

Ned K. Kulp
James P. Kyne
Robert B. Legge
Peter P. Leto
Jerome P. Lundgren
Peter K. Lyse
Justin M. McCarthy
Charles B. McCormack
Gene W. Miller
John Miller
Patrick D. Mooney
Alan C. Moore
Parker D. Morris

Daniel J. Murphy
Carl T. Nakkula
Damon G. Nalty
Edward J. Northup
John K. Oast
Edward H. O'Keefe
John G. Orewiler
Glen O. Petersen
Harry J. Petrequin Jr.
Kenneth T. Pinhero
Dorothy M. Preuss
Lennard K. Rambusch
Matthew G. Raulf

Robert S. Raymer
Leroy Reid
John Relle, Jr.
John A. Robbins, Jr.
Gerald H. Rockelli
Robert T. Rosenfeld
John P. Rowley, Jr.
John S. Saper
John E. Schroeder
Michael D. Schwartz
Thomas M. Scott
Meyer J. Seltzer
Charles K. Sheckler

John A. Skarzynski
Gerald R. Skinner
Charles R. Smith
Noah M. Smith
Peter W. Spencer
Robert W. Sprick
Edward J. Stauber
Delmar L. Strelow
Robert E. Strunk
Thomas F. Sullivan, Jr.
Harry A. Thorpe

Raymond V. Underwood, Jr.
Roger P. Vance
Thomas A. Vellanti
Donald J. Wagner

Eric H. Wall
Richard T. Whitney
Richard L. Whynot
Albert D. Wittman

U.S. NAVY

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

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FOREIGN AID: PRO AND CON

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the fiscal year 1972 foreign assistance appropriations bill has finally been sent to the White House, a mere 4 months before the start of fiscal year 1973. This long delay indicates the degree of controversy surrounding our foreign aid programs.

To gain a perspective on this controversy, I urge my colleague to read the following documents. The first is Congressman PASSMAN's comments to the American taxpayer from July 1, 1971, concerning our foreign assistance efforts. I asked the Agency for International Development to respond to my colleague's remarks. The second document is the agency's response, which I have just recently received.

These items follow:

FOREIGN OPERATIONS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D.C., July 1, 1971.

To the American taxpayer:

The attached fact sheets should have your close scrutiny. Our government is continuing to dissipate your resources and wealth in foreign nations all over the world. This unconscionable practice is destroying our world markets, destroying the value of the American dollar and placing an unbearable public debt upon the shoulders of unborn generations. This practice of giving away your wealth is creating inflation and reducing the purchasing power of your dollar which is the equivalent of confiscating your savings. I must speak out again and say forthrightly that the good claimed for this program is not supported by facts.

Our fiscal irresponsibility is so obvious that many foreign nations are again demanding our diminishing gold for the surplus dollars they hold, thus further depleting our limited gold stocks. In some countries, businesses will accept dollars only at a discount. This uncontrolled dissipation of our wealth is pricing us out of world markets. We may well finish this year with a true trade deficit of a billion dollars.

There are approximately Fifty Billion U.S. Dollars floating around in foreign countries. We do not have the gold to redeem these dollars, so they are surplus to the needs of foreign nations for commerce. Do not blame the present Administration for this unbelievable situation because it has been building up for 25 years. The habit of giving away our wealth is so ingrained in the minds of the bureaucrats who give away this money that they cannot overcome the addiction. So, those of us who know the facts must now spread this news throughout the nation and plead for support so as to bring

this outlandish, wasteful, ever-growing addiction under control, or else someday surely regret our neglect.

The attached sheets establish beyond any doubt that this program could be termed frustrating, fanatical, frightening and foolish. I am going to expose the wastefulness of this program to the Nation even if it require substantial use of my personal resources. This is an obligation I owe to the American people.

May I explain the attached fact sheets briefly before you read them:

(1) New budget requests for additional authorizations and/or appropriations for foreign assistance, fiscal year 1972, covering loans, grants and credits—thirteen billion, five hundred twenty-eight million, six hundred twenty-eight thousand dollars.

(2) Unexpended balance in pipeline from prior years—twenty-four billion, five hundred sixty-seven million, fifty-five thousand dollars, including appropriated funds and borrowing authority.

(3) If all new requests are approved by the Congress, the grand total funds available, new and from prior years, will amount to thirty-eight billion, nine hundred fifty-six million, eight hundred and thirty thousand dollars.

(4) Net cost of the foreign assistance program (1946-71) including interest on what we have borrowed to give away, amounts to two hundred twelve billion, eight hundred eighty million dollars. Many billions of the dollars we pay out in interest on what we have borrowed to give away go to foreign nations and foreign nationals.

(5) During this world-wide spending spree, our gold holdings have been reduced from twenty-two billion, eight hundred seventy-nine million dollars to ten billion, seven hundred thirty-two million dollars.

(6) Since the inception of the world-wide spending spree, short-term dollar claims against the United States (due now) have increased from eight billion, six hundred forty-five million dollars to forty-one billion, six hundred sixty-six million dollars, plus other United States indebtedness abroad which amounts to twelve billion dollars. If we should be called upon to pay off these short-term IOU's, we could not meet the demand.

(7) Our balance-of-payments situation, since this worldwide spending spree started, has placed our fiscal affairs in a grave position. We have paid to foreign nation forty-eight billion, eight hundred nineteen million dollars more than they have paid to us. This situation will continue to worsen until we bring the Aid program under control. As you know, this is what has created such a tremendous dollar surplus in the hands of foreign nations and nationals.

(8) The freewheeling spending program covering the face of the earth has helped push the U.S. Public debt to a figure eighty-seven billion dollars above the combined public debt of all the other nations of the world.

(9) Can it be denied that our country has substituted dollars for a sound foreign

policy, aid for trade, appeasement for firmness? We have become so addicted to this formula that it is no longer even suggested that it be stopped. *Only the American taxpayers have the power to stop it.*

(10) Until this Administration came into power, we had been borrowing money from the American people to pay for commodities and services which were given free to foreign nations, and then borrowing dollars from foreign nations in order to make our balance-of-payments situation look better than it was.

(11) In the main, the foreign aid program is administered by patriotic Americans, but they are almost completely without banking and business experience. It has been established that it is the fourth and fifth echelon bureaucrats who are involving us in these foreign entanglements. During 1972 alone, some portion of the aid program will be operating in 98 nations of the world, with 54,599 individuals on the payroll. This includes U. S. personnel, foreign personnel and participants. There are now 4,416 projects and subprojects scattered all over the world. While many similar projects in America cannot go forward because of lack of funds, not a single foreign aid project has ever been stopped or slowed down for lack of funds.

Please analyze the attached sheets. They convey a significant message. A careful scrutiny may prompt the overburdened American taxpayer to take the necessary steps to bring this world-wide free spending program under control. Bureaucratic estimates are so unrealistic and unconvincing that the Congress has been able to reduce the budget requests by twelve billion, three hundred forty-three million dollars in sixteen years. The total reduction was limited to this amount because of the selfish interests of thousands of lobbyists and the scares peddled by bureaucratic personnel. Yet even after the reductions, the foreign aid program was still greatly overfunded.

Aid should be limited to agencies such as the Export-Import Bank with the disguised credit and grant portion being curtailed and eliminated at the quickest possible date. We should make sure that any aid extended is on a loan basis with reasonable maturity dates and at the same rate of interest we have to pay on the money we borrow to lend.

With my knowledge of this program, if I did not furnish the facts as I have in this report, I would be derelict in my obligation to the American people. I shall do my part to awaken the American people to this state of affairs. I hope that I may have the support of the Congress in my efforts.

Sincerely yours,

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
Chairman.

July 1, 1971—New requests for authorization and/or appropriation for foreign aid and assistance—fiscal year 1972

(In thousands)

1. Foreign Assistance Act (including Military Assistance) ----- \$3,313,000

July 1, 1971—New requests for authorization and/or appropriation for foreign aid and assistance—fiscal year 1972—Continued

(In thousands)

2. Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC)	\$25,000
3. Inter-American Development Bank	500,000
4. Inter-American Development Bank (Supplemental)	486,760
5. International Bank for Recon. and Devel. (Supplemental)	246,100
6. International Development Association	320,000
7. Asian Development Bank	40,000
8. Asian Development Bank (Supplemental)	60,000
9. Expanded Multilateral Assistance	35,000
10. Receipts and Recoveries from Previous Programs	370,310
11. Military Assistance (in Defense Budget)	2,250,000
12. International Military Headquarters	74,400
13. Economic Assistance (in Defense Budget)	90,900
14. MAAG's, Missions and Mil-groups	262,600
15. Permanent Military Construction—Foreign Nations	106,000
16. Export-Import Bank, Long-Term Credits	2,445,000
17. Export-Import Bank, Regular Operations	1,195,639
18. Peace Corps	82,200
19. Ryukyu Islands	4,450
20. Migrants and Refugees	8,650
21. Public Law 480 (Agricultural Commodities)	1,320,400
22. Contributions to International Organizations	160,680
23. Education (Foreign and Other Students)	51,000
24. Trust Territories of the Pacific	59,739
25. Latin America Highway (Darien Gap)	20,000

Total new requests, foreign aid and assistance, FY 1972

OTTO E. PASSMAN,

Chairman, Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations.

July 1, 1971—Unexpended balance for foreign aid and assistance in pipeline from prior years for appropriation and authorization

(In thousands)

1. Foreign Assistance Act (including Military Assistance)	\$4,403,985
2. Export-Import Bank, Uncommitted Borrowing Authority	5,230,600
3. Export-Import Bank, Long-Term Credits	2,937,800
4. Export-Import Bank, Regular Operations	624,600
5. Export-Import Bank, Export Expansion Program	295,000
6. Inter-American Development Bank	2,304,051
7. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	5,715,000
8. International Development Association	460,000
9. Asian Development Bank	150,000
10. Foreign Military Credit Sales Program	290,000
11. MAAG's Missions and Mil-groups	10,000
12. Military Assistance (in Defense Budget)	945,000
13. International Military Headquarters	18,000
14. Economic Assistance (in Defense Budget)	15,000

15. Permanent Military Construction Overseas	\$210,000
16. Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC)	203,000
17. Public Law 480 (Agricultural Commodities)	664,439
18. Peace Corps	24,077
19. Contributions to International Organizations	5,808
20. Education Exchange	28,397
21. Ryukyu Islands	1,740
22. Migrants and Refugees	2,264
23. Inter-American Highway	6,100
24. Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands	21,656
Total	24,567,055

OTTO E. PASSMAN,

Chairman, Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations.

July 1, 1971—Total net foreign assistance to 127 nations of the world—fiscal years 1946 through 1971

The five F formula: Frustrating—fanatical—frightening—foolish—factual

(In thousands)

Afghanistan	\$373,800
Albania	20,400
Algeria	176,100
Argentina	341,100
Australia	594,400
Austria	1,218,400
Barbados	700
Belgium-Luxemburg	1,742,200
Bolivia	532,000
Botswana	19,100
Brazil	2,738,200
Burundi	7,800
Burma	158,600
Cambodia	613,700
Cameroon	33,500
Canada	46,500
Gen. African Rep.	5,600
Ceylon	176,600
Chad	9,800
Chile	1,281,800
China, Rep. of	5,096,500
Colombia	1,119,400
Congo (B)	4,000
Congo (K)	456,000
Costa Rica	188,200
Cuba	43,700
Cyprus	22,400
Czechoslovakia	189,500
Dahomey	12,900
Denmark	873,300
Dominican Rep.	483,400
East Germany	800
Ecuador	296,700
El Salvador	145,400
Equatorial Guinea	300
Ethiopia	394,100
Finland	10,300
France	7,059,700
Gabon	7,600
Gambia	3,300
Ghana	264,800
Germany & Berlin	3,652,400
Greece	3,681,900
Guatemala	355,300
Guinea	113,000
Guyana	69,900
Haiti	117,200
Honduras	122,800
Hungary	13,300
Iceland	59,800
India	8,003,600
Indochina	1,535,200
Indonesia	1,343,800
Iran	1,945,700
Iraq	90,600
Ireland	105,700
Israel	992,000
Italy	5,528,500
Ivory Coast	80,000
Jamaica	92,400
Japan	3,419,900
Jordan	710,000
Kenya	77,100
Korea	10,059,500
Kuwait	29,500

Laos	\$1,449,500
Lebanon	98,000
Lesotho	12,100
Liberia	217,100
Libya	221,600
Malagasy Rep.	14,100
Malawi	26,400
Malaysia	72,600
Mali	30,000
Malta	8,300
Mauritania	5,000
Mauritius	6,100
Mexico	451,600
Morocco	731,800
Nepal	157,600
Netherlands	2,033,300
New Zealand	58,800
Nicaragua	165,600
Niger	18,900
Nigeria	383,600
Norway	1,127,100
Pakistan	4,484,100
Panama	242,300
Paraguay	131,000
Peru	465,200
Philippines	1,938,600
Poland	437,300
Portugal	432,900
Romania	10,000
Rwanda	8,000
Saudi Arabia	178,800
Senegal	40,100
Sierre Leone	44,100
Singapore	31,300
Somalia	79,300
South Africa, Rep.	33,300
Southern Yemen	200
Spain	2,028,400
Sudan	91,000
Swaziland	4,900
Sweden	135,300
Switzerland	45,300
Syrian Arab Rep.	56,700
Tanzania	73,400
Thailand	1,592,400
Togo	17,300
Trinidad & Tobago	49,700
Tunisia	699,400
Turkey	5,640,500
Uganda	42,500
United Arab Rep.	759,900
United Kingdom	7,209,100
USSR	186,400
Upper Volta	18,500
Uruguay	184,900
Venezuela	317,600
Vietnam	15,213,700
Western Samoa	2,500
Yemen	45,300
Yugoslavia	2,515,600
Zambia	6,100
Bahamas	31,800
Brit. Honduras	5,900
Brunei	14,000
Sou. Rhodesia	1,500
Surinam	9,200
West Indies	8,900
Hong Kong	44,700
Papua & New Guinea	23,700
Ryukyu Islands	403,300
Trust Ter. Pac.	284,200
CENTO	54,700
W/W, Regional	15,907,600

Total Net Disbursements to Foreign Nations, 1946-1971

Total Net Interest Paid on What We have Borrowed to Give Away, 1946-1971

Grand Total—Cost of foreign assistance, 1946 through 1971

Of the 3½ billion people of the world, all but 36 million have received aid from the United States.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
Chairman, Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations.

