumsfeld leans on Earl harder than he leans on anyone else here—even the fellows he brought in. Earl's just so damn competent." Rhode's own explanation of his staying power: "I give Rumsfeld good service—and I'm not being facetious. I learned at OMB to get in the saddle once it's strapped on. But until then I argue from my own point of view."

Rhode's title is—"with calculated ambiguity," he says—director of the executive secretariat of the CLC. He prepares the agenda for the CLC's weekly meeting, acts as liaison with the Price Commission and Pay Board, and prepares quarterly progress reports like the one released by CLC last weekend.

Businessmen concerned with the controls system have offered Rhode plenty of money to leave Washington. The best bid so far: \$45,000 from a New York company. But Rhode is not interested in more clover—yet. Says he: "First we're going to make this damn thing work."

RED, WHITE, AND BLUE

This kind of commitment seems to permeate the senior staff people who administer Phase II. "We're going to make this bear fly," says Robert Tiernan, a relative newcomer who took over as executive director at the Pay Board eight weeks ago.

When Tiernan, a 43-year-old labor-management expert and chief counsel at California's Kaiser Industries Corp., walked into the Pay Board offices, the staff was filled with temporary people. Numerous key jobs had to be filled, and basic regulations were yet to be spelled out.

Now this is all changing—thanks chiefly to Tiernan and Administrative Director Millard Cass, who came to the Pay Board out of semi-retirement after years in the Labor Dept. Tiernan never worked in Washington before. "Cass takes care of knowing where it's at in this town. He's like a seeing-eye dog to a blind man," he says. Fast-talking Tiernan, who is on leave from Kaiser, makes no bones about the tough work ahead: "But the juice is flowing," he says.

Since Tiernan and Cass came on board, they have urged Pay Board Chairman George Boldt to go home at 5 p.m. each day. According to Tiernan, Judge Boldt was working hours "too long for a man his age." He is 68. But Tiernan offers the highest praise for Boldt and for his evolving staff of 133. "The people involved in this effort," says Tiernan, "are bright, able, very hard-working, and they are also very patriotic." In fact, as Tiernan would have it, it is patriotism, not money, that lured him to Washington. He earns \$36,000 a year from the Pay Board—"And I'm taking a bath, I'll tell you," he says. "They waved a flag at me, that's why I'm here. You'd be surprised how many patriots there are. I'm on a red-white-and-blue mountain."

LOTS OF ROOM

The third member of the inner circle of controllers is Louis Neeb, 32, director of the executive secretariat at the Price Commission. While Neeb's boss, Commission Chairman C. Jackson Grayson, is the most visible Phase II chieftain, Neeb—like Rhode and Tiernan—has a lot of room to exercise initiative. He answers only to Grayson and to the members of the Price Commission—preparing agendas for meetings, keeping on top of the broad policy guidelines set down by the commission, and helping the staff to apply these guidelines whenever questions arise. Executive Director Bert Lewis "really runs the place," says one staffer, leaving Neeb free to work closely with Grayson.

Neeb, a tall, dark-haired MBA from George Washington University, has been with the Price Commission from the start, signing on with Grayson after spending the freeze at the Office of Emergency Preparedness. At OEP, Neeb—a stockpile-policy expert—was transformed overnight once the freeze began into a special assistant to OEP's General George Lincoln. Describing himself as a "professional government administrator" with a desire to shift back and forth to private industry, Neeb says he wrote a "large part of the policy in Phase I" himself.

ANGELA DAVIS AND BAIL REFORM

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the California court decision to release Angela Davis on bail pending the determination of her trial must be hailed by all who cherish civil rights and liberties. Miss Davis' long imprisonment while awaiting trial calls to attention the power that the State can wield over individuals charged with crimes, simply by denying bail and release.

This is the first indication that the California courts might be able to deal fairly with her case. The release, however, in no way vitiates the suffering of Miss Davis, her family and her many friends. It underscores the need for a new examination of a bail system which incarcerates so many people before any determination of guilt, as a recent editorial in the Washington Post has noted:

ANGELA DAVIS AND THE BAIL SYSTEM

Angela Davis is free on bail after sitting in jail for 16 months, having been convicted of no crime at all. This turn of events came about because the California bail statute presumes that a person against whom the state has amassed "any substantial evidence," whatever that means, of the commission of a capital offense, might prefer to flee and forfeit bail rather than face the gas chamber after trial. Now that the California Supreme Court has ruled the death penalty unconstitutional under the California Constitution, the presumption under which Miss Davis was held has evaporated and she is free.

All this must be a great comfort to her family, her lawyers and her friends, who have watched her health fail, her teeth deteriorate and her eyesight dim because of the conditions of her various incarcerations and the limited access that doctors and dentists have had to her. And it must be a real boost to her defense team, which has seen her under conditions which have made the preparation of her defense much more arduous than it would have been had they had easy and normal access to her. Finally, Miss Davis' own

state of mind must be substantially eased as she gains some liberty just before she faces the most stressful period of her life.

But the jubilation of Miss Davis and her supporters buries more fundamental issues about the use of bail in the criminal justice system of this country. There is a general impression that the bail reform movement, which we heard so much about a few years ago, really worked. It didn't. The original, essential and sole purpose of bail was to permit accused persons who were unlikely to flee in order to avoid trial to maintain their freedom to live and to work and to prepare to defend themselves against charges of which they are presumed to be innocent. Bail was to be denied only to those who seemed likely to run away.

But over the years, the system has become freighted with other problems and other issues. The courts and the society have come to believe that there are some people who are so dangerous that it is better to separate them from society even before trial, for the protection of the people. Rather than facing this problem squarely, however, courts and prosecutors have bastardized the bail process in order to enable the criminal justice system to detain preventively, those who appear to the judge and the prosecutor to be too dangerous to be set loose while awaiting trial. There can be reasonable debate about whether preventive detention is ever a good idea and if it is, what procedures should be followed and what standards should be applied in order to determine who should be detained and who should not. But the criminal justice system has avoided that course for the easier path of demeaning the bail process and limiting its value for all.

We have had that kind of debate here in Washington over the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970. That act established detention standards and procedures which provided for the protection of society, speedy trial for those detained and relief of the bail system from unnecessary and burdensome freight. In this respect, the District is far ahead of any other jurisdiction in the United States.

In the rest of the country, however, the courts have become more crowded and the jails have deteriorated. Thus, people who cannot make bail or who are denied it are forced to wait great lengths of time in often inhuman places or trials which are endlessly delayed in a system that is now so creaky that it no longer deserves to have justice in its name. And most of those waiting in squalor and degradation are, unlike Angela Davis, unsung, forgotten and probably substantially more frightened than she must have been.

Although Angela Davis' sympathizers must be buoyed by the fact that her 16 months is over, no American who cares about the quality of our civilization can rest easy until the kinds of issues her bail motions have presented are faced by criminal jurisdictions throughout the country.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT: A 90TH BIRTHDAY OBSERVATION BY ARTHUR SCHLESINGER, JR.

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I inserted in the RECORD of February 24, 1971, several of the papers delivered at the Hunter College observation of Franklin D. Roosevelt's 90th birthday anniversary.

Since that time, I have received an additional paper delivered on that occasion, and I am inserting it into the RECORD today. This paper is the work of Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., whose monumental narrative of the Roosevelt era is the definitive work on that period. It is an excellent piece of work, and I commend it to you.

The paper follows:

ON THE 90TH BIRTHDAY OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.)

There is nothing more evanescent and unreliable than the verdict of history. For the verdict of history is only the verdict of one generation of historians. Alas, every new generation of historians has its own worries about the future and consequently its own demands on the past; and each tends to re-create the past in the image of its own preoccupations and values. Reputations rise and fall, like stocks on Wall Street, responding to the supply and demand equations of some later age. In addition, as Emerson reminds us, "Every hero becomes a bore at last"—though not necessarily forever; every hero, however out of fashion for a season, also remains a subject for revival. The one certainty in history is the revision of historical judgment. That is why the word "definitive" is employed only by reviewers who do not understand what history and biography are all about.

But the historiographical rhythm is not altogether unpredictable. The reputation of a commanding figure is often at its lowest in the period ten to twenty years after his death. We are always in a zone of imperfect visibility so far as the history just over our shoulders is concerned. It is as if we were in the hollow of the historical wave; not until we reach the crest of the next one can we look back and estimate wisely what went on before. When I went to college in the nineteen thirties, Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson were at the nadir of their reputations.

Henry Pringle's brilliant but deflationary biography of 1931 had set—it seemed for good—the image of TR as the adolescent-at-large in public affairs; the First World War revisionists had set—it seemed for good—the image of Woodrow Wilson as the man who had misled the United States into a foolish war and then botched the peace. But the passage of time and the emergence of new concerns produce new judgments. Those Theodore Roosevelt stocks have been rising steadily on the historians' exchange; and Woodrow Wilson has long since recovered from the gross disfavor of the thirties, though new generations, it is true, have perceived new flaws in the Wilsonian character and outlook.

The reputation of Franklin D. Roosevelt has undergone particular permutation and vicissitude. This is partly because of the elusive nature of the man. Some men stride into history all of a block, solid, positive, unitary, monolithic, granite-like, impermeable; thus, in our time, Churchill, Stalin, De Gaulle. Others are not blocks but prisms; they are sensitive, glittering, quicksilver, protean, pluralistic; their levels of personality peel off with the delusive transparency of the skins of an onion, always frustrating the search for a hard core of personality within. One recalls Keynes's description of Lloyd George: "... rooted in nothing; he is void and without content; he lives and feeds on his immediate surroundings; he is an instrument and a player at the same time which plays on the company and is played on by them too; ... with six or seven senses not available to ordinary men, judging character, motive, and subconscious impulse, perceiving what each was thinking and even what each was going to say next, and com-

pounding with telepathic instinct the argument or appeal best suited to the vanity, weakness or self-interest of his immediate auditor."

The greatest statesmen, like Lincoln, partake of both qualities, are both granite and prism. FDR, I would judge, was more a fox than a hedgehog. He had, not a single personality, lucid, definite and infrangible, but a ring of personalities, each dissolving on touch, each promising to reveal another beneath, all concealing the central core of personality. Yet it could not be said of Roosevelt, as Keynes said of Lloyd George, that he was rooted in nothing. FDR's paradox lay in the contrast between the dazzling variety on the surface, the succession of masks, so easily donned and doffed, and what one can only feel to be, in the end, a basic simplicity, even innocence, of mind and heart. The complexity, the deviousness, were real enough, but they pertained to tactics.

"He sometimes tries to appear tough and cynical and flippant," the really tough and cynical and flippant Harry Hopkins once told Robert E. Sherwood, "but that's an act he likes to put on. . . . You and I are for Roosevelt because he's a great spiritual figure, because he's an idealist." His methods were often tricky, but they did not corrupt his vision, which is why, I think, the plain people of his time adored him.

Still the impenetrability of his nature, the elusiveness of his style, rendered him a hard man to figure out, both when he was alive and after his death. Thus the most steadily acute observer of American public affairs in this century—Walter Lippmann—made his famous observation in 1932 that Roosevelt was "a pleasant man who, without any important qualifications for the office, would very much like to be President." People constantly got him wrong, then and later; and in the more than quarter century since his death he has continued to defy historians and biographers. In Joseph Lash's beautiful book *Eleanor and Franklin* Mrs. Roosevelt is a finely and fully realized character, but Franklin Roosevelt remains an enigmatic and perplexing presence.

The problem of FDR's place in history is compounded by the turbulence of his time and ours—and especially by the changing shapes the rush of his years has given to the problems with which he dealt. Thus for a long time historians condemned Roosevelt's First New Deal, with its concentration on structure and planning, as a bad turn, a wrong road, a gravely mistaken diversion of energy and administration, happily replaced after 1935 by a new concentration on compensatory fiscal policy and on the revival of the market through anti-trust action. This judgment prevailed so long as Keynesianism appeared to contain the solution to our economic dilemmas. But, as we have come to understand that fiscal policy by itself cannot restrain inflation in an economy controlled by the concentration of market power in large corporations and unions, we will come, I believe, to detect new virtues in the experimentation of 1933 and 1934. I wrote 13 years ago in *The Coming of the New Deal* that "the economic philosophy of NRA was by no means so mistaken as its conventional critics have assumed. . . . In accepting the logic of the administered market, NRA accepted the responsibility for acting directly on the relationships of prices, wages and profits. It rejected the supposition that general principles could solve specific relationships in an equitable or productive way."

"It presumed instead that the solution of these problems—and, beyond this, the use and allocation of resources through the economy—required a considerable integration of public and private planning, in which business, labor and consumers as well as government should play a part. While its institutions were too sketchy and improvised, too

distorted by special interest and too confused by melodrama, to come near realizing its objective, NRA still operated in terms of a fairly realistic picture of the modern market." Now, in the current age of Phase One and Phase Two, where in vital sectors industry and labor to a considerable degree set their own prices and wages, we are coming to see, I think, that we cannot dodge the challenge of structure and planning that Roosevelt tried to explore nearly forty years ago.

Let me suggest another example—this time from foreign policy—to show again how our contemporary perceptions reshape our judgment of the past. For a long time it was fashionable to condemn as hopeless naivete Roosevelt's determination to deal personally with Stalin during the Second World War; it was folly, we were told, for FDR to suppose that he could charm or beguile Stalin into postwar cooperation. And certainly there can be no doubt that Stalin, seeing the world through the lenses of Marxism-Leninism, had a deeply ingrained belief that the mere existence of a capitalist United States was, by definition, a deadly threat to the security of the Soviet Union. Nor can there be any doubt either that Roosevelt's indifference to and ignorance of Marxist-Leninist ideology hardly helped him around the conference tables of Teheran and Yalta.

Still Stalin was by no means a helpless prisoner of that ideology. He saw himself, as Averell Harriman has reminded us, less as the disciple of Marx and Lenin than as their fellow prophet. As the infallible expositor, he could interpret the faith to justify anything he wanted to do at any given moment. In retrospect, I think it will increasingly appear that Roosevelt's determination to deal personally with him was an expression of astute political insight.

Roosevelt intuitively understood that Stalin was the best means then available to the west to amend Leninist ideology and to deflect the thrust of Soviet totalitarianism—that Stalin was, so to speak, the only force in 1945 capable of overcoming Stalinism. The best evidence is that Roosevelt retained a certain capacity to influence Stalin to the end; Yalta was an indication of that. It is in this way that the death of Roosevelt was crucial in the rise of the Cold War—not in the vulgar sense that his policy was then reversed by his successor, which did not happen, but in the sense that no other American could hope to have the restraining impact on Stalin that, for a while, Roosevelt might have had.

As we perceive the present differently, so we perceive the past differently: hence the inconstancy of history. And the problem is further compounded by the variety of grounds for our present perceptions; above all, by the variety of political grounds. Here an examination of Roosevelt's reputation becomes a rich study in irony. In his own time conservatives denounced him as a radical, a socialist, a revolutionary, an enemy of the American way of life, a President bent on desecrating the verities and destroying the system. Today the zealots of the New Left history attack him on opposite grounds. They see him as a compromiser, a cunning opportunist who, behind radical rhetoric, sought to protect and re-establish the profit system, the most clever and effective of the champions of corporate capitalism. Foreign policy provides equivalent ironies. For the first decade after Roosevelt's death, he was the man who appeased Stalin, sold Eastern Europe and China down the river into slavery and connived at communist conspiracy within the United States. Today, under the New Left revelation, he becomes the father of American imperialism, the leader who, beneath the guise of universalist slogans, sought only to make the world safe for penetration and domination by American trade and American capital, the man who, Professor Chomsky tells us, forced war on the be-

leaguered Japanese and who, Professor William Appleman Williams assures us, opposed Nazism primarily because Hitler threatened to obstruct the establishment through the world of American economic hegemony. It is an additional irony that, in so many respects, the New Left is thus coming to occupy the positions of the Old Right.

Because Roosevelt himself was so baffling a man and because the problems of his age change as our perspectives on them change, one may expect the historical controversy to continue unabated for a long time into the future. It is hard even to conclude whether Roosevelt's major success lay in the field of domestic or of foreign policy. One historian, Robert A. Divine, has recently written, "Roosevelt's claim to greatness must rest on his achievements in domestic affairs. His conduct of foreign policy never equaled his mastery of American politics and his ability to guide the nation through the perils of depression and war." Yet others would salute his prescience in foreign affairs and add that there were still 8 million Americans—one sixth of the labor force—unemployed in 1940; that Roosevelt himself, for all the concessions he made on humanitarian grounds to the need for public spending, probably remained to the end a budget-balancer at heart; and that ominous trends in our policy—the centralization and bureaucratization of government, the militarization of foreign policy, the rise of the secrecy system, the emergence of the FBI as a political force—all received great impetus in the Roosevelt years.

A longer view would perhaps seek to locate Roosevelt in the great, rushing, roaring stream of change generated in the modern world by scientific and technological innovation. Henry Adams was the first American historian to call attention to the increasing acceleration of history—an acceleration that with mounting force disrupts our ideas, our values, our institutions and the very stability of our lives. Riding the rapids of change is not the easiest of tasks. Holding to the past is no solution; nor has anyone yet produced a dependable chart of the future. Dogma is a drag in a world of flux, contingency and unpredictability. What is required is imagination, flexibility, a capacity for innovation, a sense of adventure, an ability to inspire others with confidence and a sense of purpose—this and a vision, not ideologized or rigid, but capacious, sensitive and strong, of the kind of nation and the kind of world toward which we aspire. When a very young man, Winston Churchill once wrote to an American politician, "The duty of governments is to be first of all practical. I am for makeshifts and expediency. I would like to make the people who live on this world at the same time as I do, better fed and happier generally. If incidentally I benefit posterity—so much the better—but I would not sacrifice my own generation to a principle—however high or a truth however great." This passionate sense that concrete humanity is all was doubtless one of the things that bound Roosevelt and Churchill together in their marvelous partnership.

Coming to the Presidency when an industrial society, choked on its own mechanisms, seemed to be losing its capacity to function, Roosevelt fiddled with the machinery, succored the victims and casualties and got the contraption started again. Confronted by a world menaced by an armed fanaticism determined to murder or subjugate the rest of mankind, Roosevelt understood rather early, I think, the size of the threat; with patience and cajolery he slowly persuaded his fellow citizens that the threat was real; and he led his country to victory in the greatest war of history. In doing these things, he reinvigorated popular faith in the efficacy of democratic government and in the continuing vitality of his nation's best ideals. If Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson repre-

sented the first stage in the national encounter with the velocity of history and the anguish of the 20th century, Franklin Roosevelt, with immense brio, force and courage, carried us into the next stage, learning and teaching through error as well as through success. To say that he did not solve the problems he faced hardly diminishes the astonishing power of his achievement. "Great men," wrote Emerson, "exist that there may be greater men." Let new generations take up where Franklin Roosevelt left off—and try to do better.

He was unquestionably a great President—along with Lincoln and Washington, the greatest in our history—great in his instinct for problems and possibilities, in his strength of leadership and purpose and in his capacity to restore the confidence of the people in themselves. He was also a flawed President, even though, as we have seen, one man's flaw may be the next man's virtue. "Some people," wrote LaRocheffoucauld, "resemble ballads, which are only sung for a certain time." Roosevelt, I have no doubt, will be sung throughout the life of our nation—most of all, perhaps, because he lived in the spirit about which Emerson wrote: "If there is any period one would desire to be born in—is it not the era of revolution when the old and the new stand side by side and admit of being compared; when all the energies of man are searched by fear and hope; when the historic glories of the old can be compensated by the rich possibilities of the new era? This time like all times is a very good one if one but knows what to do with it." More than any of his contemporaries, Roosevelt knew what to do with his time.

THE TRADITIONAL WIT OF THE JACOBS CLAN

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the reputation of my distinguished colleague and friend from the Hoosier State, ANDREW JACOBS, for wit and irony is unparalleled in the annals of this House. But satirists, unlike Wheaties Champions, are born, not made. There are many Members of the House who will remember the equally distinguished progenitor of our colleague from Indiana, his father, the Honorable Andrew Jacobs, Sr., who served in the 81st Congress.

To resolve any lingering doubts about the source of ANDY JACOBS, Jr.'s humorous talents, I would like to insert in the RECORD a copy of a presentation by his father, Andrew Jacobs, Sr., before the Century Club of Indianapolis. The club has offered a 1-year free membership to anyone who is able to interpret all of the hidden meanings and double entendres of this speech, entitled the "Report of Chatta Cheeta."

The material follows:

THE REPORT OF CHATTA CHEETA (By Col. Asa J. Smith, USMCR)

INTRODUCTION

The Century Club of Indianapolis, Indiana, is an honored Indianapolis literary club organized in 1889. Meetings are on Tuesday evenings, where the small and select group listens to a learned paper prepared with great research and laborious effort. At its conclusion the "ohs" and the "ahs" do not emit, nor great applause.

Usually the discussion is acrimonious and the faults, not the virtues, of the presentation are vehemently expressed. No holds are barred. It is an exchange of high class criticism and defense.

Among the Charter Members were Hilton U. Brown, James W. Fesler, William Fortune, Allan Hendricks, William L. Taylor, Charles N. Thompson and Evans Woolen. Also, carried in its records, In Memoriam, are to be found the names of James Whitcomb Riley, Jacob P. Dunn, William Dudley Foulke, John L. Griffiths, Edwards J. Hecker, F. Hopkinson Smith, and many others. Among the latter included those with extreme erudition from all walks of life, Justices of the Supreme Court, bankers and printers.

Some years ago, the name of Andrew Jacobs was added to the list, and while it is impossible here to include the condemnations received by him as he has expounded his theories and presented his papers, the following text is an example of what has been suffered.

It has been rumored that, while mostly of the Republican faith, all members of the Century Club voted for Jacobs for Congress to "get him out of Indianapolis." Another rumor is that they all helped defeat him in order to get him back to spice up the club once more. After his return, however, it is alleged that there is now a new movement afoot to send him back to Congress again and relieve the club from the sort of thing that appears in this printing.

Jacobs is acknowledged to be an Andrew Jacksonian Democrat with leanings, historically speaking, toward Alexander Hamilton and a slight divergence from the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson. However, while there appears to the undersigned no reason for anyone being a Democrat, the only definition of Jacobs' general position is that it is one of kaleidoscopic confusion. But this is undeniably true: That Jacobs proceeds firmly in whatever direction he has chosen, even though that direction may be, politically speaking, every which-way.

The undersigned, as a member of the Century Club, never misses a meeting whereat Jacobs is to speak and Jacobs reciprocates when the undersigned produces a paper, each in order that on each occasion the sparks may freely fly. The undersigned can remember no occasion when he has spoken favorably of anything produced by Jacobs, nor, on the other hand, when anything that he has produced has been approved by the now "happily" ex-Congressman.

Herewith, read "Mission To Midville" in order that you may comprehend what the undersigned has endured.

ASA J. SMITH.

READ, DECEMBER 13, 1955

(By Andrew Jacobs)

In mid-October, I was extremely pressed for time. Our good friend and fellow member, Colonel Asa J. Smith, kindly agreed to exchange scheduled reading dates with me.

However, before we notified our program director, I received a strange letter, with a most intriguing enclosure.

Realizing these communications were far more interesting than any composition of mine, I concluded, despite our rules, to read it instead of preparing one for this occasion.

Therefore, Colonel Smith and I resumed our respective places upon the printed schedule.

Each of you must decide for yourselves how seriously one should take these communications, copies of which I shall now read.

MR. ANDREW JACOBS,
Indianapolis, Indiana,
United States of America.

DEAR SIR: You will not remember me by my correct name. I am the former high official of your government who once said to

you that it was a pity the President didn't have the intelligence of a monkey.

You must recall your resentment and my great agitation. I encouraged you to believe I feared loss of patronage. Actually, that was of no concern to me.

The truth is I feared exposure because I was a spy and not even a citizen of your country. I am now safely back in my own land. Enclosed is a copy of my report. It may help you and your people, though I doubt it.

Make it public if you aren't afraid of a Congressional investigation or an Insanity Inquest.

Very truly,

CHATTA CHEETA.

FOREWORD AND BACKGROUND

Brethren: I was born a freak. You thought I was a throwback to the human species. But when I sought no political honors and didn't try to corner the coconut market you realized that I couldn't possibly be human. Then I was accepted as 100% monkey.

Human beings descended from Marmosets, who once had the run of the Garden of Eden.

Only the Lord's favorite apple tree and Fountain of Eternal Life were forbidden to them. The Lord told them they'd die the same day they ate one of His apples. The Devil argued they would become wiser and so they tried it. The Lord kicked them out of the garden.

At least this is how the people tell it.

Marmosets then degenerated into humans. They lost their power of communication and began arranging that queer little grunts and groans would mean certain things. But they retained their ill disposition and clung to their pride and agreed.

While trying to build a Tower, through which they could invade Heaven, they fell to quarreling over which sound meant what. The project was, of course, a failure.

With true human instinct they sought a scapegoat. They claimed the Lord fouled up their language in fear they would succeed. Although they now know Heaven is not within millions of miles of earth, they still pretend they had the Lord worried.

Carrying on a vendetta with God Almighty soothed their ego. Once, after some extraordinarily heavy rains, they accused Him of trying to drown them. They even claim He entered into a treaty promising never to do it again.

The Lord didn't appear concerned. He was probably busy elsewhere in the universe. He had left His universe an open book and it was up to people to solve their own problems.

Not being smug like our lower cousins, we conceded they had some intelligence.

Early in this century human scientists began toying with atomic energy. The public taunted the scientists as dreamy egg-heads. Wise monkeys said, however, people would eventually have a go at this science when it could be used—not to better but to destroy themselves.

In support of their prediction, the wise monkeys pointed out that in the competition between the Lord and the Devil for the minds of men the Devil seemed to be getting the upper hand.

At this time I was called before the Presimian and his council.

CALL TO GREATNESS

The Presimian was visibly concerned. Reports of returnee Zoo-prisoners, as well as eavesdropping safaris, had occasioned great apprehension.

Security demanded we have an observer among people and I was the only monkey who could mingle with them on an equal basis. My freakish appearance had become a blessing in disguise.

I was directed to proceed to the center of population in the United States, because

there I'd be in the pit of the melting pot of the world.

As a steamer cabin-boy I arrived in New Orleans. Thence, as a roustabout, I made my way up the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers. One night, as the Mayflower, an old stern wheeler, was loading hogs about sixty miles southwest of Louisville, I slipped into the willow bushes and proceeded into a desolate countryside.

INTRODUCTION TO CIVILIZATION

Soon I came upon a dimly lit one-room school. From it came sounds as weird as I had ever heard in the jungle. A protracted revival meeting was in progress.

The preacher was alternately leaping high in the air, then falling to his knees and pounding the floor and exhorting the people to fear the Lord—because He was apt to fry them alive; and explaining the heat of hell and how long it would last.

The worshippers were moaning, groaning and screeching as though they felt sympathetic pains from the lost souls who had predeceased them.

Amid this, a hank of hair and bone in a calico bonnet strode up the aisle and demanded of an old man:

"Oh, Mr. Swazie, don't you want to go to heaven? Don't you want to go to heaven?"

The old gent rolled his watery blood-shot eyes and without hesitation replied—"Not now, by God!"

She snorted, "Heathen" and turned to others who were definitely interested in Heaven—but only as a last resort.

I later learned the old man was considered the town fool. The hank of hair and bone was the preacher's wife.

Soon two men mosed piously down the aisle, hats in hand. At this exact point the preacher seemed to have formed a better opinion of God. He ignored the danger of being fried alive and stressed God's great mercy and how much greater it would be if people supported the preacher's work.

Sounded pretty hopeful as small coins clinked in the hats.

The sounds of misery changed to ones of jubilation. The hank of hair and bone screeched:

"Somebody hold my bonnet. I wanna shout."

She thrust the bonnet into the chapped hands of a shock headed lad and jumped up and down bellowing:

"Bully for God, bully for God!"

At this point I withdrew from the meeting and clambered up a sycamore tree where I slept overnight.

I thought it best to acclimate myself gradually into this thing called civilization.

ADOPTED

In the grey dawn I followed a creek upstream, emerging into a small bottom field.

The older of three corn cutters yelled, "Hey, young fellow, wanna job, four bits and dinner?"

I countered, "How long do you work?"

"From can't to can't," he replied, explaining, when I looked puzzled, that he meant from time you can't see in the morning until you can't see at night.

I thought, why not?—and then said it out loud.

He ordered, "Run up to the house and have Ma give you a corn knife and a twist with some dry matches."

The twist was tobacco which Pa (as I soon learned to call him) slivered with a barlow and tamped into his corn-cob pipe.

During the next few days Pa kept me about as busy attending his pipe as he did cutting corn.

When he paid them Pa docked the two hands a nickel a day for time they had sheltered from the rain. This amounted to fifty cents and when they were gone he gave it to me, explaining that I had been good to him and he wanted to reward me.

This exemplifies two very common human traits.

First: To reward one's benefactor, if possible, at other people's expense.

Second: That you can best endear yourself to a human by humoring his vices.

Pa liked me and suggested I stay on with him. I agreed and remained twenty years. During these twenty years I learned about all there is to know about people.

During the next thirty years I learned how to interpret this knowledge.

GOLDEN SCHOOL DAYS

Ma and Pa sent me to school. There I saw the human race in miniature.

During books most children twittered incessantly. Those who followed the rules were called the teacher's pets.

Kids just naturally divided into gangs. During their frequent fist fights the friends of each gladiator would shout, "Pick on someone your own size." These taunts were never governed by the actual weight of the embattled pal nor which one really picked the fight.

During free-for-all some would dance around and root for their side—and demand that others dive into the fray.

Apart from subtlety, the kids acted exactly like grown-ups.

The girls made more pretense to gentleness. But it was often the gentleness of a harried cat, never smooth like their mothers and aunts.

Here is the contrast. A little girl told her playmate that her hat looked like a pile of cow dung. I was later reminded of this at a social event, when I heard a grown up lady say to her rival:

"Oh, dear, what a cute little hat you have. I told Jack, just last night, that I like those cheap little hats almost as much as I do my own hats."

Jack was the object of their rivalry. I knew she wasn't even with Jack the night before because Jack was waiting on another Belle.

Woods closed in three sides of the school. The front yard ran down a steep slope to the big road. There we played some scrub baseball. Our ball was made from old stitched yarn.

Pa made us one centered with old boot rubber. You could knock it farther. But an electronic brain couldn't have charted its course.

When I shacked up the ball I observed the game closely. The side playing team work won and the prima donnas lost.

Parents graded our ever-changing teachers up with the use, and down with the sparing of the rod. This wasn't always fair as I will explain.

Pa had a penchant for the law. Being intrigued with this I preferred argumentation to fistcuffs.

Once, however, I actually licked the so-called toughest boy in school. I was in my seat with the five minute bell, just like a lawyer returning early to court. I was primed for the forensic battle of the year.

Teacher called the first class. She pretended she didn't even know there had been a fight—let alone the fight of the season.

That was the severest discipline I experienced during all my school days. Maybe it served me right for succumbing to human egotism. On the other hand, maybe this annoying penchant for forensic histrionics will placate human belligerency and save the species.

No one had much respect for authority except when it was on his side.

A boy's error was excused by his teacher saying a mistake wasn't a hay stack.

He retorted, "Naw, hit hain't. Iffen hit were you'd be settin' in a hay mow." Her parental rating went up.

Rules required passing grades for participation in inter-school contests—just like the colleges. They were observed the same way.

A fleet and lanky, but illiterate, lad moved away one summer and returned that fall to play. Challenged by his old teacher his new one said:

"Freddie isn't very smart in his books, I'll admit. But he's one heck of a nice fellow, so we gave him a special examination, asking two questions and 50% was a passing grade."

"First question was, 'What color is blue litmus paper?' He missed by saying it was green. The next was, 'Do you know what year Columbus discovered America?' He said he didn't and that was a correct answer and it was worth 50% and he is going to play in this game."

Despite their human traits, I grew to like my classmates. Some think they are an improvement over their parents. I don't see any difference. The younger generation is more dangerous, not because it is worse but because of the dangerous instrumentalities at its disposal.

"Oh wad some power the giftle gie us to see oursels as others see us."—Burns.

Our community was known as the Nation, which meant the home of hillbillies and bumpkins. The boundaries of the Nation were quite indefinite.

Most folks claimed it began on the next farm. Few admitted they lived in the Nation. Yet it was well known for miles around Arsenic Creek. Somewhere, beyond the familiar hills, the name became vague and just petered out.

For us that was in the outer reaches of the universe.

Nationers always moved pretty lightly. They'd sell out and shake the straw from the bed ticks so that everything could go on hoof or in the jolt wagon.

At one sale eight little pigs were offered. Every pigless Nationer bought a pig in the spring and slopped out his winter meat.

The auctioneer announced he would first sell the pigs one at a time and then sell them all together. The way they fetched the most would be honored as the sale.

Eight Nationers bid on a pig apiece. Then Pa over-bid them and took the lot.

As he loaded his pigs in his wagon he was vainly trying to get an audience to hear him on his favorite subject—that the trusts and monopolies were crushing the little fellow.

The distinction between the big and little fellow appears to be about as indefinite as the boundaries of the Nation. And I have often wondered if the proportionate line of demarcation differed much whether in the Nation or on Wall Street.

The truth is that a human is generally contemptuous of less and envious of more success than he himself enjoys.

The rich fear the poor because the poor outnumber them and thus have the physical power to raid sacred apple trees. What the rich don't comprehend is that even the proportionately poor have their own sacred apple trees and aren't sure it would pay to join a raiding party which might turn them.

The reason the rich don't comprehend this is that they aren't in favor of anybody else having their own sacred apple trees.

The poor fear the rich because they think the rich are paragons of power and wisdom, and hence can, at will, take whatever they care to take from the poor. What they don't understand is that the rich can't do any such thing or they would have done it a long time before, and that the rich have their hands full guarding their own orchards from the fellow who is just a shade smaller than they are.

Still, sad to say, they are both a wee bit right. The tension all stems from human pride and selfishness.

I may be wrong, but I believe the rich hate the poor a little more than the poor hate the rich, because the rich have more

to lose, hence more to fear and fear is the principal ingredient of hate.

PRIDE GOETH AFTER THE FALL

One day Pa was telling a lawyer how a Nationer beat him in a horse trade.

This Nationer was another legal beagle. He insisted upon passing title to Pa in due legal form. So he drew up a bill of sale reciting that he was "a-sellin' and assignin' (to Pa) one Hoss, Wheezey" which Pa took to be the horse's name, but which turned out to be quite descriptive.

The lawyer wanted to sue instanter, but Pa overruled him asserting "The hell we will—and let people know a damned Nationer skinned me in a horse trade?"

Horse trading is a lost art. But the spiritual descendants of the old horse traders are still with us.

Years later a prominent judge's no-good kinsman blew into town. He peddled an imaginary damage case among several lawyers, obtaining advances of money from each to use in fetching the plaintiff to the Capital City.

A starving beginner ponied up five dollars. Having made the investment he concluded to keep his eyes on it and followed the scamp.

The fellow beat a bee line to the door of the keeper of the Bar Association's conscience. Whereupon our young friend called the police who juggled the culprit.

The judge asked me to see his relative in the local Bastille; got his victim list and ascertain the amount of loot he had taken from each and repay the victims; then get the rascal out of the clink and board him on a train with a long distance ticket.

I undertook the assignment. First I repaid the young lawyer's five dollars. Then I called on the keeper of the Bar Association's conscience from who \$100 had been filched. He informed me that my client was a depraved liar—that, as an ethical lawyer, he wouldn't think of advancing money on a case—besides he had plenty of business and on top of it all, he knew the scallawag was a fraud the minute he laid eyes on him and (he seemed to just recall this) he had actually thrown the so and so out of his office.

I heard substantially the same "story" from all the other lawyers on the list. Of course I will respect their good names and right to privacy.

I restored almost one thousand spurned dollars to my bank account instead of restoring them to their rightful owners.

The adage is wrong. It should read:

"Greed goeth before the fall—pride followeth."

THANKS, THANKS TO THEE MY WORTHY FRIEND

It takes all kinds of people to make the world; that is to say the kind of world we have—which is not saying we couldn't have a better world if we were "shet of some people."

But I don't think we could agree which ones to get rid of.

Take, for example, the character nicknamed Gerrillar, by which the Nationers meant Guerrilla. Gerrillar shaved annually in deference to the summer heat. He may have fished and gardened a bit. He never performed any useful work in the presence of witnesses. Pa called him a loafer—with colorful adjectives.

Gerrillar's only known exertion was the stroll to Pig's corner where the philosophers foregathered. He had no worldly interests to influence his views. He remained silent until other debaters exhausted their ideas and breath. Then if he had a view, he expressed it without any wastage of words.

For example, the Cracker Barrel Trial of a local murder case raged off into the broader controversy of capital punishment. As collective breath was almost exhausted, one philosopher proclaimed:

"Hangin' Clem won't stop anybody from killin'."

Gerrillar capped the climax with this cryptic comment:

"It'll stop Clem."

People in general had either a low or neutral opinion of Gerrillar. Personally I held him in high regard, for the lessons he taught.

First, his commendable independence was all too rare. It was nobody's business how he wasted his life, and I admired his unconcern about the gossip he inspired by just being his plain self.

Secondly, he was the purest example of intellectual honesty I ever knew. If people could put aside their selfish interests (as they swear to do when they judge their fellow man), the quality of justice would be enhanced a hundred fold.

Thirdly, he demonstrated the futility of keeping up with the Joneses and that one can live cheaply, which brings more real happiness than selling one's soul for false security.

Fourth and finally, about 90% of our judges could well take a leaf from Gerrillar's book, and keep quiet throughout trials instead of jumping off half cocked at erroneous conclusions in which their vanity acquires a vested interest.

Gerrillar produced nothing for our physical comforts, and yet many who did have a smaller credit balance on the records of total human happiness.

THE MAJESTY OF THE GOVERNMENT AND ITS LAWS

Clearing new ground consumed much of the Nationer's labor. From the new ground came fuel, fence rails, barrel staves, palling slates, cross ties and hoop poles.

The new ground was broken with the jumpin' shovel plow. The plow handles wore callouses on one's hips as the plow stubbed its tortuous way through stumps and rocks. This experience nurtured profane rather than noble thoughts.

When the mule was allowed to blow in the shade of a tree, spared for that purpose, the rural mind wandered to an imaginary life of more ease, remuneration and excitement.

Besides farming there were only two occupations requiring absolutely no qualifications. One was the law. The other was public office. Both were alluring in comparison to the jumpin' shovel plow or the grubbin' hoe.

Every human has a yen to be a hero. But one can't be a hero without the cooperation of a villain. Even the Book of Genesis had one in the person of the fallen angel, His Satanic Majesty, the Devil.

Since genuine villains were about as scarce as real heroes, the county abounded with synthetic examples of each. One could make a villain of a litigant, his lawyer, the holder or seeker of an office or anyone else of different religion, politics or race.

This was the era of the Menace and the Yellow Jacket, two super patriotic publications which warned the people to arise—that under every Catholic church there was a cache of arms. One day the Pope would give the signal and the Catholics would rise up and overthrow the government.

The vast majority around Midville were white Protestant Americans, many of whom were of the 100% variety. There were a few Negroes and Jews and foreigners in the persons of the "Damned French," as the Nationers called the Belgian settlement in the next Township.

With varying degrees of fervor, each group "cussed" and damned all the others. The degree of fervor varied in about the ratio that group bore to the whole population.

In this soil the Ku Klux Klan later flourished. It could have prospered more had it preached hate against only one of its targets. From the others it could have recruited a harvest of members at \$10 a head.

After all, one villain suffices for a mighty big plot. Too many are confusing.

For those to whom public office was sour grapes, the law afforded emotional outlet. Some pretty corny drama and repartee centered around forensic contests.

Legal talent was plentiful, and such as it was you could get several firm, if not sound, opinions upon any question.

I recall, however, two unanimous decisions from the Supreme Cracker Barrel Bench. Asked one Justice, "Hear what the damned fool Legislature done? Passed a law that if you have a telephone line with more'n two on hit, anybody can hook up."

Old Jeb (whose correspondence Pa handled because Jeb couldn't read or write) pronounced the opinion of the court. He said, "Well, that's unconstitutional as hell."

All justices concurred and took up the next case, stating it as follows: They passed a bill that "Ifen your hired hand was hurt, you still had to pay him." This was also laid to rest in the Potter's field of unconstitutionality.

Years later I learned someone had resurrected both the Public Utility and Workmen's Compensation laws. And I recalled these constitutional decisions when a fellow law student announced he would specialize in constitutional law. When I last heard from him, he was raising onions in the north muck country.

When the real court convened in Midville, the countryside gathered to hear the real lawyers "plead." One diminutive and one giant were leaders of the Bar. To the amusement of the audience they nearly always enacted one scene. Quoth the giant, "Why, the nerve of a little runt like Peck arguing with me. I could swallow him with one gulp." Retorted Peck, "I reckon Silas could swallow me but if he did, he'd have more brains in his stomach than in his head."

The crowd would roar and this bit of corn was reshelled, over and over, in every cross-road store in the county.

This juvenile mirth was less harmful than other legal attitudes. A senior barrister once reproved me for my criticism of the law's greater devotion to form than to substance. He said the law should remain mysterious so as to require the services of a lawyer.

A couple of legal yarns illustrate the point. After a long and expensive appeal, the Supreme Court held the trial judge should have permitted witnesses to testify what a party had said on a certain occasion. On the re-trial (occasioned solely by excluding this testimony at the first trial), all the witnesses were permitted to answer and swore that the party in question, hadn't said anything.

The other yarn was of a lawyer who boasted of making a 10 hour argument to a jury which deliberated four days before reaching a verdict. Asked what happened to his client, he responded, "My client—oh him—well, they hung him—but he sure had his money's worth."

These yarns graphically expose human mentality, the vast majority of which is bent toward the law, and its rowdy sire, politics. The court drama and political soap box are the crucibles which expose every human trait.

Descendants of the Nationers have gone forth into the wide world. They have become Admirals, Generals, realtors, factory hands, doctors, lawyers, politicians, ham actors and advertising moguls. Yet, at the core of almost each of their hearts is a yen for the forensic and political arena.

Every military man will eventually get around to the wisdom he expounded at courts-martial; realtors dispense legal medicine daily with professional pride and abject ignorance; factory hands have union meetings for political oratory and trial boards for jack leg lawyers; any doctor can tell a lawyer how to try a case and does tell every-

body how he broke it off in the attorney who once cross-examined him.

Advertising moguls huckster happy little wash day soaps, and presidential candidates—the former, as often as not, in court room scenes, the latter as superman and the father image.

The greatest conglomeration of hams ever to foregather on one medium sized planet are concentrated in Hollywood. Their "Make Believes" depict the court room second only to the show-story within the show. Naturally, they put their own racket first. Third place goes to the brave young man who drives the money changers from the temples of justice—after which everyone can relax.

Make believe relaxation satisfies temporarily—but such contentment wouldn't endure even if it weren't make believe. No one in his reason can imagine people being happy with no villains to slay or humble.

Slaying villains in real life has lost its appeal. In make-believe a car load of ammunition is shot up and still the hero lives to wed the damsel and the villain to go to court—where everybody has a hand in slaying him.

In real life the punk would high tail it for tall timber—and so might the hero. Even the hero has no immediate interest in Heaven.

The court room provides a bloodless arena for inflating the ego of less courageous heroes while the political hustings really warms the cockles of the spleen.

In some trials any resemblance to a search for the truth is purely accidental. The judge might as well be ruling according to the Ouija Board. Truth, in her vain pursuit of elusive justice, approaches the bar of justice trembling with fear. With clenched teeth she commences her run through the gauntlet of asinine objections and juvenile rulings. If she reaches the record she is a champion, but probably mangled, lacerated and distorted beyond recognition.

This nonsense, in some cases, is practiced to make the judges and lawyers appear wiser than common mortals. In other cases it creates confusion to obscure the escape of the real culprit.

Humans have an unwritten law allowing one to murder his wife's spare lover. Even Casanovas respect this law. Humans hate any sin in which they don't participate. For most judges, age has closed "Youth's sweet-scented manuscript" and so purity is practiced as well as decreed.

But there is section two of this unwritten law. It excuses thievery, providing the thief steals a million dollars or more. Such thieves usually become pillars in the church of their choice. The judge might throw the book at a skirt chaser, but I've seen but few who would be so cruel to a million dollar thief.

The judge wouldn't touch any of the filthy lucre. However, a pillar of the church (with that much money) deserves respect. Besides he can invite the judge to speak to the Sunday School on election eve, where judicial denunciation of sin is apt to do the most good—for the judge.

People, like wolves, run in packs. Packs will attack what is unpopular, be it good, bad or indifferent. The few Horatios who have stemmed Tuscanian hysteria haven't really gotten land and oxen very often. They were lucky if they weren't ridden out of town on a rail, for not baying with the pack.

This keeps most of them in line and makes for party unity.

Once in Midville a candidate's worst enemy told him, "If you didn't want my vote, you should've kept off my ticket."

A few brave souls break away as did one defector to whom his party's nominee complained, "Gabe, I've heard you say you'd vote for a yellow dog if he was on your ticket." Responded Gabe, "That I have said, and that I mean, but I won't go a damned bit lower."

Law is born in the labor pains of political

controversy which is the embryo of government. Thus the lawyer and politician are kindred spirits with each other—and with most of the people who are also politicians and lawyers at heart.

When people are annoyed at legal and political crocodile tears, they simply prove they are allergic to themselves. Humans really like make-believe. They carry a politician's letter to prove their contact with synthetic greatness; or carry on a feud with him as a balm to their ego as did their ancestors who accused God of trying to drown them.

Politicians play upon this ego—pretending to remember faces and names—when in fact the local chairman is whispering the identity of the on-coming constituent.

True or false, this yarn illustrates the point. A congressman, attending a sale, asked a young man about his father. The lad said, "Pa died last winter." "Oh, my," sadly said the congressman, "Why didn't you notify me so I could have attended his funeral?" After excuses the congressman resumed his arm pumping.

That afternoon he met the same lad again and asked, "And how is your father?" Answered the lad, "He's still dead."

WAR

Having been a teacher, Pa liked to teach us young 'uns, especially history and geography.

He said that the Kaiser wasn't making all those big guns for rabbit hunting. We were the only Nations who took a daily paper. One day, as I fetched the paper from the Post Office, I saw a large picture on the front page. Two four-horse teams, galloping tandem, were pulling a huge cannon into Belgium.

Before America entered the war against Germany, England seized some of her ships. England claimed they were carrying meat to Norway for reshipment to Germany.

Pa said our own Supreme Court had ruled a warring nation had the right to seize cargoes destined for her enemy. But there was no use talking sense to a mad neighborhood—or country. Our neighborhood was ready to renew the Revolutionary War.

Old Hezekiah bespoke the local sentiment when he fairly leapt up on his creaking and tottering legs and, stamping his cane on the floor, said:

"Let's ram our fists down their throats and turn 'em wrong side out!"

Then Germany sank ships she claimed were carrying supplies to England. We joined in against Germany and no more was heard about the Chicago Packing Company cases.

Ma had helped nurse in the birth and illnesses of most of the children in the neighborhood. Her father was a German immigrant. One day she was at the store and heard the Cracker Barrel Court decree the attainder of every drop of German blood, wherever found.

She continued to minister to the sick and newly born and was always welcome in the homes. I think she had an intuitive sense that people were dangerous only in packs, so she stayed away from the store where the patriotic pack met and held daily sessions of the Cracker Barrel Court. There they meted out justice to such dangerous characters as Ma and slackers, one of whom was a consumptive little runt. Under pressure, the draft board finally sent him. The Army sent him back with instructions to hide him in case of invasion.

After doing full justice, they resumed playing mumblepeg and the more energetic pitched a few horse shoes.

Pa used to point to the map and say, "There's Russia, a sleeping giant. If she ever awakes, there's going to be trouble." As the war closed Russia stirred fitfully, as though her sub-conscious mind knew the role of

international villain was vacant and might go begging.

Nationers were a bit perplexed over going to war so far away. But they knew the war was righteous. Besides it afforded unlimited opportunities for heroism—and villains—we had millions of them!!!

Any Nationer would rather have been caught with his britches down than be suspected of not favoring the slaughter of every German on earth. They were devout Christians. They'd skin you alive for doubting Christ's divinity. If you really followed His teachings they'd send you to the bug-house.

IN RETROSPECT

I could extend this report with later experiences in the law and public office. They would, however, only duplicate my experiences around the Nation and Midville.

People still crave a call to greatness—use villains as springboards to fame—pursue the proverbial Joneses—claim Divine alliances in politics and war—pay their debts at the expense of others—demand full freedom for themselves and restraints upon others—fit from today's prejudice to tomorrow's hysteria, which they chain-smoke with the one on the day after tomorrow.

These perversities are born—not of hunger and privation—but of senseless pride and craving for the empty plaudits of the multitude. Individual traits bend into national policy—as people demand proof that their leaders love them more than they do non-voting Hottentots.

If the country has an enemy, the politician must prove he hates the enemy more violently than does his opponent.

This falls into a deadly contest of hate. Then some old man is apt to stamp his cane and pontificate self virtue and righteous cause for war. Certain powerful old men in every country could thusly set off chain reaction.

Lacking five years, I would have lived in the United States during one-third of her independent existence. I have a fair conception of its past and the human race in general. But I would not dare prophesy the future.

Perhaps nations will disdain the H-bombs as individuals have become gun shy.

Forensic and parliamentary contests may soothe the human spleen. I doubt it.

There is apt to be another war which won't formally end because no organized government will remain to arrange or accept peace.

In view of earth's plentiful resources and the scientific possibility of a new Garden of Eden, this doesn't make sense.

But neither do people—from a monkey's viewpoint.

Respectfully submitted,

CHAITA CHEETA.

THE CHILD DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATE—A NEW CHILD CARE PROFESSION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in vetoing S. 2007, the OEO bill containing comprehensive child development programs in December, President Nixon pointed out that good public policy required the enhancement rather than the diminution of both parental authority and parental involvement with children, especially during their early years when social attitudes and a conscience are being

formed and religious and moral principles are first inculcated. He rejected the comprehensive child development plans in that they would commit the Government to the support of communal approaches to child rearing.

The President in his veto message also stated that

There has yet to be an adequate answer provided to the crucial question of who the qualified people are, and where they would come from to staff the child development centers.

I considered this statement as just another argument by the President to substantiate his veto until I learned recently that the administration is proceeding with plans to train people to develop America's children. It appears that the Nixon administration indeed intends to develop our children according to the designs of the New American Revolution.

I am certain that the vast majority of the people of my District would prefer that parents rear their own children so as to form the consciences and social attitudes as well as to inculcate in their children religious and moral principles of their choosing. I feel that in many instances these attitudes and principles would be antithetical to those desired by the New American Revolution.

In a speech delivered last November at the annual meeting of the National Association for the Education of Young Children in Minneapolis, Dr. Edward Zigler, Director of the Office of Child Development, revealed plans for developing "a middle level professional group to care for our nation's children."

I insert in the RECORD at this point the text of Dr. Zigler's speech entitled "A New Child Care Profession: The Child Development Associate," the text of a form letter sent to those expressing an interest in the new professional position, and two pertinent announcements from a local newspaper.

The speech follows:

A NEW CHILD CARE PROFESSION: THE CHILD DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATE*

(By Edward Zigler)

The Office of Child Development will begin implementation during this coming year of the development of a new profession of child care workers in this country—the Child Development Associate. Last year, I pointed out that the need for child care workers in this country over the next decade will be so great that this nation must do what other nations have already done; we must develop a middle level profession in this country, a middle level professional group to care for our nation's children. The need for the Child Development Associate, an individual who has not had as much scholastic training as those with college degrees, but nevertheless has the competencies to care independently for children, is really central to a major issue in child care. Are we going to provide the children of this nation with developmental child care or are we going to merely provide them with baby-sitting?

When we focus on what developmental child care really means, it becomes obvious that in addition to the primary caretaker of the child, it also involves other professionals and other disciplines.

*Excerpts from speech presented at Annual Meeting of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, Minneapolis, Minn., November 6, 1971.

The health and nutrition of the child, the social services to the family, the volunteers in the child care centers, and parental involvement are all aspects of the developmental concept. Nevertheless, the central element determining whether a child care program is developmental or not will be the quality of the child's educator, that is, the quality of that adult who takes the primary responsibility for the development and socialization of the child. If we do not have an adequate number of such individuals equipped to take on this developmental role then I think we will be assigning our children, in ever larger numbers, to the type of care that is deleterious to their growth and development.

There is already a shortage of trained personnel in programs for young children. If enrollment in programs providing day care services swells as expected, an even greater shortage of trained staff personnel can be anticipated. The needs are rather obvious. I mentioned them to you last year, but we have done some further homework since then to prepare for this announcement.

Since 1960, the number of licensed day care facilities has tripled and the number of children in other preschool programs has doubled. If this trend continues, kindergarten and nursery school enrollment will increase from 3.9 million children in 1968 to 6.3 million in 1980. With the current emphasis on Federal support for day care and early childhood education, it is likely that the increase will be even greater. In addition to this, the President's Welfare Reform Plan which has passed the House and is presently before the Senate Finance Committee anticipates that 875,000 children will be placed in day care under the provisions of this bill in its first full year of implementation alone.

The Department of Labor estimates that 23,000 new teachers in early childhood education will be needed each year between now and 1980 to cope with the accelerated preprimary enrollment. This increase, plus the proposed increase for child care contained in various pieces of pending legislation, makes it clear that our nation must develop new institutional forms if we are to produce trained individuals in large enough numbers to meet the demand.

Related to this need is a phenomenon that is often overlooked. When we think of child care, the image that typically comes to mind is our conventional center with from 12 to 20 children. What is often overlooked is that the bulk of children who are presently in day care are in family day care homes which typically serve 4, 6, or 8 children.

But then again, often must ask where the trained people are to come from capable of providing developmental experience even in the family day care setting.

The answer, I think, is a new profession of child care worker, the Child Development Associate. It should be understood that the Child Development Associate will not replace the college trained teacher, the master teacher, or supervisor, nor will the Child Development Associate serve as an aide. This person's role is seen as that of a competent professional staff person in programs for young children who must (1) understand and be knowledgeable about children; (2) be able to provide valuable experiences for preschool children in part-time or full-day programs or in extended day care; and (3) have achieved the minimum competencies of a good preschool teacher. I think what is revolutionary and most exciting about this program is that it will introduce a new concept to the problem of accreditation and certification in the field of early childhood. Individuals will be credentialed as Child Development Associates based on demonstrated competency rather than only on completion of courses or acquisition of credit hours. This will guarantee recognition of people already in the field who are qualified by experience but who may not necessarily

have had formal educational opportunities. The Child Development Associate certificate should be nationally negotiable and awarded through a national system. Training for the program, the entry into this system, encompasses at least three possibilities: college based programs, supervised internship programs and work study programs. The group that is working on this very vigorously is also examining other, even more innovative forms of entry into the system.

The program features are essentially as follows: (1) a delineation of the competencies that one would want of an individual responsible for the care of children; (2) the development of training programs which will permit individuals to obtain these competencies and (3) the development and implementation of procedures that will effectively assess whether the individual does indeed possess these competencies.

What must be emphasized is that certification will be based on an assessment of the individual's performance as an educator of young children, not upon our typical trappings of academic accomplishment.

We are at present working to develop a system which will accomplish several objectives. First, this system should give recognition to those persons presently performing competent work with young children. Second, we hope that our efforts will legitimize field training and on-the-job experience. People who have gained competencies either through experience or formal education or a combination of both will have the opportunity to become Child Development Associates. Those who need additional training will be helped to obtain such training. Through this program, National and Regional offices of the childhood programs will be assessed and those unable to meet requirements will be assisted in doing so. Third, we hope to initiate innovative new training programs and work with existing programs designed to develop the needed competencies.

To aid in the implementation of the program, we are exploring the feasibility of establishing a consortium composed of a number of national professional organizations. Such a consortium would assist in the development and administration of the CDA program. National and Regional offices of the Office of Child Development, with the help of such a consortium, will implement the Child Development Associate program during the coming year.

The performance competencies have been tentatively defined. What now confronts us is a difficult problem but a solvable one, namely developing the process whereby we might assess whether individuals do or do not possess these competencies.

We are undertaking a very important, new large scale effort. This nation is confronted with a very real need for child care workers. If we are not successful in meeting this need, then we are assigning the care of our nation's children to individuals totally untrained in the demanding task of caring for the young.

We will proceed with great care in establishing this new profession since we want to insure the optimum development of individuals to serve the children of this nation.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION AND WELFARE,
OFFICE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., December 17, 1971.

DEAR Mr. —: Thank you for your letter expressing interest in the new professional position, in early childhood education, the Child Development Associate.

We are at present completing the definition of competencies for the Child Development Associate and working on plans for implementation of the program.

We have enclosed a copy of the announcement of the CDA made by Dr. Edward Zigler, Director of the Office of Child Development. Since we are still in the planning stage we

do not have any other information available at this time.

I suggest that you contact us sometime in April when more information will be available. Thank you for your interest and concern.

Sincerely,

JENNY W. KLEIN,
Senior Education Specialist.

Enclosure.

P.S. There is certainly a need for Child Development Associates at present even if no legislation passes in the near future.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 2, 1972]

WORKSHOPS FOR PARENTS

"Turn On to Learning," a conference featuring 17 workshops for parents of children from birth to 9 years of age will be held Saturday, March 18, at Paint Branch High School, Burtonsville, Md. The day-long meeting, being sponsored by the Maryland Council of Parent Participation Nursery Schools, will focus on helping parents keep pace with changing ideas about the care and education of children.

Topics at the workshop will include "Being Equally Different—A Basic Right for Boys and Girls," "Making Kindergarten Relevant," "Discipline as Learning" and "Is Day Care for the Suburban Middle Class Child Possible?"

Keynote speaker Dr. James Gibbs, head of child psychiatry at Sheppard Enoch Pratt Hospital, Baltimore, will speak on "What Really Counts for the Young Child."

Registration fee of \$6.50 includes luncheon and both morning and afternoon sessions. Parents or teachers interested in attending can call Cynthia Silverstein, or Lola Hillman, for more information and a registration form.

SYMPOSIUM ON CAREERS

A symposium called "Careers for the Future" for senior high and college students will be held Sunday at 2 p.m. at the Jewish Community Center of Greater Washington.

All interested young people are invited to attend. Pre-registration is requested and may be arranged by calling the center's youth department. Admission is free to center members and 50 cents for non-members.

AMNESTY

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, in the last few weeks much discussion has occurred in the press concerning the issue of amnesty for those who have in some form resisted involvement in Southeast Asia. Yesterday Senator KENNEDY held hearings on this issue. I am submitting the testimony of one of the witnesses from the KENNEDY hearings, Mr. Henry Schwarzschild. I feel his statement helps to explain the many facets of this issue.

The testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF HENRY SCHWARZCHILD, DIRECTOR OF THE PROJECT ON AMNESTY OF THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION FOUNDATION, NEW YORK, N.Y.

My name is Henry Schwarzschild. I am the Director of the Project on Amnesty of the American Civil Liberties Union Foundation. I am grateful to you for having asked me to testify and I am pleased to be able to submit my views on the question of amnesty for those who have refused to participate in the War in Southeast Asia.

For over three centuries, America has been

the place of refuge for the political exiles and refugees from religious and political oppression. It is one of the unprecedented consequences of the War in Indochina that America has now produced, for the first time in its history, a large class of American political exiles, refugees and prisoners of conscience.

These men, numbering probably well in excess of 100,000, are of the young generation of Americans. They have had to confront in the most painful fashion the dilemma of deciding whether or not directly to participate in a war that the overwhelming majority of this nation wishes had never begun and prays may be quickly brought to an end. The revulsion against this war is now almost universal in our society and in the world, and even from the very beginning of American involvement the nation has been deeply divided over the merits of this war. No wonder, then, that so many thousands of young men, of whom their government demanded that they do the killing and the being killed in a war which they could not support, that was unpopular and undeclared, refused to participate in that cruel War in Southeast Asia. Some refused to submit to the draft, some, once inducted, left the military service on their own, others went underground or into prison or into exile or into military stockades, and still others so rebelled against the dehumanization of the war and of military life that they were expelled from the armed services and given less than honorable discharges. While men of our generation dispute the merits of the war and the blame for it, the burdens of the war will be the lifelong inheritance for these young men, and they alone will bear the legal consequences of a war that began when they were not even old enough to vote—unless, that is, this nation decides to end this war and to bring about a reconciliation with those of its young sons who could not participate in this tragic and destructive episode of American history, by extending to them a broad, plenary, and unconditional amnesty.

This nation has been bitterly divided—indeed, polarized—by the war. It is of the greatest importance for the future of this country that we do whatever can be done to mitigate the destructive effects of the war, at home and abroad, on behalf of the victims of the war in Asia, for the families of those who were killed, for those veterans who suffered injury and life's dislocation, and for those other victims who have undergone prison or exile. One step in the healing process must be the declaration of amnesty for those many thousands who have been convicted or are subject to prosecution, so that they can return to our society free of any legal impediments and can share with us all the opportunities and responsibilities of building a better nation.