To whom it may concern:

Gold holdings, July 1, 1971

	Thousands
Gold Holdings, United States, December 31, 1950.....	\$22,879,000
Gold Holdings, United States, December 31, 1970.....	10,732,000
Gold Holdings, Other Countries of the World, December 31, 1950.....	10,935,000
Gold Holdings, Other Countries of the World, December 31, 1970.....	26,108,000
<i>Foreign short-term dollar claims against United States</i>	
Short-term Dollar Claims Against United States, December 31, 1950.....	\$8,645,000
Short-term Dollar Claims Against United States, December 31, 1970.....	41,666,000
<i>U.S. balance-of-payments</i>	
1950 Net Deficit.....	-\$1,912,000
1951 Net Deficit.....	-578,000

1952 Net Deficit.....	-\$1,100,000
1953 Net Deficit.....	-2,100,000
1954 Net Deficit.....	-1,500,000
1955 Net Deficit.....	-1,100,000
1956 Net Deficit.....	-1,000,000
1957 Net Surplus.....	+500,000
1958 Net Deficit.....	-3,400,000
1959 Net Deficit.....	-3,700,000
1960 Net Deficit.....	-3,800,000
1961 Net Deficit.....	-2,400,000
1962 Net Deficit.....	-2,200,000
1963 Net Deficit.....	-2,660,000
1964 Net Deficit.....	-3,006,000
1965 Net Deficit.....	-1,306,000
1966 Net Deficit.....	-2,077,000
1967 Net Deficit.....	-3,650,000
1968 Net Surplus.....	+93,000
1969 Net Deficit.....	-7,208,000
1970 Net Deficit.....	-4,715,000

Net U. S. balance-of-payments deficit (21 yrs.) 1950 through 1970..... 48,819,000

<i>Gross public debts</i>	
Public Debt, United States, December 31, 1970.....	\$391,626,000
Public Debt, All Other Nations of the World (Est.) December 31, 1970.....	304,160,241
<i>Public Debt, United States EXCEEDS Combined Debt of All other nations of the world by.....</i>	
	87,466,049

The above statistics cover (1) Gold Holdings, (2) Short-term Dollar Claims against United States, (3) United States Balance-of-Payments Position, 21 years, (4) Public Debt of the United States, (5) Public Debt of all other nations of the world, and (6) Amount by which our public debt exceeds combined public debt of all other nations of the world. These statistics should be of interest to every American, conservative or liberal.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
Chairman, Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations.

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM (FOREIGN AID), ANALYSIS ON CONGRESSIONAL ACTION: 16-YEAR PERIOD, 1956-71 INCLUSIVE

Fiscal year	Budget estimate	Appropriation	Reduction below estimate	Percentage below budget estimate	Fiscal year	Budget estimate	Appropriation	Reduction below estimate	Percentage below budget estimate
1956.....	\$3,266,641,750	\$2,703,341,750	-\$563,300,000	17.24	1965.....	\$3,516,700,000	\$3,250,000,000	-\$266,700,000	7.58
1957.....	4,859,975,000	3,766,570,000	-1,093,405,000	22.50	1966.....	3,459,470,000	3,218,000,000	-241,470,000	6.98
1958.....	3,386,860,000	2,768,760,000	-618,100,000	18.25	1967.....	3,385,962,000	2,936,490,500	-449,471,500	13.27
1959.....	3,950,092,500	3,298,092,500	-652,000,000	16.51	1968.....	3,250,520,000	2,295,635,000	-954,885,000	29.38
1960.....	4,429,995,000	3,225,813,000	-1,204,182,000	27.18	1969.....	2,920,000,000	1,755,600,000	-1,164,400,000	39.88
1961.....	4,275,000,000	3,716,350,000	-558,650,000	13.07	1970.....	2,710,020,000	1,812,380,000	-897,640,000	33.12
1962.....	4,775,500,000	3,914,600,000	-860,900,000	18.03	1971.....	2,203,500,000	1,940,185,000	-263,315,000	11.83
1963.....	4,961,300,000	3,928,900,000	-1,032,400,000	20.81	Total.....	59,873,861,250	47,530,717,750	-12,343,143,500	20.62
1964.....	4,525,325,000	3,000,000,000	-1,525,325,000	33.70					

RESPONSE TO CONGRESSMAN PASSMAN'S
COMMENTS ON FOREIGN AID

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Congressman Passman's letter of July 1, 1971 on foreign aid is misleading in several basic respects. For example—

More than half of the items listed in the letter do not fit within any reasonable definition of foreign aid. Those programs which do constitute such assistance total only about \$5.9 billion, less than half of Congressman Passman's total.

Most foreign aid does not consist of "giving away our wealth" to other countries in the form of grants or gifts. Over one-half of our bilateral development assistance, including the sale of P.L. 480 commodities, is in dollar-repayable loans and these loans are being repaid. Although much of the world has received help from the U.S., many countries have not received aid for years. For example, in the last six years the number of countries receiving bilateral economic aid through A.I.D. has declined from 74 to 37. No communist country now receives foreign aid from the United States except for limited emergency assistance to relieve human suffering in time of natural disasters.

The United States does not dispense foreign aid indiscriminately all over the world. Over three-fourths of our military and economic assistance is concentrated in 22 countries. One-fourth of the current recipients get only small gifts of food or self-help assistance valued at less than \$1 million each.

Whether the amount of foreign aid being provided by the United States is reasonable or unreasonable is a subjective question that obviously reflects the honest opinion of the individual. There are also equally strong critics of various domestic programs. On balance, however, the foreign aid being provided by the United States is not unreasonable compared to our economic capacity or when our efforts are compared to the efforts of other industrialized nations. In 1970, the U.S. ranked 12th among non-communist

donor countries in development assistance as a percentage of Gross National Product.

The foreign aid program cannot "live off its pipeline". The "pipeline" consists of funds which are tied up in items already contracted for or in ongoing projects which cannot be abruptly terminated.

Foreign aid is not the cause of our balance of payments problem. In FY 1971 over 85 percent of A.I.D.'s funds were used to buy goods and services from thousands of firms and institutions all over the United States for use abroad. For the most part A.I.D. does not send "dollars" overseas and is not responsible for the large dollar holdings of foreign governments or individuals.

Development of the economies of the poor countries and aid-financed sales of U.S. goods to them for this purpose build rather than destroy commercial export markets for American farms and industries. For example, during CY 1970 U.S. exports to three former economic aid recipients—Iran, Israel and Taiwan—totalled over \$1.4 billion. In 1959, only 11 years earlier, these same three countries imported less than \$500 million from the United States, including goods financed under the foreign aid. It is fair to conclude, therefore, that aid and the resulting development lead to greatly increased trade.

If foreign aid were limited to agencies such as the Export-Import Bank and to commercial terms, there would be no aid. Aid is intentionally concessional in order to help the poor countries in their economic development effort. The poor countries desperately need low-interest, long-term loans to provide the capital and foreign exchange without which they cannot work toward development. These countries cannot afford to pay back the money we lend them at the same rate at which we borrow it. If they could pay the higher rates, they could borrow on the commercial market, and there would be no need for a development loan program.

The following table shows FY 1972 requests for a new appropriation for programs which can properly be described as U.S. Govern-

ment foreign aid. (These amounts will decrease, of course, if the Congress appropriates less than the level requested.)

"Foreign aid" programs
(In millions)

Economic assistance (Item 1).....	\$2,348.0
Military Assistance Grants and Foreign Military Sales (Item 1).....	1,215.0
Receipts, Recoveries and Reimbursements (Item 10).....	370.5
Subtotal, "Foreign Aid".....	3,933.5
<i>Other assistance</i>	
Inter-American Development (Items 3 & 4).....	*125.0
World Bank (IBRD) (Item 5).....	*24.6
International Development Association (Item 6).....	320.0
Asian Development Bank (Item 8).....	60.0
Peace Corps (Item 18).....	82.2
P.L. 480 (Item 21).....	1,320.4
Subtotal, "Outer Assistance".....	1,932.2
Total, FY 1972 Request.....	5,865.7

*Does not include budgetary requests for callable capital, which provide backing for Bank borrowing in the private capital market, but remain in the U.S. Treasury.

(The total net budget authority requested by the President for all U.S. Government activities in FY 1972 is \$248 billion. All assistance listed above totals less than 2½ % of the total budget request, and development assistance amounts to only about 1½ %.)

Foreign assistance can take many forms, such as assistance for economic and social development, support for private enterprise in the recipient country, assistance to maintain economic and political stability in threatened countries, and military assistance.

Many items, which Congressman Passman includes in his total of \$13.5 billion, however,

cannot reasonably be considered "foreign aid" under any concept of that term.

The 25 "foreign assistance programs" listed by Congressman Passman represent all transfers of resources from the United States to foreign countries for any purpose, as well as programs which do not transfer significant resources but do relate to foreign countries.

Insofar as economic assistance is concerned, the U.S. Government accepts the international definition. Such assistance includes all transfers of financial resources and technical services to less developed countries and multilateral institutions by official agencies of the donor nation which, as their main objective, promote the economic development and welfare of developing countries (including security-related economic assistance). However, to be considered assistance, the financial terms must contain some element of subsidy as compared with commercial loan terms. Military assistance is defined according to similar criteria.

Thus, the criteria for an expenditure of public funds to be foreign aid are (1) that the principal purpose is to help other countries and (2) that the terms are concessional.

Many of the programs on Congressman Passman's list assist the recipients, but do not meet the first criterion of foreign aid, because their primary benefits accrue directly to the United States. For example, the provision of arms and equipment in Vietnam and the U.S. share of the support for International Military Headquarters cannot be considered foreign aid since their primary purpose is the support of U.S. military operations overseas. Export-Import Bank loans have as their primary purpose the promotion of U.S. exports.

The Department of Defense now funds some limited economic or social rehabilitation activities in Vietnam, but these are related to its war zone responsibilities for highway maintenance or improvement, communications, and the provision of medical services and supplies to civilian war casualties.

As a secondary benefit, the U.S. administration of the Ryukyu Islands may provide the islands with roads and buildings, but the primary benefit accrues to the strategic defenses of the United States. Thus the cost of the U.S. military presence in the islands cannot be considered a part of the foreign assistance account.

Other programs on Congressman Passman's list which also cannot be considered foreign assistance are the construction and maintenance of U.S. military bases abroad and foreign sales of military or other types of equipment at commercial interest rates.

UNEXPENDED FUNDS

Congressman Passman's listing of the pipeline of unexpended balances for foreign assistance activities from prior years covers many programs, some of them noted above, which are not considered to be foreign aid. Moreover, the list includes funds which are not intended to be spent, such as callable capital subscriptions to international financial institutions, which remain in the U.S. Treasury as backing for bonds issued by these institutions.

Unexpended funds, or pipelines, consist of those funds appropriated to a government agency, committed by the agency for specific purposes, but not spent by the end of a fiscal year. It includes funds expended for long-lead time items which have not yet been delivered.

Most government agencies have financial pipelines. The total pipeline for all U.S. Government agencies at the end of fiscal year 1971 was about \$102.5 billion. The A.I.D. pipeline at that point was \$3.2 billion, or about 3% of the total. The military assistance and credit sales pipeline was \$1.6 billion, for a total Foreign Assistance Act pipeline of \$4.8 billion.

Pipelines build up when agencies undertake projects that cannot be completed within a single fiscal year. It may take five years or more to complete a hydroelectric project, for example. When A.I.D. lends a country \$10 million to buy American equipment and pay American engineers for such a project, part of the \$10 million will show up in the A.I.D. pipeline for several years. A balance will remain until the last generator or transformer has been delivered and installed, and the final payments have been made to the American manufacturers and engineers.

The so-called pipeline for military assistance, in most cases, represents the undelivered balance, rather than unexpended funds—that is, funds expended on orders placed with U.S. industry for military equipment which has not yet been delivered.

Pipelines give rise to a frequent question: "Why can't pipeline funds be used to run the foreign aid (or defense, or space) program, instead of seeking new appropriations?"

They can't be used, very simply, because nearly all these funds are already being used to complete projects or activities that are *already* under way or for equipment *already* ordered but not yet delivered. If these funds were pulled out of the pipeline, it would mean breaking international agreements, leaving projects unfinished and wasting the initial expenditures, and forcing American industries to take losses on orders partially produced or on investments in production for which there is suddenly no customer.

Whenever funds are not needed to complete a project or a project is not carried through according to plans, the funds are "deobligated", or recovered for use during that fiscal year. Such recoveries total some 4% of the total A.I.D. pipeline and 6-7% of the military assistance pipeline during any one year. A.I.D. and the Department of Defense estimate the anticipated recoveries each year and subtract that amount from their request to the Congress for new funds. These recovered funds are then applied against current needs.

CUMULATIVE FOREIGN AID COSTS

The 26-year cumulative total of \$212.88 billion for Congressman Passman's list of programs for "net foreign aid" costs includes an attribution of interest costs of \$74.4 billion for the period 1946 to 1971. It is not correct to attribute such costs of Federal borrowing to foreign aid, which under any definition is a small portion of the Federal budget. The factors which contribute to the public debt arise from overall government expenditures, including defense and space programs as well as all domestic programs, and cannot be logically attributed to any one government agency or activity.

Excluding the interest attribution, the remaining \$138.4 billion includes:

Over \$22 billion for economic assistance (mostly to Western Europe during post-war reconstruction and the Marshall Plan) to countries now considered in the "developed" category and no longer receiving economic assistance—a confirmation that assistance has accomplished the objective of helping countries achieve sound and viable economies;

Over \$18 billion for U.S. surplus agricultural commodities made available under P.L. 480 sales and grant programs, most of which would have been expended in any event in support of U.S. domestic agricultural programs;

Over \$41 billion for military assistance and credit sales—almost half to the developed countries of Europe, Japan and Australia—which has helped maintain free-world security and offset further increases in U.S. military costs.

The total amount of cumulative net assistance to all countries since 1946 is simply not relevant to the President's current request for economic and military assistance

to a limited number of "less developed" countries to be used in an effort to move them into the "developed" category or to help them maintain adequate defenses.

GOLD HOLDINGS, DOLLAR CLAIMS, AND BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

The decline in United States gold reserves to \$10.3 billion and the increase in short-term dollar claims to \$41.7 billion during the past 20 years reflect the large deficits in the U.S. balance of payments recorded during that period. These deficits represent the shortfall of receipts in the total of all private and governmental transactions between the U.S. and the rest of the world. They are caused by such factors as tourist and military spending abroad, the competitiveness of foreign goods and American private investments abroad. Our foreign assistance programs are but one relatively small portion of these transactions. It is not appropriate to attribute this decline in our gold holdings, or the increase in dollar claims, or the cumulative deficit in the U.S. balance of payments, to foreign assistance programs.

The United States is making a concerted effort to eliminate the deficit in our balance of payments. A number of the measures outlined by the President in his New Economic Policy are designed to strengthen this effort. However, foreign aid is not the cause of our balance of payments problem. In fact, at present the A.I.D. program has a positive direct impact on our balance of payments—the program resulted in a net inflow of \$79 million in FY 1971. This is because, for the most part, U.S. goods and services—not dollars—are sent abroad. Only \$272 million, or 14% of A.I.D.'s total expenditures in FY 1971, were spent abroad. This outflow of dollars was more than offset by \$351 million of return flow in receipts from interest and amortization payments on outstanding loans.

In the longer run, foreign aid actually helps our balance of payments by building markets for U.S. exports. As countries develop, they increase their ability to purchase agricultural and manufactured goods from the United States. Moreover, A.I.D.-financed sales help create preferences for U.S. products. U.S. exports to the developing countries have more than doubled over the past ten years. This increase was made possible by the rapid economic growth of the less developed countries, to which the United States and other industrialized countries contributed through foreign aid programs.

BORROWING FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AND FOREIGN NATIONS

The U.S. Government has never borrowed from the American people specifically to pay for foreign aid. Foreign aid programs are funded out of annual Congressional appropriations and constitute only about 2% of the President's budget. The budget is financed primarily from federal taxes. Tax receipts are supplemented by the sale of securities by the U.S. Treasury. Although these securities represent a loan from those who buy them, the individuals do so willingly and receive interest on their investments. There is no way of distinguishing which of these federal revenues are used to finance the foreign aid appropriation.

Similarly, the U.S. Government does not borrow from foreign nations to pay for foreign aid. Other governments choose to hold dollars for various reasons, including the fact that the dollar is a reserve currency. These dollars are usually held in a form—such as U.S. Treasury securities—which will earn interest. Since the U.S. pays interest on these securities, in a technical sense they can be called "loans". However, these "loans" were not entered into for the purpose of providing funds for foreign aid.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE A.I.D. PROGRAM

The overriding objective of nearly all less developed countries is creation of a viable

economy which will permit them to stand as free and independent nations able to engage in international trade as equal partners with the developed countries. As the keystone of our foreign policy with the less developed countries, our foreign assistance programs support their efforts to develop. These programs are complex and require dedicated people of many skills and backgrounds. In fact, the United States is recognized internationally as having the most competent group of people engaged in development assistance today. The Administrator of the foreign aid program personally approves the level of assistance to be provided to each country. Moreover, in the case of major assistance programs, the President personally approves the levels of assistance. It is therefore incorrect to state that fourth and fifth echelon bureaucrats are solely responsible for decisions on the foreign assistance program.

Carrying out foreign assistance programs requires people of different backgrounds—not only persons with banking and business experience. Many people working on capital lending programs do have banking or business backgrounds. However, technical assistance programs require skilled specialists in agriculture, education, public health and other technical areas. Other programs require a knowledge of the total economy of a country, its agricultural production capacity and so on. Thus, economists and other specialists participate in formulation and implementation of assistance programs.

Of the nearly 55,000 individuals cited in Congressman Passman's letter as "being on the payroll", nearly 13,000 are foreign nationals being trained under the economic assistance program for employment in their own countries. Another 8,500 are trainees under the Military Assistance Program. In addition, Congressman Passman's number of personnel is considerably expanded by including over 8,500 Peace Corps Volunteers, trainees and related personnel. The actual number of direct-hire American personnel administering A.I.D. programs is now only 6,298—while the Military Assistance Program accounts for over 4,000 more. To the extent possible, our overseas missions employ foreign nationals to reduce the number of American employees, and therefore the cost of U.S. assistance activities.

Development assistance projects cannot be stopped in mid-stream without breaching international agreements. However, because of the severe reductions in the President's requests for economic assistance, many projects have been severely cut back. Other projects were necessarily dropped or postponed, prolonging the process of development and, in many instances, increasing the cost, not only to countries receiving our assistance but to the United States as well.

COMMENTS ON INDIVIDUAL ITEMS

Comments on each of the 25 items on Congressman Passman's list follow. The figures listed are the amounts requested by the President, not the amounts that may ultimately be appropriated.

Item 1.—Foreign Assistance Act (including Military Assistance) (\$3,563,000,000): This is the traditional "foreign aid program" and represents the budget request for the economic and military programs and activities authorized by the Foreign Assistance and Foreign Military Sales Acts, for which funds are appropriated under Titles I and II of the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriation Act. The original request of \$3,313,000,000 was increased by \$250 million to provide funds for relief and rehabilitation of refugees from East Pakistan and humanitarian relief in East Pakistan.

Item 2.—Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) (\$25,000,000): This is an installment of \$25 million required to build OPIC's insurance and guaranty reserves back

to a point where they maintain investor confidence in the program and are adequate to meet valid claims, with less possibility of resort to the full-faith-and-credit backing of the U.S. Treasury. These liquid reserves are required to discharge promptly liabilities under political risk insurance and commercial risk guaranties. This item should not be charged to foreign aid unless or until it is spent.

Items 3 and 4.—Inter-American Development Bank (\$261,760,000):

The amounts included in the Committee list (\$500,000,000 plus \$486,760,000 supplemental) were based on preliminary budget estimates and have been revised to reflect changes as a result of Congressional action before the aid of FY 1971. The current request includes (a) \$50,000,000 for the second installment of the U.S. share of the \$1.5 billion replenishment of the Fund for Special Operations authorized in 1970, carried forward as not appropriated in the FY 1971 supplemental; (b) \$75,000,000 toward the U.S. share of an increase of \$400,000,000 in paid-in capital, of which \$25,000,000 is carried forward as not appropriated in the FY 1971 supplemental; and (c) \$136,760,000 as the balance of the U.S. share of callable capital carried forward as not appropriated in the FY 1971 supplemental.

An important part of U.S. support for multilateral development assistance efforts, the contribution to the Fund for Special Operations and the paid-in capital subscription will enable the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) to increase the loans made to Latin American countries on a concessional, long-term basis. On the other hand, U.S. subscriptions of callable capital are kept in the U.S. Treasury, enabling the IDB to market the equivalent value of its bonds. None of the money has ever had to be called. Therefore, while the concept of callable capital can be considered as foreign assistance, no monetary amount can legitimately be charged to its account.

Item 5.—International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (\$246,100,000): These funds are for the U.S. share of subscriptions to the special \$2.2 billion increase in the Bank's capital stock, approved by the Board of Directors, effective December 31, 1971. The \$2.2 billion includes an increase of \$222 million in paid-in capital and increase of \$2 billion in callable capital. The U.S. share includes \$24.6 million of paid-in capital and \$221.5 million in callable stock. The latter is to be kept in the U.S. Treasury as backing for the Bank's bonds. As in the case of items 3 and 4, it is misleading to include the full amount of callable capital in a total of foreign assistance requests. The Bank relies on sales of its obligations in world capital markets for the bulk of the funds it lends to member developing countries.

Item 6.—International Development Association (\$320,000,000): These funds are for the first installment of the U.S. contribution to the current replenishment of the resources of the International Development Association (IDA) and meet the criteria of official development assistance. IDA assistance is made available on a low-cost loan basis as an alternative or supplement to higher interest loans to member developing countries which are in the most difficult financial circumstances. Over a 3-year period, the total U.S. contribution will amount to \$960 million, while other developed countries will contribute \$1,440 million. Thus, replenishment of IDA's resources will total \$2.4 billion—40% from the United States and 60% from other countries.

Items 7 and 8.—Asian Development Bank (\$60,000,000): The amounts included in the Committee list (\$40,000,000 plus \$60,000,000 supplemental) were based on preliminary budget estimates and have been revised to

reflect changes as a result of Congressional action before the end of FY 1971. The \$40,000,000 request has been deferred until FY 1973. The \$60,000,000 has been carried forward as not appropriated in the FY 1971 supplemental. The total \$100,000,000 authorization being sought represent the proposed U.S. contribution to the consolidated Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank. With these funds the Bank will be able to make loans on concessional terms to finance priority projects and programs contributing to the development of the region.

Item 9.—Expanded Multilateral Assistance (\$35,000,000): The \$35,000,000 included in the Committee list was based on a preliminary estimate of contingency needs for contributions to the International Finance Corporation and the African Development Bank. Since it was subsequently decided that neither will be requested in FY 1972, the amount should not be counted as a part of the total request for foreign assistance in FY 1972.

Item 10.—Receipts and Recoveries from Previous Programs (\$370,485,000): The amount included in the Committee list (\$370,310,000) was based on a preliminary budget estimate and was subsequently revised to \$370,485,000. These funds are receipts and recoveries from A.I.D. and Military Assistance (MAP) activities. Each year estimates are made on the amount of recoveries from prior year programs and receipts of payments of principal and interest on past loans that will become available for re-use in the programs. The amount of new appropriations requested for these programs is accordingly reduced by the estimated level of receipts and recoveries in both cases.