In the history of the United States, amnesty has an honored tradition. From the earliest time of the Republic on, virtually every military conflict in which the United States has been engaged has been followed by an amnesty, by a governmental exercise of power not to prosecute those who for political or moral reasons came into conflict with the laws. In 1795, President George Washington granted "a full, free and entire pardon" to those involved in an insurrection in Pennsylvania against the United States. In explaining this to the Congress, President Washington said:

For though I shall always think it is a sacred duty to exercise with firmness and energy the constitutional powers with which I am vested, yet it appears to me no less consistent with the public good than it is with my personal feelings to mingle in the operations of Government every degree of moderation and tenderness which the national justice, dignity and safety may permit.

During and after the Civil War, Presidents Lincoln and Johnson offered amnesty even to those who were engaged in treason and

open war against their own government. President Johnson declared, in words profoundly relevant to our country's present condition, that

A retaliatory or vindictive policy, attended by unnecessary disqualifications, pains, penalties, confiscations and disfranchisement, now as always could only tend to hinder reconciliation among the people and national restoration, while it must seriously embarrass, obstruct and repress popular energies and national industry and enterprise.

World Wars I and II engaged the overwhelming, well nigh unanimous support of the American people. Yet, even there, upon the ending of those wars, many of those who had refused to participate in them because of their religious, moral or political convictions, were pardoned or amnestied. How much more appropriate, after the war in Southeast Asia, which never engaged the wholehearted support of the nations, for which the formal consent of the Congress was never sought or obtained, which many Americans in and out of the Congress thought from the beginning to be a ghastly mistake if not indeed a terrible crime—how much more appropriate, indeed, mandatory, to free those who refused to fight this war far from our shores.

Amnesty, I want to emphasize, is not identical with pardon. It is distinguished from pardon in two significant elements. A pardon affects a single person, while amnesty extends to a whole class of persons, and where a pardon forgives a past offense, for which punishment is remitted, amnesty is "oblivious" of certain acts, a sovereign declaration that the best interests of society as a whole will be served by dismissing the question of any possible culpability. Amnesty is not a finding of criminal conduct and the remission of penalties, but rather it extinguishes the interest of the law in the acts amnestied. Amnesty, of course, is not a "right," but rather a sovereign state's discretionary act of grace and reconciliation. The American Civil Liberties Union, which traditionally seeks to protect and extend the constitutionally guaranteed rights and liberties of the individual, now—through the Project on Amnesty of the ACLU Foundation—seeks not rights but an act of moral and social generosity and greatness from American society. We make this plea on behalf of the young generation, many of whose most promising and courageous members are in prison or exile because of the war. All the young generation has grown up in an age in which they have experienced this country only as a mighty and powerful mechanism that pursues objectives and interests, that asserts and applies power. They have not known this country to act out of humane and selfless principle. Much of the alienation and disaffection of the young generation from the America they have observed might be mitigated if, by the enactment of a broad and generous, non-punitive amnesty, the government could once again be seen as sensitive to the passionate concerns for peace and justice that animate these young men.

To be sure, historically amnesty has been most often an act of the Crown, of the Sovereign, of the Chief Executive. But a series of legislative enactments, of Supreme Court decisions, of constitutional and legal doctrines and interpretations, going back over a hundred years, leave no doubt that the Congress, as well as the President, may enact amnesty or remit all penalties for offenses. We therefore gratefully welcome the concern shown by this Subcommittee and by numerous members of the Senate and the House of Representatives in the subject of amnesty for those who refused participation in the war in Southeast Asia. We believe that both the executive and legislative branches of government can properly enact amnesty, and the present hearings will do much to clarify the problems and to educate the coun-

try and the government about the need for and the benefits of amnesty.

We urge that amnesty be enacted promptly as the war is brought to an end. It is hard to believe that this war, which the people want ended, which the President and the Administration talk about ending but which is still being pursued by an escalated air war and by indigenous troops trained and supplied by us, can long continue. It is not too early then to consider, debate, and resolve the issue of amnesty, along with other great issues of the war and the immediate future of our country.

We urge that amnesty be extended broadly, that is, alike for draft refusers, for deserters, for exiles living abroad, for men convicted by courts martial, for those serving sentences in prison, for those who have already served their sentences, for those who have been separated from the service under less than honorable conditions, for those who saw disavowal of their citizenship as their only way out, and for civilian acts of protest and opposition to the war. An amnesty that would cover only draft refusers (as some propose) would compound the inequities already visited upon the young generation by the war and the draft. By and large, the middle class, white, well educated were spared from the military service—they found shelter in the reserves, in college deferments, and in conscientious objection. The disproportionate burdens of fighting this war have fallen upon the poor, the less well educated, the Black and other minority groups. But the same qualities of good education, middle class and white race in a general way also characterize those who refused to submit to compulsory military service and went to prison or into exile or underground. It is again the poor, the less educated, and the members of minority groups who contribute a much larger proportion of the deserters, of those who submitted to induction and became aware only in the military of the cruelties and irrationalities of the war.* It would be outrageous if amnesty, too, were to become an instrument of class and race discrimination, as are in effect so many other institutions and actions of our society. The circumstances which impelled these as well as those to draft refusal or desertion are the same: the war and the draft. And the motives were usually the same: a refusal to submit to the machinery of the war, whether for religious, moral, ideological or personal reasons. All acts and failures to act, we urge, that arose out of the war, that would not have occurred but for the war, and that might be subject to criminal penalties, should be included in amnesty.

We urge that such an amnesty ought to be plenary, that is, it should automatically cover all the classes referred to, without a case-by-case examination of the motives that prompted the acts or failures to act that are to be amnestied. To begin with, it is in the very nature of amnesty that it extend to classes of political acts, not to singled-out individuals. Equally important is the need to avoid putting these young men through an investigation of their conscience, their religious training or beliefs, their bona fides, and demanding that young men who are not yet or barely out of their teens be able to articulate a system of beliefs, a *Weltanschauung*, that will satisfy administrative or judicial bodies of the government. Those who have pleaded conscientious objection to war have already had to undergo this searing experience that would be a challenge to men two or three times their years. Here again, the inarticulate and less intellectually so-

*It is these men, too, who in glaringly disproportionate numbers have been tried by military courts for various offenses and who have been given less than honorable discharges—impediments of the most serious nature for their future lives and careers.

phisticated have suffered from discrimination—and it would be cruel to make amnesty once more a means of unfairly discriminating against those with fewer advantages. (The Amnesty Board created after World War II by President Truman subjected selective service violators to a case-by-case examination and recommended only about 10% of the over 15,000 men convicted for presidential pardon. The Board's title was a misnomer; it was really a pardon board, not an Amnesty Board, and the results of its work were systematically—though perhaps not intentionally—discriminatory against lower-class, uneducated, minority-group draft violators. It applied criteria, such as previous convictions, that eliminated lower-class persons who classically are more often arrested and convicted for petty offenses, and excluded whole groups of religiously motivated war resisters. Even though the total number of cases before the Truman Amnesty Board was perhaps one-tenth of the number that a board would have to consider now, they spent a very few minutes going over each case history to decide a man's fate.) The main point, however, is that the legal debris of the War in Southeast Asia ought to be removed from the lives of all, irrespective of motive or act, so that this generation may not be the only one who will bear the adverse consequences of the war throughout their lives and careers. No system of amnesty can or should weigh the ideas and motives, the pressures and impulses that made young men and women resist participation in this tragic war. (We do believe, however, that where there are allegations or findings of acts of substantial injury to persons or property, it might be proper to look into the circumstances and responsibility of the individual draft resister or deserter.)

We urge that no conditions whatever attach to the amnesty granted and that neither alternative nor national service nor any formal declaration be required. In the first place, the deserters and draft evaders have already suffered the pains of prison or exile or underground life, to say nothing of the fears and risks of the lonely decision to resist the awesome power of the United States government and its instrumentalities. Secondly, we believe that the war has already made more than enough demands upon the young generation. It would be mere vengeance to exact further obligations—and unnecessary, unjustifiable ones at that—of these young men. And then: If amnesty is intended to gain the return of these men to our—*their*—society, the fact is that they view "alternative service" as punitive, and they simply reject the notion that this country and this government are in a position to punish those who have refused to become personally responsible for the brutalities, the killing and the destruction in Indochina. They will (and do) disavow any amnesty that seems to punish them for their acts of moral courage and human compassion. Further, we believe that it is constitutionally extremely dubious to deprive persons of their liberty to arrange their own lives except by reason of extreme national emergency (which alternative service would not be designed to meet) or in punishment for a crime—but the very purpose of amnesty is not to punish but to restore national harmony to a country deeply torn by war. Nor is it really very likely that socially constructive work would be accomplished by a system of forced labor. If our hospitals need staffing, our strip-mined hills need restoration, or our inner cities community planning, these urgent human and social needs can hardly be met by a labor corps of conscripted and therefore unwilling men. And the agencies of government have not shown themselves especially skilled at channeling large numbers of people into tasks of social reconstruction—bureaucracy is simply not the proper setting for such work, as the problems of the Peace Corps or VISTA plainly teach us.

The War in Southeast Asia has wreaked havoc both in Asia and in our own society. In a very real sense, all people affected by the war are its victims—Asians and Americans, the soldiers and sailors and airmen, those who were killed or injured, the veterans, the prisoners and the exiles alike. One step toward overcoming the tragic consequences of the war in American society and toward seeking that reconciliation that we need in order to tackle the gigantic social and economic problems of race and poverty is a broad, plenary and unconditional amnesty for draft resisters and deserters and all those who have suffered the war's legal disabilities. Amnesty would demonstrate that America is still capable of a communal moral act, after the appalling experience of the war. The healing and reconciliation of the nation, its redirection toward peace with itself, will be difficult enough. Let all of our country's sons return to join freely in the making of a better America.

THE NEED TO ASSIST THE AEROSPACE COMMUNITY IN MEETING TODAY'S PRESSING DOMESTIC PROBLEMS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the problems confronting America are omnibus. The air we breathe is tainted with pollution. Over one-third of our streams are choked with industrial, agricultural, and municipal waste. Many of our citizens do not live in adequate housing. The time and money wasted by commuters on our clogged highways is shocking. There is evidence that our health care system is failing. The list goes on and on.

Yet, at the same time, welfare rolls and unemployment offices are filled with individuals whose efforts and abilities should be channeled into meeting these problems.

Many of those who are now collecting unemployment and welfare checks were formerly employed in the aerospace industry. A short 8 months ago, in June 1971, over 38,000 engineers, scientists, and technicians were unemployed in Los Angeles alone.

What have aerospace workers been trained and educated to accomplish?

All of us are aware of their great achievements in placing man on the moon. All of us are aware of the benefits in technology that have accrued through the space program.

But what happens to individuals who have been trained in mathematics, engineering, physics, and related sciences when our space program is drastically reduced?

In order to create jobs and continue our exploration of space, I, personally, favor an expanded effort in the form of an economical, reusable space shuttle.

However, the immediate question remains: How can we channel the efforts of the talented, imaginative, and dedicated engineers, scientists and technicians into meeting the pressing problems of today?

One answer is converting the skills and applications of the scientific and technical community to new endeavors.

In 1970, I coauthored H.R. 19037, a bill designed to involve our defense and space-oriented personnel in efforts to meet our needs in transportation, housing, health, and pollution control. This bill authorized \$450 million over a 3-year period for specific programs of education, research, and business assistance to aid the aerospace community in a conversion to domestic needs.

H.R. 19037 died in the 91st Congress; however, on the first day of the 92d Congress—January 21, 1971—I introduced H.R. 1209, a similar bill, that would establish a separate organization within the Federal Government having the primary responsibility of determining and planning appropriate research and development in the areas of housing, pollution control, et cetera. In addition, this new agency would place engineers and scientists in these fields.

In order to provide a wider latitude of discussion in the Congress, I also coauthored H.R. 1422, a bill which would grant the National Science Foundation the authority to conduct the conversion and education program.

The Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development conducted hearings on the various research and education proposals during June, July, and August 1971. However, to date, no legislation has been reported.

Mr. Speaker, our scientific community is crying for work, and our problems are begging for solutions. Let us move expeditiously to bring the two together by preserving the skills in the aerospace community and, at the same time, fulfilling the domestic needs of the Nation.

Legislation must be forthcoming which will solve the tragedy for both the unemployed aerospace personnel and for the Nation by putting this talented pool of human resources to work in meeting our domestic problems.

COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the following is the final portion of the proceedings of the sixth annual Community Leadership Conference I sponsored for residents of the 23d Congressional District on November 14, 1971:

PANEL I: IS THE CONSUMER ADEQUATELY REPRESENTED?

Chairman: Honorable Robert Abrams, Bronx Borough President.

Panelists: Ms. Betty Furness; Congressman Benjamin Rosenthal; Hon. Paul Dixon, Federal Trade Commissioner.

Reporter: Ms. Ruth K. Nezin.

The panel was opened with words of welcome by the Chairman, the Hon. Robert Abrams, Bronx Borough President, who introduced the panelists and gave background information on them.

Ms. Betty Furness: Through human history

we've had to stop at intervals and reevaluate our rights; to begin figuring out who we are; and we've been slow about this as consumers. When we were first told some cars were unsafe, some medications had menacing side effects, certain food additives were carcinogenic we didn't believe it. We found it hard to give up the security blanket concept that they wouldn't let unsafe, untried or undernourishing products on the market—hard to realize that if they are unscrupulous or over-competitive manufacturers they are out to sell a product that anyone is foolish enough to buy. Not all our problems are traceable to a mere handful of irresponsible entrepreneurs—we must suspect even the benign corporate giants we have come to love and trust. She then read a list of consumer problems and the companies involved, where the FTC (Federal Trade Commission) took action: separate complaints were announced against Procter & Gamble, Colgate Palmolive and Lever Bros. for false claims as to the effectiveness of their enzyme detergents; Dr. West's toothpaste not only didn't fight germs but it contained mercury; Coca-Cola company's claim as to the tooth nutritional value of Hi-C; challenge to Reader's Digest for deception and misrepresentation in sweepstakes contests; automobiles recalled by General Motors and Ford for faulty design and manufacture—highly recognizable firms—some of the top ones in the country—involved in these transactions in a year.

We've begun to look more and more to government protection but they too offer less than most of us believe; they may not have sufficient authority, manpower or sophistication to protect us. It has taken four years for the Secretary of Commerce to establish standards of flammability for children's sleepwear (in May, 1967 she testified on amendments to the Flammable Fabrics Act) and these standards won't be completely effective until July, 1973—six years.

She stated that a great deal did happen at Federal level largely because Pres. Johnson was truly and sincerely interested in consumer protection—he had a comprehensive program and many bills were introduced and passed to protect the consumer—up to 20. When she shifted to the State government she hoped that the Legislature could move faster than Congress—that they might be more interested in innovations like unit pricing, which would be excellent to be tried at State level. But she found she was naive—many of the State legislators are torn in their loyalties when it comes to consumer affairs. While they are also consumers and legislators they are also producers and in this role spend more time and make more money than as legislators, so one who is a banker is wary of legislation affecting banks; farmers are wary of dating dairy products; the pharmacist is not going to vote to identify drugs by generic names. They voted the NYSt. Consumer Protection Bd. into existence in July, 1970, an election year—there had been no official protection at State level since Governor Harri-

man. Ms. Furness took the job in August, 1970 and the Legislature voted a budget of 1/4 million dollars to run the balance of the fiscal year—7 months. In the next session they voted the same amount for a full year which was not enough—had to fire staff. She didn't complain because many State programs were voted down and she wanted to try to get consumer legislation passed. Had been warned that bills do not tend to get passed early in the session—the last couple of days they go through. But only 3 bills were passed of any significance and she realized that this Legislature which had voted the office into existence in an election year had, in a nonelection year not given enough funds and paid no attention to consumer legislation. She concluded therefore they were not serious about protecting the consumer and she considered

it might be a consumer fraud to continue in that office. That same year Louis Lefkowitz, Attorney General, had a budget of 2 million 400 thousand dollars for his Consumers Fraud Division while she had \$250,000 for consumer protection. She spoke of the fine job his office is doing in matters pertaining to consumer fraud.

She warned about those who are "big" about consumerism in election years and forget in nonelection years. Check the voting record of those already in office if they suddenly get "consumer religion". "Never mind promises—a new aspirant must know we're watching him and will hold him responsible for his voting record." Many who vote for us one time do not always continue; they have been known to support a consumer or environmental bill and then refuse to vote for appropriations to make it viable."

She concluded that with a few notable exceptions, and Congressman Rosenthal is one; with the exception of what is going on in the FTC which is very exciting and a few exceptions in Washington, the consumer is not well represented at the Federal government level and when it comes to the State level "kids, you're on your own!"

Congressman Benjamin Rosenthal: in responding to the broad concept, stated the answer is "No;" the consumer never has been adequately represented and his prognosis is he never will be until a new Consumer Protection always is established. He pointed out attacks upon the consumer by James Roche, President of General Motors; Goldwater's attack on Ralph Nader. . . . What they have said and many business corporations have said, is that consumerism is a measure without a purpose; that politicians enamored with political success devote themselves to consumerism but there is no need. This is a misstatement. "Those of us committed to and involved in the consumer movement got there because there was a need shown that need was great, and increases geometrically every year for two reasons: growth in technology and the fact we can buy things we weren't able to buy a few years ago. As a result we have lost the one to one relationship with retailers our forefathers had; it has prevented us from understanding the product we are buying, whether it will be useful and safe, and the more sophisticated technological growth we have the more this happens." He cited the TV sets that blew up; flammable sleepwear. . . . He stated we have lost the ability to use judgment because we are denied dependable information we need to make the judgment. He pointed out that Bon Vivant soup had only two FDA inspections in the four years preceding the botulism incident. "Misrepresentations, lack of information, death and desperation have continued. Phase I—is the inability to make the tests of protection on which we rely on others who do not make them. Two is the tremendous growth of monopoly in the U.S.—we do not have price comparison or competition any more. We buy things on slogans—we see 'breakfast of champions' and the reaction is that 'I too want to be a champion.' Jokingly, he spoke about buying a brand of car because he saw the advertisement with Raquel Welch in it. He mentioned that bags of hog food list the nutritional value of its contents while baby foods do not. He stated we are restricted in the opportunities we have in the market place.

"Is the government being a balance wheel on behalf of the buying and consuming public? There are dozens of regulatory agencies (FTC, CAB, FDA, etc.) presumably regulating the consumer's relations with business, but the consumer's voice is never fed into the decisions of those agencies. When utilities companies ask for a rate increase and produce batteries of lawyers, investigators and professionals, when it comes to appearing before this quasi-public body no one fills

the consumers seat." Spoke about trying, in the past few years, to create an intelligent consumer protection agency to be an ombudsman for the people with no regulatory powers. It went through the House of Representatives this year and he was forced to vote against his own bill because all special interests, GMA, NAM, US Chamber of Commerce got in and thru their lobby cut the heart out of the bill. Had he voted for a bill that said Consumer Protection Act of 1971 he would have engaged in a "consumer fraud and deceptive program." Mr. Rosenthal stated that "we pass beautiful sounding legislation in Washington and either cut the guts out of it or don't fund it."

"Is the consumer represented? I can only say loud and clear and outrageously, 'not one bit!'"

Mr. Paul Dixon: made an opening remark that if he admitted to the charges Ben Rosenthal just made he should resign; if he didn't admit to it he would be partially right.

"Betty came and Betty went and Betty learned something because she told you that today. The real problem whether the consumer is adequately represented boils down simply to adequate funding." He stated he had been in government all his life; was a student of government; and has been Counsel to the FTC. The consumer movement started in 1957 when he went with Kefauver, and when Kefauver looked at the drug industry everyone predicted his defeat but instead he won. Mr. Dixon disagreed with Ben Rosenthal—he thinks the consumer movement is here to stay.

He gave a history of the FTC—the act was passed in 1914 and the Commission created in 1915 after this country nearly allowed monopolies to take over. But the people passed the Sherman Act declaration against allowing this to happen. Not much was done about enforcement machinery and the greatest monopoly period in this country was the early 1900's with the Sherman act on the books. Not until 1938 was an amendment passed by Congress which for the first time indicated concern for the consumer because it declared unfair and deceptive acts and practices unlawful and made it part of enforcement responsibility and added sections dealing with food, drugs and devices. In 1939/40 special consumer acts were passed—the Food Products Labeling Act, The Flammable Fabrics Act, the Wool and Fur Acts and the Textile Act.

In 1961 when Mr. Dixon returned to FTC as Chairman he found it the same size it was in 1938 with national responsibility to proceed against things in commerce. In 9 years as Chairman, by plaguing everyone and asking everyone to help funds had increased to 23 million dollars to take care of a trillion dollars economy and to see it is fair and not deceptive. As for the Flammable Fabrics Act, Mr. Dixon said we must worry about it because, with standards passed by the Commerce Dept., enforcement came to FTC. They got only 60-70 employees for that undertaking to check wool, fur, flammable fabrics and to inspect retail stores—he tried to point this out to various committees and nothing was done about it—he asked them not to pass bills unless they provided people to enforce them. He spoke about the Magnuson-Morse Act which, if it passes the Senate, will have the FTC across the barrel because they do not get the employees nor the money needed for enforcement. He stated Congress gave away the power of Congress to the President under the so-called Budget Act. There was a time when the Congress under Constitutional provisions originated all taxation measures but every year every agency of government must be reconstituted through reappropriation. He said that as an independent agency, not subject to the control of the President other than appointments and reappoint-

ments, they must nevertheless appear before the Budget Bureau who recommends what they get. "When we did get recommended for an increase, we went to the House and always they want to prove they are as economy minded as the President, and have always cut us."

He stated that many years ago he hoped the consumer fight would have an effect in the states and they would pass laws and throw out their elected officials and governors if they didn't do something about it. 35 states have some kinds of enforcement legislation on the books. "It isn't fast enough, and what's taking place in Washington is what is happening in all our government affairs—it isn't fast enough." "Now the FTC is going to be made policeman of consumers in 50 states with 20 million dollars—how ridiculous can you be?" He stated that bills will pass—20 passed under the President who reappointed him. The only time he got an increase in appropriations was the last year of his office when he told the Budget Bureau either to increase or he would go to the President—either go to him directly or make a speech—and he got \$3 million. "You've got to fight for everything. I'm old fashioned. I think more like Ben Rosenthal and others like him, and they are becoming more numerous. I think the people's voice will be felt and maybe that is the best way."

He then went on to speak about Phase I and Phase II—the former came because "the Democrats played a trick on Nixon; they passed a law putting him on the barrel telling him he must fix prices and he didn't want to use it but things got so bad—he didn't even try guide lines—he used it and now has recommended Phase II. Lawyers are going to get real rich because it is complicated and comprehensive, and I have a prediction—we have now entered a managed economy. You have lost your freedom. Our system worked in free enterprise; we work best in that system; we work worse when we are managed. In the depression—Blue Eagle, OPA, OPS—all failures. Now we are not in a depression—it was pushed upon the administration and, in my lifetime and yours, I predict we are in a managed system. Where does anti-trust fit? No place, because they are fixing prices. There will be a lot of room for the consumer and I hope to be adequately funded and adequately supported and with that we'll try to do our best."

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD FOLLOWED

Q. (By Chairman, Robert Abrams): A great consumer advocate resigns because she can't get any action from the State Legislature; a Congressman has to vote against his own bill; a tremendous advocate from a Federal agency says he doesn't have enough money to do a job for 50 states—the obvious question is: where are we going from here? Consumers are probably the least effective group in our society, they are not organized, not structured, how are we going to deal with it? What will it take to effect changes?

A. (By Cong. Rosenthal): In 1962 we couldn't pass a drug bill until a lady named Sherry Finkbein was threatened with a thalidomide abortion. The government in Washington responds to crisis and great drama. The fact is that Congress and the President have not properly funded the agencies. FDA last year got no money at all for enforcement of the Fair Packaging Labelling Act. It happened for two reasons: the Budget Bur. does apportion funds and there has never been a political movement that goes into the budgetary process—the absence of a consumer voice to be heard in the budgetary process. Additionally, special interest groups have always, because of hundreds of industry advisory committees, had access to the Budget Bureau—they all are not advocates of spending more money for consumer enforcement so pressure is never even remotely adequate for consumer enforcement. The final answer

is that until there is a political movement that has a constituency such as consumers that demand action and attention from their legislators, the special interests will prevail. We do not have free enterprise in this country—we think we do but we don't. Oil companies are buying up all the coal and uranium companies, all the resources in this country; 200 of the largest corporations in the U.S. control the economy of the country eliminating competition and free enterprise. We have to enforce anti-trust laws and laws on the books and readjust the budgetary process. This can only happen when we have an adequate political movement.

A. (By Betty Furness): "The thing to turn this around eventually is going to have to be the consumer. There are scant chances of that today—everybody's car breaks down; everybody's panty hose runs; ladies don't know what they're feeding their family but people want their own problems solved and are not willing to rally around to get the other fellow's problem solved. The important thing is in terms of organizing in some fashion—I don't know how but it isn't going to happen until it comes from the grass roots. Today there is consumer protection in the White House but this particular President doesn't seem to be very interested in the consumer's future. His Spec. Asst. in Consumer Affairs hasn't been allowed to move. She is processing consumer complaints. You write to the White House and say your toaster is broken and she will write to the company and ask them to fix your toaster and it gets fixed—but I don't think this is consumer protection. My concept is to try to work with industry and if you can't work with them on a voluntary basis you go to law and get them to make better toasters—that's the answer to the problem. Until we began to learn about environmental problems nothing was being done about this problem; now there are all manners of people meeting to get together to try to clean up the world—housewives, students, etc. When you get that dedication and enthusiasm into other consumer groups then we can make enough people in Washington understand we want protection so that we will eventually get it."

A. (Mr. Dixon): It is our corporate structure by and large that is providing jobs and paying salaries and taxes to afford us to be where we are. We've come a long way—it will work—the improvements that must come, must come from our goods producing industries. Only 38% of gainfully employed people in this country are employed by goods producers; 62% are in service industries. This means something. You better start looking at these things because guys bringing home that paycheck are doctors, lawyers, filling station operators, retailers, teachers—62% strong. How are they affecting the consumer? He spoke about the people's movement out of the ghetto telling us about the atrocious things happening on the street—they came to Washington because they were not getting any action in the cities (NYC, Philadelphia, Detroit)—and he queried why the Mayors aren't thrown out of office if these things exist; why the District Attorneys do not jail those who permit fraud. He insisted these things are going to stop.

Q. How come no mention is made of organizations in existence so many years like Consumer Reports? Haven't they done a marvelous service?

A. (By Betty Furness): Consumer Reports, as everyone knows, is a magazine put out by Consumer Union, in existence 35 years. They test products bought on the open market so they take the same chance you do. They tell you what they tested it for and rate the products in their magazine by brand name. They perform a marvelous service and I don't think anyone wants to downgrade them—they do a marvelous job. It just isn't enough. Subscription rate went up from 800,000 four years ago to 2 million now.

which only shows how confused consumers are about products in the market place.

Q. So far the talk has been about corporations producing damaging products. What about industries like the insurance industry? Many people have received calls from their broker telling them automobile insurance has been terminated for no obvious reason. What is Congress doing about the insurance industry?

A. (By Cong. Rosenthal): Congress has started two sets of hearings in the Judiciary and Commerce Committees. Even though the question is interstate commerce in character, special statutory exemption relinquished control to the States which have done a bad job. There is a movement to eliminate the change in the statute and set up a national regulatory commission to address themselves to the problem you speak of.

A. (By Mr. Abrams): I was a former Assemblyman on the Insurance Com. The insurance industry and lobbyists defeated every reform bill coming into that committee. The New York Times has begun to publish votes of Congressmen in the metropolitan area; we need it on the State level too.

Q. It would be a good idea to have an Independent Consumer Advocate Committee to look into these things. Newspapers will not print these things by themselves unless forced by a Bronx group. I am sure there are people who would be willing to serve on a group of this nature.

A. (By Mr. Abrams): It's a good idea. We will try to generate some support for this committee. Anyone interested write to me or Congressman Bingham.

Q. A few years ago newspapers said TV servicemen will be licensed. What happened?

A. (By Robert Abrams): that bill also provided that automobile repair mechanics were supposed to be licensed and the bill was defeated. There are something like 14,000 bills filed in the New York State Legislature and little over a thousand are passed, some of which are terribly inconsequential.

Q. Miss Furness, you passed over in your opening address the fact that dairies are not dating all products. I know for a fact that only containers of milk are dated—no other dairy products are. How can we get consumers together to pass a law dating all dairy products.

A. (By Betty Furness): Bess Myerson did get such a law through. She has advantages some of us did not have. She is Commissioner of Consumer Affairs in New York (it used to be Marketing & Licensing) and she has powers to make regulations; she has a couple of hundred inspectors and has legal powers. She has open code dating in NYC. They should have it on the State level; you should talk to State representatives, groups, organizations, etc.

Q. As a Consumer Protection Advocate, what are your opinions that corporation executives should be held responsible for the harms their claims and products inflict upon the innocent consumer? Should they be subjected to criminal sanctions?

A. (By Cong. Rosenthal): I think that when executives of GE and Westinghouse get together to have price fixing on electrical generators sold to cities and communities they should suffer severe criminal penalties. I am on the verge of going in the direction of making people responsible for their acts. We should stop excusing business not only for malfeasance but for misfeasance. I am willing to experiment for holding people responsible for something short of wilful injuries. Many thousands have been injured or killed because of faulty electrical equipment in hospitals. People should be held accountable for their acts and I am willing to explore it.

A. (By Mr. Dixon): I would suggest that as you explore it you will find laws up to your ears holding people responsible to nature of fraud which means criminal intent.

How many corporate officials do you think are stupid enough to make a machine meant to kill you? That was said about me in a book written by Ralph Nader. Corporate officials are trying to run these companies to make money so they can make profits to pay taxes to take care of welfare people, to put it bluntly.

A. (By Cong. Rosenthal): Whenever a business feels a pinch and wants to cut costs they cut inspection and quality control. Recently we were faced with 6 million GM cars where the mounting engine might or might not be defective. No one maintained someone should suffer as a result of this act but a reasonable society has the right to say if 900 youngsters died last year from flammable fabrics someone should be held accountable—the man who inspected, designed, manufactured it—what I am suggesting is that there is an area of exploration here.

A. (By Mr. Dixon): But already there is a criminal side in that law. The Sherman Antitrust Act can be enforced civilly and criminally; \$50 thousand fine and incarceration in jail for those company officials that were by facts shown to have been the perpetrators of the crime. We have a law like that; every one of the 50 states has the common law against fraud.

A. (By Betty Furness): Commissioner Dixon said corporations are in business to make money and indeed they are. I think the time has come when they have to think about a broader spectrum. GM should not just be in business to make money but to make an automobile that will serve many needs and as long as they are making automobiles whose bumpers will not withstand a crash within 2½ of a miles an hour they are not fulfilling their obligation. You can't buy an American automobile in which you can afford to take a crash in a parking lot. The government has had to intervene to get them to come up to 5 miles an hour a couple of months hence. I don't believe they couldn't have put better bumpers on cars a long time ago. Commissioner Dixon we do not want to put American business out of business—just make them do what they should have done in the first place.