Item 11.—Military Assistance (in Defense Budget) (\$2,250,800,000): This item is almost entirely for equipment for the armed forces of Vietnam, Laos and Thailand and for costs associated with support of allied forces in South Vietnam. Funding authorities for these activities were transferred to the Defense budget (P.L. 89-374, March 1966 and P.L. 90-66, September 1967). A small amount is for the U.S. share of certain NATO activities. These costs are part of the U.S. overseas defense operations and, therefore, not foreign aid.

Item 12.—International Military Headquarters (\$72,300,000): The amount included in the Committee list (\$74,400,000) was based on a preliminary estimate and was subsequently reduced to \$72,300,000. The money is used for the U.S. share of the operating support of International Military Headquarters and as such is not foreign assistance, but defense preparedness. Because it is an expenditure in support of U.S. forces, the IMH account was transferred to the Department of Defense budget in 1969.

Item 13.—Economic Assistance (in Defense Budget) (\$90,900,000): These activities, funded some years ago as a part of normal development assistance efforts by A.I.D. on a lesser scale, were transferred to the Defense Department budget as the rising military conflict in Southeast Asia altered their character. They were judged to be so closely related to the conduct of military operations that they were properly a Defense Department, rather than an A.I.D., funding responsibility. For example, highways and railways are important military lines of communication, and extraordinarily heavy use, coupled with sabotage and other wartime damage, call for maintenance and repair programs far beyond A.I.D.'s normal programs in such areas. Similarly, the need for medical services and facilities expanded significantly beyond the scope of a normal economic assistance situation. While these activities are similar in kind to those A.I.D. conducts in other countries, they are part of the U.S. military effort, which is different in magnitude, scope and purpose, and should not be counted as foreign assistance.

Item 14.—MAAG's, Missions and Milgroups (\$261,600,000): The amount included in the Committee list (\$262,600,000) was based on a preliminary estimate and was subsequently reduced to \$261,600,000. It is not foreign aid, but an estimate of the pay and allowances of U.S. military personnel, and operation and maintenance related to Military Assistance Advisory Groups, Military Missions and Military Groups, including certain elements of the military assistance command in Vietnam. The funds requested for FY 1972 are part of the regular U.S. armed services budget request. Such items as pay and allowances under this account would be paid to military personnel regardless of their assignment.

Item 15.—Permanent Military Construction—Foreign Nations (\$106,000,000): Funds are annually required for the construction and maintenance of U.S. bases in other countries. These bases are used by the U.S. military and are essential to the protection of U.S. security interests. This item is part of the normal Department of Defense budget request and serves primarily for the defense of the United States. As such, it does not constitute foreign aid.

Item 16.—Export-Import Bank, Long-Term Credits (\$2,445,000,000): The primary objective of the Ex-Im Bank is—as it has been for over 30 years—the promotion of U.S. export trade throughout both the developed and less developed areas of the world. A commendable by-product of the Bank's activities has been to spur economic growth in Africa, Asia and Latin America, but its principal function is to bolster U.S. commercial sales to these areas as well as to developed countries. It is therefore not foreign aid.

The \$2,445 million figure is the Bank's estimate for equipment and services loan authorizations (formerly called long-term loans) in FY 1972 within the overall Congressional limitation on Ex-Im Bank operations. These loans are made at an interest rate (now 6%) which, alone or in combination with commercial bank financing, permits U.S. exporters to meet officially-supported foreign export credit competition.

Item 17.—Export-Import Bank, Regular Operations (\$1,195,639,000): The same comments made with respect to the Bank's long-term credits apply to commodity authorizations, emergency foreign trade authorizations and other activities of the Bank—their primary objective and result is the promotion of U.S. export trade. They are not aid on concessional terms to less developed countries.

Item 18.—Peace Corps (\$82,200,000): As a part of the U.S. bilateral development assistance effort, Peace Corps volunteers perform a variety of functions (teaching, public health, community development, etc.) overseas. They provide needed services in less developed countries, improve the knowledge of the United States in these countries, and broaden their own understanding of the less developed world.

Item 19.—Ryukyu Islands (\$4,450,000): Pursuant to a treaty with Japan, the United States has been responsible for the administration of the Ryukyu Islands. The U.S. Army has provided this administration. U.S. presence in the Ryukyus has been motivated primarily by defense concerns; it has not been aimed at developing a self-sustaining economy. Although construction of roads, airfields and barracks may constitute permanent improvements at the site of such a military installation, benefits to the economy as a whole have been incidental to military uses. On June 17, 1971 the U.S. and Japan signed an agreement providing for the transfer of administrative control of the Ryukyus to Japan sometime in 1972. Follow-

ing the turnover this item can be expected to be dropped.

Item 20.—Migrants and Refugees (\$8,650,000): In 1962, legislation unrelated to economic development in the less developed world or other foreign assistance purposes provided authority for aid to migrants and refugees in various parts of the world for humanitarian reasons. This aid is extended both on a multilateral basis, through contributions to the Inter-governmental Committee for European Migration and the U.N. High Commission for Refugees, and bilaterally to European, Chinese and Tibetan refugees.

Item 21.—Public Law 480 (Agricultural Commodities) (\$1,320,400,000): P.L. 480, the "Food for Peace" program, began as a program administered by the Department of Agriculture for the sale and donation of surpluses of U.S. agricultural commodities which could not be sold on commercial markets. This program continues to support and utilize domestic farm surpluses; it also develops and expands export markets for U.S. agricultural commodities.

At the same time, it permits the United States to provide millions of hungry persons in the less developed countries with food and to contribute to their economic development on a concessional basis. It is therefore a legitimate part of the foreign aid program. The Food for Peace program serves both domestic and foreign purposes, and priorities are determined according to agricultural as well as foreign policy criteria. The \$1,320.4 million requested by the Department of Agriculture is the estimated amount necessary for appropriation to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for costs involved in the program.

Item 22.—Contributions to International Organizations (\$160,680,000): These are assessed contributions and are appropriated to the State Department primarily to help pay the U.S. share of operational costs of the United Nations and several other international bodies to which the United States belongs pursuant to treaties, conventions or specific Acts of Congress. They are not foreign aid, but dues and other costs of membership in these organizations. They should not be confused with funds appropriated under the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriation Act for voluntary contributions to international organizations, which are used mostly for development purposes and are covered by item 1.

Item 23.—Education (Foreign and Other Students) (\$51,000,000): These are educational and cultural exchange activities. The United States makes available funds—largely in foreign currencies—to send Americans abroad and bring foreign nationals to the United States for educational, scientific and cultural purposes. These funds obviously are not intended to promote "foreign assistance" objectives; rather, they are intended to strengthen relations and understanding between the United States and other nations.

Item 24.—Trust Territories of the Pacific (\$59,739,000): The Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands are those islands that the United States captured from Japan during World War II and for which the United Nations assigned administrative responsibilities to the United States. Although the inhabitants of the territory are not U.S. citizens, they travel in foreign countries under the protection of the United States in the same manner as U.S. citizens. Many U.S. domestic programs, such as the school lunch program, extend to the territory. In addition, the Department of State represents the Trust Territory in all matters pertaining to foreign affairs. Moreover, the Congress itself considers the area to be a domestic area to the extent that all legislation pertaining to the

area goes before the House and Senate Interior Committees and the Interior Subcommittees of the respective Appropriation Committees. These funds can hardly be considered foreign aid.

Item 25.—Latin America Highway (Darién Gap) (\$20,000,000): The Federal Aid to Highways Act of 1970 contained a provision authorizing \$100 million for construction of the Darién Gap Highway linking Colombia and Panama. On the basis of this authorization, an initial U.S. contribution of \$5 million was appropriated in FY 1971. The FY 1972 Department of Transportation appropriation request contains an additional \$20 million for this purpose. The Darién Gap project will provide the final link in the 14,000 mile Pan American Highway system running from Alaska to Argentina, thereby contributing to the regional economic integration in an area of major interest to the United States.

AMERICAN LEGION DAY ON THE HILL, A FITTING WAY TO CELEBRATE THE LEGION'S 53D ANNIVERSARY

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1972

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) in paying well-deserved tribute to the American Legion on its 53d anniversary.

The facts of American Legion accomplishment make impressive reading:

Membership of about 2.7 million, plus another million members of the Legion Auxiliary.

Sixteen thousand posts across the Nation and around the world.

Four hundred twenty-five thousand new members who are veterans of the Vietnam conflict.

Sponsorship of Junior Legion baseball for 46 years.

Active support for such activities as Boys' and Girls' State and Nation, high school oratorical contests, and musical and marching units.

But this array of statistics does not measure the worth and impact of the American Legion. Since its charter by the Congress in 1919, few organizations have done more to advance the principles upon which our country was founded. In effective and nonpartisan manner, the Legion has worked to strengthen the character of America's people.

One of its most important concrete achievements is reflected in the existing veterans' legislation, designed to aid returned servicemen in a variety of ways. That is what brings more than 1,000 representatives of the Legion to Washington this week, for meetings and hearings to refine and publicize their legislative aims. The Congress and the country owe a substantial debt to the Legion for its illumination of these important issues.

Mr. Speaker, the American Legion has

always defended steadfastly the principles of freedom and democracy outlined in our Constitution. It is my privilege to join today in honoring this fine organization.

BISHOP MUZOREWA ON AFRICAN OPPOSITION TO THE RHODESIAN SETTLEMENT

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, Bishop Abel Muzorewa, head of the Methodist Church in Rhodesia and chairman of the African National Council, met with me and other members especially interested in African affairs, include members of the Congressional Black Caucus, on Thursday, February 17. The African National Council is the leading voice of the Zimbabwean opposition to the settlement proposals. The Council was organized just 2 months ago on the 16th of December to coordinate the strong spontaneous rejection to the proposal. No issue in the last 10 years has so united the people of Zimbabwe as the issue of their acceptance or rejection of these proposals; the reaction of rejection was one of spontaneity and unanimity.

The visit with the Bishop, who informed us on present events in Rhodesia, was greatly enlightening on the spirit of total opposition of the Zimbabweans to the settlement. Bishop Muzorewa, who was educated in the United States and holds degrees from Central Methodist College, Fayetteville, Mo., and from Scarritt College, Nashville, Tenn., stressed that he and the 5½ million Zimbabweans have great respect for this country, but that he has been grieved and hurt by the decision of this country, which has been called the leader of freedom, to break the Security Council's sanctions against Rhodesia and that he can only hope that our Government will, in the interest of freedom in the whole world, reverse that decision.

In his meeting with us, Bishop Muzorewa reiterated his support of sanctions and the position of the Zimbabweans accepting sanctions as the price they are prepared to pay to secure their freedom. "Do not," he declared, "for a moment withhold sanctions on the pretext of helping us." He emphasized that there are ample means, if there is the will, of solving the problem of Rhodesia without shedding one drop of blood.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the moving statement which the Bishop made before the Security Council on February 16.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY BISHOP ABEL MUZOREWA TO UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1972 AT 3 P.M.

It is a great honour for myself and for the people of Zimbabwe to be invited by the three African members of the United Nations Security Council to put before you the feelings and grievances of 5½ million

suffering human beings in my country. The body I represent, the African National Council, is the only body in Rhodesia that has any right to speak for the vast majority of the population of that country.

WHAT IS THE A.N.C.

The A.N.C. was formed in December 1971 as a spontaneous grassroots reaction to the announcement of the terms of the Anglo-Rhodesian proposals. Although having a formal structure it represents the demands of African people in the country to express their view as to the terms of the Settlement. A.N.C. is not a political party and is not interested in building up a large membership as such, but is prepared to join with any person of any political party or organisation who wishes to say "No" to these proposals. A.N.C. claims to represent the overwhelming number of people in the country—who have rejected these proposals as being unacceptable to them. The objectives of the A.N.C., therefore, are to explain and expose the dangers of accepting the settlement proposals and to co-ordinate the campaign for their rejection. The A.N.C. calls for a non-violent rejection of the Settlement terms, a demand which it believes is inevitable as a conclusion for those who are engaged in testing opinion.

We are determined that history shall not record that the Africans of Rhodesia accepted the betrayal of their birth rights. We are supported in this stance by a wide spectrum of opinion in Rhodesia, including teachers, farmers, workers, students, and the churches, and indeed even some of the Chiefs have risked their positions to oppose the Anglo-Rhodesia settlement proposals together with us.

The Home/Smith deal which we have been presented with is both racist in substance and in its consequences. It is based on the illegal and racist 1969 Rhodesia Front Constitution and its claim to provide majority rule is ridiculed by constitutional experts; it is also a deliberate attempt to deceive millions of people into thinking that they might have freedom in a police state. But even if the proposals were in fact what Sir Alec Douglas Home says they are, their implementation assumes the good faith and honour of Mr. Smith and the Rhodesia Front Party. I am sure most of you here will agree with me the record provides no good reason why any sensible person should make that assumption. The history of Rhodesia is a long, sad and sordid record of betrayal and broken promises. The illegal regime of Mr. Smith is an outfit of men who have already torn up the 1961 Constitution, and now the British Government apparently in all seriousness believes that it is unreasonable that the Africans should not trust him to respect the present constitutional proposals.

The African National Council puts forward the following specific criticisms behind its rejection of the settlement proposals embodied in the document Annex 1 entitled "Why the ANC says NO to the Settlement Proposals".

WHY THE A.N.C. REJECTS THE PROPOSALS

Both before and after U.D.I. the British Government has carried on a dialogue with the Rhodesian authorities to the complete exclusion of the recognised African leaders. The basic demand of the A.N.C. is that no settlement of the Rhodesian problem can be achieved without the active participation by the African people, through the leaders of their choice, in the actual process of negotiation leading to any settlement to be approved by them. The A.N.C. accordingly rejects these proposals which have been arrived at without consultation with the people of Rhodesia. Further, the A.N.C. believes that after the cynical disregard for law rep-

resented by U.D.I., the 1969 so-called "Republican Constitution" is a high-water mark in such lawlessness and can never be made the basis for any settlement. The A.N.C., on behalf of overwhelming majority of people in Rhodesia, cannot in any circumstances accept a settlement whose result, directly or indirectly, is the legalisation of U.D.I. and the Republican Constitution. The A.N.C. believes that the present proposals do not amount to any significant amendment of the 1969 Constitution. Unlike previous occasions when the fate of the country was being considered, the African people can at least say "No" to these proposals and attempt to block them, even though they have not been consulted during the stages of their negotiation. This is the first and last chance for the African people to pass a verdict on white minority rule. To our mind they are a constitutional fraud, a prescription for increased racial bitterness, the making of an inevitable bloodbath and an insult to the dignity of every African in Rhodesia. The proposals, contrary to some arguments do not decolonise Rhodesia; rather, they "recolonise" the country, and to ensure the success of this dangerous and dishonourable venture the British Government seems prepared to subsidise it. Our rejection of these proposals is therefore unanimous.

Despite all the intimidation of the African people by their employers, the Government, the police, the District Commissioners and the British Government, they have been unanimous in their rejection of the Anglo-Rhodesian Settlement Proposals. The world has been told by the Smith regime that only four people, the Todds and the Chinamanos, have been detained and only 14 people were killed since the arrival of the Pearce Commission in Rhodesia. But the information available to the A.N.C. is that 31 people were killed by the police in Gwelo, Salisbury, Umtali and Shabani following the disturbances that took place during the first week of the work of the Pearce Commission and that 250 were detained and 1,000 were arrested—those that stood up for their dignity in rejecting the Proposals.

A. The A.N.C. calls upon the Security Council to press the U.K. Government to honour the principles of U.N. Resolution 1514 of the 14th of December, 1960 on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples which principally declares that "the subjection of the peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation."

B. The A.N.C. requests the U.N. to accept the African expression of "No" to the Anglo-Rhodesian Settlement proposals as a genuine reflection of the 5½ million Africans who, despite intimidation, have expressed their political attitude against racialism of the Smith regime backed by the British Government.

NONRECOGNITION

The A.N.C. is suspicious that the British Government is going to find an excuse to implement the most unacceptable proposals by blaming it on "African intimidation."

Already their Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary, Sir Alec Douglas Home, has indicated that this is the last chance and there will be no other constitutional conferences even if the answer is an overwhelming "No." Now one wonders why the Commission was ever sent to test the acceptability of the Settlement Proposals if the only desirable answer was "Yes". With this in mind, the African people are already preparing themselves for a long confrontation with the racist regime and therefore calls upon the international community not to recognize the imposed independence by the British

Government. We realize that the British Government is desperate to get rid of the problem, to trade with Rhodesia, to give the regime international respectability, and most important, to open channels of investment in Rhodesia. This is most unacceptable to the Africans. We, therefore, call upon the Security Council not to change its present attitude which forbids member states from having economical or diplomatic relations with the Smith regime. We know, too, that in order for the sanctions to be withdrawn the Security Council must give its consent and that the General Assembly should accept Rhodesia as one of its members. We are totally opposed to this and we can only accept a situation where Rhodesia becomes a member of the U.N. following a government elected under "one man, one vote".

ECONOMIC SANCTIONS

Even in spite of violations there is no question of the effectiveness of sanctions, hence the Smith regime's desire for settlement. The economy is gradually grinding to a halt due to the lack of foreign currency, necessary capital for the advancement of the economy and the lack of machinery and vehicular spare parts used in the Army, Airforce, railways and industrial sectors.

The Africans accept sanctions as a price for their freedom and declare as our enemy any person who claims on our behalf that sanctions should be withdrawn to alleviate African suffering through lack of employment. In fact, sanctions were never designed to hit Africans and indeed this has been the effect because it is the farmers, the miners and importers and exporters that have suffered as a result of sanctions. None of these is African.

The A.N.C. calls upon the Security Council and the states who supported the cause for human freedom to intensify sanctions by fully blockading Beira and Lourenco Marques under Chapter 7 of the United Nations Charter for all goods that are exported or imported into Rhodesia. Without the facilities offered by the Portuguese through these ports, the Smith regime would have long collapsed.

It is our determination to see racism eradicated, and this can be achieved only by getting rid of the present regime in Salisbury. The A.N.C. hopes that the U.N. now recognizes that Britain has defaulted on its responsibility to promote majority rule in Rhodesia because its policies in southern Africa are influenced by racial considerations, and this explains why she has not been able to stand to the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter. The African people of Rhodesia have been deeply shocked by the blatant disregard for the U.N. Charter, for human suffering in Rhodesia and for international law by the United States in violating the Security Council Resolution which imposed sanctions on Rhodesia. The purchase of chrome by the United States, in my opinion, had no other motives apart from encouraging and boosting the morale of the racist regime in order to make it defy the world. I was wondering whether it is not time someone investigated to establish whether or not the United States violated the law. If it did, it is time someone brought the United States before the International Court of Justice. Whatever the motives, the Africans believe it is an expression of bad faith.

ASYLUM FOR REFUGEES

All along the British Government has been claiming an international prerogative to look after Africans who are victims of the regime, who escaped either from detention or police surveillance. But what we have seen is that many of these victims have been ignored, sometimes deported from country to country and, in other countries, sent home to face persecution by the police. I call upon the Security Council to confer proper interna-

tional refugee status for the refugees and the granting of asylum to those who find it necessary to leave their territory. This is going to alleviate the suffering which the African people of Rhodesia have put up with during the last six years since UDI.

IMMIGRATION

Africans in Rhodesia have been extremely surprised to see streams of Europeans continuing to come to Rhodesia displacing them from their land and their jobs despite the Security Council Resolution of May, 1968 which explicitly calls upon the member states not to allow their citizens to migrate to Rhodesia. I hope that from now on member states will do their best to stop these immigrants who continue to prop the racist regime in Rhodesia.

SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEM

When we asked for freedom we are in no way saying that the settlers should be expelled from our country. On the contrary, we are seeking for a peaceful and just means of racial co-existence in order to avoid the impending bloodshed. We call upon the British Government to assist those white people who do not want to live under majority rule to leave the various parts of the world where there are white governments, and in this we are prepared to pay the price of the repatriation, as was the case in Kenya. The sum of 50 million pounds, which the British Government believes they were generously giving us, could best be used in repatriation of those that would like to leave the country. We are aware that over 140,000 whites out of a total of 243,000 still hold British citizenship and only 35,000 have no other home, while the rest came from various European and Commonwealth countries. It is, therefore, clear to us that African life is being made impossible by foreign citizens. We call upon the member states of the United Nations, the World Bank, the Commonwealth Development Corporation and other international organizations to participate in this scheme, in solving the problem as they did in Kenya in 1962-63. We are prepared to sit down and frame a constitution acceptable to us as a whole with those white people who accept non-racism which is brought by majority rule.

POSTMASTER BENUCCI NAMED TO POST

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, my dear friend, former district secretary and the present postmaster of Newark, N.J., the Honorable Joseph J. Benucci, has recently been named acting manager for the Newark Sectional Center of the Postal Service. His new role is described in the following editorial of the Newark Star Ledger. I share the sentiments expressed in the editorial that "he can be relied upon" and I wish Joe much success and my warm congratulations upon his new assignment which was earned by his able and effective leadership and administration:

JOURNEY BY MAIL

Anyone who has checked recently on his mail delivery needs no reminder that service has not improved with the creation of the U.S. Postal Service.

It's taking as long or longer for a first-class letter to reach New Jersey cities from out of town mail boxes.

The promised speed and improved efficiency that were to come with the restructuring of the Post Office Department into an independent, government-owned corporation have failed to materialize.

The only noticeable difference is that it now costs one-third more to mail a first-class letter.

If anyone can bring about improvements it's Newark Postmaster Joseph J. Benucci. Since 1962 he has done much, against great odds, to speed delivery and expedite the handling of outgoing mail.

Benucci has now been named acting manager for the Newark Sectional Center of the postal service. The center is made up of 59 associate offices in Essex, Hudson, Union and parts of Bergen and Middlesex counties.

His job will be to coordinate mail processing operations, customer services, training, transportation and other management operations. He has set his sights on better service, and he can be relied upon to do everything possible to deliver . . . quickly.

ASSOCIATIONS FOR MILITARY COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS STRENGTHENED BY MERGER

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the military colleges and schools in America have taken a very important step to preserve and advance this very vital and traditional academic institution.

It is an honor to announce to you, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues in Congress, the merger of the two national associations representing the educational institutions which offer a program of military training. As a result of their simultaneous annual conventions recently held in Washington, D.C., the Association of Military Colleges and Schools founded in 1914, and the National Association of Military Schools founded in 1950, have combined into the Association of Military Colleges and Schools of the United States—AMCS. Several points of contention between the two associations concerning the qualifications of member institutions have been settled, and the new expanded and strengthened AMCS will now represent virtually all of the major military schools in America.

I am confident this merger will offer a better service to the member institutions, as well as provide a more efficient and extensive clearinghouse of information for those young Americans seeking an education which includes a military program designed to assist them in preparing for a military career. Most importantly, this new and expanded association will enhance the image of military schools and broaden the understanding of their function.

It is a personal honor to also announce, Mr. Speaker, that my friend, and our former colleague, Mr. J. T. Rutherford, will serve as the executive director for the new AMCS. It is gratifying to know that this able and dedicated man will provide the direction and administration for this very important association.

I have had the opportunity to attend several national meetings of the AMCS and I have been greatly impressed with their concern and commitment to establish a curriculum of the highest academic excellence. Combined with this academic excellence, the very nature of military training provides a student with an experience in leadership and personal character development which will stand him in good stead for the rest of his life. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the military schools in this country are providing not only a great service to the young men and women attending them, but they are providing a valuable pool of talent from which America will draw its future leadership and direction.

In these times of great controversy over America's military posture in the world, it is commonly believed that the youth of America have turned their backs on the military. This is not true. Despite the present economic situation in America, which would lead us to believe that a privately financed education would be on the decline, the private institutions offering an education combined with military training, as well as those public schools and colleges with military training programs, report a renewed interest in their schools and an increase in their enrollments. If indeed there was an antimilitary spirit in the American youth and their parents, the tide has turned.

My interest in, and support of, military schools and colleges is more than academic. I am certain that my years as a student at Texas A. & M. University in College Station, Tex., provided me with the motivation to become a public servant and to serve in this great body of legislators. It is a great privilege to now represent the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Texas which includes my alma mater, Texas A. & M., and also Allen Academy in Bryan, Tex., another outstanding school combining a military training program with an excellent record of academic instruction. Both of these schools are member institutions of the newly expanded AMCS.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to speak in behalf of the military educational institutions in America and their now strengthened national association, The Association of Military Colleges and Schools of the United States. I call on you, and each of my fellow Members of Congress, to take an active interest in these colleges and schools and support them in their efforts to provide this valuable service to America.

As an extension of my remarks, I include a press release from the AMCS concerning the recent merger:

ASSOCIATIONS FOR MILITARY SCHOOLS MERGE
WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Association of Military Colleges and Schools (AMCS) and the National Association of Military Schools (NAMS) announced a merger of the two organizations following their simultaneous annual conventions held in Washington, D.C.