A. (By Mr. Dixon): The first time the automobile industry was taken apart I did it, in 1958, piece by piece but the thing that always amazes me is that it has about 15,000 parts and one out of every 7 persons of the U.S. gainfully employed is either directly or indirectly employed in that industry. It is the key of their economy. I agree they can make an automobile that is maximum safe—it will look like a tank, be very costly and different from the fancified car that is changed every year. We'll get these safety factors because we are entitled to them but I don't know what the cars will look like.

A. (By Cong. Rosenthal): We'll risk it.

Q. It has been pointed out that it is difficult to monitor small problems in FTC as inadequate financing. What is the opportunity and effectiveness of class action law suits?

A. (By Ben Rosenthal): stated he thinks the bills pending in the House and Senate are a realistic possibility. This is where aggrieved consumers who are damaged can band together in a law suit. "Frankly it has been told us that if they didn't change the styling of cars as frequently each car would cost \$700 less. We are really denied the opportunity to make freedom of choice; we do not have the option of buying a \$700 cheaper car so that a giant corporation like GM with net asset value larger than the gross national product of most countries has great impact in our daily lives. They ought to have some public accountability; they have it only for the budget motive not in the public interest. This should be turned around by legislation if necessary.

A. (By Mr. Dixon): "There's a lot in what

the Congressman says but what bothers me about that choice is that if government has to, by fear of legislation, make that choice then we are right where I am afraid of being—that managed type of system. Volkswagen was sold to the American public on the statement that it never would change. Today one of the great problems on the balance of payment comes from the fact that 17% of the cars sold are coming from abroad. This year there was a drastic cutdown in the number of models because of competition rather than because the Fed. govt. said to the number one industry in this country "you can't change models every year. . . .

A. (By Cong. Rosenthal): "But let's have more companies to give us a shot at it."

Q. On the subject of meat. In this day of consumer protection why don't we get a law dating meat like milk? Beef is edible a few weeks old but veal and lamb can make you sick if its old. Nobody speaks up about dating meat.

A. (By Betty Furness): It's a fine idea—a number of people would like a number of edible products dated. She suggested two things to do about it: to address your legislators, especially this coming election year. She cautioned to be careful of those you election and to watch them. Her other suggestion was that this could be done at supermarket or grocery store level if enough people in the neighborhood would go to the manager and tell him to date the meat he might comply. She stated this is an opportunity for programs to start at the consumer level.

Q. Another product—human blood. Terrible things are going on in some hospitals because of purchase of human blood. There has been a big increase in hepatitis. Why isn't something done to protect our people?

A. (By Mr. Abrams): "You are quite right. There is legislation pending in the City Council. I don't know what the existing statutory authority is but apparently it was inadequate. I don't know what the status is now."

Q. The licensing of auto mechanics—one tremendous problem is the quality of the roads. Are there any Federal or local standards as to the quality of the roads? The Bronx should get Federal standards—the roads are quite poor.

A. (By Mr. Abrams): There are standards but with bad weather and the salt sprinkled to melt ice, potholes were created—but there are regulatory standards.

Q. What about deceptive advertising, like Wonder Bread, etc.?

A. (By Mr. Dixon): They are being tried by the Federal Trade Commission right now.

A. (By Cong. Rosenthal): The FTC is doing something about false and deceptive advertising. Eventually we will have to come to a Truth in Advertising Law.

Q. One of the key problems is that we are educated constantly by the advertising industry and by corporations to lean towards what they want us to buy—but we need education of the consumer. There is a serious lack in consumer education knowing what products are good and where we can go to buy them. What can be done in this field?

A. (By Mr. Dixon): The FTC as a body has been going completely into all nuances of advertising and the relationship it plays upon emotions. . . .

Q. What about educating the consumer?

A. (By Betty Furness): There aren't many good consumer education courses except getting stung in the market place. Lincoln H.S. in Yonkers started a program a few years ago on consumer education at the high school level—how to buy a used car; how to read an ad; how to read a warranty. Consumers Union is working on trying to get together with prominent educators on an idea as to how consumer education might be put in a school system. We need it in schools and at an adult level. "The lower on the economic level a person is the more he needs consumer

education. A bad purchase of furniture in a poverty area can cause a man, if he doesn't pay for something that failed, a garnishee on his wages; he can get fired; his wife can leave him or he can commit suicide. We've got to be very careful where we get the education from. The Better Business Bur. has recently reorganized because they haven't been doing the job to protect consumers. They are getting together consumer education materials and asking schools to use them. Pay attention in most cases where industry starts giving you consumer education. The banking business will tell you how to take a loan. But be very very careful. The insurance business will say they will tell you how to buy an insurance policy but they will never tell you how not to buy a policy you don't need.

Q. I become impatient when years of legislation are spent under consideration of flammable materials like children's pajamas. If it is passed why will it take three years for manufacturers to change the production of materials for pajamas. I can understand retooling or redesigning of cars but when material is going to burn children to death, why?

A. (By Betty Furness): "When the law was passed it gave the Secy. of Commerce authority to establish the standards. He represents industry within the government. The Textile People come around and say: 'We don't know how to do it.' and he says: 'Try.' They come around 6 months later and say they can't figure it out and he says: 'I bet you can. You're just not trying.' It is the responsibility of the Secy. of Commerce to tell industry: 'Do it.' With some pressure they come up with answers, but now they say 'If we do it it's going to cost the consumer more money. What's that going to do to the poor people?' The Secy. of Commerce, Johnson's secy. didn't say and Nixon's didn't either until it became such a scandal and now they have the standards you have heard it will take 1½ years before it becomes effective.

A. (By Mr. Dixon): "I am puzzled because the Flammable Fabrics Act covered everything that was wearing apparel. We are supposed to be enforcing that law. If there are pajamas you know of that flunked the existing test we are supposed to get that off the market. Do you know of anybody who has been burned up? Here's the problem about the test. A test was established where a sampling was made of a certain number of garments—a swatch was put on a hangar and if it burned within a certain number of seconds it flunked, but if it took a few more seconds it passed. What the Secy. of Commerce was supposed to do was to reevaluate the test. Commerce finally developed the carpet test and it is becoming effective, and now we're going to enforce this test in the whole carpet industry.

Q. What about communications systems—is that out of orbit—the Post Office, telephone system and various others?

A. (By Mr. Abrams): From the point of view of the state, which has the Public Service Com. regulating utilities, have been very critical of them. They have been far too easy. Congressman Rosenthal indicated that when consistent rate application increases are made it has gotten to the point where they inflate the increase, knowing they only want 60% and 8 months later we get a newspaper report that they knocked down the increase to only 60% and the public is supposed to be happy. In NYC with Con Ed we have the highest utilities electric rates in the USA. In Queens the Long Island Lighting Co. pays \$7. for what \$10. is paid to Con Ed. We have seen deterioration in telephone and electrical service with escalation of rates. The new Chairman, Mr. Swidler, has instituted some changes and we have again gotten the pressures from state government. With respect to postal service:

A. (By Congressman Bingham): There is considerable feeling about the new postal setup. We passed legislation to make it a corporation so that it would be able to operate on a self-sustaining basis and take it out of politics. It isn't going as well as we had hoped: We are not satisfied with the way it is working and there is growing realization that the postal service is not necessarily a service that can operate on a self-sustaining basis.

Congressman Bingham thereupon thanked all the panelists and the audience.

PANEL III: HOW CAN WE HUMANIZE BUREAUCRACY

Chairman: Councilwoman Aileen Ryan.

Panelists: Mr. Edward Hamilton, Deputy Mayor, City of New York; Mr. Victor Gotbaum, Executive Director, District Council 37, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees; Dr. Jewel Bellush, Professor of Political Science, Hunter College; Director, City of New York Commission on State-City Relations.

Reporter: Ms. Sheelagh Perry.

Councilwoman Aileen Ryan opened the proceedings by introducing the Members of the panel and outlining briefly some biographical information on each participant. The discussion then began with each panelist making an opening statement.

The following is a summary of New York City Deputy Mayor Hamilton's remarks:

I'd first like to take exception to the implications of the panel topic "How can we humanize bureaucracy." The question whether bureaucracy is really inhuman is vastly overdone. Seeming bureaucratic inhumanity is unavoidable; it is a result of the difficulties full-time city, state, and other government bureaucrats face each day. What can be done about this?

The adoption by the Federal Government of the Pay Reform Act of 1962 is a first step. It helped state and local governments increase salaries in the public sector to the point where they generally have doubled across-the-board in the last eight years. This Act was the result of a long-overdue reawakening recognition of bureaucracy's purpose and how we should treat bureaucracies. The previous attitude was that government was a necessary evil, but that anyone could govern or be part of the government if he had good will, good common sense, and was responsible. There was no professionalism in the bureaucracy. The attitude of the population was that it was a waste to go into government; the good people were going into the private sector of the economy.

It took a long time for the public to accept the fact that Civil Service employees were overloaded and underprivileged. By the mid-sixties, as the result of prodding of unions, it was recognized that there was a need for both minimum pension benefits and job security for all public employees. Going into government was no longer expected to be a sacrifice. Previously, this attitude had meant that quality people were not drawn into the government except during periods of depression. Today, we find that even having the promise of a reasonable pension and job security is not enough to attract top-notch people into state and municipal government. A degree of professionalism is still lacking. There is no incentive for it. The traditional status of public employees is still low in the eyes of the public.

Led by the Federal Government, public salaries and pensions have increased but not uniformly. Still, they are reaching levels comparable to those in the private sector and the trend is to give civil servants a square deal. So with all these benefits, what does the civil servant owe you? Many assume that it's the inhuman attitude of the bureaucrats that produces the welfare mess, burdensome taxes, high prices, and unemployment. Inhumanity in the bureaucracy is an issue, but

we must look at the wider picture. Take the City bureaucracy—is it, in fact, inhuman? Given the conditions, resources, and problems under which it operates, it responds as best it can, but it's not perfect. Improvements can be made. How can we secure a higher degree of professionalism in our civil servants? This is tough to do.

First, we can try to provide educational opportunities for civil servants at every level. Providing such educational programs within our current budgetary restraints is a very difficult problem. Training and incentive funds must be maintained at an adequate level. It's the best money we spend because it increases the capacity of the civil servant by providing him with more skill to do his job. We owe it to the civil servant to demand more of him.

Secondly, we can provide better managerial guidance by devising a better productivity program in each agency. We must improve the deployment or performance of public employees. For example, better deployment practices in the Fire Department such as rescheduling most of the men to shifts during peak hours of fires (3:00 to 9:00 in the evening) would save the City government \$4-million. It would mean we would have the right number of men in the right place at the right time.

The first object of bureaucracy should be service. If this were so, then we would see more humanity in the bureaucracy. We need to have better middle management personnel utilizing better deployment practices toward the goal of greater productivity. These matters have to be worked out at the bargaining table. Unions can't be just concerned about salaries and pensions; they need to follow through on practices that affect civil servant performance.

The second development concerned the deployment of the Anti-Ballistic Missile System. We held televised public hearings. This was a very bitter and close battle. We lost by a tie vote. But we really didn't lose. This was the beginning of many battles to redirect America. It led to the defeat of the SST. It led to the administration backing off on ABM.

These instances show what it means to the American people to be brought into the decision-making process. This was enlightened public opinion in participatory democracy. If we can do it on the big, the technical, the sophisticated issues, then we can do it on the other issues: tax policies, social security, the urban problem. This third reform added to the other two represent three fundamental steps which will bring Congress into a new order of effectiveness.

Mr. Hamilton argued two additional points:

(1) Congress can only do its job if the federal structure is changed. This means federal assumption of national problems such as: welfare, national health insurance, and general revenue sharing.

(2) Reform of the seniority system. New York City's obstacle with regard to revenue sharing is a single Congressman from Arkansas who sits on the Ways and Means Committee. It must be politically profitable for him to change his views. Presently the system is not structured to express popular will.

There is a serious danger of this nation falling apart if Congress does not confront the problems of our cities and states.

Victor Gotbaum, Executive Director of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, District Council 37, spoke next and the following is a summary of his remarks:

I must say that I come to the same conclusion as Ed about the humanization of the bureaucracy. I have no optimistic predictions on this, but I basically feel we can't think we can humanize bureaucracy until we humanize the country. We spend \$81 billion

on arms, war, etc., while we spill our guts to get funds for education. Meanwhile citizens are constantly demanding more services and the demand keeps growing. If you want law and order, you need more cops; if you want social justice, you need more classrooms; etc. But we can't get money for this. The result is a citizen disdain for government. To change this situation there has to be an environment in the country to reorder its priorities.

As Ed has pointed out, the civil servant has obtained a certain standard of pension and salary. Now we say to him "produce for this". I feel productivity should not be contingent on salaries or pensions. It should be regardless. We must have productivity, efficiency, and good management. Good productivity benefits the worker. It is not just a term to be sloganized as it is by the City Administration.

The City Administration doesn't know what it is talking about when it cries "productivity". We need a high-level session with top labor leaders sitting down with top City officials to talk over these questions of training programs, deployment practices, and productivity, then we can move on the demand to humanize the bureaucracy. I make this challenge to you, Mr. Hamilton, to sit down and talk. I've tried to arrange this kind of thing for months. The Administration keeps on crying it can't get more money unless it increases the productivity of clerical workers. Let's sit down and talk about it! I have some suggestions: (1) we need courses in Spanish so that clericals who serve bilingual areas can be bilingual, and (2) we should make high school equivalency programs available to all clericals. When we lowered the requirements for public employment so we could let in more minority workers, we created dead-end employees out of them. They can't get promotions. The union is trying, but it can't do it all. (3) We need courses and meetings with clericals who deal with the public to give them an esprit d'corps and sensitivity training. (4) We need courses for clericals to learn how to manage and delegate responsibility. Middle management doesn't know how to manage those under them; they have no direction.

The Lindsay Administration has never had a tough enough top Deputy Mayor for Administration to move on these things. The City Administration only responds when a crisis comes. An example of this is the welfare hotels controversy. The unions had alerted the Administration of this problem two years ago. If the Administration and the unions would sit down and cooperate, we would be able to work out problems before they reach the crisis stage, and work out where the City Government is going and the way to go. An example of cooperation is the case of the Hospital Corporation. The union helped to lobby and pass legislation creating the Corporation which provided hospital management with flexibility and allowed community participation. After the legislation went into effect, the unions were ignored. Fourteen months later, the Hospital Corporation is a chaotic mess and the workers are demoralized. Don't blame it on a lack of productivity or too high salaries as a *New York Times* editorial did. The only real increase in productivity comes with union involvement. The City Administration uses the productivity slogan to make brownie points in the press, but by doing this they lose productivity. The slogging lowers public servant morale which in turn lowers productivity and efficiency. We lack competent middle management, an esprit d'corps and good working conditions; productivity's not the issue. Let's set the record straight!

The last panelist to speak was Dr. Jewel Bellush, Professor of Political Science at Hunter College and Director of the New York City Commission on State-City Relations:

I think it is good to witness this labor-management fight between Mr. Hamilton and

Mr. Gotbaum. Being an egghead in an ivory tower far away from battle, it's good to confront the problem on the real level. BUT, such battles should be placed in a framework to enable us to get a broader perspective. All share, in a sense, in the dehumanization of the citizen—big unions, big government, big business, yes even big universities. Both Messrs. Hamilton and Gotbaum have to focus on the dehumanization the consumers of their services as well as members of their respective bureaucracies.

Written records of Chinese officials indicate that bureaucracies existed as far back as 165 B.C. At that time, officials were selected by examinations and notions such as seniority, merit ratings, official statistics, and written reports were familiar practices. So what's new? What is new is the ever increasing dimensions of bureaucratic involvement in our lives. The welfare state and the administered society have grown tremendously. From our infant days when we are confronted with health regulations and birth certificates to our death we have been "papier maché" with forms, papers and applications. Why these signs of such regulation and inordinate amounts of control? It is because of the needs of society, the need to have protection. It grows out of the very fact that we expect so much and want so much more. By our demands, we, ourselves, have created the monsters (bureaucracies).

Institutional reforms are not the only reforms that are necessary. Various techniques have been suggested. (1) Americans need desperately ombudsmen—people courageous enough to do something about bureaucracy. I don't want to sound like an old political hack, but there was once an organization called the political machine symbolized by the local clubhouse where people could go to have someone listen to their problems and help in their solution. The red tape would be cut and the citizen had the feeling someone cared about his little problem.

(2) I'd like to suggest to Messrs. Gotbaum and Hamilton that part of the solution lies in taking some things out of the hands of the bureaucracy. Let's see some processes become automatic by eliminating the middle men, the czars, the Bob Moses, the gods. Let's have none of these welfare brownie points—questions such as is a man in the house, or are there trousers in the closet? I'm sick of this and ashamed to be connected with such a society. We are so slow to realize that we need a guaranteed income. Let's get rid of all the red tape to trap people, to compel dishonesty. Thirdly, I would like to see everyone have a credit card. When we are serviced properly, then we can have punch x-credits on the card of the one who pleased us. This practice should also extend into the private sector. When we are met with a nasty government clerk or a rude sales lady, a dangerous busdriver, etc., then no punch in the credit card. After a certain number of credit points, you win a toaster or a promotion or a trip to Florida. Let people evaluate other people. Let's put performance on a reward system, and encourage people to serve each other humanely.

Finally, I'd like you to join me in non-violent guerrilla warfare and start dismantling organizations of all types. Let's become subversive and throw away the inhumane aspects of organizations and keep only the parts that are serving us. It will take thousands of such subversives to make a difference.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

The following is a summary of some major questions and answers:

Question: The City complains about restraints from above, but the City Government is part of the overall government bureaucracy. Isn't it guilty of doing the bureaucratic thing of passing the buck up again when presented with a problem, just like all bureaucracies.

Answer (Hamilton): The City Government gets 40% of its funds from other governments. It's a fact that the City has to live with. I'd like to answer Mr. Gotbaum. We do what we are saying when we talk "productivity." Better deployment practices, etc., such as rescheduling firemen or dividing case work from income maintenance clerking duties, create a lot of trouble for unions, but they do mean more output for less money, and that's productivity! In addition, we need more employee education, training, and research programs; but it's hard to choose between training and generation (active services) given the budget restraints.

As for the suggestion of Dr. Bellush that the City Government spin off some of its functions, it won't help the problem. If you spin off a function, such as in the case of the Hospital Corporation, you create another bureaucracy which is even less responsive than its parent bureaucracy because it is an independent one. Any large operation has a bureaucracy.

Question: I'm a City worker in Social Services and involved in this new separation of functions policy designed so case workers can provide more services. It's a fine plan but the City is not following through. The attitudes of the agents of government, the bureaucrats, are important and perhaps sensitivity training is needed, but the case worker staff has been cut by the City Administration so how can they carry out their jobs?

Answer (Gotbaum): We must be more kind to the City. The City is trying to supplement the income of the poor working toward the goal of a guaranteed income, but the City doesn't control its own destiny. It negotiates with unions, signs a contract, and then can't follow through because the State Government and the State Legislature won't let them. At the same time, the State Administration is calling for more investigation in the social services. Given this situation, what happens to employees in City departments such as Social Services? Young people come there to work filled with idealism and after six months they are disenchanted, swallowed up, demoralized. When you change policies or a part of the government structure, such as the Hospital Corporation, you have to give them the where-with-all to accomplish their mission. Without it, the new policy is no better than the old one.

I have no quarrel with Hamilton about what the City brings to the negotiating table, no quarrel with rescheduling etc. What disturbs me is that more things are given publicity than is first brought to the negotiating table. If the City has a problem, it should confront the union with it without involving the Press. Then things can be worked out. We need to reform the upper structure of the City Administration, not demoralize the understructure with talk of "productivity" in the Press. There are no easy solutions.

Answer (Hamilton): I agree that the City should discuss a problem with the unions before it's talked about in the Press. On the firemen rescheduling issue, we brought it to the bargaining table with the fire union in January of 1970, long before it was mentioned in the Press. We prefer it this way, but when it gets to the point where agreement is impossible, then I believe it's in the public interest to bring it out into the open. The public has a right to know why the firemen are taking a job action.

Question: Government is not the only dehumanizing bureaucracy. What about bureaucracy and dehumanization in private industry.

Answer (Bellush): It's true. The problem is bigness at every level. To a large extent the revolutions on campus are due to the question of bigness. Students want to be part of the decision-making process and that fact helps explain their unhappiness. In the busi-

ness world, the same malaise exists. The big-business system has to go through a process of decentralization and citizen participation. Some things can be spun off. We all need to stop a moment and see what we can do to change a little part of our world.

Question: What do people like myself do? I want to better myself, get a high school equivalency, participate in bi-lingual programs, but I'm afraid to go to school. I can't go out at night. I've been mugged three times and the cost of transportation is too high for me to afford it. I should get a supplement to pay for transportation. No one seems to be able to help me. I'm sick and have high medical and drug bills. I went to the City for help but I was thrown out of the office. Why can't the government help me?

Answer (Dr. Bellush): This is just the kind of thing I've been talking about. Many people face these kinds of experiences with the government bureaucracy every day. There are so many rules and regulations. People come to government with a problem and then receive shoddy treatment. No one cares. There is a desperate need for ombudsmen—someone to listen and then do something about it.

Answer (Hamilton): I agree it's up to us in government to do better. We can't have this kind of treatment. The problem is that the State needed to save money; to do this, it decided it was better to save taxpayers from a tax increase rather than meet human needs. How do you choose where to cut government services. It was a bad choice to drop the income level for Medicaid eligibility. If we don't raise taxes, we must be ready for the consequences which are the human costs of such policies. To cut money out of the lives of people who need it the most is a social disaster. We need to revise that.

Question: Everyone digs welfare, but why is it different from government subsidies for airlines, big business, farmers. Why not subsidize human beings? How far would a politician get if he advocated a just tax for big business?

Answer (Hamilton): New York City is the only city which has a progressive income tax, including a corporation income tax and taxes on stock transfers and utilities. Influential officials up-State say that progressive taxation drives out the tax base—those people who hold up the economy. We say no! Lindsay is on record in favor of the progressive income tax. Most politicians are for it. The hard question comes when money needs to be saved—where to cut? The trend, unfortunately, is to take it from the services for the poor. That's the tragedy.

Question: All this talk about lack of money. What about reallocating the money that is available, like the happenings in Central Park. They should not occur when you need the money for other things. Also, do we need to refurbish offices or what about the Mall?

Answer (Hamilton): Allocation of funds is already austere. There are much less happenings than before. By the way, the happening you speak of was financed by private funds gathered for that specific purpose. The City got 85% of what it asked for this year from the State. This 15% cut meant the City had to provide a lower level of service with 14,000 fewer employees, 4,000 fewer teachers, and 1,300 fewer cops. That's why the library is not open some hours. In addition, the City is limited in what it can cut, because many programs are not transferable to other needed programs. Consequently, the City can cut funds only from those programs over which it has control which mostly involve services. The City needs general revenue sharing, money without State or Federal strings, money with community control. Without revenue sharing, the City can't do much about the allocation problem because of the constraints on the money that it has.

Question (addressed to Mr. Hamilton): You make excuses about not having the money. That's not where it's at. I work for a Housing Corporation. Nine-tenths of my job is to get the City to do its job. It's not just the money, it's the City employees' attitude. Money is just an excuse. There is so much red tape. No one can cut through it. Open up the dams in the bureaucracy. Give us a chance. We need community control and participation.

Answer (Hamilton): There isn't much of what you say which I disagree with. We in government can try to do better; it's an important point—Government is insensitive. We need to get people to behave more sensitively. If we make the civil service system sufficiently rewarding, perhaps provide employees with sensitivity training, they will be better professionals. But until civil servants have the where-with-all to deliver, kind words are not going to be enough.

Answer (Gotbaum): You can't divorce the problems of money and attitude. The system overwhelms the idealistic because you can't produce the services the public demands. What can an employee in the Housing Development Administration say to the public when there are no houses, no apartments to give. The housing situation is an economic tragedy. It creates bureaucratic frustration which mere human beings can't reconcile. I'm not apologizing for a low level of service; I'm just saying that we are all victimized—the civil servant and the citizen, the provider of goods and services and the consumer. It's a lousy environment.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, unless it is reversed by a higher court, a decision recently handed down by a U.S. district judge in Salt Lake City could have far-reaching effects. Judge Willis J. Ritter ordered the removal of a monument depicting the Ten Commandments from the front of the Metropolitan Hall of Justice in the Utah capital.

Inasmuch as most laws are based on the fundamental and eternal principles contained in the Ten Commandments which the Almighty entrusted to Moses, the great Hebrew leader, and indirectly transmitted to the Christians and Mohammedans, the jurist's decision could jeopardize all the laws now in existence in the United States, the 50 States that it comprises, the District of Columbia, its territorial possessions, and all the counties, cities, towns, and villages throughout the Nation. If a mere symbolic representation is obnoxious to certain people, how much more offensive would actual enforceable laws flowing from the Decalogue be?

For the edification of my colleagues, the overwhelming majority of whom adhere to the Jewish and Christian faiths and consequently accept the Ten Commandments, I am inserting a news account from the Deseret News, a Salt Lake City publication, and an editorial that appeared therein.

The day may come when some overzealous person, group of persons, or organization will institute litigation that

would lead to the removal of certain statues from the Capitol, such as those honoring the memories of Father Damon, Eusebio F. Kino—a Jesuit, Rev. Jason Lee, Father Marquette, Father Junipero Serra, Rev. Thomas Starr-King, and Brigham Young. These men were all clergymen and religious leaders.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that silly attempts to undermine America's religious heritage were treated with the contempt they deserve. Few in our midst desire a state church and fewer still believe that a monument to the Ten Commandments could lead to its establishment.

The news story and editorial follow:

MAYOR TO PUSH APPEAL OF COURT MONUMENT ORDER

"I can see nothing wrong whatsoever with saying 'thou shalt not steal' in front of the courts building."

So stated Salt Lake Mayor E. J. Garn today in announcing he would recommend an appeal of decision by U.S. District Judge Willis J. Ritter ordering the removal of the Ten Commandments monument from in front of the Metropolitan Hall of Justice, 240 E. 4th South.

Garn stated that Ritter's decision was "very predictable; most of his decisions are." "I don't think that the Ten Commandments reflect any particular religion," he added. "They are the basis for most of our laws, and even religions such as Buddhism, Shintoism and others use similar concepts as the basis for their beliefs."

RECOMMENDATIONS

"I will definitely recommend to the city commission that Ritter's ruling be appealed," he reiterated. County Atty. Carl Nemelka said any appeal would have to be ordered by the commission.

Ritter's decree came in response to a suit filed against Salt Lake City and County Jan. 12, 1971 by four county residents—Alma F. Anderson, Diana Barclay, Betty Jean B. Nielsen and Parker M. Nielsen.

The stone tablet, five-feet high and three-feet wide, was erected in July 1970, at 240 E. 4th South, through a gift by the Utah State Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles.

RESTRAINT

In addition to ordering the removal of the tablet, Ritter also restrained the city and county from "erecting, permitting the erection of or maintaining on public property any monument or monolith or structure which is to advance or inhibit religion."

Defense attorneys had argued that the Ten Commandments transcended mere religious significance, serving as the basis for Western law. Ritter wrote, however, that the monolith has other symbols inscribed on it, including the emblem of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, an "All Seeing Eye of God," Stars of David and the Greek letters, Chi Rho, signifying Christ.

"A primary effect of the erection of the monument on public property is to advance the ideas of the Judaeo Christian religions and to inhibit the ideas of persons professing other religious beliefs or no religious belief," Ritter added.

People entering or leaving the Metropolitan Hall of Justice are lead to believe that "those administering the laws of Utah, Salt Lake City and County support the religious expressed in the monolith," the judge added.

RELIGION IN AMERICA

Must all traces of religious conviction and all expressions of faith in God be expunged from public life in America?

That would certainly seem to be the case if the U.S. ever follows to its logical conclusion this week's ruling by Federal District Judge Willis Ritter on the subject.

His ruling: The Ten Commandments monument must be removed from the north lawn of the Salt Lake Metropolitan Hall of Justice because it violates the Constitution's guarantees of freedom of religion.

In line with that ruling and similar decisions elsewhere, must the words "known but to God" be chiseled from the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington National Cemetery?

Must the U.S. Mint strike from America's coinage the phrase "In God We Trust"?

Must we eliminate from the Pledge of Allegiance the words "one nation under God"?

Must we abandon the practice of swearing in court witnesses with a hand on the Bible?

Must such witnesses stop saying "so help me, God" when promising to tell the truth?

Must Congress and state legislatures stop opening their sessions with prayer?

Must the President of the United States no longer place his hand on the Bible when taking the oath of office at his inauguration?

Must prayers no longer be uttered at those inaugural ceremonies? Or does anyone seriously think President Kennedy, for example, was trying to foist Catholicism on the country when he had one of the nation's most prominent prelates pray at his inauguration?

In an era when moral and spiritual decay abounds, America needs more religion in its public life, not less.

PENSION PLANS CALLED BIASED AGAINST WOMEN

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Minneapolis Tribune on February 1 printed a very informative interview. Mary Hart, a Tribune staff writer, interviewed Irene Scott, a partner in the Minneapolis law firm of Leonard, Street and Deinard. The interview centers upon working women and how they are subject to discrimination in pay, promotion, pensions, and prerequisites.

Irene Scott says:

If we deprive a woman of her right to work and her right to raise children—zero population—we are going to have a substantially greater drug-alcohol problem in this country.

Prevention of a disease is worth considerably more than a cure for the same disease and often prevention is simpler. In this case, prevention requires simple justice—the end of discrimination against women.

The interview follows:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Feb. 1, 1972]

PENSION PLANS CALLED BIASED AGAINST WOMEN

(By Mary Hart)

Social Security and many company pension plans have inequalities for women, said Irene Scott, attorney and partner in the Minneapolis law firm, Leonard, Street and Deinard.

Ms. Scott, who isn't a "hatchet-holding or sign-waving women's liberationist," said that women must become more active in politics, must become advocates against this discrimination.

One women's liberation group gets the publicity to focus attention to the problem, while another group pushes to get the laws passed, she said.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 forbids discrimination in employment by sex, race, religion and color, but the subtle inequities still exist, she said.

She urged women to see that the equal rights amendment is passed, because it would prevent any government unit from discriminating against women either in pay or promotion.

"When it comes to promotions, businesses always say that women quit or change jobs often. Statistics show that men have 11 percent turnover in jobs, while women have 8.6 percent," Ms. Scott said.

"Women rapidly lose incentive in their jobs, sitting next to a man who makes more money for the same work."