The merged organization will retain the name of the older association, The Association of Military Colleges and Schools of the United States (AMCS) which was founded in 1914. The AMCS brings 30 member institutions to the merger, while the younger NAMS organization has 24 member institutions. AMCS now represents 54 military educa-

tional institutions in 23 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

"The new revitalized AMCS will strengthen the association and its members, as well as provide a greater service for young Americans seeking an education at a military school," said Col. Charles Stribling III, the newly elected national president of AMCS. Col. Stribling is the President of the Missouri Military Academy in Mexico, Missouri.

According to J. T. Rutherford, Executive Director of AMCS, a merger of the two associations has been in the talking stage for the past several years. A merger has been rejected in the past because qualifications for membership were different in the two associations and never settled. The agreement to hold simultaneous annual conferences in Washington allowed negotiations which resulted in the merger.

Member institutions in the new AMCS are required to meet two basic qualifications. They must be accredited by a state or regional accreditation board, and they must have a military training program approved by the Department of Defense. Member institutions not presently meeting these qualifications have a probation period of five years to receive academic accreditation, and three years to establish a Department of Defense approved program of military instruction.

Officers of the new AMCS elected at the Washington conference were: President—Col. Charles Stribling III, President of Missouri Military Academy; Vice President—Col. Keith G. Duckers, Superintendent of St. Johns Military School; Secretary—Col. Raymond R. Kelly, Superintendent of Howe Military School; Treasurer—Col. A. F. Muzyk, Superintendent of St. Johns College High School.

In addition to the elected officers, the following representatives of member institutions will serve on the executive committee: Col. Wesley P. Smith, President of Lyman Ward Military Academy and immediate past President of NAMS; Col. Ralph A. Lucas, Superintendent of Castle Heights Military Academy and immediate past President of AMCS; Col. Arvin S. Williams, President of Randolph-Macon Academy; M/Gen. James W. Duckett, President of The Citadel; Col. L. P. Risher, Headmaster of Camden Military Academy; and Capt. Raven O. Dodge, Headmaster of Admiral Farragut Academy.

The AMCS will be based in Washington, D.C. at 1660 L Street, N.W.

LIGHT ON CRIME

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, my correspondence and discussions with constituents reflect the growing concern with the menace of street crime. I have attempted to make practical proposals to deter what has become an intolerable situation in New York City. My blow the whistle on crime campaign and my bill to relieve our local police of the responsibility to guard foreign missions are two of these recommendations with which you are perhaps familiar.

On March 1, I introduced a bill, H.R. 13522, to establish a Federal light on crime program. This legislation would mandate the expenditure of \$30 million in each of the next 3 years specifically for the purchase and installation of high pressure sodium type lights. The funds would come in grants made directly to

local governments and would be matched on a 50-50 basis by the locality.

High pressure sodium lights are able to illuminate a city street far better than our traditional street lighting. They, in a sense, turn night into day and their effectiveness as a deterrent against crime is undeniable.

In Washington, D.C., after installation of high-level lighting in high crime areas, crime decreased by 31 percent. Prior to installation, the crime rate for these same areas had gone up 12 percent.

Gary, Ind., installed 5,000 new street lights. Criminal assaults dropped 70 percent and robberies 60 percent.

In Chattanooga, Tenn., crime in a 12 block area dropped 70 percent after lighting.

Statistics are available for many more cities including some parts of New York City. It is simply outrageous that we are forced to feel like prisoners in our own homes after dark; given the potential impact of a light on crime program, it is not only outrageous but unnecessary. This program I am proposing involves relatively low costs, and can have an immediate impact on reducing street crime. This is a program designed to light our streets for people rather than just for cars; it is a program designed to return the streets to the people.

New York City and other localities have initiated their own, successful high level lighting plans on a limited scale, combining private and local government funding. Some such light illuminates parts of our own East Side even now. But in a time of budgetary crisis in local government, it is clear that the Federal Government should provide funding for high intensity lighting. An infusion of Federal funds would allow the type of massive lighting program which I believe we need in our urban areas, and which localities can never finance alone. Rather than having only individual blocks sporadically lighted, Federal funding could conceivably insure that whole communities would be illuminated, to the benefit of residents and merchants alike.

I hope that the Congress will give prompt consideration to H.R. 13522. We must do what we can to move the country to the day when we can all "see the light" and end the terror in our streets.

MASSIVE BUSING: A WASTE

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, as the issue of busing has come to the forefront of attention in this country, black and white Americans have been pointing out in no uncertain terms that busing schemes are wasteful and counterproductive. Not only does racial busing destroy the concept of the neighborhood school, it wastes funds which could be better used to improve the quality of education. It sacrifices quality education in

favor of the establishment of artificial quotas of pupils.

Instead of insuring equality, massive busing falsely reinforces in the minds of children the idea that whites are somehow superior to blacks. In a recent Washington Post column about racial busing, black columnist William Raspberry wrote:

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

I certainly agree. The column, entitled "Massive Busing: A Waste," presents a cogent argument against racial busing—though I must add that I do not accept Mr. Raspberry's arguments against a Constitutional amendment to end racial busing—and I insert the column into the RECORD:

MASSIVE BUSING: A WASTE

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

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

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

Others are talking up constitutional amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

They would like to put us all into that metaphorical melting pot and ladle out

enough portions of homogenized American to fill every schoolroom, workroom and living room in the country.

Well, what's so ideal about mathematically precise distribution of human beings? What's so inherently evil about a block in which all the homeowners (or a classroom in which all the pupils) happen to be black? Or white?

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

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

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

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

The Vice President was right again when he said:

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

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

HORTON PAYS TRIBUTE TO FLORA LARUE ON 82D BIRTHDAY

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, too often we in Congress are prone to generalize about America's elderly citizens, about their problems, their hopes, and their important role in our culture. I think, once in a while, it is important to look at the individual to gain an insight into the human side of America's elderly.

There is a remarkable and refreshing woman in my congressional district who has just celebrated her 82d birthday. Since she has done so much for me, countless other individuals, her community and her Nation, I would like to pay special tribute to her today.

Flora LaRue was introduced to me several years ago and, at the time of this introduction, it was mentioned that it would be difficult to find anyone who had contributed more in service to fellow Americans. Her devotion to the church and community activities are evidenced in Flora's love for people through her teaching, the many hours spent in civic work, her official duties as conference officer in Central New York's Women's Conference Organization and Flora's dedication to her local political organization.

Flora is perhaps one of the most inspiring people I have ever met. She radiates a warmth and sincerity which is

heartwarming in today's fast moving "can't take the time for that" world. Her life has seen countless joys and sorrows and Flora has acknowledged each of these as a blessing to her life which she is eager to pass on to others. Her story has been told and her example has been cited many times through those who are fortunate enough to know her. This story is again revealed through the newspaper articles which follow:

NEARLY 100 GUESTS HONOR MRS. FLORA LARUE

Nearly 100 guests greeted Mrs. Flora LaRue in her home, 126 Washington Street, on Sunday, Jan. 30, 1972 at an open house in honor of her 82nd birthday.

Her daughter, Mrs. Jerome Lillyquist, assisted by Mrs. Irene Cutter, Mrs. Clarence Nesbitt, Miss Mary Ella Fraher, Mrs. Douglas Wehrlin and Mrs. Lewis Black, greeted the guests and presided over the tea table.

Best wishes and appreciation were extended to this remarkable woman for her activities during the years in the First United Methodist Church and in the local community, in her official duties as conference officer in the Central New York Women's Division of the Church, teaching in summer youth camps and participation in local political organizations.

Following graduation from high school, Mrs. LaRue was graduated from Teacher's Training Class after which she taught 4 years in District School No. 1, Town of Manchester.

Last summer her pupils in the local community and those who came north for the summer planned a reunion for her in Perkins Park, Newark.

Former students unsolicitedly expressed their sincere appreciation for the little devotions which they had together at the beginning of each school day and the effect it had on their lives during the years.

Mrs. LaRue is active in her home duties using her wheel chair mornings and her walker in the afternoons to assist in the use of her prosthesis.

Mrs. LaRue has been well known and highly esteemed in her community for many years. Last Sunday her many friends took the occasion of her birthday to pay tribute to her.

FRIENDS PAY TRIBUTE TO FLORA LARUE (By Ethel Mae)

Mrs. Flora LaRue of 126 Washington St., Palmyra, well known and highly esteemed in her community for many years, was greeted at an Open House in her home by approximately 100 guests on Sunday afternoon, January 30, 1972, on the occasion of her 82nd birthday.

When I met with Mrs. LaRue on Monday afternoon I came away inspired and in awe of this gracious and remarkable lady. Her warmth is reflected in her lovely home and one immediately feels drawn to her—and welcome.

Is I returned home to write about our visit I thought about her name, "Flora," which means "flower," and how appropriate a name it is! Indeed she is as beautiful, refreshing, colorful and individual as any flower I have ever seen.

Mrs. LaRue's activities were curtailed only temporarily since the amputation of her right leg some time ago. Her mornings are spent in a wheel chair and she "graduates" to her walker in the afternoons to assist in the use of the prosthesis (artificial limb). With these aids she is still able to do her own housework, cooking, etc., and she gave me a demonstration on how she can still bake a pie!

She was born in Manchester, N.Y. and after high school was graduated from Teacher Training Class. Four years were spent teaching in District School No. 1. (Although she has many pleasant memories, her fondest

includes a special day last summer when several of her former pupils who live in this area, along with several who had come north for the summer, held a reunion in her honor at Perkin's Park in Newark.

Many expressed their sincere appreciation for the devotion they had together at the beginning of each school day and the effect it has had on their lives over the years.

Her late husband, Alvin LaRue, was a contractor and real estate broker and after his death Mrs. LaRue followed in his footsteps selling real estate in association with Dennis Cook of Fayette St., Palmyra.

Mrs. LaRue is admired and respected for her service to her beloved United Methodist Church; civic work in her community; her official duties as conference officer in Central New York's Women's Conference Organization; teaching in summer youth camps; and devotion to her local political organization.

Another favorite pastime was giving a helping hand to her late son-in-law, Jerome Lillyquist, in his jewelry store on Palmyra's Main St.

Her daughter, Mrs. Jerome (Arlene) Lillyquist is a teacher in the Palmyra-Macedon Central School. Mrs. LaRue's grandsons, Michael and Timothy, reside in Tucson, Ariz., and Boston, Mass., respectively, and her two great grandchildren are Michael's sons.

Assisting her daughter, Arlene, in greeting guests at Open House on Sunday were dear friends, Mrs. Irene Cutter, Mrs. Clarence Nesbitt, Miss Mary Ellen Fraher, Mrs. Douglas Wehrin and Mrs. Lewis Black, all of whom also presided at the tea table.

Mrs. LaRue enjoys having her friends drop in for a visit—anytime—but beware! If you have a preconceived notion that you might drop in to brighten her day I'm sure you'll find—as I did—that she will brighten yours!

H.R. 9615 SHOULD BE REPORTED TO HOUSE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee has had before it since September of last year, H.R. 9615, which would correct certain inequities in the immigration laws of this country. This bill has been delayed far too long and should be reported out immediately.

While it took the Rules Committee 4 months to schedule its first hearing on this bill, all the blame cannot rest with that Committee. They subsequently scheduled hearings on January 20 and 27 and again on February 22.

While the bill does not go far enough for certain countries, such as Greece, it would clear up most of the backlog in the fifth and sixth preference categories and at the same time eliminate inequities in the law that have produced a disadvantageous situation for formerly privileged countries of northern Europe.

I urge both the Rules Committee and the Judiciary Committee to work together to report this bill to the full House membership at an early date. To assist my colleagues in understanding the need for this bill, I am including in the RECORD an excellent evaluation of the bill by the American Committee on Italian Migration:

H.R. 9615: ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION WHAT IT CONTAINS

Immigrants from previously undersubscribed countries, e.g., Ireland, England, etc., would be allocated additional visas to the extent of 75%, less the numbers issued during the previous fiscal year, of the average number of visas available to these countries in the ten-year period 1955 to 1965. The visa numbers to be issued shall not exceed 7,500 for any such foreign state. Labor Certification does not apply in reference to any such visas issued.

Furthermore, H.R. 9615 carries a section providing for the issuance of special immigrant visas for brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens, from any country whose registrations were pending on July 1, 1964, who qualify as fifth preference immigrants under Section 203(a) (5) of the Immigration Act of 1965 and for whom petitions have been filed with the Attorney General prior to July 1, 1971; a number equal to 25% of the number of these pending registrations shall be allocated and distributed over a four-year period to any such country. Special immigrant visas not used by the fifth preference described above shall drop down into the sixth preference category.

The bill is limited to a four-year period, during which time the additional numbers would be distributed.

WHY THIS BILL

a. To alleviate a situation of distress experienced under the new law by the formerly privileged countries.

According to the formula devised, the following countries would benefit by an additional total of 32,887 visas:

Germany	7,500
Great Britain	7,500
Ireland	4,096
Poland	2,970
U.S.S.R.	1,562
Norway	1,461
Netherlands	1,379
Sweden	1,232
Czechoslovakia	1,017

b. To eliminate the backlog created under the Walter-McCarran Act of 1952. According to the formula devised, the following countries would benefit by an additional total of 39,764 visas:

Italy	28,680
Greece	2,166
Poland	1,922
Portugal	1,897
China	1,405

EVALUATION

We feel this bill is fair. The new law has unwittingly produced a situation of disadvantage for formerly privileged countries. When the 1965 Act was first formulated, a five-year phase-out period was contemplated in order to give the privileged countries a realistic opportunity to adjust to the new system. The phase-out period, instead, was reduced to two and one-half years. As a consequence, immigration from Ireland, for instance, has dwindled from an average of 5,000 before 1965 to little more than 1,000 at present.

On the other hand, the three-year phase-out period was also not sufficient to clear existing backlogs as it was intended.

This bill seeks to eliminate the remaining inequities in the present law.

We feel this bill is also realistic. The total number of additional visas is 72,531. A temporary annual increase over four years of 18,000 immigrants, only half of whom will enter the labor force, can hardly be conceived of as a hardship on our economy.

IMPACT ON U.S. EMPLOYMENT SITUATION

Any proposed increase in the current labor market through immigration is greeted with

categorical opposition by some spokesmen for organized labor. Though understandable, the fears expressed by these exponents are completely unfounded. The total number of immigrants, over and above present limitations which could be admitted in any one year is 18,000. It must be pointed out that this number includes spouses and minor children of the principal applicants. Therefore, a conservative estimate of the actual number of immigrants who will enter the labor market is approximately 9,000. In a total labor force of 86 million an increase of 9,000 workers—many of whom will fill jobs left begging by local manpower—can hardly be considered to threaten either the economic stability of the United States or the job security of the American worker.

OBJECTIONS RAISED

a. This bill is a return to national origins. It should rather be considered as a facilitation for the formerly privileged countries to become adjusted to the new system of selecting our future immigrants.

b. This bill perpetuates a system of piecemeal legislation.

It rather corrects once and for all the inequities of discrimination which under the old law created the need for emergency legislation.

NOTES

1. The Dennis Amendment

In the course of the Congressional iter thus far, H.R. 9615 has met with opposition in the form of an amendment offered by Rep. David W. Dennis (R-Ind.) which sought to change the permanent immigration law by eliminating from the 5th preference the category of "married" brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens. The rationale behind this amendment is the contention that the 5th preference would otherwise be perpetually oversubscribed.

It is our opinion that such an amendment is completely unwarranted. H.R. 9615 is an emergency bill seeking to solve limited areas of concern; the proposed amendment, instead, brings about a substantial change in the permanent law.

Furthermore, the fear of the recurrence of backlogs is completely unjustified by the evidence available. At present in the Eastern Hemisphere only Italy and the Philippines have a backlog in the fifth preference. The Philippine problem stems from the fact that all 20,000 numbers are pre-empted by the first three preferences. The Italian problem is caused by the huge backlog existing when the new law went into effect. (It must be recalled that this backlog was accumulated over years of discrimination under the 1952 Act.) The new registrations under 5th preference are in balance with the numbers available, as can be proven with the 1970 figures:

1970 fifth preference registrations

Country:	
Philippines	10,975
Italy	8,745
Greece	8,185
Portugal	5,929
China	4,404
Yugoslavia	1,150
Great Britain	1,140

2. More on the Italian backlog

According to the Visa Office of the State Dept. the total Italian fifth preference registration as of July 1, 1971, is 86,054. The same office advises that 64,000 of these have been reached by the American Consulates as of January 25, 1972. On that date, in fact, the cut-off date for Italian 5th preference was March 1, 1970. The "live" Italian backlog, therefore, is about 22,000. The difference between the figure 86,054 (the backlog on the books) and the figure of 22,000 is the mortality rate. The reasons behind it are various, but irrelevant to this discussion. The realistic

backlog we are to contend with is 22,000, and H.R. 9615 is more than adequate to bring up to date the Italian fifth preference and to grant some numbers also to the Italian sixth preference which has been closed for years.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The bill H.R. 9615 is fair and realistic.
2. The Dennis Amendment is unwarranted, unwise and detrimental, and therefore totally unacceptable.
3. H.R. 9615 should be enacted as introduced and *without any amendments*.

ITT CASE SHOWS HOW THINGS GET DONE FOR BIG BUSINESS IN WASHINGTON

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Miss Mary McGrory in a recent column in the Washington Star, makes some very timely and interesting observations concerning the current controversy over a gift by International Telephone & Telegraph to the Republican Party.

Miss McGrory evidences justifiable concern over the influence of big business on the executive branch of our Government—even on the Justice Department which, under the law, is charged with the responsibility of defending the people of this Nation against exploitation by antitrust law violations, massive trusts, conglomerates, and mergers, in the public interest.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this matter, I place the column by Miss McGrory in the RECORD herewith.

The column follows:

THE ITT CASE SHOWS HOW THINGS GET DONE (By Mary McGrory)

"Kleindienst" in German means "little service."

It is, of course, the name of the attorney general-designate, who is accused of having rendered a large service to a giant corporation that had some trouble with the Justice Department and, even so, made a handsome present to the Republican National Convention in San Diego.

The question is whether International Telephone & Telegraph gave the Republican \$400,000 or \$100,000—the figure is in dispute—out of hope or gratitude.

Richard Kleindienst asked to meet with the Senate Judiciary Committee, which just a week ago had unanimously approved him to become what Richard Nixon gratingly calls, "the president's lawyer."

Half the town turned out for the show yesterday. Hearings have gone out of style and this one gave off long-denied vapors of scandal at the top.

Columnist Jack Anderson, who originated the charges of Kleindienst's "tilt" towards ITT, sat in the front row, spoiling to finish him off. His big weapon: A secret memo from a lady-lobbyist for ITT, who dropped all the big names that led to the White House and the President.

What transpired during the long day was a heady glimpse of how things get done in Washington between the biggies of government and business.

There was also a picture of the altruistic corporation preoccupied with the "economic statesmanship" now being peddled in the business magazines. They think not of them-

selves, when caught in the toils of antitrust, we are told, but of their stockholders, the "ripple effect" on the economy, the adverse impact on the balance of payments.

And there was also a new view of Kleindienst, the hardliner out of the far right, the ogre to peace groups that have pleaded in vain for parade permits and never got an audience for the "ripple effects" of their enterprise.

Kleindienst has an angry face and a truculent manner, but not for Felix Rohatyn, an international financial wizard and a director of ITT.

Kleindienst, who had never heard of Rohatyn, granted him an interview on request. He had four subsequent meetings with him. He was "impressed" with his recital of the "ripple effects" that would follow the "harsh and rigid" settlement proposed by Richard McLaren, then chief of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division.

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, the champion of the Mayday tribes whom Kleindienst caused to be jailed by the thousands, elicited from the attorney general-designate the fact that the meeting was not, after all, completely out of the blue.

Kleindienst bore Kennedy's questioning with unconcealed resentment and impatience, but was to change his tune somewhat. Kennedy asked him about a man named Ryan. Kleindienst dismissed him as a "casual social acquaintance," a neighbor in suburban McLean, Va., whom he sometimes saw at neighborhood Christmas parties.

But he came back 15 minutes later, his recollection refreshed, and said that Ryan at a springtime gathering may have asked him to see "someone in the company" who could explain the "domestic consequences" of the antitrust action.

Kennedy told the hearing after lunch that Ryan was John Ryan, deputy director of the ITT Washington office.

Why, some of the Democratic senators inquired, had Kleindienst seen Rohatyn at all? He had told Democratic National Chairman Lawrence O'Brien in a letter that he had never been involved in the ITT negotiations.

They were not negotiations, Kleindienst said, and as an "officer of the government" he had been merely doing his duty.

He had arranged and sat in on a meeting with Richard McLaren and Treasury officials. The outside financial economic expert was provided by the White House, "probably Peter Flanagan."

The mention of that name, notoriously solicitous of the boardroom, caused a titter in the hearing room.

McLaren seemed authentically pained that the settlement was being disparaged. He saw it as "stopping a juggernaut." Rohatyn called it "the largest divestment in the history of world enterprise."

The oddest part about the whole affair is that the settlement might have turned out as it did even without Kleindienst's intervention. McLaren has the reputation of being the toughest antitrust chief of recent history, far more zealous than any Kennedy or Johnson appointee. He has since been made a federal judge, a circumstance that does not greatly aid in the appearance of things.

Sen. Philip A. Hart, D. Mich., observed sadly that 90 percent of the people who read the story would not believe it.

"It is another chapter in the history of why people lack faith in the system," he told Kleindienst, who has perfect faith in the system and does not trouble himself about the way things look. He expects the Democrats not to believe him when he says that the settlement and the largesse "have 100 percent nothing to do with Republican party politics." He is not concerned with "ripple effects" of the revelations, and he expects to be confirmed as attorney general.

HON. ANDREW P. MILLER SPEAKS ON PROPOSED CRIMINAL CODE

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Andrew P. Miller, attorney general of the Commonwealth of Virginia, recently appeared before Senator McClellan's Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures in connection with the proposed Federal criminal code.

I feel the presentation by Virginia's attorney general is outstanding, and I would like to share the text of his testimony with my colleagues.

I am pleased to insert this statement by the Honorable Andrew P. Miller in the RECORD for the benefit of all Members:

STATEMENT OF TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE ANDREW P. MILLER, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA

On January 7, 1971, the National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws submitted to the President and Congress its final report on a proposed new federal criminal Code which would, if enacted, replace the existing criminal laws found in Title 18 of the United States Code. The proposed Code would, I feel, do significantly more than merely revise the existing laws. It would in effect substantially restructure intergovernmental relations.

My first comment is with regard to the basic jurisdictional section for all offenses committed under the code. Although I am told that the intent of the Code Commission was not to increase but to merely re-define the limits of federal jurisdiction, I cannot help but feel that the effect of § 201(b) may run counter to that intent. Under this "piggyback jurisdiction" section, many crimes which have previously been exclusively the province of state law enforcement will be brought under the federal umbrella. The benefit of this section is said to be that it permits lesser penalties for non-serious crimes which can be graded as misdemeanors, leaving the piggy-back base for aggravating the penalty when such conduct is a means of committing a more serious offense. I note that the wording of § 201(b) apparently would not require the government to prosecute for the lesser crime, but would allow federal authorities to go directly to the major crime simply by showing that federal jurisdiction existed for the lesser one. As a practical matter, in view of the liberality of the sentencing provisions, which are relatively lenient and provide primarily for concurrent sentences, this consideration would be of little significance. In any event, the operation of this section will bring innumerable offenses within federal jurisdiction.

This assumption is of additional significance to Virginia and all of the States due to the operation of the concurrent jurisdiction provisions (§§ 707-708). While the code does provide that federal jurisdiction is not preemptive or exclusive, federal prosecution is an absolute bar to state prosecution, while state prosecution is a bar to federal prosecution unless the Attorney General of the United States certifies that the interests of the United States would be unduly harmed if federal prosecution were barred. Such a federally imposed prohibition on state prosecutions may be unconstitutional, and in any event will certainly be damaging to relations between state and federal governments. Although this provision may be of little current effect in Virginia in view of § 19.1-259 of the Code of Virginia which

provides that a federal prosecution is a bar to prosecution in Virginia, the General Assembly which enacted § 19.1-259 doubtless did not foresee the type of expansion of federal jurisdiction which is made possible by this Code. Even if § 19.1-259 were not amended, these sections may result in a race to the courthouse between state and federal law enforcement officials, except that if the federal officials lose the race, they can still disqualify the winner.

Section 201(g) provides a jurisdictional base which I believe could create the same broad opportunity for the expansion of federal jurisdiction as § 201(b), although it does not now appear as a base for as many offenses as does § 201(b). For example, any homicide could be said to interfere with the victim's right to travel, thereby "affecting" interstate commerce. Section 201(i) appears to provide that the mere fact that an item of property happens, at the time it is stolen or destroyed, to be on a truck or a railroad car which may later cross a state line should give rise to federal jurisdiction, regardless of whether the item itself would still have been aboard. Like § 201(g), this section is susceptible of too broad an interpretation. Any justifiable purpose of these two sections in honoring established concepts of federal jurisdiction over interstate traffic is amply covered by the provisions of §§ 201 (h) and (j). Similarly, § 201(h) could serve its purpose by providing for jurisdiction only where the victim or defendant crosses a state line, thereby eliminating the possibility of federal jurisdiction where the only connection with interstate travel might be a person who is an unwitting agent of the defendant.