Because they earn less women who work end up getting less money from Social Security when they retire," she said. "Women receive 60 percent less than men do when they draw Social Security."

Ms. Scott said that many wives are not aware of their husband's pension plan or what Social Security they are entitled to.

"Too many women are apt to say their husbands will provide," said the attorney.

Then at 50 they may become widowed, discover there is no pension, they are not covered under Social Security because they are too young and have no dependent children, she explained. "Trying to enter the labor market at this age is difficult," she said.

She urged women to check into company pension plans, whether it is their own or their husband's. Some provisions in pension plans are subtle and do not give the same benefits to women workers.

"Wives should be aware of provisions for widows. Some pensions give men an X number of dollars for life when they retire, but when they die, the payment stops. Most plans have provisions, so that if the husband takes a lesser amount, then the benefit continues for the wife."

Because women's salaries for comparable positions often are less, Ms. Scott said that Social Security and pensions pay less on retirement. She is quick to state that she feels that men should be able to retire at the same age as women.

Colleges and universities are big offenders in paying women less, she said. Starting salaries are about \$1,000 less for women.

"Widows (when they are eligible) get only 82.5 percent of what their husbands would have received from Social Security," Ms. Scott said.

She also thinks Social Security and life insurance are similar. Because the husband has paid for both, she said the widow should get the 100-percent Social Security payments to which her husband was entitled on retirement.

"The effect is a large number of retired couples live together, but do not marry, so the widow won't have to forfeit her Social Security payments," she said.

"If a widow remarries, she should be given her choice as to which husband's benefits she receives. She should not be able to collect from both husbands."

"Many women work on what's called part time, or they are called extras, and are not covered by a pension plan. This can be negotiated."

Child-care centers and training programs for mothers, who may have to enter the labor market, are two of the greatest needs of our country, said Ms. Scott. "A great majority of AFDC mothers do not abuse the program. But where in the job market does she fit when her children are grown?"

Ms. Scott said that working women need more income-tax credits for hiring baby sitters or for payments at child-care centers.

"If we did this, we would be creating more jobs, and we would get many more women into medicine and other professions."

"If we deprive a woman of her rights to work, her right to raise children (zero popu-

lation), we are going to have a substantially greater drug-alcohol problem in this country," said Ms. Scott.

She also cited the discrimination against single people in the income-tax laws and noted that there are more single women than single men.

ON SECRECY AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of controversy during the past few years over the ability of government to conduct some of its most sensitive business in private and the public's right to know.

The press has scored what it considers several "coups" in keeping the public informed by releasing secret documents. However, in my opinion the media have performed a grave disservice to our Nation by publishing certain secret documents. I have in mind in particular the so-called Pentagon papers and the revelations of columnist Jack Anderson.

I do not mean to imply that the public should be kept in the dark, but there are frequently times when secrecy is absolutely imperative in the national interest.

In a letter to the editors of the Washington Post, Peter F. Krogh, dean of the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service, discusses the importance of confidentiality in the conduct of government affairs, and I now insert the letter into the RECORD:

ON SECRECY, THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO KNOW AND NATIONAL INTERESTS

In the process of advocating the people's "right to know," the public media have too easily dismissed the serious risks and dangers to our government and general welfare in the practice of leaking confidential government information. The result is to give the average citizen a simplistic, one-dimensional and distorted picture of what is a very complex issue with many more questions at stake than just the people's right to know.

The American people have a right to a rational, honest, convincing explanation of their government's policies. They have a right to maximum of information consistent with the national interest. They have a right to vote out of office a government they mistrust or believe incompetent.

Granting all this, it is nevertheless true that the people's right to know is not an absolute. It should not be seen primarily as an end in itself. It should be viewed, rather, as a means to the wise conduct of domestic and international affairs. With respect to foreign policy, it has legitimate limits circumscribed by the degree to which "fish-bowl" decision making is effective, practical or prudent in the conduct of international relations; by the importance to the nation's capacity to engage in foreign affairs of trust and credibility with other governments; and by considerations of national interest, broadly defined.

Separate from, but of course related to, the people's right to know is the necessity of confidentiality in government and the question of unauthorized release of secret documents. The meaning of each of these things ought to be carefully pondered.

The right to, and the need for, privileged communication is acknowledged and defended by our society with respect to almost all human endeavor. We sanctify lawyer-client relations; we allow the press to protect its sources; we respect the confidentiality of business decisions. In government, such confidentiality is equally essential to good decision making, orderly administration and the conduct of relations. Without confidentiality, our officials simply cannot engage in the free, tough give-and-take of debate and the frank, even brutal, judgments which good decision making requires.

One of the major reasons for confidentiality is not so much that revelations, such as the Anderson papers, will "telegraph punches" to an adversary or competitor (though this is a consideration), but that they invite misperception and misunderstanding by the average observer. They actually serve to confuse the public (albeit at a higher level). It is precisely the point that leaks of the recent kind wrench information out of context and perspective which raises the question of whether even the right to know is really served by this practice.

Even conceding the fact that secrecy may be used to deceive and cover up, how well is the nation served by a unilateral decision of an official or a columnist to "expose" the deception? On what basis do they arrogate to themselves the right to know when the national interest may or may not be harmed by publication of documents? To be relatively sure that much information is overclassified is one thing; to decide that a given piece of information is so overclassified is another. What wisdom or expertise gives an editor or columnist the right to determine that it is all right to reveal a given document? How does he know?

It is another error to think that by leaking information decision makers will be forced into better decision making. On the contrary, the reverse is likely to happen. If officials are made to feel that their every action or word is at the mercy of any other official who, out of disgruntlement or for any other reason, can reveal parts of the record with impunity, the result can only be less candor in decision making. Nor can we expect in these circumstances that foreign governments will deal candidly with us, or that allies will ever again quite trust themselves to talk frankly and freely to us.

Perhaps most disturbing of all is the effect on our values and the professionalism of our public servants of the apparent legitimacy with which current media comment has clothed the leaking of sensitive official papers. Such practice, if pursued and indulged further, will give every government official license to be a free agent, enabled if not actually encouraged to undermine secretly (the people who have leaked the secret documents enjoy the protection of secrecy) decisions with which he may personally disagree. It virtually invites officials to indulge frustration and resentment with impunity, under the guise of moral righteousness. Orderly administration can literally break down in these circumstances.

I cannot, in short, emphasize too strongly that the practice of leaking secret documents, and its indulgence by the press, will rapidly lead to a crippling, not strengthening, of the decision making process, and a deterioration rather than an improvement in the quality of our foreign policy. Deception and covering-up may be real concerns, but the answer to these ills is hardly to resort to a practice which can be equally pernicious in its total effect.

The public may be titillated by the Anderson revelations. The press may be congratulating itself on striking another blow for the people's right to know. But make no mistake. In the end, this country's capacity to conduct foreign relations will have been the casualty. The gravity of that casualty should

be measured against whatever utility and public excitement the publication of secret deliberations may provide. And those responsible for the leaks should know that however well intentioned they may have been, they performed a real disservice to their country.

PETER F. KROGH,
Dean, Georgetown University School of
Foreign Service.

SPEECH BY MAYOR JOHN V. LINDSAY

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, recently Mayor John Lindsay made a very fine speech about our national priorities and our foreign policy, taking particular note of the Nixon administration's inhuman and destructive policy with regard to Bangladesh.

I think that his remarks are worth reading, and I include them at the conclusion of my remarks:

SPEECH BY MAYOR JOHN V. LINDSAY

For almost two centuries the promise of America has provided moral leadership for the world. The devotion of our citizens to liberty, the justness of our Constitution, the commitment of our leaders to the rights of man—these are things all people have understood. They have been the standards of our nation's greatness at home and the true source of our strength abroad.

Nothing has been more true of this country's history than the bond between what we do for our own people and how we act toward other nations. In this century we have fought to win economic security for all Americans—that was the battle of the New Deal in the depression and the Fair Deal fifteen years later, that is what we still fight for in our cities' ghettos and in the depressed pockets of rural America. And that same impulse to free man from want was the moving force of the Marshall Plan which rebuilt Europe and a program of foreign aid that has used billions of our wealth for the hungry of other nations.

In this century we have fought to win the rights of all Americans: of women whose rights were ignored, of blacks whose rights were denied, of poor people without hope. And that same impulse to secure man's freedom sent our armies into two world wars and inspired the 14 points of Wilson and Roosevelt's creed of freedom.

To stand by the oppressed, to feed the hungry, to offer liberty to all people—that has been America's heritage and its commitment around the globe.

But today some of that seems lost. That heritage seems weaker. That commitment seems remote. We are all concerned that these principles have grown distant from our lives and unimportant to our leaders. And what the President said to the nation last week deepened that concern.

Nothing in the State of the Union message conveys the desperation of 5 million Americans out of work, of families who can't find decent medical care or can't afford the care they find, of young men still forced to fight and die in that insane war, of blacks and browns and women shut out from jobs and education and housing.

And, incredibly, while the President quietly noted these grievances, he proposed more money for defense—for guns and bombs and planes. We can hardly believe that they

would dare start that cycle again. But we are being told again that we must spend more for death abroad and that means we won't have enough to build for a better life at home. They have decided again to wind up that inflated military machine, and deny us the billions of our own tax moneys that we so desperately need in the streets and neighborhoods of our cities.

From this speech, with these distorted priorities, we learn anew how what we do abroad is tied to what we do at home. At home and abroad, there is a cynicism that is all too evident in our government's acts as well as their words. At home and abroad, this government has forfeited moral leadership and strayed from basic principles.

We had hoped that the wounds of Vietnam would have begun to heal with the beginning of this new decade. But that mindless war drags on and the toll is everywhere around us. And it seems that this administration has failed to grasp the lessons of that tragedy. For in recent months in another part of South Asia, as India and Pakistan took up arms against each other, we saw again how our government's neglect at home is reflected in blindness abroad. What our nation did and what our leaders said about that conflict gives stark insight into the values of the men in Washington who now lead us.

We all watched that relentless tragedy unfold. The growing estrangement of East from West Pakistan, separated by a thousand miles of hostile India. The savage military repression of East Pakistan. The flight of more than ten million people across the border to India. The suffering of those refugees in disease-ridden camps. And then war between India and Pakistan, the Indian victory, and the establishment of the new nation of Bangladesh.

The single common thread in this tragedy is a failure of American leadership. From start to finish, our policy was dreadfully, incredibly mistaken. An administration priding themselves on mastery of strategy has left us in a strategic mess in the Indian subcontinent which could take years to repair.

The policy we needed was not so complicated. It should have been very simple to pursue.

We had to maintain honest relations with both India and Pakistan, caring for neither more than we cared for the good of the entire subcontinent.

And, of course, we had to do everything we could to keep them from fighting one another.

Yet in the turbulent events of 1971—when our actions counted most and our stake there was most endangered—the Nixon Administration ignored the most basic principles, honesty about our purposes, concern for democracy's strength, relief for human suffering, and support for peace around the world.

When our Ambassador in East Pakistan reported what he called "selective genocide," we kept sending arms to Pakistan's brutal dictatorship.

In the name of territorial integrity, our arms aided—and our silence condoned—a reign of terror in Bangladesh which made its secession inevitable.

In the name of peace, our heedless support for Pakistan drove India to war as the only relief from the crushing burden of 10 million refugees.

In the name of balance, our one-sided policy drove an alienated India into the arms of the Soviet Union.

I wonder if the strategists in the White House have stopped to look at the results of their handiwork.

We have made ourselves the enemies of the 550 million people of India and the 70 million of Bangladesh.

Even our position in West Pakistan has deteriorated as the people have overthrown the military dictatorship we supported.

And the Soviet Union, yet to exact its price for support of India, may well stand on the threshold of Russia's centuries-old dream a naval base on the Indian Ocean.

In that respect at least, this Administration's policy deserves a place in history. In nine short months, Messrs. Nixon and Kissinger managed what all the Tsars since Peter the Great could not.

The presence of those Russian ships in the Indian Ocean is going to be felt, I'm afraid, by every taxpayer in America. The same Administration that provoked the Soviets by sending the carrier Enterprise parading into the Bay of Bengal is now rushing to the Congress with defense spending plans to deal with this so-called new threat.

Now burdened with another ocean to guard, the President proposed in his State of the Union message to build new nuclear carriers and submarines whose final cost is anybody's guess.

A government willing to face its mistakes would not have to pay all these costs. A government honest with itself and others could begin to repair our relations with India and could refuse to begin the senseless spiral of a naval race with the Russians.

But the crisis of Bangladesh also showed us all too clearly that we do not have that kind of government in Washington today.

From the record of public statements, from Congressional exposures, from those mysterious White House background briefings of newsmen, from secret documents recently published by columnist Jack Anderson, we know this Administration was not honest about its actions. It did not admit its blunders to itself or to others. It simply persisted in them, hiding behind a shroud of official secrecy and press flackery.

On April 12, on April 15 and again on April 29, State Department spokesmen assured us: "There is no military equipment in the pipeline and none has been delivered."

Yet while our government persisted in these denials, American military material was on the high seas bound for the war in East Pakistan. And Senator Church showed on the floor of the Senate the bills-of-lading for \$35 million in military equipment still being sent to Pakistan!

Then we heard from the Administration the inevitable "explanations." The Administration "explained," for example, that ammunition is not a "lethal item." That would be hard to "explain" to a Bengali mother whose child has been killed by an American bullet.

The same Administration earnestly told White House reporters during the war that our policy was "even-handed" and not "anti-Indian" . . . and then held their secret meetings to figure out ways to "tilt" toward Pakistan. The published minutes of those secret meetings show the same old contempt for public opinion, the same old bureaucratic back-biting, the same frightening indifference to human suffering that we saw in the Pentagon Papers and have heard throughout the years of war in IndoChina.

"We see the light at the end of the tunnel," the Generals told us in 1967. Then the Pentagon sent another 200,000 troops to the jungles of Southeast Asia.

"We are winding down the war," this new Administration said. Then they invaded Cambodia and Laos and renewed the bombing in the North.

So none of this is really new. What burdens our conscience in IndoChina is the same ultimate outrage of our policy in Bangla Desh.

Some now say that three million people died in the holocaust of East Pakistan—three million.

Ten million refugees—more than the population of New York City or many of our states—ten million people were driven from their homes into illness and starvation as refugees.

I believe that what happened there was perhaps the greatest human catastrophe since the murder of six million Jews in World War II.

And the United States, once the symbol of compassion and justice in the world, once holding, as Jefferson wrote, "a decent respect for the opinions of mankind," stood by in silence.

We found reasons of state for ignoring the supreme unreason of mass killing and suffering.

What imaginable goal of policy could justify this?

I think we have to ask over and over—what sort of men do we now have in Washington who think and act this way?

President Nixon talks about a "generation of peace."

It's time we talked about the positive measures we must take to build that generation. It's time we talked of an arms-free zone in the Indian Ocean, not another insane arms race.

It's time the President announced an international relief program of a scale commensurate with the plight of 10 million refugees. And it's long since time we proposed the establishment of indigenous regional organizations for cooperation and settlement of disputes which might allow the world to avoid these tragedies in the future.

There will be no "generation of peace" until there is a new generation of American foreign policy.

And why don't we have the vision and the will which can renew our world leadership? I'm afraid we are guilty of what the poet Archibald MacLeish called "the divorce between knowing and feeling."

We have forgotten so completely how to feel that the most callous, insensitive words roll out. At that secret Washington meeting some tasteful bureaucrat mentioned Bangla Desh was a "basket case." And Henry Kissinger answered: "It doesn't have to be our basket case."

And that's not only foreign policy. As I said when I began, what we do abroad reflects what we do to our own people here at home.

The awful truth is that there is a Bangla Desh of the spirit in too many corners of America . . . in the migrant labor camps . . . on depressed farms . . . in the unemployment lines everywhere . . . in the slums of our troubled cities.

Millions of Americans are refugees in their own land from a government that doesn't care.

Can we believe the White House meetings on domestic policy are so different from the sessions on Bangla Desh?

Can't you hear the refrain in so many of Nixon's actions?

—When he vetoed day care that would have helped millions of children and their working mothers. Can't you hear them saying "they don't have to be our basket cases"?

—When the Nixon Administration tried to cut school lunches for two million children.

Or when the President vetoed a legal services program for poor people who are trying to get justice in our courts rather than the streets.

When he gave big corporations an enormous tax cut while most Americans are fighting to stay even with high inflation and stay out of 6% unemployment. Can't you hear them saying "they don't have to be our basket cases"?

I think we can have again in America a government that cares for our people in need here and for suffering abroad.

I've made my share of mistakes in governing New York City these past six years. But I've learned one thing. I know from hard experience that we can't rebuild America with old answers, the old political ma-

nipulation at home and the old dehumanized diplomacy abroad.

Franklin Roosevelt was right when he said: "Better the occasional faults of a government living in the spirit of charity than the consistent omissions of a government frozen in the ice of its own indifference."

I think Americans want something better from their government. They want it to stop destroying the spirits of children and the dignity of adults by callous neglect.

They don't want it to declare war on other countries every time there is evil in the world. But they do expect it to declare America on the side of life and justice.

Those are not unreasonable demands. We can have that sort of leadership and we can have the moral purpose, the vision, the truth that ought to be what government is about in this country.

I believe we can do that now. And that's why I run for the Presidency.

AIRCRAFT MANUFACTURER CRITICAL OF FAA

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days, I have offered an amendment to try to get relief for the people suffering from jet noise. The amendment would have taken away from the Federal Aviation Administration the control over setting jet noise limits and given it to the Environmental Protection Agency. The reason for the amendment was the fact that the FAA has, for 3½ years, done nothing to use this power to help the people suffering from this terrible problem.

The main argument used against my amendment was the fact that the FAA was going slow because it was trying to protect the safety of the flying public. In the Wall Street Journal, on Wednesday, March 1, appeared an article in which the McDonnell Douglas Corp. criticized the FAA for delaying the installation of anticrash systems on aircraft. I wonder how the FAA justifies this delay, as it certainly could not be because it is trying to protect the safety of the flying public. I am setting forth the article herewith:

McDONNELL CRITICIZES FAA DELAY ON BACKUP FOR ANTICRASH SYSTEM—PRODUCER, IN UNUSUAL MOVE, DESCRIBES AGENCY'S COURSE AS WRONG FOR UNITED STATES, A GAMBLE

(By David P. Garino)

ST. LOUIS.—In a highly unusual move, McDonnell Douglas Corp. has decided to take on the Federal Aviation Administration.

In the past, the giant aerospace concern has been most reluctant to publicly criticize a government agency, or for that matter, even to comment on the affairs of its competitors.

Apparently, though, recent actions by the FAA on the proposed backup collision avoidance system has upset the company, and James S. McDonnell, chairman and chief executive, has given the go-ahead to voice opposition to the FAA.

"McDonnell Douglas doesn't make fusses about many things," a company executive explains in an obvious understatement.

"Mr. Mac" reportedly has taken a deep personal interest in the collision avoidance system, which the company has been work-

ing on for over a decade, and began marketing in the latter part of 1970.

Last August the FAA indicated that by the end of 1971 it would have enough information to make a recommendation on the usefulness of a backup collision avoidance system, as an addition to its own air traffic control system. McDonnell Douglas was then stunned by an apparent two-year delay. Last January, FAA Administrator John H. Shaffer said in a speech that "by the end of 1973, FAA should have enough experience" to make a decision on the collision avoidance system.

Hearings are being conducted by the Aviation subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee on a bill, introduced by Sen. Frank E. Moss (D. Utah) to make installation of a collision avoidance system mandatory on commercial aircraft by Jan. 1, 1975.

At the hearing yesterday, Kenneth M. Smith, deputy FAA administrator, said only airlines could afford the McDonnell system, and this would protect only 3.7% of the civil fleet. This would only protect one airliner from colliding with another, not from smaller planes, he added.

While the agency is convinced that a ground-based control system "is and will be for the foreseeable future the primary collision-avoidance system for aviation," it also believes an airborne system has "potential value" in expanding collision-avoidance capability and as a backup in case of ground-system failures, he said.

In addition to installing an advanced air traffic control system around the nation, currently in progress, a new ground-based, computer-directed anticrash system that eventually would warn both controllers and flight crews is "promising," Mr. Smith said.

In an interview, D.C. Arnold, president of McDonnell Douglas Electronics Co., the subsidiary that developed the collision avoidance system, criticized the FAA's delay in reaching a decision. "We obviously think it's a mistake," he said. "The delay merely strengthens the side of those who don't want a backup system. We will try our darndest to show this action is the wrong course for the country."

In an interview, D. C. Arnold, president of near-misses (of aircraft) is too high to gamble." He said an FAA study showed 1,166 near-misses last year. "Controllers are taxed to the limit because of traffic density, and it will get worse," the executive continued. He also said the FAA's automated air traffic control system won't be completed until the 1980s. Even after then, he maintained, "An independent backup system will be necessary. If the automated system ever went out, there would be utter chaos" without a backup.

The FAA is avoiding two key questions, Mr. Arnold charged. "Should there be a backup collision avoidance system? And if there should be, what technology should be selected as a national standard?"

The McDonnell system is called EROS, which stands for Eliminate Range Zero System, "range zero" indicating a crash. Under the system, each equipped aircraft broadcasts a signal for a brief instant once every three seconds, automatically reporting its precise range, altitude and range rate to all other equipped aircraft in the area.

If a collision is imminent, a warning in the form of a beeping sound and flashing red arrows instructs the pilot to climb, dive or level off. In the case of a typical potential collision, the pilot of one aircraft receives a climb arrow, the other a dive arrow.

McDonnell Douglas says its system can handle 2,000 planes in a radius of 90 miles in a three-second period.

The cost of the unit for commercial aircraft is about \$50,000, and the company is also marketing a Micro-CAS unit for about \$2,500 for general aircraft.

CHARMING SAVANNAH—"THE CITY BY THE SEA"

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, Savannah, Ga., often known as "The City by the Sea," has unique charm—and it seems to be growing on people, especially writers.

Millions of people enjoyed a nine-page feature on Savannah in the last May 9 issue of *Life*. Other stories about the city appeared between April and June 1971, in *Harper's Bazaar*, *Nation's Business*, and *Investor's Reader*. But this was just a grouping of interest in a short period. There was much more that had already been published or was to be published.

Historic Savannah Foundation, with Reid Williamson executive director, and Beth Lattimore, his staff assistant, keep a running record of the appearance of Savannah in various magazines and newspapers.

According to a former advertising slogan, "Such popularity must be deserved." The city of Savannah is a source of pride to all of us who live in the First District of Georgia.

An account of the recognition the city is receiving was carried in the *Savannah Evening Press* of February 12, 1972, as follows:

HISTORIC SAVANNAH LOVES FREE PUBLICITY—
NATIONAL MAGAZINES HAVE STRUCK A GOLD
MINE WITH STORIES ON CITY'S RESTORATION
(By Kathy Haerberle)

The best things in *Life* are free.

That's particularly so if you're looking at last May 7 issue of the slick magazine and you're a Savannah booster.

In the issue, the city was featured on nine pages with a story embroidered with magnificent color photographs. It was a promotion triumph.

But the *Life* story was but one of many that have been appearing in national publications with gratifying frequency.

Historic Savannah Foundation usually ends up squiring around the steady processions of writers, photographers, gourmets and other interested parties.

And Historic Savannah's executive director Reid Williamson and his staff assistant Beth Lattimore, keep a running record of Savannah's appearance in various magazines and newspapers.

A SAMPLING

Recently, with the help of an advertising agency, Williamson also got a sampling of how much readership Savannah had gained and what it was worth in the space it had been paid for.

The tally shows that the city was featured between April and June of last year in *Harper's Bazaar*, *Life*, *Nation's Business* and *Investor's Reader*.

Those articles alone reached over 23 million readers. And, if they had been paid for at the going prices, they would have cost a whopping \$410,700.

The Historic Savannah promotion list, beginning in 1960, is a telling barometer of how Savannah has "grown up" nationwide.

The list begins with a feature in "Action and Progress" the Savannah Area Chamber of Commerce publication (what else would it feature?) and runs through some specialty publications, such as "Antique Monthly" and

"Asphalt Quarterly" in those early years of the historic restoration movement here.

STEADY BASIS

But, by the 1970s, Savannah was appearing on a steadier basis in such prime publications as *Times*, *House and Garden*, *Esquire*, *Woman's Day* and *Newsweek*.

Williamson describes the build-up of Savannah publicity as a kind of "spawning action." For instance, he said, the *Life* article prompted a feature on Savannah by Tom Wicker in the *New York Times* last December. Wicker is syndicated, so that article appeared all over the United States in major newspapers.

He called the recent attention given the city and its history and renewal "incredible."

Williamson said the "crush" of publicity and the letters generated by it have prompted the need for another full time employee at Historic Savannah just to handle the public relations.

He said a good example was a small "blurp" on Colonial crafts in the supermarket-distributed *Woman's Day* magazine brought 100 letters from throughout the U.S., including a request from a woman in Highland, Calif., for a Colonial doll. (She got one compliments of the Cunningham Golden Age Center.)

In addition to the calls and letters generated by the articles, Historic Savannah is regularly contacted by such organizations as the East Alabama Regional Planning and Development Commission or the Chicago Landmark Association on local preservation efforts and advice on historic covenants.

If this weren't enough Historic Savannah officials frequently speak to visiting groups here or travel to other cities to spread the word on Savannah.

It's not all gravy however, Savannah's had a few bad experiences in publications, which highlighted pollution problems and pictured the city as a deep South hick town. But, Williamson said, far and away, the favorable publicity—some of it downright promotion pieces—far outweigh the bad.

When writers come to town, most of them have set aside a day or a day-and-a-half to work Williamson said.

"But, they are really startled with the size of their job," he said.

"They expect to find a tourist attraction like Old Salem and find an entire city. They expect to find a section or a street and aren't prepared for the preservation of 1,100 buildings, 20 squares and two-and-a-half miles of historic city" Williamson said.

"I swear," he said, "most of them call the head office" and rearrange time scheduling.

Williamson said *Life* was a good example. They came to town with the idea of comparing an old city with a new city such as Reston, Va. for the year-end issue and cancelled that idea after being in a town a short time.

Instead, the *Life* photographer stayed three weeks and the writer came "lord, I don't know how many times," Williamson said.

THE TORMENT OF NORTHERN IRELAND

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I had the privilege of testifying on Northern Ireland before the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The tragic situation in the six counties of Ireland which form Ulster is

one which concerns freedom loving individuals throughout the world, and which should concern the Members of the Congress of the United States as well.

We must not overlook the fact that the entire island of Ireland has traditionally been a single entity. The artificial creation of Northern Ireland was effected in 1921 by the British Government as a temporary measure, and unification should be the ultimate goal if that is what the people of Ireland want.

Aside from the question of unification, there is the shocking denial of civil rights in Northern Ireland. Whether the six counties remain separate or are reunited with the rest of Ireland, all citizens there must be afforded equal rights in determining the operations and policies of the authority which governs them. That is the immediate issue, and it is one on which we should all be able to agree without regard to our feelings about unification.

The text of my statement before the subcommittee follows:

BELLA S. ABZUG TESTIMONY OF NORTHERN IRELAND BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EUROPE, MARCH 1, 1972

The situation in Northern Ireland is no more a "local situation" for freedom loving people than is the oppression of blacks in South Africa and Mississippi or the genocide in Bangla Desh.

Rather, the situation in the Six Counties of Ulster is one which must be of grave concern to all who care about democracy and the right to self-determination and participation to all who care about the right to human dignity and the right to earn a livelihood in security and peace.

The basic issue here is *self-determination*. To us as Americans, it is as old as our nation, for it was the issue which led us to seek our own independence nearly two centuries ago. In addition to demanding it for ourselves, we are demanding it for the people of Vietnam, and we must demand it no less for the people of Ireland. Self-determination is a right for which people will fight if they do not receive it in peace. I am amazed that the British, who have been taught this lesson in such former colonies as America, Israel, and the Republic of Ireland, have not yet learned it.

I will not attempt to go into a lengthy historical analysis of the root causes for the tragic situation that now prevails in Ulster. That job has been well done by other witnesses.

I want to talk briefly about what is happening right now in the Six Counties and why it is of concern to me and to my constituents. I have in my district people whose relatives are languishing in Long Kesh and the other internment camps. These camps are in reality concentration camps which contain hundreds and hundreds of innocent people, swept up in dragnets, snatched from their homes in the dead of night.

Fathers have been taken from their families, leaving them without income.

Sons have been snatched off the streets leaving their parents to worry whether they have been killed by a British bullet or felled by an exploding bomb.

Heart patients have been brutally removed from their sickbeds at 4:00 in the morning.

And all this without trial, without warrant, without evidence, without due process, in the most arbitrary and dictatorial manner seen in a western country since the dark days of Fascism and Nazism.

Our own Alien and Sedition Acts of two centuries ago seem like the Bill of Rights by comparison to the Special Powers Act. The government in Stormont is one of the most

unrepresentative, undemocratic bodies ever to go under the guise of a democratic government. The aristocratic masters of Stormont conduct the affairs of state as in a feudal barony, and their British masters prop up this wretched authoritarian regime with armed might.

Contrary to popular opinion in America, the issue in the Six Counties is not basically a religious one. The issue in the Six Counties is a fundamental issue of civil rights and human rights, in which a huge minority is wholly denied a meaningful vote, a voice in government, a say in determining the operation and the destiny of the country that is theirs. More than that, the Catholic minority is denied the right to work by the owning class in Ulster. Catholics are the last to be hired and the first to be fired. Whole categories of employment are barred to them, and as for government jobs, there are few indeed.

If anything is more striking in proving that this is a human rights and not a religious question, it is that the major leaders of the opposition to Stormont—John Hume and Austin Currie—are themselves Protestants, men of good will who have found themselves thrust into leadership of a movement because they could not sit by and watch the oppression continue.

The British troops in Ulster conduct themselves as an occupying force. The Citizens of the Catholic minority find democratic paths to change denied them, and are forced into violence by the oppressive British presence which props up the fictitiously democratic Stormont regime. Hundreds of elected Labor, SDLP, Independent, and Nationalist, and Liberal elected officials in the Six Counties have withdrawn their participation in government as long as the British troops stay, as long as the Special Powers Act and Internment continues, as long as Catholics are excluded from government in the North.

We cannot have more Bloody Sundays. We cannot stand by as, in the words of Senator Kennedy, Britain's Vietnam gives birth to Britain's My Lai. We must in conscience speak out.

I am pleased to be a sponsor of the Carey-Ribicoff resolution—H. Res. 653. This resolution calls for the termination of the policy of internment without trial, the restoration of full civil rights in Northern Ireland, the dissolution of the totalitarian government of Stormont, and, ultimately, the taking of steps toward the unification of Ireland.

I am also a sponsor of Mr. Bingham's resolution, H. Con. Res. 424, which calls upon our own government to exert its influence toward developing a solution to the torment of Northern Ireland, both directly and through the United Nations. The U.N. should institute a full and impartial investigation of the situation in Northern Ireland with an eye toward making recommendations for a peaceful solution; it should also consider sending a peace-keeping force to oversee conditions there.

I would add that the ultimate solution to the crisis in the North will be found when British troops are withdrawn and when the government at Stormont is replaced by a democratic government that allows all the people of the Six Counties to participate.

The ultimate solution must be a free government in the North that can find a peaceful path to a united Ireland. For Ireland is indeed one country. Anyone who has been there knows it. Even militants like the Rev. Ian Paisley have said that unity is desirable and possible. If anyone doubts that a peaceful solution can be found let him read a column by Pete Hamill in the New York Post of February 12, 1972, in which he details a compromise that could have brought peace to the North, that was agreed to by both wings of the IRA and by Ian Paisley, but was rejected by the British.

The British must be brought to their senses, and we, as Americans, as men and women of conscience who love freedom, must help them find their senses.

[From the New York Post, Feb. 12, 1972]

THE DOVE THAT DIED

(By Pete Hamill)

DUBLIN.—On the Thursday before Bloody Sunday, the British government was presented a secret five-point plan that could have brought an immediate IRA ceasefire in Northern Ireland, to be followed by a peace conference. The British rejected the plan, and by the following Monday morning all hope for a swift peace seemed to have been lost in the slaughter in the Bogside.

The plan was presented to "very high officials" in the British Home Office by Dr. John O'Connell, a Labor member of the Irish Parliament in Dublin. O'Connell had been working for weeks to try to find a way out of the political and diplomatic impasse that had been in effect since internment without trial started last Aug. 9, and for a few days he seemed to have succeeded.

"O'Connell wanted to see the killing stopped and the talking begin," said a man who was very close to the negotiations. "Since he was not part of the ruling Dublin government, he had certain advantages over many people."

O'Connell first approached leaders of the Provisional IRA in Dublin. After a series of discussions, the Provisionals agreed to halt the campaign of bombing and shooting in the North if certain concessions were made. This in itself was encouraging, because the Provisionals had been stereotyped as hard-nosed gunmen who would fight to the bitter end.

Basically, the Provisionals agreed to an immediate 30-day ceasefire, if the British government would stop internment. During that period, while groundwork was laid for a peace conference, the British Army would be confined to barracks, and army harassment of Catholics in the North would come to an end. The Official IRA went along with the plan as long as it guaranteed that the British Army would be confined to barracks.

"The key there was an agreement that internment would end," the source said. "That then freed the politicians in the SDLP to join the negotiations."

The Social Democratic and Labor Party (SDLP) is the major opposition party in the North, and has withdrawn from the Stormont Parliament until internment is ended. If the IRA could agree, even to a phased-out end of internment, SDLP leaders would then be free to negotiate. O'Connell made clear, however, that the IRA would have to have a seat at the conference table.

With agreement from the IRA and SDLP, O'Connell then traveled North to see the Rev. Ian Paisley, the Protestant militant whose constituency includes the most hard-lined Protestants in the North.

In a series of extraordinary discussions, O'Connell managed to convince Paisley that a peace conference was necessary to end the killings, but that Paisley and the IRA must be present at the table. O'Connell reminded Paisley that Michael Collins, one of the greatest of all IRA leaders, had attended the peace conference of 1920, and Paisley agreed that this was a legitimate precedent.

Paisley went along with O'Connell's plan. And so, armed with agreements from the major opposition party, both wings of the IRA and the most powerful Protestant militant, O'Connell traveled to London on Jan. 27 for meetings at the Home Office. There were five basic points in his proposals.

1. Amnesty for all political prisoners. (More than half the 750 people in the camps are being held for their political beliefs and are not members of the IRA.)

2. The end of internment.
3. The immediate withdrawal of the British Army to barracks.
4. The complete restructuring of the Stormont government along democratic lines.
5. A declaration of intent by the British on the future of Ireland.

If the British agreed to a conference, the Provisionals would have put a ceasefire into effect immediately, as a sign of good faith. If at the end of the 30 days, internment was also ended, talks would begin the following week.

Despite a public statement about not sitting down with gunmen, the British were prepared to admit the IRA to the conference table. Initially, they had no trouble accepting the first four points but were shaky about the fifth because that dealt with the re-unification of Ireland.

"We told them that the fifth point did not have to be agreed upon going in," the source said. "That's what the conference would be all about."

Unknown to O'Connell, Northern Ireland's Prime Minister Brian Faulkner was in a nearby room during these top secret talks, and was being informed of all developments. At the end of the day, O'Connell was asked to stay overnight in London for further talks in the morning. He agreed.

The following day, he returned to the Home Office and the British turned down the whole package.

Their only apparent excuse was that "We didn't know what would happen if the talk broke down." O'Connell flew back to Dublin. Within 48 hours, 13 people were dead in the streets of Derry, and a major chance of peace had been lost.

"They are either very stupid," the source said, "or they already had planned the events at Derry and had opted for the military victory over the IRA. Either way, we are now back at square one."

THE 46TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY OF REV. AND MRS. EDWARD G. LATCH

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1972

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House, the Honorable GEORGE MAHON, in extending to Rev. and Mrs. Edward Latch best wishes on this, their 46th wedding anniversary.

This is a momentous occasion for Dr. and Mrs. Latch and I am sure that all of his many thousands of friends and admirers, both in the House of Representatives and elsewhere, will be pleased to know about this happy occasion and to join in extending our best wishes to both of them.

I have had the privilege of having known and been associated with Dr. Latch for many years before he became Chaplain of the House on March 14, 1966, and, of course, have been associated with him almost daily since that time, as have all other Members, during his distinguished tenure as Chaplain of this body.

I know this is a most pleasant and memorable occasion for Dr. and Mrs. Latch, and we all salute the occasion.

THE CURRENT PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 3, 1972

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, an article entitled "The Current Program of the Communist Party (U.S.A.)," published in the February 1972, issue of the American Legion Firing Line, is, I feel, worthy of our consideration.

The author of the article warns against allowing ourselves to be influenced by the Communist Party, U.S.A., in the belief that the Communists are genuinely interested in the welfare of our people. Historically, as the author explains, the Communist Party and its American affiliate have never been genuine supporters of the people within our Nation but rather seek to seize upon political issues to gain their ends.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extension of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was order to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the American Legion Firing Line]

THE ASSAULT ON FREEDOM: A COMPENDIUM OF THEORETICAL AND POLICY STATEMENTS BY THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT, DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL, AND BY OTHER ORGANIZATIONS COMMITTED TO THE VIOLENT OVERTHROW OF FREE INSTITUTIONS

(Prepared for the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate—The Current Program of the Communist Party (U.S.A.))

The current Communist Party program, like all Communist programs, is a mixture of the moderate and the revolutionary—of the almost impossible, the clearly impossible, and of desirable reforms that most people could go along with. It is tailored to appeal particularly to the black community and other ethnic communities—even at the risk of alienating large numbers of white workers. For example, very few nonethnic workers, even among those who strongly believe in equality of treatment, could be expected to go along with the demand for "preferential treatment of black workers, also workers of other oppressed peoples, to compensate for past discrimination."

Among their more extravagant economic demands are the demands for "2 million low-rent housing units per year, situated in the best locations"; a guaranteed minimum family income of \$6,500 per year; the establishment of the 30 hour week with 40 hours' pay; a 75 percent cutback in military spending.

The Communists call for militant action by trade unionists, unemployed, ethnic groups, women's groups, youth, etc.—needless to say, ignoring the fact that there are no independent organizations of any kind in those countries governed by the dictatorship of the proletariat, and that in these countries the various social groups receive only what the dictatorship decides to grant them.

Again we come back to the point made by Peter Berger that, while Communists and other revolutionaries feed upon genuine issues, "in the fully 'radicalized' circles, 'issues' are propaganda devices, not to be taken seriously in themselves, around which support can be built and people manipulated."

CHRIS EVERT, TEENAGE TENNIS DARLING

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, determination and ambition explain Chris Evert's meteoric rise to the top of the tennis world at the tender age of 17. Although she is fortunate to be the daughter of a notable tennis professional, Chris' achievements are a product of an irrepressible desire to be the best tennis player in the world.

As she grew up in southern Florida, the beaches and ocean must have posed a tantalizing diversion from the long hours on the tennis court.

Now as a high school junior, she is reaping the benefits of her years of hard work.

Chris not only stands on the threshold of a lucrative tennis future, but one of community leadership as well, for she is an excellent student. Despite becoming a celebrity in her teens, Chris' personal decorum on and off the court has been impeccable.

As a model for all young people, Chris Evert has demonstrated the value of determination and the desire to excel.

Dave Heeren, in a recent issue of the Sporting News, has put together an excellent article on Chris Evert.

I would like to introduce this into the Record at this time:

SWEET 16, BUT CHRIS IS DYNAMITE ON TENNIS COURT

(By Dave Heeren)

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.—Outdoors where it's warm and indoors where it's cold, tennis enthusiasts keep playing the game during the winter. In that respect, 16-year-old Chris Evert is no different than a lot of others on the courts, except that potentially she is the best girl player to come along since Maureen Connolly 20 years ago.

A junior at St. Thomas Aquinas High School here, Chris is preparing for next season by working on her serve and her power game in practice sessions with one of her brothers, Drew, who is 18. They play at Holiday Park, a public membership tennis club where her father, Jimmy, is the pro.

After Chris caught the public eye at the U.S. Open at Forest Hills, N.Y., she was in demand for endorsements. She turned them all down.

She has no commitments yet for next year, but she probably will play at Wimbledon for the first time.

Some tennis insiders say Miss Evert is as good as Miss Connolly, who won the U.S. Open in 1951 when she was just three months older than Chris is now. For a youngster, the pretty Miss Evert is extremely confident in her ability. If she thinks she can win, she'll tell you. But she doesn't feel she's quite in the late Miss Connolly's class as yet.

"No, I don't think I'm as good as she was. Maybe my ground strokes are slightly better and I run a little better than she did, but she had a better all-around game."

Nevertheless, the Connolly-Evert comparison is valid. Chris has earned a place among the world's best with three major tournament victories this year. She won the St. Petersburg Masters last spring (defeating Billie Jean King, Francoise Durr and Julie Heldman), the Tulsa Invitational and Eastern Lawn Tennis Championships in August,

and was the U.S. heroine of the Wightman Cup with lopsided singles triumphs over Virginia Wade and Winnie Shaw.

Playing in tournaments of various magnitudes almost every week, Chris did not lose a match for more than six months—a string of 46 matches between a February defeat by Denise Carter on a day when Chris was weakened by an illness and a loss in the semi-finals of the U.S. Open to No. 1-seeded Billie Jean King.

At Forest Hills, Chris attracted more spectators and more attention from the press than any other player, and it was here, amid the glamor of one of the top tournaments in the world, that you were reminded she's still only a high school girl.

Bewildered by all the attention she was receiving, Chris, in characteristic frankness, said: "Right after I'd play a match, the press would want to rush me to the press tent, and all I wanted to do was see my mom and talk to my dad on the phone."

DAD REMAINED AT HOME

Chris' father stayed home to prepare three of Chris' four brothers and sisters for school while mother Colette accompanied her on the trip north for the Wightman Cup and the three tournaments that made her an instant sports celebrity.

Jimmy spoke to Chris on the phone almost every night, but he couldn't help worrying about her.

"I just hope all this attention won't change her," he fretted. "I hope she's the same girl I sent away when she comes back. I want her back in school. I hope this isn't all too much at once."

Apparently, it isn't too much for Chris, but it's becoming too much for some of her tennis-playing elders. She's been embarrassing them. For instance, at age 14 she upset reigning Wimbledon champion Margaret Court. Then, at 15, to prove it was no accident, she upset Mrs. King.

Billie Jean, a three-time Wimbledon champion herself, is a proud woman. Speaking of young Chris recently, she said curtly: "Chris is very good, but I don't know how long she can do really well. Only time will tell."

Hearing of Mrs. King's remark, Chris laughed and said: "I'm surprised she said that. I'm not sure I understand exactly what she meant by that. But I'm not just going to crack as I grow up."

Had Mrs. King known a little more about Chris and her personality, it's doubtful if she would ever have made such a comment.

THE BIG QUESTION

Just before the Wightman Cup matches, English team captain Ann Haydon Jones said about Chris: "She's a wonderful player in the small tournaments around her home. But I wonder what she would be like if she played in the big ones."

Mrs. Jones found out, to her dismay, as Chris routed Miss Shaw, 6-0, 6-4, and England's No. 1 ranked player, Miss Wade, 6-1, 6-1, to win the Cup for the United States. Had Chris lost either of these matches, England would have won the Cup.

After beating Miss Wade in the decisive match, Miss Evert was given a glass of champagne. It went straight to her head.

"Yes, I had some champagne," she stammered. "Heck, I can't even think."

Later, after her head cleared, Chris made some observations about Miss Wade that revealed remarkable maturity. "I could tell she was nervous," said Chris. "There was a lot of pressure on her because she was supposed to win. I was expected to lose, and I wasn't nervous because I knew nobody would be too upset if I did."

"During my matches in the Wightman Cup, I thought a lot about how nice it would be to win for the team, but it wasn't until it was all over that I suddenly thought, 'Hey, the United States won!'"

Right after the Wightman Cup, Chris was nominated for the August Life-Saver of the Month Award. All of the other nominees were major league baseball players.

THE COMPARISONS BEGIN

And then the comparisons with Miss Connolly started. Victories in the Wightman Cup launched Little Mo to meteoric success in 1951. In her brief career, Maureen was to win three U.S. Opens and three Wimbledon titles.

Can Chris match these feats?

Actually, there is little similarity between her and Miss Connolly other than early success. Oldtimers say Chris' slender poker-faced appearance is more like that of Helen Wills Moody than Maureen Connolly. But comparisons are inevitable now that Chris is a world-class player.

How good Chris becomes probably will depend on how much more strength she develops in the next year or two. At age 15, she was only 5-2 and weighed 100. She is up to 5-4 and is 110 now and would like to add two or three more inches and 10 or 15 more pounds. If she does continue to grow, she could add a strong serve and volley to her impeccable ground game, which is probably already the best of any woman in the world. If that happens, she'll be virtually unbeatable.

ARTIST ON SLOW SURFACE

As it is, there are probably no better players than Chris on a slow surface. Her victories over Mrs. King and Mrs. Court both came on clay. But on a fast court such as grass or the synthetics, the likes of Mrs. King, Court, Rosemary Casals and Yvonne Goolagong probably are superior to Miss Evert.

"It is because of their strong serves and volleys," Chris admitted. "My serve isn't quite that strong yet. It doesn't give me a chance to rush the net."

But there is nothing weak about her forehand or two-fisted backhand.

"She can just thread the needle with her ground strokes," said Carole Graebner, captain of the U.S. Wightman Cup team. "And her lobs and drop shots are great."

When it comes to making comparisons, Colette Evert, Chris' mother, prefers to liken Chris to her younger sister, Jeanne, than to Maureen Connolly or Helen Wills Moody. Mrs. Evert believes 14-year-old Jeanne, 1971 national 14-and-under girls' champion, is going to be just as good as Chris.

AMERICAN LEGION DAY

HON. ARTHUR A. LINK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1972

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, this week we are pleased to host members of the American Legion in our National Capital. The Legionnaires are here for their annual Washington conference and to celebrate the 53d anniversary of their organization. During those years they have actively sought to fulfill the goals set forth in the preamble to the American Legion constitution.

Today I want to comment on the preamble. The preamble states:

To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America: To maintain law and order; To foster and perpetuate a one hundred per cent Americanism; To inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, state, and nation; To make Right the master of Might; To promote peace and goodwill on earth.

Since its inception the Legion has been in the forefront of all major programs of benefit to veterans. In 1930, they were there working for the creation of the Veterans' Administration. They worked for the development of the GI bill of rights after World War II. They continue to actively seek improvements in programs and facilities for veterans and their survivors. The 16,500 posts throughout our country have been instrumental in implementing and maintaining numerous programs for children and youth. Their support for programs like baseball teams, Boys Nation, Boy Scouts, and many others testifies strongly to their humanitarian concern for the young people in our Nation.

The American Legion is very active in my State of North Dakota. They were instrumental in the passage of State legislation creating a bonus for servicemen who have been on active duty during the Vietnam conflict. It is projected that over 33,000 servicemen will receive bonuses under this program. To date, 13,962 bonuses totaling \$5.5 million have been paid as a result of this legislation.

I salute all of our legionnaires for their extraordinary accomplishments in "promoting peace and goodwill on earth."

THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1972

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the National Park Service as we celebrate the 100th anniversary of the creation of the national park system in America.

The Director of the National Park Service, George B. Hartzog, and all employees of the Park Service, can be proud of the system they have created. Through their dedication and effort these men and women have developed a park system that is an example to all the nations of the world.

Years ago, as expeditions ventured further west, word came back of the magnificent wonders of the Yellowstone country. Little did President Grant realize on March 1, 1872, when he signed the act establishing Yellowstone National Park, the great ecological contribution he was making to this Nation.

From its beginning 100 years ago the system has grown to the point where the National Park Service now administers over 280 natural, historical, and recreational areas within the United States and its territories. As our Nation continues to develop, these magnificent areas will play an increasingly important role in the lives of all of us by preserving more and more of our natural and cultural heritage.

The National Park Service, created in 1916 to replace the Army as the custodians of the Nation's parks and cultural antiquities, has done an excellent job and is to be commended.

OLDER AMERICANS HOUSING ACT OF 1972

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, two distinguished members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am also a member, have introduced the Older Americans Housing Act of 1972. This bill is a step in providing needed housing for the elderly. A recent HUD audit of all 236 interest subsidy units showed that only 6 percent of the HUD 236 units are now housing the elderly. The Stephens-Blackburn Older Americans Housing Act will help meet this crying need.

Recently, Mr. John Herbers of the New York Times wrote an article clearly explaining the need for this legislation. For the information of my colleagues, I hereby insert this article in the RECORD:

DRIVE TO REFORM U.S. AID TO HOUSING GAINS IN CONGRESS

(By John Herbers)

WASHINGTON, February 19.—A bipartisan coalition is forming in Congress in an effort to reform a portion of the Government's subsidized housing programs, a subject of rising national controversy.

Legislation has been introduced, despite opposition from the Administration, to remove housing for the elderly from the jurisdiction of the Federal Housing Administration and to alter the method of financing.

This is the latest move in an intense, embittered debate that has been under way for several months. Although only housing for the elderly is directly involved, the dispute goes to the heart of the troubled subsidy programs.

Last year, about one-fourth of the two million housing units built or rehabilitated carried Federal subsidies. In recent months, there have been widespread disclosures and charges of financial failures, poor construction, corrupt practices and mounting costs to the Federal Government in the subsidized projects.

EXCESS SPENDING AT ISSUE

While the debate on the elderly phase of subsidized housing has attracted little attention, it centers on a major question of whether the Government is committing itself to spending billions of dollars more than necessary to obtain housing for low- and moderate-income families.

The bill that was intended to be the first step toward general reform was introduced by two Georgia Representatives, Ben B. Blackburn, a Republican who has been a staunch supporter of President Nixon, and Bob Stephens, a Democrat who has been influential in housing legislation.

Their measure would carry out in part recommendations of the White House Conference on Aging, which were based largely on the findings of the Senate Special Committee on Aging. Senator Harrison A. Williams Jr., Democrat of New Jersey, chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, conducted hearing on the matter last summer and fall and is making several legislative moves along the lines of the White House conference recommendations.

The dispute is known in housing jargon as 202 vs. 236, figures that arouse strong emotions among those involved.

DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM

Until 1968, subsidized housing for the elderly, other than public housing built and

run by local authorities, was provided largely under a small direct loan program known as Section 202. Over a 10-year period only 45,000 units were built under the program, but many who utilized it were convinced it was an economical way of obtaining good housing.

The 1968 Housing Act did not disturb Section 202, but it created an over-all apartment subsidy program known as Section 236, which provides for interest subsidies rather than direct loans from the Government. The Nixon Administration in 1969 phased out Section 202 and converted it to Section 236, because it wanted to hold down immediate Government outlays, and bring all apartment programs under one system.

Everyone acknowledges that in the long run direct loans cost the Government less. Evidence has been mounting, however, that shows an enormous disparity of public costs between the two methods, even if the Government borrows the money for direct loans.

The Administration has estimated that by 1978 all housing subsidies will be costing the Government \$7.5-billion annually. The Government guarantees mortgages and makes a locked-in commitment to pay as much as all but 1 per cent of the interest for the life of the mortgage, usually 40 years. Critics charge that much of the housing being produced will not last the life of the mortgage.

HOUSING CONSULTANT'S TESTIMONY

Senator Williams' committee relied heavily on testimony from Robert P. Renfrow, a St. Petersburg (Fla.) housing consultant for nonprofit groups who worked with both the direct loan and the interest subsidy programs.

Mr. Renfrow, in a detailed listing of costs, said, for example, that a \$2.8-million project under way in Raleigh, N.C., would cost the Government almost \$7-million under the Section 236 program, whereas the cost to the Government under Section 202 would have been only \$2.6-million.

The loan, under Section 236, was closed at 7 per cent interest for 40 years, with the Government committed to paying all but 1 per cent. Under Section 202, the Government lent money for housing for the elderly at 3 per cent. Mr. Renfrow arrived at Government costs under Section 202 by estimating that the Government could borrow the money it would lend at 5 per cent—the average cost to Government from 1969 to 1971—and subtracting the interest it would receive at 3 per cent.

LOSSES BY TAX SHELTERS

While most of the cost difference between the two programs is in interest, Section 236 also adds a number of fees for the F.H.A. that were not paid under Section 202. That program was administered by a small agency operating outside the F.H.A.

Further, the difference in costs does not include the revenue loss the Government undergoes by providing a tax shelter for high-income people who invest in Section 236 housing. Rather than lend money itself, the Government pays people to invest in the housing it wants built.

Senator Williams, noting the cost differences, said, "If that isn't a nuclear attack on fiscal responsibility, I never heard any thing like it."

Even though authorities such as Eugene A. Gullidge, the Federal housing administrator, agree that direct funding is "the right thing," there is agreement that it has been politically unfeasible. There would be little difference in the economic impact—the drain on capital would be the same—but elected officials have been reluctant to increase budget outlays in the short run to save money in the long run; and there is the traditional opposition to the Government's being in the lending business.

The Rev. Richard L. Fullerton, an Atlanta housing consultant who has been testifying

against the subsidy programs since before their enactment, expressed a view held by some that the subsidy programs are "a gift to the mortgage bankers."

ABOUT 202 FUNDS NOT USED

Congress did appropriate some money to continue Section 202 on a small scale, but the Administration has not used it. The Department of Housing and Urban Development prefers to keep all of its apartment programs under the F.H.A.

There is further criticism that Section 236 provides quick profits for builders and investors and thus encourages poor construction. As a result of all this, the White House conference recommended a return to Section 202.

The Blackburn-Stephens bill would do so only partially. It would provide for the projects to be carried under Section 202 procedures, but in order for the Government to obtain money to lend it would set up a revolving fund of about \$500 million. The fund would be established by converting those Section 202 projects already built to Section 236 financing. And as soon as a new project is built and 90 per cent occupied it would be converted to Section 236, keeping the revolving fund going.

The authors maintain that substantial savings would result and the apartments could be rented for less money. But the long-range costs would remain high because of the interest subsidies under Section 236.

The legislation does not go all the way in replacing Section 236, a spokesman for Representative Blackburn said, because Congress would not accept it. The measure also contains provisions for grants to construct senior citizen centers and grants or loans for the elderly to rehabilitate homes they own, further recommendations of the White House conference. Congressional sources indicated it stood a good chance of passing despite Administration opposition.

However, the ultimate aim of critics of the present law is to bring down the entire Section 236 and other programs that operate along the same lines.

OUTSTANDING YOUNG LAW OFFICER

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sgt. Joseph T. Zero, Jr. of the Baltimore County Police Department, has been chosen "Outstanding Young Law Officer" by the Dundalk, Md., Jaycees.

Sergeant Zero has a commendable record of service to his community. He worked on 61 grand larceny cases during 1971, 32 of which were solved. He solved three stolen goods cases, three indecent exposure cases, 28 forgery and false pretense cases, and five lewdness cases.

Sergeant Zero demonstrated his ability to move into action quickly when he pursued and caught an auto thief last year.

Sergeant Zero has also participated in the solution of one homicide case, and has taken part in many vice raids. He recovered a total of \$8,700 worth of property during 1971, all of which was returned to its owners.

The Dundalk Jaycees also salute six other Baltimore County policemen for outstanding service to the community.

These men are Detective Joseph Leitzer, Jr., and Detective Frederick C. Wise of the investigative division; Officer Robert Redyk, Officer Edward Phelps, and Officer Leonard Malinowski, Jr. of the patrol division; and Officer William Pulaski of the traffic division. Each of the six will receive a certificate of appreciation from the Jaycees.

These men have placed service above self. No society can be free unless the individual can be free of fear that he might at any time be robbed or assaulted in his home or on the street. These law officers whom the Dundalk Jaycees have honored have done their part toward making this a truly free society.

POST 181, JEWISH WAR VETERANS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege recently to attend the 10th annual brotherhood banquet sponsored by members of Post 181, Jewish War Veterans, in the city of McKeesport, Pa.

This organization, founded in 1923 in memory of Pvt. Jacob Greenfield, who died in the defense of our country in Europe during World War I, has a long history of dedicated service to American veterans, particularly those hospitalized, because of the sacrifices they made for ideals we cherish as Americans. Each year Post 181, JWV, dedicates the proceeds from its annual brotherhood banquet to fulfilling the personal needs and comforts of these men and women.

This year, as in the past, the theme of brotherhood was emphasized in eloquent speeches by men who have earned the respect and admiration of their friends, neighbors, and comrades. The speakers included such outstanding citizens as the Reverend Fred E. Johnson, of St. Paul A.M.E. Church; Samuel Vidnovic, treasurer of the city of McKeesport; Herman Rosner, commander of Post 181, JWV; John L. Patterson, mayor of White Oak Boro; Nate Mayerstien, Pennsylvania State commander of the JWV; the Reverend W. J. Irey, of Sampson Mills Presbyterian Church; Rabbi Irvin I. Chinn, of Gemilas Chested Synagogue; Father William Harvey, of St. Peter's Roman Catholic Church; Judge John P. Hester, of the Court of Common Pleas; and Cyril H. Wecht, Allegheny County coroner.

These men, in their remarks, made it clear we cannot hope to achieve brotherhood among men on earth until, and unless, we have a fatherhood under God. I believe that brotherhood in America, for example, will not be achieved by placing all our people into a melting pot, then squeezing them out drop by drop with the result that each is the same in every respect. Instead, I think of our country as a mosaic, made up of different people of different colors with different ideas. All are different, yet all alike, for they are part of the same mosaic and if they complement each other, then we will have brotherhood.

I was most proud to be selected at this year's brotherhood banquet to be the recipient of Post 181's "Community Service Award" which was presented to me by Benjamin Papernick, general chairman of the affair. It is one that in past years has been bestowed upon leaders in various fields as a taken of recognition of their service to their God, their country, and their fellow men.

Former recipients of this award include men such as: Leonard C. Staisey, chairman of the Allegheny County Board of Commissioners, Rabbi Chinn, Karl Palmer, Samuel Buchman, Robert Cox, Dr. M. L. Mermelstein, Dr. Raymond Wargovich, Dr. Albert Rosenberg, and Dr. M. J. R. Hadley.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great honor to join in the company of such men. I accept the award in deepest humility and assure the officers and men of Post 181, JWV, that I will strive to my utmost to be worthy of the trust and responsibility they have placed in me.

PITTSBURGH SETS JAZZ WEEK FOR FAMOUS SONS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, when the name Pittsburgh is mentioned, a hundred thoughts come to mind: the Golden Triangle, the Mellons, Jonas Salk, steel mills, the Pirates, industry, and on and on.

But to some, when you say Pittsburgh, they smile and think of Erroll Garner, Dakota Staton, Billy Eckstine, Ahmed Jamay, Roy Eldredge, and a host of others. These jazz greats all were born in Pittsburgh.

And our city is going to do its best to bring them back when we stage Jazz Week, June 12-18.

Roy Kohler, a man who knows more about Pittsburghers in jazz than anybody else I have ever met, heads a list of local people who have joined to make this week a reality.

Roy and Walt Harper, a great jazz pianist in his own right, who will be festival director for the week, are trying to bring to the city all of those jazz giants who call Pittsburgh home.

It promises to be a great week of entertainment and good music. I invite all of my colleagues to come to Pittsburgh for Jazz Week.

I would like to introduce into the RECORD an article on the preparations underway for Jazz Week in Pittsburgh:

WALT HARPER PICKED TO TRUMPET CITY'S JAZZ WEEK JUNE 12-18

(By Lenny Litman)

Pittsburgh will become the jazz center of the world June 12-18 when Pittsburgh celebrates jazz week.

Business leaders, headed by Theodore L. Hazlett Jr., president of the A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust Fund, and Roy Kohler, community relations chief at Gulf Oil Corp. and a jazz buff from way back, will join forces to present a week of activities in city schools, parks and the Civic Arena.

Walt Harper, director of the CYO (Catholic Youth Organization) Jazz Festivals at the arena, will serve as the festival director.

Planned are programs throughout the city, topped off by a two-day affair June 17-18 at the Civic Arena.

Harper is now combing the talent agencies for big jazz names and has already contracted Herbie Mann, who opens a four-night stand at the Harmor House Wednesday night, and Carmen McRae, who worked for him twice at his Attic on Market Square.

A highlight of the week will be a labor of love for Kohler when trumpeter Roy Eldridge will be honored at a luncheon.

Kohler and "Little Jazz" have been friends for years going back to the days when Kohler started to write for "Downbeat," which he still does, and Eldridge was starring in such jazz rooms around the city as the Midway and the Carnival.

Eldridge was featured and was one of the big hits at the Monterey Jazz Festival last year.

Since he is just one of the city's jazz greats, attempts are being made to bring back some of the musicians who started their careers here.

The committee certainly won't be able to get them all or even a large portion of them but everyone will be in their pitching to bring back such giants as Erroll Garner, Billy Eckstine, Eddie Safranski, Mary Lou Williams, Earl "Fatha" Hines, Billy May, Ray Brown, Ahmad Jamal, Stanley Turrentine, Dakota Stanton, Ronnie Simon and Henry Mancini.

Some may be able to make the Eldridge luncheon and others may be part of other events but they're all being asked.

All of the local jazz luminaries, including Harper himself, will be part of the week's activities.

Now with the Civic Arena open all summer with big shows and Heinz Hall presenting the Civic Light Opera shows, Pittsburgh Jazz Week may be the added incentive to keep everybody home this summer and, lest we forget, there is always the World Champion Pirates at Three Rivers Stadium.

U.S. FARM EXPORTS: A MARKET-ING CHALLENGE

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion recently on the serious balance-of-payment problems plaguing our economy. At the same time, there has been much discussion about the decrease in productivity in the United States which has contributed to our trade problem. One sector that has steadily increased its productivity is agriculture. The American farmer continues to distinguish himself in the world as the most efficient and productive agriculturalist known anywhere.

In my judgment, it is important that we capitalize on the great capacity of the American farmer and vigorously promote agricultural exports. By giving priority to such export programs, we could make major steps in redressing our balance-of-trade problems.

A recent article by George Nakata in the Portland Commerce magazine puts this challenge into an excellent perspective:

U.S. FARM EXPORTS: A MARKETING CHALLENGE

(By George Nakata)

Significant changes are taking place in the international marketplace. Recent headlines have highlighted monetary issues, an improving East-West trading environment, and balance of payment problems. Agricultural exporting, not being immune to these challenges, must reassess its role in this fast-moving arena.

Today we see an accelerated mobility of people, a rising standard of living taking place in many lands, containerization and improved port facilities, soaring growth of international tourism, and greater demand for products of foreign origin. There will probably be powerful forces at work to raise the demand for food, energy, raw materials, and finished goods in most parts of the world.

The challenge for U.S. and Pacific Northwest farm exports is clear.

For years, the United States has stood as the world's single largest exporter of farm products, and in 1971 supplied the goods for one-sixth of international agricultural sales.

At the same time, overseas markets are important to our farmers. About one-seventh of the average U.S. farmer's income originates from foreign sales; and the output of about one acre out of every four harvested is either exported directly or used to produce agricultural exports.

Although the United States has had difficulty in recent years in maintaining a favorable balance of trade, the agricultural sector has remained overwhelmingly in the black. In 1970-71 agriculture had a favorable trade balance amounting to \$2 billion. U.S. farm exports without question make a positive contribution toward the balance of payments.

In 1970-71 the United States exported farm products valued at \$7.8 billion, including commercial sales of \$6.7 billion. This represents an all-time historical record for U.S. farm exports. Oregon and the Northwest must develop a capacity for innovation and flexibility to see—and seize—a fair share of these international opportunities.

From Oregon \$62 million worth of agricultural products were sold abroad, whereas Washington originated \$158 million, and Idaho \$96 million. Witness, however, the impressive figures of Illinois with \$655 million, Iowa \$591 million, California \$555 million, Texas \$553 million, and North Carolina \$413 million—thus, the challenge for Northwest agriculture becomes quite clear.

Aggressive salesmanship is essential. Observe MIATCO, the Mid-American International Agri-Trade Council, representing the Departments of Agriculture of twelve Midwestern states scheduled to sponsor a U.S. food exhibit in Tokyo this April 17-21. Last year the U.S. Department of Agriculture joined with MIATCO for a similar exhibit resulting in some \$3 million sales of U.S. foods.

Closer to home, our 1972 Oregon Trade Mission to the Far East led by Governor Tom McCall was directly aimed at increasing further the more than \$1 billion worth of goods bought and sold through the Oregon Customs District. This February mission directed a great deal of attention on agriculture with stops in Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Singapore, and Malaysia.

At Pacific Supply Cooperative, we are deeply involved in the export marketing of U.S. farm products. Our international operation includes a sales office in Rotterdam, 26 overseas agents, direct travel to foreign markets, and ongoing teletype communications with our foreign contacts.

Across Northwest docks flow thousands of bags of dry peas, beans, and lentils, and many of our daily cables include bids and buy orders for these commodities. An annual Pacific Northwest production of approximately 400 million pounds of dry peas and lentils

relies heavily on exportation to over 30 countries. Americans consume very negligible quantities of lentils, with over 90 percent of our production destined abroad. During the past few months Pacific Supply exported substantial tonnage of lentils to Greece. Dry beans continue to move to countries such as Japan, the Philippines, Colombia, Venezuela, Italy, the Netherlands, Brazil, and the United Kingdom.

A familiar giant amongst agricultural exports from our area is, of course, wheat, moving some 200 million bushels through Northwest grain elevators. A significant portion of our soft wheat, estimated at over 85 percent, moves into global channels.

The \$30 million U.S. seed industry is of considerable interest to our area growers. In 1970 Oregon, Washington, and Idaho accounted for some \$10 million of seed exports. This is dramatized by the fact that over 50 percent of our fine fescues, over 50 percent of the Red Clover, plus in excess of 90 percent of our Highland Bentgrass is marketed internationally.

The global seed activities at Pacific Supply involve both public and private varieties. For years we have been exporting the familiar varieties native to our area. However, in recent years we have imported OECD proprietary varieties developed by foreign plant breeders, multiplied such varieties on Northwest farms, then finally arranging the exportation of the resultant yield to the country of origin.

In the years ahead, U.S. farm exports will face stiff competition from an increasing number of agriculturally strong nations. Our corporate, regional, and national planning must think globally and act globally to meet this international marketing challenge.

ARMS LIMITATION OR ARMS RACE?

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Herbert Scoville, Jr., has served in important positions in both the CIA and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. He has been making pertinent and incisive statements on arms control and strategic weapons in appearances before congressional committees and in the print media for years. His latest comments appeared on the op-ed page of the February 24 New York Times, and in the March 4 New Republic. His views merit our attention.

The two essays follow:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 24, 1972]

ARMS LIMITATION OR ARMS RACE?

(By Herbert Scoville, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon's \$6-billion new defense requests call for an increase of more than a billion dollars for new strategic weapons. At the same time, concrete results on the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks have again been postponed, at least until he goes to Moscow.

Why the urgency on new weapons programs and interminable delays on a mutual halt to the arms race? Why wait until May? Are national politics controlling our security decisions?

An advanced airborne command post and a future generation submarine missile system headed the list of defense programs which he believes cannot even wait until next year. What has happened since last summer to require, on an emergency basis,

a new airborne command and control system for the President and top officials? Certainly we have always assumed that Russian submarines would be deployed in locations which would permit their missiles to reach Washington, just as our Polaris missiles have been stationed for years within range of Moscow.

Secretary of Defense Laird now tells us that our present command communication systems are vulnerable to Electromagnetic Pulse, the high intensity radiation pulse produced by a large nuclear explosion. But this phenomenon is not new. It has been observed in our nuclear tests for more than twenty years. We have had extensive research programs to limit its effects. In 1968 the Defense Department issued an unclassified handbook for the benefit of manufacturers who wished to build more resistant electronic equipment.

Either we are seeing another example of a fabricated danger to keep the military-industrial complex active, or our defense planners should be accused of dereliction in their duties. Although Electromagnetic Pulse is widely advertised as the new menace, the initial procurement under supplemental appropriations will be for four large aircraft, presumably Boeing 747's, the first three of which will be fitted with old electronic equipment, not items newly designed to resist Electromagnetic Pulse.

Similarly, we should ask the question: What emergency suddenly requires supplemental funds and big new expenditures for a new submarine missile system? Secretary Laird recently said this was not subject to negotiation at the talks on strategic arms because it was a replacement for the Polaris submarine. But we are still converting at a cost of \$5 billion the Polaris submarines to launch the advanced Poseidon missile. Why—if Polaris is becoming obsolete? Actually, even the Poseidon is unnecessary unless the Russians build a large ABM system which would take many years and which would be banned if President Nixon's optimism on a treaty limiting ABM's is reiterated.

Defense authorities at all levels have stated that our submarine forces are not threatened by Soviet anti-submarine warfare. Secretary Laird says our Polaris deterrent is "highly survivable." We have even no concept of the nature of such a potential threat since the required technology is as yet undiscovered. While a new submarine missile system may take seven years to build, the lead time for effective antisubmarine warfare deployment is much longer, if it can be done at all. Spending large sums now on a new submarine and missile may prematurely commit us to much larger amounts for weapons designed against the wrong threat.

What is the rush about? No new, unforeseen danger to our deterrent has developed. The Soviet ICBM program is way behind that predicted by Secretary Laird in 1969. Then we started the Safeguard ABM because of estimates that Russia would add about 150 ICBM's to its arsenal each year and that more than a third of these would be the large SS-9's. President Nixon now states that only 80 ICBM's were added last year—only a handful of these were SS-9's. In August, 1969, the Russians were reported to have more than 275 SS-9-type launchers operational or under construction; now, two and one-half years later, the number is only about 300.

The Soviets have not yet tested a missile with multiple warheads which could be aimed accurately at several targets (i.e., MIRV's), and thus threaten our Minutemen. Yet when President Nixon first justified our ABM program, he expressed fears that such testing started in 1968.

True, the Russians are building up their fleet of missile submarines at the rate of nine to ten per year, not a large increase

over Secretary Laird's prediction of six to eight per year in 1969. When those under construction are completed, they will have approximate numerical parity with the United States but not with the combined NATO fleet. However, our Polaris-Poseidon missile system is vastly superior to the Russian one.

Furthermore, such submarines cannot attack our Polaris deterrent or in any way make it obsolete so that it would have to be replaced by a new one. We must avoid the puerile notion that because the Russians are building a weapon we must have a similar program even though our security doesn't require it. This is "keeping up with the Joneses" on a billion-dollar scale.

Are we still so naive as to think we can scare the Russians into halting their programs? Delay in an agreement only ensures larger Soviet force levels. By May the Russians may have added another 100 missiles to their arsenal and the United States another 200 warheads. Bargaining chips bought for arms control negotiations are never cashed and lead only to an accelerated arms race. We should put the extra effort into improving our security by a mutual limit on arms now, not in May or not next November.

[From the New Republic, Mar. 4, 1972]

MORE, MORE, MORE WEAPONS

(By Herbert Scoville, Jr.)

Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, warned Congress on February 16 that unless an "effective" US-USSR agreement limiting the nuclear weapons build-up is reached soon, the US must get new weapons quickly or risk the "possibility" of losing "overall strategic superiority... within this decade." The "mere appearance of Soviet strategic superiority could have a debilitating effect," he said, "even if that superiority would have no practical effect on the outcome of an all-out nuclear exchange"—The Editors.

In 1971 the Institute for Strategic Studies estimated that the US had 6000 nuclear warheads fitted to delivery vehicles that could reach the USSR, and that 2000 Soviet warheads could strike at the continental United States. In the United States, there are 150 population centers with more than a hundred thousand persons each. In the USSR, there are about 175. The United States could overkill the population-industrial centers of the Soviet Union, 34 times, and the Soviets could destroy comparable centers in the United States 13 times over. So, who is ahead, the Soviet Union or the United States, with respect to nuclear military power? If the US and the USSR were to exchange their strategic forces, would it make any military difference?—Seymour Melman.

In his State of the World message, February 9, the President defended our Safeguard ABM program by saying: "The Soviet strategic forces, even at current levels, have the potential of threatening our land-based ICBMs if the Soviets choose to make certain qualitative improvements. They have the necessary technological base." What Mr. Nixon and Secretary of Defense Laird mean is that present Soviet ICBM force, about 300 of the large SS-9 type missiles, would be capable, when equipped with sufficient, accurate MIRVs (multiple warheads capable of being aimed at separate targets), of destroying a large fraction of our Minuteman ICBMs. While the Russians have not yet tested a true MIRV system, there is no doubt that they have the technological ability to do so at any time, and could begin deploying such weapons a few years later. Each SS-9 can deliver six or more MIRVs, the number required if 300 SS-9s are to be considered a threat to the Minuteman force. About these facts there is little argument. But why has the administration ignored them until now?

Why has it instead concentrated its entire attention not on a large Soviet MIRV capability but on the number of large SS-9 type missile launchers?

In 1969, when President Nixon first made the decision to go ahead with the Safeguard ABM, Secretary Laird used as a primary justification the rapid buildup of the Soviet SS-9 force, which he believed was evidence of Soviet desire to acquire a "first strike" capability. He postulated that with a continuing construction rate of about 50 missiles a year, the Russians could have about 450 SS-9s operational before 1975, and that with each equipped with three MIRVs, they would be able to knock out in a first strike 95 percent of our Minuteman force. This calculation of three MIRVs per missile was selected because since 1968 the Soviets had been testing SS-9 missiles with three reentry vehicles and Mr. Nixon and the Defense Department, despite reservations by many intelligence analysts, chose to describe this system having a "foot-print" or impact pattern which could, threaten our Minuteman. Had they selected an as yet untested MIRV system, the timing of the Russian threat would have been delayed several years and the Safeguard ABM would have been harder to justify. Now Secretary Laird in his 1973 Annual Defense Dept. Report states that "with significant qualitative improvements [MIRVs] in Soviet ICBMs even without increases in the number of Soviet ICBMs, the postulated threat to Minuteman in the last half of the 1970s could grow to a level beyond the capabilities of the four site Safeguard defense of Minuteman. Therefore we propose a FY 1973 Hardsite [ABM] program..."

As the ABM debate intensified, the preoccupation with the number of Soviet SS-9 launchers became a key factor in all US strategic planning. The projected SS-9 buildup has profoundly influenced the US position at the Strategic Arms Limitation Talk (SALT). A halt to the Soviet SS-9 launcher program became the cardinal objective of our negotiators. Since the Safeguard ABM had been justified as a counter to the Soviet SS-9 threat, the US could not agree to limiting ABMs without at the same time stopping the SS-9 program. In fact, for the past two years, the Safeguard ABM has been and is still defended in Congress primarily as a bargaining chip in the SALT negotiations. In December 1970 when the Soviets proposed an ABM limitation as a first step, President Nixon said no, insisting that limits must be placed on both offensive and defensive weapons in order to preserve stability. Progress in this area was thus delayed for more than a year. In the meantime, both the Russians and the Americans increased the size of their strategic forces.

While all attention was focused on the number of SS-9 launchers, the administration during the entire three years of SALT made no serious attempt to limit MIRVs. Although Senator Brooke in 1969 urged a moratorium on MIRV testing and deployment on both sides, this idea was discouraged by the executive branch. A year later, the Senate passed by 72 to 6 a somewhat watered-down version of the Brooke resolution (S-211) which, nevertheless, had the clear intent of urging restraint on MIRVs. This, too, was ignored; instead the US went rushing ahead with the initial deployment of MIRVs on both the Minuteman and Poseidon missiles, long before security required them. The only concession to Congress was an undertaking by Secretary Laird to halt a program to improve the accuracy of US MIRVs. Even the sincerity of this action has come into question as the administration, each year, has sought more than \$100 million for the development of improved missile guidance systems.

At SALT, the United States made one attempt for the record to interest the Russians

in MIRV controls, but this was coupled with a requirement for onsite inspection that was obviously unacceptable and provided little increased protection against possible violations. This position was put forth despite reported contrary recommendations by the President's prestigious Arms Control General Advisory Committee.

Meanwhile, what happened to the threat which Secretary Laird postulated as evidence of Soviet intentions to acquire a capability to launch a first strike against the US? The Soviet SS-9 construction program slowed markedly. From August 1969 to May 1970 no construction of new launchers was observed. Then in the spring of 1970, just when the administration was arguing most vociferously for its Safeguard ABM as a SALT bargaining chip, the construction of a small number of new Soviet launchers was observed. Even this was cut back until the winter of 1971, when construction of a new type of large launcher was spotted. Despite initial panic, only about 30 of these were started during the past year, so that the number of large Soviet ICBM launchers operational and under construction is now little more than 300, a small increase above the "over 275" reported as of August 1969. This increase of about 30 in more than two-and-a-half years should be compared to 50 per year predicted in justifying the Safeguard ABM. It is clear that the predicted 450 large Soviet missile launchers will not be operational until long after 1975 and probably never. It is rumored that the Soviets have agreed to place a ceiling on such large launchers as part of a Phase I SALT agreement to be announced in May.

The Soviet MIRV program has also not come to pass. The administration fear, that the missile tested with three reentry vehicles could threaten Minuteman, proved to be only another false alarm. The Russians now have tested systems for dispersing three warheads from both the SS-9 and more recently the SS-11, but neither is believed capable of attacking Minuteman. Secretary Laird himself notes that "the Soviets probably have not tested MIRVED missiles thus far. The last multiple reentry vehicle [not MIRV] tests were in late 1970." General Ryan, chief of staff of the air force, testified a year ago that the Russians would have to develop an entirely new reentry vehicle and guidance system before they could achieve such a capability. Rather than expending their technological efforts on a system for dispersing three MIRVs, it is most likely that the Soviets will, when they move into this area, go directly to one which will disperse six or more. It was such a system that the opponents of the Safeguard ABM and the proponents of a MIRV moratorium always argued was the real threat to our Minuteman force. It is to such a system that Mr. Nixon referred in his State of the World message.

Thus, we have come full circle in our strategic policies. By this May, a limitation on the number of large Soviet launchers will probably have been achieved at SALT, in exchange for foregoing the Safeguard ABM. But it is apparent that we have been aiming at the wrong target, for President Nixon and Secretary Laird now admit that Soviet strategic forces, even at current levels, can threaten our land-based ICBMs. We have been trapped in a blind alley. The problem today, as it always has been, is to stop MIRVs so that these potentially destabilizing weapons do not become a part of the Soviet nuclear arsenal.

Unfortunately, time has moved on and it is probably too late to achieve the desired controls. Technically, it would still be possible to verify a MIRV test and deployment ban, since the Russians have not yet developed and tested a true MIRV system. Such testing would be readily apparent to U.S. information gathering systems without requiring any onsite inspections. The U.S., however, has developed, tested and deployed two MIRV

systems, and it is most improbable that the Russians will agree to forego the MIRV option completely and leave the U.S. so far in the lead. The administration, which has disregarded all attempts to exercise restraint in this area, is unlikely to cut back or even stop our MIRV programs.

President Nixon has recognized the consequences. He announces: "We are also initiating a program at a time of increasing threat to our landbased missiles." With these words and with the request for nearly \$1 billion for a new generation submarine missile system—ULMS—he and Secretary Laird are starting us off on a new lap in the arms race. Is it really necessary? True, the Soviets are building up their submarine missile forces to a point where, within a few years, they will have achieved numerical parity. But their submarine systems are at least one generation behind ours, so that even if it were a question of maintaining US superiority, a posture which the President professes to have eschewed in favor of sufficiency, there would be no need for this new program.

More importantly, our present Polaris-Poseidon system is faced with no threat that requires the replacement or the addition of more submarines. When the Poseidon conversion is completed in the mid-'70s, the US will have a submarine fleet of 31 ships, each capable of firing 160 warheads at the Soviet Union, in addition to 10 of the older Polaris submarines which are about on a par with the present Soviet Y-class vessels. All defense authorities agree that there is no anti-submarine threat that could in the foreseeable future negate this deterrent. Surely the 5000 warheads, each of which is several times greater than the Hiroshima bomb, should be sufficient to deter a Soviet first strike, even if our Minuteman force became vulnerable. With an ABM treaty, which President Nixon states may soon be completed, virtually all of these warheads should be able to penetrate to Russian targets.

We will have made major progress if we get an ABM treaty. Let us build on that to obtain additional limitations rather than trigger a race in a new direction. Even if the Soviets continue to expand their submarine force beyond our levels, we should not allow this to panic us into deploying a new system. There is no reason why we have to be two laps ahead of the Soviet Union. Better to maintain flexibility by continuing research and development on a broad range of possible systems in order to be in the best position to cope with a threat, if it should arise in the long-range future. We have wasted three years tilting with the SS-9 launcher windmill. It is time that we realistically evaluate our security requirements and ask ourselves whether still more strategic nuclear weapons, of still greater sophistication, are needed to deter a nuclear attack or to prevent us and our allies from being black-mailed.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 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?

SOVIET JEWRY

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the plight of Jewish people in the Soviet Union is well known. They systematically undergo political harassment, job discrimination, and religious persecution. Additionally, they are prohibited from emigrating to their spiritual homeland, Israel, except under the most difficult of circumstances.

One of the most powerful weapons that we, who are concerned over the treatment of Soviet Jews, have is the spotlight of publicity. On several occasions, such as the well-known alleged skyjacking incidents last year, public opinion served to insure that Jews received fair treatment at the hands of the Soviet authorities.

Judd L. Teller has written an excellent article in the December 1971 issue of the Jewish Veteran. Mr. Teller, an authority on Jewish affairs who has traveled widely in the U.S.S.R., explains how Jewish ethnic identity and culture are being repressed by the Soviet policies. While concluding that there exists more potential for fair treatment of Soviet Jews than ever before, Mr. Teller explains that public protest and outrage over unjust Soviet policies must not abate.

Another important commentary on the subject of Soviet Jewry appears in the winter 1972 issue of United Synagogue Review. Entitled "If I Forget Soviet Jewry, Let My Right Hand Withers Away," it was written by Gideon Hausner, the chief prosecutor at the trial of Adolf Eichmann and an expert on Jewish affairs. Mr. Hausner explains how the spirit of the Jewish people remains high despite their oppression by the Soviet Government. Their dream of returning to what they feel is their true homeland, Israel, remains their overwhelming obsession.

As chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe, I held several hearings on the status of Jewish citizens in Russia, exploring in depth the problems they face. Many learned authorities testified, and all agreed that this is a problem that cannot be ignored by the American people or by the Congress. The Foreign Affairs Committee will have more to say on this shortly when it takes up House Concurrent Resolution 471, a resolution calling upon the President of the United States to demand personally of the Soviet Government that it permit freedom of religion, freedom of emigration for all persons. I am hopeful the committee and the House will pass this resolution prior to the President's departure for Moscow this spring.

Mr. Speaker, we must not forget the seriousness of the Jewish situation in Russia; our commitment to their just and humane treatment cannot be weakened. It is with this thought as well as with the desire that the Congress and the public remain informed about the plight of Soviet Jews, that I insert both

Mr. Teller's and Mr. Hausner's articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Jewish Veteran, December 1971]

SOVIET JEWRY—A DENIAL OF ETHNIC IDENTITY AND CULTURE

(By Judd L. Teller)

(NOTE.—Judd L. Teller, authority on Jewish affairs here and abroad, has travelled widely in the USSR. His most recent book is "Strangers and Natives: The Evolution of the American Jew From 1921 to the Present.")

The essential facts about the condition of the Jews in the USSR are summarizable in a few paragraphs. They are classified, under Soviet law, as a nationality, a distinctive collectivity. Anyone born of Jewish parents is automatically so classified. This information appears on all his records, from birth to death, and is requested on all questionnaires that he fills out, or guardians fill out for him, when registering for school, applying for employment, seeking travel permits.

This information is required also of all other nationalities in the USSR. In a country with a centuries' old history of anti-Semitism this has its serious drawbacks for the Jew. It makes him vulnerable to covert discrimination by the bigoted, the kind of discrimination that cannot be legislated out of existence precisely because of the disguises under which it functions. Jews who have through the centuries refused to abandon their faith even at the pain of death, are willing to bear the disadvantages of their designation.

The fact is that immediately after the Revolution they insisted on being designated as a distinctive people or nationally and had long argued against Socialist and Communist theoreticians, in Eastern Europe and in Western Europe who viewed the Jews as a disintegrating religious sect and, in fact, a no-people.

The special problem this represents for the Jews in USSR is that while all other designated nationalities are provided by the government, albeit reluctantly sometimes, with facilities to sustain their ethnic identity and culture, the Jews are denied that opportunity. Instruction of Hebrew is forbidden. Opportunities for Yiddish cultural life are circumscribed, and their availability—a few new volumes of Yiddish literature annually, occasional Yiddish variety shows, a monthly with a limited press run—is so restricted as to make them appear to be more than show window samples.

Instruction in Jewish history is nonexistent. Bans on religious instruction are more severely applied against the Jews than against most others. Literature about the Jews in Russian, Ukrainian and Georgian, to cite the languages of republics in which the concentration of Jews is considerable, or worse Jewish population, even if small, is highly conscious and proud of its origins—is unavailable. Jews who possess neither Yiddish nor Hebrew, largely because they were unable under Soviet conditions to receive instruction in them, cannot turn to Russian, Ukrainian or Georgian texts, the way American Jews turn to English texts, to learn about their people. All this at a time when ethnic studies—black studies, Judaica—are sweeping the American campus.

Such texts on the Jews as are available in non-Jewish language are propaganda-charged and distorted, designed to serve a specific governmental interest at a specific point in time, as for example several books published in Russian Ukrainian in recent years. Clearly modeled after the Protocols of the Elders of Zion, a notorious forgery which alleged a Jewish conspiracy to achieve world dominion, these books allege world dominion aspirations and conspiracies by Jews "jointly with the Western imperialists," and misquote the Bible and the Talmud, as the medieval inquisitors used to do, to prove that the source of that conspiracy and of all evil is the Jewish religion. They

allege that Israel is at the center of this conspiracy, with its agents implanted in the Communist lands and appealing to the Jews of those lands.

The political purpose of this propaganda is obvious. The Soviet peoples are unhappy over Soviet military spending in Egypt and other Middle East countries. The Soviet peoples feel that this is at the expense of the consumers goods and relief from drabness and make-to-do-with-little that has been the fate of the Soviet citizen, not only compared with the life-standard of people in the West, but even with standards in some of the other Communist countries, most notably Hungary, which is within the Warsaw axis, and Yugoslavia, which is not. Hence Jews become an excellent deflector of popular discontent over Kremlin spending in Egypt. Ancient malicious myths are evoked. Ancient prejudices are appealed to. The "Christ-killing" people, greedy, avaricious, cunning, mercurial, plotting once again from its ancient Zion, and strip-mining the loyalties of fellow-Jews in the Communist countries, hence every Jew in these countries becomes suspect to his neighbors and fellow-workers.

Discrimination against Jews in education and employment has at various times been conceded by Kremlin spokesmen, sometimes with striking naivete, sometimes obliquely. Nikita Khrushchev, who was personally intensely anti-Semitic as none of the men at the pinnacle of Soviet power today are at this time known to be, and Yekaterina Furtseva, the Minister of Culture under Khrushchev and under his successors, said that of course Jews were being replaced in positions of responsibility in the various republics. That is natural, they explained. The Jews were placed there, when these Soviet republics had no trained personnel of their own, and it was to be expected that they would eventually be replaced by "the indigenous."

Since the Jews are designated as a distinct nationality, yet have no territory of their own inside the USSR, the implication is that throughout the USSR, its republics and autonomous regions, the "native" or "indigenous" should be given first consideration, ahead of the Jew. Thus a Jew whose family roots in the Ukraine may go back many generations—Jews began settling there in the mid-seventeenth century—is to be second choice for a job or appointment because, being a Jew, he is not "a native." It is not suggested here that this is common practice. However, where the competition is keen or close, such discrimination is indeed in effect and can be justified in terms of custom and ethnic definition.

This policy, particularly as applied to the Jew, has political purpose. The cliché about "divide and rule" certainly applies here. Most Soviet nationalities, albeit they have republics of their own, feel that they are hobbled by the Russians. It is good Kremlin tactics to deflect attention to the Jew as the alleged cause of their discomforts. The underdeveloped Asian regions of the USSR need skilled and professional manpower. Inducements notwithstanding, Soviet citizens from the European regions are reluctant to resettle there.

This is no less true of blue collar workers than of professionals. Discrimination against them in the European republic might serve as a goad to induce Jews to take up post in Far Eastern Soviet republics until such time as those republics too will have acquired their "indigenous cadres." In practice, it has not accomplished its purpose. The Jews are not easily goaded.

Assuming a Jew wishes to dispose of his disadvantageous ethnic designation, the option is not his, as it is not of any Soviet citizen. If both parents are Jewish, or Polish, or Ukrainian, or Latvian, in the Soviet ethnic definition, their offspring is forever landlocked in that designation. Only offspring of

an intermarriage have the option on reaching majority to choose the nationality of either parent.

Once the choice has been made, it cannot be reconsidered or altered. This applies to all Soviet nationalities, of course. The effect upon the Jew is especially perverse. Let us consider again that Ukraine Jew whose family has lived there for generations. He is automatically denied first consideration because he is a Jew, therefore not a native. On the other hand, the son of a Polish father, recently settled in the Ukraine, and a Ukraine mother, becomes a native by choosing his mother's nationality and thus obtains preferential treatment.

The standard Soviet reply to charges of discrimination in education has been that Jewish professionals and students far exceed the percentage of Jews in the total population. Lurking behind such argument is a justification of ethnic quotas, which the Soviet deny exists. It is strange nonetheless that their "excessive" percentage has declined in the past few decades. It used to be considerably higher. Of course, if the Soviets were to admit that this indeed is the case, and there is an appearance of discrimination, they could then proceed to argue that the percentage of Jews has declined not because fewer Jews are admitted, but because many more of all the others have now chosen higher education.

The sons of peasants and blue collar workers, under the Soviet system of preference for proletarian origin, have joined the professions, preside over clinics, staff faculties. However, such argument would hold no water, either. Soviet statistics relate the percentage of Jews to the total population. They should be related only to the population in the several metropolitan areas in which they are densely concentrated. Such comparisons would reveal deliberate, systematic discrimination.

One must bear in mind that the Jews had been urban, traditionally inclined to learning and to professions amidst an agricultural population afflicted with illiteracy. If fewer Jews are now enrolled in the institutions of higher learning in Kiev, Moscow, Leningrad, Odessa and several other centers, it means that fewer Jews will graduate into the professions.

They apply to universities and are directed, instead, to technical and trades schools. The unadmitted reason being—"native cadres." The schools are overcrowded. The Jews are landlocked in their ethnic designation, hence are always listed as "stand-bys" only, exceptions being made of course for the extra-extra exceptional Jew, the genius caliber whom the Soviet regime cannot afford to waive aside.

The same applies to a wide range of Soviet occupations. When "native cadres" were not available, the Jews "exceeded" their percentage in the military, in the diplomatic corp, in the regime's top offices. Today, they are invisible or very nearly invisible in these services. They are still highly visible in the arts and mass media. However, they are fading out of administrative, supervisory and policymaking posts in these fields. They no longer are Jewish newspaper editors, periodical editors, book publishing editors, or too few to attract attention. Yet these are posts in which, at one time they had been extremely prominent.

Visitors to the Soviet Union, unless familiar with these facts, will be pointed to Jews in the theatre and cinema, in the medicine and engineering and be persuaded that discrimination does not exist. The people pointed out, will for obvious reasons, deny anti-Semitism, and will sometimes do so with simulated passion. Yet their own offspring may be barred from enrolling in universities in which the parent teaches, which means from following the parent's profession or any

other. This is done under a cloak of legality. The student is failed, not on the written exam which can be checked back upon, but in the orals, especially orals in Marxist-Leninist dialectics.

The circumstances have become so onerous, that some Jews have been seeking to opt out of their ethnic designation. This was accomplished much easier immediately after the war. Official records had been pillaged and burned—birth, school, and marriage certificates. Hence, Jews—how many we shall never know—redesignated themselves as Russian, White Russian and as other kinds of Soviet nationals. Today, this is obtainable only by bribe and subterfuge, but it can be and is done.

Some, unable to escape the grip of their designation, deliberately plan to spare their offspring this affliction by marrying outside their faith so that their child would have a choice. Curiously, anywhere from five to ten percent of the offspring of such mixed marriages, aware of the discomforts they thus assume, nonetheless chose the Jewish parent's nationality, thus the son or daughter refuses the "amnesty" which their parents had provided for them. Indeed, those now in Soviet jails for "Zionism," and among those who, after a struggle with the authorities, were finally permitted to leave for Israel, are some who were born to intermarried parents and consciously and deliberately chose to register as Jews.

The emergence of Jewish awareness among these young people, very often sons and daughters of parents who condemned their origins and bore their designation reluctantly, is one of the great surprises. It parallels a similar ethnic awareness among other nationalities of the Soviet Union. This "nationalist" awakening among the Soviet nationalities makes the Kremlin apprehensive. It interferes with their design of producing a Soviet Man and Woman with no national and ethnic allegiances. Yet, in the Kremlin's scheme of things, the culture of that de-ethnicized Soviet citizen would be Russian. There is ample evidence that Soviet policy to bring about the assimilation of its non-Russian nationalities and to absorb them into Russian culture has been accelerated since the all-Soviet Communist Party Congress earlier this year.

Here are some of the means by which this is accomplished. Russians are placed in key posts in the various republics for control purposes. However, proconsuls are insufficient to cause or force assimilation. More devious means are used. Migrants of other ethnic origins are implanted en masse in the midst of a republic, its territory is reshuffled, it is forced to cede some and forced to accept an unwanted gift of other territory, and the effect of this mix is that the native population soon finds itself a minority in its own republic.

This has been done in some of the Asian republics. It is being done in some of the Baltic republics. In each of these republics there are Russian language schools on all levels, from kindergarten to university. The implanted new populations do not enroll their children in the native-language schools but in the Russian schools. All this is done within the law. Assimilation is "by natural process," conceived and engineered by the authorities.

Under these circumstances the Kremlin sees Jewish resistance to assimilation as subverting its larger policy. If the Jews who have no territory of their own inside the USSR, persist as an identifiable ethnic group, then nationalities that are in a more advantageous position, that are rooted in their native lands, are emboldened to similarly resist. Hence, in the Kremlin view, the suppression of Jewish culture must continue. Jewish youth has responded to this oppression in the most striking way. Suddenly a

Zionist movement has sprung up; young people demanding the right to emigrate to Israel.

At first the authorities would not yield. But the boldness of these young men and women, and the support of world public opinion their bravery has enlisted for them, compelled the Kremlin, more sensitive to world opinion than had been assumed, to reconsider. There has been a gradual increase in the numbers permitted to leave for Israel. It is all still a fitful game. From time to time all visas are suddenly discontinued. Then, unexpectedly, there is a new flow of immigrants out of Russia. Applicants for visas are fired from their jobs and deprived of their livelihood without knowing when permission to emigrate will be granted them, if at all. There are house searches, sudden arrests, trials, Jewish applications for emigration mount and, correspondingly more applicants are visa'd and cleared for emigration.

The purpose behind this may be to defuse Jewish reluctance and ethnic awareness by shipping out the initiators and leaders, those who sustain that awareness, who conduct classes in Hebrew and Jewish history, circulate Jewish literature and produce Jewish information bulletins without license and on pain of arrest, trial, and severe prison or work camp sentence. Another reason may be that the Kremlin hopes to trade emigration for Jewish silence abroad on the suppression of Jewish culture and Judaism inside the USSR.

Jewry will agree to no such trade. Jewish awareness stimulates emigration demands; emigration demands in turn stimulate awareness and pride in Soviet Jewish youth. The Soviet Union will eventually yield on both points, permit free emigration of Jews and also permit those who wish or must stay behind, for various personal reasons to maintain facilities for the sustenance of Jewish culture and its transmission to future generations. There will be, of course, many Jews who will choose a third course, total assimilation. That is their privilege. Our concern is with that larger number who wish to be Jews inside the USSR or who seek Jewish fulfillment, maximal fulfillment, through emigration to Israel.

We are confident that both these aims are achievable, that the Kremlin will yield, because the present Soviet rulers are responsive to world opinion, however slow their responses may be forthcoming. Under Stalin professors, no matter how high their station in the Soviet scientific hierarchy would not have dared sign protest petitions and to form a committee for the protection of human rights. If they had, none would ever have heard of it. They would have disappeared without trace, with no spoor left of their protests, which is what probably happened in those horrendous decades under Stalin's rule.

Under Stalin, or even under the deceptively avuncular Nikita Khrushchev, it would have been inconceivable for young Jews to engage in sitdowns in visa offices, Jewish protestors would barge in on high level commissars. Trials—other than show trials—would not have been reported, men and women pulled in for interrogation would not have been released within hours or days, court sentences would be announced, death sentences commuted. Of course, justice is perverted, charges are fabricated; dissidents—a retired Red Army general, scientists, writers—are forcibly detained in psychiatric wards and silenced by means of the strait-jacket.

A young Jewish girl, Sylva Zalmanson, is apprehended circulating Jewish literature. She is arrested. Through perjured testimony and by barring essential defense witnesses, the prosecutor and judges somehow manage to fabricate a capital case against her, as if the circulation of Jewish literature were an

act against the security of the state itself. She faces her prosecutors bravely, refuses a guilty plea which would bring a lighter sentence. She is sentenced and deliberately thrown in amidst prostitutes and other felons who taunt and torture her. She is denied the medicines she requires to keep her alive. Yet she may still be released before she perishes if world public opinion calls out in her cause.

In fact the regime is bound to permit both emigration to Israel and maintenance of Judaism in the USSR, under the normal Soviet restrictions of course, because, all the above horrors notwithstanding, this is the most responsive regime to have ruled the Soviet Union. On his visit to Canada, Premier Kosygin saw and heard how Canadians feel on this issue. On his Scandinavian tour, he heard how Scandinavians feel. His peers, touring other Western countries, saw and heard how those peoples feel. The Kremlin may still be counting on public protests running their course and public outrage dying down. This must not happen. If protest is sustained, the resultant reversal of Soviet policy, when it comes, will bring, among other things, purification of the soul of the Soviet regime.

[From the United Synagogue Review,
Winter 1972]

IF I FORGET SOVIET JEWRY, LET MY
RIGHT HAND WITHER AWAY

(By Gideon Hausner)

Over a year has now passed since the Leningrad Trial wherein eleven Jews were made to account for their desire to live as Jews. Edward Kuznetsov, one of the accused, said in court on that occasion: "I have always wanted to live in Israel." Anatole Altman, before hearing his sentence of twelve years' imprisonment, said: "I was born in the Soviet era and have spent all my life in the land of the Soviets. Today, on the day when my fate is being decided, I feel wonderful although very sad; it is my hope that peace will come to Israel. I send my greetings to you, my land. *Shalom aleichem*, peace unto you, land of Israel!"

Sylva Zalmanson before hearing the sentence of death passed on her husband Kuznetsov, said:

"Israel is the country with which we are bound spiritually and historically. We shall never abandon the dream of being united with our people in our ancient homeland. Our dream of living in Israel is comparably stronger than fear of the suffering we may be made to endure. Even now I do not doubt for a minute that sometime I shall go and that I will live in Israel. This dream, illuminated by 2,000 years of hope, will never leave me. Next year in Jerusalem!"

These statements are the highest expression of Jewish rebirth in the Soviet Union. After over half a century of crushing propaganda and forced assimilation, of using every device to make the Jews drift away from their past, young Jews are now speaking out in a language comparable only to the speeches bequeathed to us by our martyrs of earlier days. Unprecedented is the fact that these young men have actually had no contact with Jewish culture or values. Their fathers never took them to a synagogue, and in their homes there was neither Bible nor prayer book. Their cultural heritage was predicated on Soviet communist propaganda. Still, they somehow discovered within themselves their Jewishness. It will certainly require profound research on the part of sociologists and historians to establish how this became possible.

The severe sentences passed by the Leningrad judges did not deter the Soviet Jews. The obvious tactics of the Russian Government to let a trickle of the trouble-makers go and frighten all the others by inflicting

exemplary penalties have misfired. The stiff-necked Jewish nation reacted in a manner which has perplexed the Soviet authorities, for now the national movement has assumed larger proportions than ever. Presently mass petitions have been sent out to the entire world. Soviet Jewry's answer to the calamities which their government is pouring on Israel has been an even stronger urge to go and live there.

This cry from the depths of captivity was taken up by Jews and non-Jews. The problem of Soviet Jewry has become an item on the international agenda of contacts with the Soviet Government, as well as a constant demand which Jews of the free world are voicing at present. There can be no doubt whatsoever that even the modest achievements which we have so far witnessed when a trickle of Soviet Jews is being let out, is thanks only to this incessant pressure maintained by world public opinion.

We are facing a prolonged struggle which can be successful only if carefully planned and adequately conducted. We must bring the Soviet ruling quarters to realize that they are pursuing a self-defeating policy. Stepping up anti-Semitism brings about an increased demand on the part of the Soviet masses to get rid of the Jews. When, simultaneously, the gates are being locked up for any mass emigration, the result is an internal clash with which the Soviet Union will not be able to live for very long.

Above all, we must fight now for the right of the Soviet Jews to petition their authorities. At present, this well-established freedom of a citizen to submit a petition to his government, is denied in the Soviet Union. A legitimate request for exit is being visited with dismissal from work, dismissal of one's children from school, and often with imprisonment. This is a barbarian denial of a basic human right. The world must never acquiesce in a situation where a citizen of any country does not have the right to ask his government for a permit to leave that country, a right which is firmly rooted in international law and usage.

We have recently heard that the Soviet Union wishes to keep back the Jews as hostages for the policies of Israel. It has been officially proclaimed that as long as the tensions in the Middle East continue, Russia will not let Jews out lest they join the armed forces of Israel. This cynical allegation penalizing Soviet Jews for the present day policy of Israel is without precedent, even in this century of contempt for basic human values.

The world will not accept this vicious attitude and will continue fighting for the right of the Soviet Jews to leave according to their desire and according to the demands of Jewish history. We have already witnessed the first cracks in Soviet intransigence. It will be up to us now, to our efforts, to our will, to our appropriate choice of means to insure that the barrier, which has already been slightly removed, should fall down altogether and that all Jews wishing to leave the Soviet Union should be able to do so without delay.

We have been through this in our generation when Jews in another country were doomed because of their Jewishness. In Hitler's Europe the only freedom allowed to Jews was to die as such. But now there is a difference. First of all, there is a place to which persecuted Jews can go, for the State of Israel is now on the map. Secondly, Jewish consciousness throughout the world is alerted and determined to foil and to frustrate the present day spiritual genocide perpetrated on our brethren in the Soviet Union.

We must succeed in this struggle of ours. We have taken a vow and must live up to it, for "If I forget Soviet Jewry let my right hand wither away."

CHURCH LEADERS FIND NO IMMORALITY IN COMMUNIST EXPLOITATION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, some church leaders have now joined the United Nations Security Council in criticizing the U.S. Congress for authorizing free trade with Rhodesia in strategic and critical materials which otherwise could only be obtained from Communist countries.

These same church leaders have never been outspoken against human rights violations in Communist countries nor against trade with Communist countries. Americans are beginning to wonder if these Christian church leaders find no immorality in exploitation of the masses by communism.

I insert related newsclippings at this point:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 29, 1972]

U.N. COUNCIL CRITICIZES UNITED STATES ON RHODESIAN CHROME ISSUE

UNITED NATIONS.—The Security Council adopted a resolution yesterday criticizing the United States for violating its treaty obligations by importing chrome from Rhodesia. The vote was 13-0 with the United States and Britain abstaining.

The resolution declared that any legislation passed or act taken by any state that would allow the import of any Rhodesian products, against which the United Nations has imposed sanctions, would undermine the sanctions and be contrary to the state's obligations.

The U.S. Congress last year passed an amendment which prevented the government from banning strategic imports from any country if the goods are bought from a Communist country.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 26, 1972]

CHURCHES REQUEST SANCTIONS AGAINST RHODESIA ECONOMY

NEW YORK.—The chief executives of five churches and a leading official of a sixth have asked President Nixon to continue economic sanctions against Rhodesia until a settlement supporting the rights of the black majority in the African country can be worked out.

The request referred specifically to a U.S. Treasury Department announcement that it had licensed the import of chromium and other "strategic and critical" materials from Rhodesia.

A nonpurchase policy had been in effect for several years, following the United Nations' condemnation of the white-dominated regime of Ian Smith in Rhodesia.

Signers of the request were United Methodist Bishop Paul Hardin, Jr., of Columbia, S.C., president of the denomination's Council of Bishops; Presiding Bishop John E. Hines of the Episcopal Church; Dr. Robert Moss, president of the United Church of Christ; the Rev. Marion de Velder, general secretary of the Reformed Church in America; Dr. William P. Thompson, stated clerk of the United Presbyterian Church, and the Rev. Robert A. Thomas, head of overseas ministries for the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ).

Both President Nixon and Secretary of State William Rogers were asked to hold up relaxation of the sanctions against Rhodesia

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

until the rights of the black majority in the former British colony are assured.

The churchmen also said that the U.S. should urge Great Britain not to ratify a proposed settlement with Rhodesia, which broke away from Britain in the mid-1960s and declared independence under a white minority government.

The proposed settlement has been vigorously attacked by black Rhodesians, who number 5 million. Whites number 250,000.

"In the light of U.S. government policy supporting self-determination and the long-range self-interest of our nation in Africa," the U.S. church officials said, "it is urgent that we find ways to convey to the British government that nothing less than a true majority expression of all the people of Rhodesia can be accepted as meaningful."

The draft agreement envisions eventual majority rule, but no timetable is set, thus drawing the opposition of black Rhodesian nationalists. A U.N. Security Council resolution scoring the settlement was vetoed by Great Britain.

The U.S. churchmen told President Nixon and Secretary Rogers that there are no Africans on a special committee testing Rhodesian sentiment on the agreement. They said that African nationalists should be "free to campaign all over the country to explain their views without restrictions."

OLYMPIC PLANS DRAWN

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most tragic facts of life is that many children are born retarded each year. As it becomes more and more widely recognized that these children can lead productive, happy lives, more and more individuals and groups are joining in the effort to help them. A striking example of this important work can be seen in the special Olympics track and field day activities sponsored by Savannah, Ga., area city and county recreation departments and civic organizations. On March 15, some 600 retarded children will participate in this event. The following story noting the effort appeared in the February 26 edition of the Savannah Morning News:

OLYMPIC PLANS DRAWN

More than 600 retarded children will participate March 15 in Special Olympics track and field day activities sponsored by the city and county recreation departments, officials coordinating the event announced Friday.

"Our goal in the program is to create opportunities for sports training and athletic competition for these children," said Jim Golden, chairman of the Special Olympics steering committee.

Sponsored nationally by the Joseph Kennedy Jr. Foundation for Retarded Children, the program is coordinated locally by the recreation departments with the aid of various civic and service organizations. * * *

Hunter Army Airfield is providing 18 buses to transport the public school children, and the Regional Hospital and Retarded Children's Association are providing their own transportation.

The Citizens and Southern National Bank's Community Development Department will provide hot dogs and soft drinks for the youngsters.

BAND TO PERFORM

Entertainment for the day will feature the 80th Army Band from Hunter Army Airfield and a puppet show. Golden said he also hopes to get a high school band to perform for the Olympics.

Serving as judges for the competition will be members of the physical education departments of Armstrong State College and Savannah State College, city and county recreation departments, board of education and Hunter Army Airfield Special Services Divisions.

THE FEDERAL INCOME TAX—RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I recently reported to my people on the Federal income tax. I insert the report at this point:

RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE ON THE FEDERAL INCOME TAX

Between now and April 15th, millions of American taxpayers will be engaged in the annual chore of filling out income tax forms and paying the federal government for their right to be producing Americans. So, I thought today we'd talk about the federal income tax—its background, the uses to which your income taxes are put, the threat which it poses to our freedom, and what can be done to remove the threat.

Most of the more elderly citizens listening to this telecast may remember that prior to 1913, there was no income tax. Many younger listeners may question how the federal government was able to pay all of its expenses without revenue derived from the income tax. The answer, of course, is that prior to 1913 the government was run in accordance with the Constitution. Local and State governments performed their duties and there was no federal bureaucracy. Under such a system the working people enjoyed considerably more individual freedom than now and were able to use their earnings in accordance with their individual desires. Remember, every time the government takes a dollar from a citizen in taxes, it denies the citizen the freedom to use as he sees fit the earnings of his labor.

Under our Constitution, the federal government is delegated a limited number of specific powers. All powers not delegated to the federal government, the agent of the sovereign States in the Constitutional contract, are reserved to the States and the people thereof by the 9th and 10th Amendments.

Prior to 1913 the 9th and 10th Amendments were then as important as the 1st and 14th Amendments. The emphasis was on less government and more individual responsibility. The population in 1913 was 95,000,000 and the total federal budget was about \$600,000,000 or \$6.30 per person. The people enjoyed abundant freedom from governmental interference, freedom to work, to save, and to use their earnings without restraint.

From 1776 to 1862, except for periods of war, citizens were free of all federal taxes except the tariff on imports. From 1862 to 1913, federal revenues collected came from taxes on liquors, tobaccos, from import tariffs and sale of public lands.

During these years our federal government followed this admonition of Thomas Jefferson:

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues and public debt as the

greatest of dangers. To preserve our independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy or liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we can prevent the government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy. The same prudence which in private life would forbid our paying our money for unexplained projects forbids it in the disposition of public money."

Prior to its adoption in 1913, the income tax—an unequal tax—was forbidden by the U.S. Constitution. The 16th Amendment was proposed by Congress in 1909 and was proclaimed adopted on February 25, 1913. It was the Republicans under President William Howard Taft who proposed the income tax amendment which opened the floodgates for the destruction of our Constitutional republic by providing broad taxing powers to the federal government.

The first income tax was passed in October 1913, under Woodrow Wilson's Administration. It imposed a minimum rate of 1 per cent on incomes over \$3000 and a maximum tax of 7 per cent upon incomes in excess of \$500,000. Since then the tax has continued to rise until today the minimum rate is 14 percent on the first \$500 earned by a single person and on the first \$1000 earned by a married person up to 70 percent on earnings in excess of \$200,000.

The progressive federal income tax, which takes the largest bite of the productive citizen's earnings, is augmented by ever-increasing Social Security and Medicare payroll contributions as well as by State and local income, sales, and property taxes.

In order to show the results of excessive taxation, Freedom Magazine in May of 1970 made a statistical study of the U.S. population, the total amount of the federal budget and the annual cost per person to pay the costs of the federal government for each 10 years from 1900 through 1970. As you can see from the chart the annual cost per person to run the federal government increased from \$6.90 in 1901 to \$956.19 in 1971. And, it's much higher today and continues to increase.

PROOF OF EXCESSIVE TAXATION

U.S. population		Federal budget		Annual cost per person
Year	Amount (millions)	Year	Amount (millions)	
1900.....	76	1901	\$525	\$6.90
1910.....	92	1911	691	7.51
1920.....	106	1921	5,062	47.75
1930.....	123	1931	3,577	29.08
1940.....	132	1941	13,980	105.90
1950.....	151	1951	45,797	303.29
1960.....	180	1961	97,790	543.30
1970.....	210	1971	200,800	956.19

1 Estimated.

Source: Freedom Magazine, May 1970.

Taking an average working family of four persons, we multiply the last figure on the chart, \$956.19, by four and get \$3,823.76, which is what a family of four pays on the average in federal taxes alone. To this must be added local, parish and state taxes, the many hidden taxes in everything purchased, and inflation—the cruelest hidden tax of all. Considering the federal taxes plus these additional taxes, a working family of four pays on the average over half of what is earned just to pay taxes. This often requires that mothers must leave their children to work in order to make ends meet.

Many have been made accustomed to feel that the income tax is the fairest tax because it is based on ability to pay. It doesn't work out that way. Government statistics indicate that 51% of federal income taxes are paid by individuals earning less than \$15,000 per year, and those earning \$25,000 a year or

less pay 72% of the total federal income taxes. The very wealthy have managed to escape their share of income taxes through various loopholes and tax dodges such as tax free foundations and capital gains.

I have introduced several bills to limit or deny tax dodging by the multi-million dollar foundations including H.R. 425 to establish illegal acts by foundations, and H.R. 8298 to deny tax free status to foundations engaging in propaganda and lobbying.

The Governor of Alabama recently filed a suit against the Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service to remove this gross discrimination. In his brief, Governor Wallace stated:

"When private foundations use tax exempt income to espouse the cause of communists in America, to promote revolution in the streets of our cities; to participate in registration drives among blacks to elect radical mayors of certain cities; and bankroll the pro-Viet Cong American Friends Service Committee; grant funds to organizations which preach revolution and racial hatred; financing of communists and radicals to run school 'decentralization' in New York City, producing the bitterest sort of racial antagonisms; and making grants to the leftist Urban League—they are not engaging in propaganda activities, attempting to influence legislation, and aiding and abetting political campaigns on behalf of candidates for public office?"

The Supreme Court indicated its lack of interest in tax inequities by refusing to even give a hearing.

It is unjust as well as ironical that small businesses, factory workers, farmers, and other hardworking taxpayers—who produce in the free market economy to build America—must pay taxes while tax-exempt organizations, which accumulated their wealth through the free enterprise system, should escape paying even their fair share of taxes while promoting socialism or communism—the antithesis of free enterprise—while at the same time competing with the worker's dollar causing prices to rise resulting in inflation.

It is equally unjust as well as irresponsible for the Nixon Administration and the Congress to continue to propose and approve spending programs unauthorized by the Constitution and which result in huge deficits. No where does the Constitution authorize taxing American citizens to give to foreigners in foreign aid or to the United Nations.

As you figure your 1971 taxes, here are some of the things your tax dollars are going to pay: \$3,189,437,000 will go for foreign aid. Foreign aid has been sold to the American people as a humanitarian program for containing communism by helping the poor overseas. Yet, most knowledgeable persons know that foreign aid is a gimmick to help remake the entire world under a one-world government. Not only has foreign aid been a failure in stopping communism, but it has also caused nations once considered our friends to hate America.

The foreign aid bill also included an additional 86 million to the United Nations after an increased contribution had earlier been voted the U.N. in the State Department Appropriation bill. The leadership talk of reducing U.N. financing by your tax dollars was soon forgotten.

\$15 million was specifically earmarked for UNICEF or U.N. Children's Fund. Possibly crime on the streets has become so bad the Halloween UNICEF collections by children are off; so its no longer whether or not you want to contribute, you are now forced to do so.

Sweden, for example, while trading with and aiding North Vietnam, has received over \$135,000,000 of our foreign aid. Our commitment to provide Israel with planes and military aid has caused ill-will towards the U.S.

by Egypt and other Arab nations. India and Pakistan recently fought each other using U.S. arms furnished as foreign aid.

The U.S. government has subsidized Russian agriculture by selling over 20 million bushels of oats at prices below the U.S. market price. The U.S. taxpayer is, in effect, footing a new kind of international food stamp to improve the diet of the impoverished Russian people.

On February 16th, the same day that our government announced a \$50 million guaranteed loan to build 11,000 homes in Israel, it announced approval of \$367.1 million worth of export licenses for the Kama River trucking plant in the Soviet Union. Previously the government had already approved more than \$1 billion worth of licenses for the Kama Project.

Our government has contributed millions to the Inter-American Development Bank, the World Bank, the Export-Import Bank and other international banks to provide long-term, low-interest loans to foreign countries which—make no doubt about it—are used by U.S. corporations to export jobs to foreign countries where labor is cheap and unorganized. For example, earlier this year, the World Bank lent Chile \$5 million and the International Monetary Fund lent Chile \$39.5 million. In effect, the U.S. taxpayers promote Marxism by our contributing to such international banks.

\$25,000,000 of your federal tax dollars were provided in this year's Foreign Aid Bill for the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, a program established by Congress in 1969 to "insure" U.S. capitalist operations in foreign countries against revolution and nationalization by the leaders of the "emerging nations."

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 provides that the full faith and credit of the United States of America is pledged for the full payment and performance of obligation incurred by OPIC under its insurance and guarantee contracts. Thus, if claim settlements are in excess of available reserves, OPIC will be required to request supplementary funds from the Congress to pay the claims.

In addition, the Internal Revenue Service has ruled that U.S. companies whose overseas property is seized by a foreign government without promise of payment may write off their losses as an income tax deduction. Quite an incentive for U.S. industrialists to move abroad. And you the taxpayers are being forced to finance the rape of our own country.

The American industrialist cannot lose; the foreign governments stand to gain. As usual, only the U.S. taxpayer loses.

These are just a few of the uses—or should I say misuses—of how your hard earned tax dollars are squandered on the foreign scene—dollars which our taxpayers could better use at home.

On the domestic scene, we find a similar situation—billions for education to engage in sensitivity training, sex education, busing of students, using drugs on students, and a myriad of other innovative experiments using our children as guinea pigs; billions to OEO to promote revolution in this country; and billions for ineffective welfare programs which promote welfare as a way of life, etc., etc.

It has been estimated, if this country continues at the present rate the trend away from free enterprise and toward a government controlled society, that by the year 2000 America will be a 100 per cent socialist country. America would then no longer be the "land of the free and the home of the brave."

I have introduced numerous bills to help working people. Bills to allow federal income tax deductions for social security tax contributions, cost of repairs and improve-

ment to residences, costs of pollution control, as well as police and fireman tax deductions, and deductions for cost of tuition for education and graduate teacher study. I have also introduced legislation to aid our elderly, veterans, retired, and blind, as well as special legislation to remove tax-exempt status from foundations engaged in propaganda and politics.

If enacted, these bills would give a measure of tax relief. However, they do not provide the answer to the grave situation in which America finds herself today. If you haven't heard of these bills, remember they are unpopular with those who want to fool the people rather than help them. The solution to our predicament is to repeal the personal income tax and require the federal government to obey the Constitution by assuming

only those functions authorized by the Constitution, leaving all other functions to the discretion of State and local governments. To this end, I have re-introduced H.J. Res. 23 known as the Liberty Amendment. This proposed amendment to the U.S. Constitution which has passed our Louisiana legislature would repeal the 16th Amendment and abolish federal income taxes as well as take the federal government out of competition with free enterprise.

The adoption of this bill would strengthen and enlarge the free enterprise sector, restore power to the people at the State and local levels, and would greatly reduce the size and scope of the federal government. In summary, it would take off the handcuffs and allow the Constitution to function as intended.

I began this telecast with a remark that taxpayers are getting fed up with high taxes. They have had enough of the waste and corruption in government—the use of their tax dollars to build political patronage and party loyalty instead of improving the country. Most people realize that they can have anything they want if they are willing to pay the price. They also realize that the government can do nothing for them that they cannot do better for themselves.

Taxpayer groups throughout America continue to organize as taxpayer dissatisfaction mounts. Taxation without representation has developed into a new cause celebre as taxpayers suffer government representation of those who pay no taxes. If taxation without representation is tyranny, then representation without taxation is anarchy.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, March 6, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rev. Charles H. Carpenter, national chaplain, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Shawboro, N.C., offered the following prayer:

O God in heaven, bring us to a halt for a moment with Thee. In the quiet of this moment, direct us to Thy spirit. Help us to turn away from those who would keep us from our duty and set our minds and hearts on Thee in whom alone is hope for peace and growth. Guided by Thy spirit, help us to see beyond the coldness of mankind and nation, and with clearer vision glimpse the warm eyes of children, the anxious faces of fathers, and the quiet concern of mothers. Help us to know that we affect these, for these are our Nation. They breathe and care and hurt.

May we deliberate—and decide—with them in mind, continually pricked by Thy spirit. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 23, 27, and 40, to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 907. An act to consent to the interstate environment compact;

S. 2094. An act for the relief of Col. Charles V. Greffet;

S. 2713. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code to authorize the Attorney General to provide care for narcotic addicts who are placed on probation, released on parole, or mandatorily released;

S. 3160. An act to provide for a modification in the par value of the dollar, and for other purposes;

S. 3248. An act to consolidate, simplify, and improve laws relative to housing and housing assistance, to provide Federal assistance to local governments in support of community development activities, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 117. Joint resolution asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September "National Hunting and Fishing Day."

REV. CHARLES H. CARPENTER

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the membership of this House, I would like to express my deep appreciation to the Reverend Charles H. Carpenter, presently national chaplain of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, for offering the prayer today in the House of Representatives.

In addition to his religious activities, he is involved in other public services which include serving as eastern area membership chairman for the VFW department in North Carolina. Also, he is employed by the North Carolina Employment Security Commission, and for over a year has served as veterans employment representative for the Elizabeth City, N.C., area.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that Reverend Carpenter consented to be with us today, and I am sure that all who heard him were most impressed with his sincerity, and I only hope that he will be able to visit us again sometime in the near future.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AGAINST W. A. BOYLE, JOHN OWENS, AND JAMES KMETZ— COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,

March 3, 1972.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: On this date, I have been served with a subpoena duces tecum that was issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. This subpoena is in connection with the case of the United States of America v. W. A. Boyle, John Owens and James Kmetz (No. 1741-71).

The subpoena commands the Clerk of the House to appear in the said United States District Court for the District of Columbia, on the 6th day of March, 1972 for the purpose of testifying, bringing and explaining certain House records that are outlined in the subpoena itself, which is attached hereto.

The rules and practices of the House of Representatives indicate that no official of the House may attend either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpoena without the consent of the House being first obtained.

The subpoena in question is herewith attached, and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

SUBPOENA TO PRODUCE DOCUMENT OR OBJECT
[In the U.S. District Court for the District of the District of Columbia]

United States of America v. W. A. Boyle, John Owens and James Kmetz, No. 1741-71
To Honorable Pat Jennings, Clerk, or his authorized representative, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the District of the District of Columbia at 3rd & Constitution Avenue in the city of Washington, D.C. on the 6th day of March 1972 at _____ o'clock A.M. to testify in the case of United States v. Boyle, Owens and Kmetz and bring with you all records reflecting reports filed with the Clerk of the House by the following named committees for the designated time period:

1. D. C. Humphrey for President Club—1968
2. National Republican Congressional Committee—1967, 1968, 1969, 1970
3. National Republican Senatorial Committee—1967, 1968, 1969, 1970
4. Republican National Finance Operations Committee—1967
5. Citizens for Humphrey and Muskie—1968

This subpoena is issued upon application of the United States.

MARCH 3, 1972.

JAMES F. DAVEY,
Clerk.
By WILLIAM BROWN,
Deputy Clerk.