In addition to my objection to these jurisdictional bases, I note that the last sentence of § 201 provides for plenary federal jurisdiction where no base is specified for a given offense. Although it appears that the reason for this is to avoid the necessity of defining jurisdiction over clearly Federal crimes such as those defined in Chapters 11, 12, and 14, this provision opens the door for future expansion of plenary jurisdiction over other crimes as was done by the 1970 Drug Act (whose plenary jurisdiction over drug offenses is found in the proposed Code).

Another jurisdictional provision which is of special importance to the citizens of Virginia is § 209 which deals with assimilated offenses. This section, of course, provides that conduct which occurs on a federal enclave is a federal offense if it would be a state offense in the state where the enclave is located, and there is no federal law penalizing such conduct. Since Virginia has a substantial number of naval installations, army and air force bases, and other federal enclaves all along the metropolitan corridor from Washington to the Tidewater area, this provision is of concern to Virginia because it further provides that the maximum penalty for such offenses is a misdemeanor. As the Commission's comment indicates, such offenses as bigamy, incest, and illegal abortion are felonies in Virginia, and the reduction of these and other offenses to misdemeanor status can only have the effect of creating sanctuaries from state laws. The Commission admittedly sought to minimize this possibility, but I cannot agree that the misdemeanor penalty provides sufficient deterrence, and I see no reason why the felony penalty could not be assimilated as well.

At this point may I say that I believe several features of the Code are good ones. The grading technique, for example, may as a valuable byproduct generate a new respect for the criminal law by eliminating one of the oldest complaints voiced by the public especially and convicted criminals in particular: the wide variations in sentencing and punishment for different persons in different jurisdictions, or in the same jurisdiction, who are charged with and convicted of the same crime. I might further compli-

ment the Commission on its overall drafting technique, which as Senator McClellan pointed out, states each offense in a succinct manner and avoids the prolixity of present statutory language.

Regardless of my compliments to the Commission for its work in reorganizing the Federal Criminal Laws, and I do believe that the Congress and the Department of Justice are to be commended for their efforts to keep their own house in order, I cannot emphasize too strongly my criticism of the proposals for expansion of federal jurisdiction into areas which have always been reserved to the citizens of each State. While it is true that under the proposed Code, Virginia would continue to have concurrent jurisdiction with the federal authorities for offenses, which are violations of both federal and state law, let me remind you that under the proposed Code, federal prosecution would be an *absolute* bar to state prosecution. When the crimes are strictly federal in nature, such as mail fraud or counterfeiting, this section would be of little effect and little consequence. If, however, the proposed set of jurisdictional bases are enacted into law, the scope of conduct which would be federally punishable would increase tremendously.

This is not to say that state criminal courts would be put out of business immediately, since the federal court system is not presently equipped to handle the huge caseload that would result if federal jurisdiction were exercised in every case. For several years, discretionary abstention would have to be practiced by federal authorities in many cases until more courtrooms, judges and prosecutors could be added to handle a criminal docket that would probably be one thousand per cent of what it is now, together with all of the appeals and habeas corpus actions that inevitably stem from each criminal case. Indeed, it is quite likely that the federal judiciary would never attempt to exercise its jurisdiction over every available case for the very reasons I have just mentioned. Even if this assumption proves to be well founded, however, I am opposed to the federal government having the opportunity to pick and choose which Virginia cases it would like to try.

Additionally, while I am not opposed to the sentencing scheme itself, I do feel that the general tenor of the provisions would undoubtedly result in sentences much more lenient than those now being imposed. I note that the sentencing judge must give written reasons for imposing a minimum sentence (§ 3201(3)), or for imposing a long sentence for certain dangerous offenders as specified by the statute (§ 3202), and on appeal the sentence itself would be subject to modification in addition to a review of the conviction. Once again, this would be less significant were it not for the expansion of the federal jurisdiction over so many crimes pursuant to § 201(b). The effect here would be to remove from the community, as it is represented by the jury, the right to express itself regarding the punishment to be meted out.

One further area in which I am quite concerned at the prospect of expanded federal jurisdiction is that which deals with bribery, coercion, and influencing of state and local officials. The bribery sections (§§ 1361-1369), for example, would impose a federal felony penalty on anyone who knowingly offers, or accepts, a "thing of value" as consideration for the recipient's "official action" as a "public servant" or his violation of a known legal duty as a public servant. Specially excepted from the definition of "thing of value" is "concurrence in official action in the course of legitimate compromise among public servants". The purpose of this exception, of course, is to exclude "log-rolling" from the scope of the offense, but this highlights the subtle dangers hidden in these sections.

Please do not misinterpret my concern in this area as an implication that Virginia

officials are in any way involved in any wrongdoing. On the contrary, Virginia has an excellent record with regard to the integrity of its public servants. What I am very concerned about is the possibility of the federal courts deciding what is and what is not "legitimate compromise" in Virginia's government. When you consider again that federal prosecution would be an *absolute* bar to state prosecution, this would remove from the states the opportunity to prosecute their own officials, and at the same time create an implication that State governments, like teenagers learning to drive, are not capable of handling this responsibility on their own.

It is interesting to note that the Commission justifies this type of creeping federalism by saying that these provisions "recognize a federal interest in preserving the effectiveness of local law enforcement, particularly against subversion by organized criminals." (Comment to § 1368). What they also do, however, is ignore or subvert the state's interest in keeping its own house in order, an interest that is not delegated to the federal government by the Constitution. In the original draft of the proposed code, the Commission wanted to use all twelve of their jurisdictional bases, as well as any instance where an elected local official was involved, to create jurisdiction over state and local governmental activities. In the Final Report, however, "concerns about federalism" led to a cutting back of the jurisdictional bases to four:

- (1) where the offense is committed within the special maritime or territorial jurisdiction of the U.S.;
- (2) where piggy-back jurisdiction could be invoked;
- (3) where the mails or telephone were used; and
- (4) where there was movement of persons across state lines in connection with the offense.

One does not have to possess a great deal of imagination to see that almost every offense could somehow be fitted into one of these broad categories.

Finally, I believe that adoption of the proposed Code will require criminal lawyers to learn two sets of laws for the same crime—one federal and one state. I believe consideration should be given to the adoption of a rule similar to that of *Erie v. Tompkins*, whereby State substantive law would be assimilated into federal trials, where a crime was committed against a federal public servant or against federal property. This rule would apply in such non-enclave situations where the federal courts have jurisdiction to try crimes in which the Government has a substantial interest. If § 201(b) is to be retained as a jurisdictional base, the necessity for the adoption of this rule for all prosecutions brought in federal courts solely by reason of that section is even more urgent, since the same substantive law should apply to prosecutions against defendants whose crimes otherwise are distinguished only by the happenstance of federal jurisdiction. Federal enclaves, of course, would continue to be governed by federal law and the Assimilative Crimes Act. Since most federal judges were state judges or lawyers before going on the federal bench, such a system would be of no inconvenience to them, and I am sure the same could be said of Government prosecutors.

I hope you do not feel that I have been an unnecessary alarmist in my criticism of these proposals, which are, after all, the work of many sincere and dedicated individuals over a period of four years. I must point out, however, that with the exception of Howard R. Leary, who as police commissioner of New York City served on the advisory committee, neither the Commission itself nor the advisory committee had members representing state or local law enforcement interests. Quite nat-

urally a commission which is established by Congress and composed largely of federal officials, cannot help but come up with a product that, even with all good intentions, results in a greatly expanded federal role. I say "with all good intentions" because I do not believe that the Commission or its staff are seeking to foreclose on state courts as to their exercise of criminal jurisdiction. Nevertheless, federal inches have a way of turning into federal miles. I believe that it is my responsibility as Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Virginia to bring these matters to your attention. I seek to insure that, whatever the final resolution may be, it reflects the will and desire of the citizens of the Commonwealth of Virginia as much as that of the federal authorities.

In conclusion, therefore, may I respectfully recommend that the following changes be made in the proposed code:

(1) redraft § 201 omitting Paragraph B, G and I and changing the word "person" in Paragraph H to "victim or defendant";

(2) omit the last paragraph of § 201 and provide separate jurisdictional provisions for each offense or group of offenses;

(3) bring the concurrent jurisdiction provisions of §§ 707 and 708 in line by either making a state prosecution an absolute bar to federal prosecutions, or by allowing the Attorneys General of the several states to certify that the interest of their state would be unduly harmed if state prosecution were barred;

(4) provide in § 209 that assimilation of offenses would include assimilation of the state penalty as well, as is now provided in 18 U.S.C. § 13.

(5) make the provisions of § 1361 through 1367, which relate to bribery and intimidation, applicable to Federal public servants only.

COMPREHENSIVE AND DEVELOPMENTAL CHILD CARE SERVICES—A MUST

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, the President veto, last December, of the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1971, nullified the hopes of the citizens of this Nation for a meaningful and comprehensive child care program. Congress has attempted to recoup this loss. The House, under the leadership of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) has incorporated into H.R. 12350 a greatly expanded Headstart program which will, unless the President chooses to veto the measure or impound the funds, do much to reach the neediest of our children. But, valuable as this provision is, I do not believe that it goes far enough. I believe now as I believed last year that this Nation needs and must have a comprehensive program of child care which will be available to all children whose parents want to avail themselves of the service. For this reason, I take great pleasure in introducing here on the House side the measure which was introduced on the Senate side by Senators MONDALE and NELSON.

This bill contains provisions to meet, as far as possible, the objections that the President expressed to the vetoed measure in his measure to Congress. Some of the objections could not be met, of

course, without gutting the entire program. However, I believe that my colleagues will agree that the legislation's provisions represent a very reasonable compromise.

PRIME SPONSORSHIP—DELIVERY SYSTEM

In order to meet the administration's objections that the locally based administrative structure was unworkable, the population criteria for prime sponsorship was raised from 5,000 to 25,000, thus reducing by two-thirds the number of localities eligible to administer their own programs. In order to retain local initiative and involvement in areas where the State will be prime sponsor, however, the bill provides for the establishment of program areas—not to exceed 50,000 in population—with councils composed of parents and representatives of the localities to participate in the approval of the child care plan and projects for that area.

ELIGIBLE CHILDREN

Priority will be given to children from families with an annual income below the lower living standard budget determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics—currently \$6,900 for an urban family of four—by reserving 65 percent of all Federal funds for children from such families. The fee schedule agreed to by the administration, providing free services to children from families with incomes up to \$4,320 and a fee limitation of \$316.00 on an urban family of four earning \$6,900 are retained. The remaining 35 percent of the funds may be spent to include children whose families have an income above the lower living standard budget. Priority under this provision will be given to children with the greatest need—those of working mothers or single parents. Ability to pay will be taken into account in applying the sliding fee schedule.

EFFECTIVE DATE AND COSTS

To meet administration objections concerning costs, the effective date has been postponed 1 year—to the beginning of fiscal 1974—and the authorization for the first program year has been cut by 25 percent to \$1.5 billion—which includes the existing authorizations for Headstart programs during that year.

NEEDS OF MINORITY GROUP AND BILINGUAL, MIGRANT AND INDIAN CHILDREN

Year-around programs are funded for migrant children and for youngsters living on Indian reservations. In addition, each locality must provide equitably for the needs of minority group children, with particular emphasis on the needs of children coming from bilingual background.

PROTECTION OF EXISTING HEADSTART PROGRAMS

Funds are set aside to assure continuation of existing Headstart programs target groups at no less than the 1972 level, and the first \$500 million of the fiscal year 1974 authorization is reserved for programs serving poor children, with priority given to continued assistance for Headstart projects. In addition, community action and Headstart agencies will be given an opportunity to comment on the comprehensive child development plan in their area before it is approved by the Secretary.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

Assistance will be provided for local community groups and governmental agencies to develop comprehensive child development programs and to train the professionals and paraprofessionals, especially members of the community, necessary to conduct quality programs.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the measure I am introducing today is desperately needed by the children of our country. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the measure and would welcome the cosponsorship of all Members of the House who are interested in comprehensive child development.

For the convenience of my colleagues, I am inserting at this point the text of the bill into the RECORD:

H.R. 12350

A bill to establish Comprehensive and Developmental Child Care Services in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act be cited the "Comprehensive Child Care and Child Development Act of 1972".

Sec. 2(a) The Congress finds that—

(1) child care programs must build upon the role of the family as the primary and most fundamental influence on the development of children and must be provided only to children whose parents or legal guardians request them;

(2) many of the over three million children of preschool age living in poverty do not receive adequate health care, nutrition, and educational opportunities;

(3) there are over five million preschool children and twenty million school-age children whose mothers are working full or part time but there are fewer than seven hundred thousand openings in licensed day care facilities to serve them;

(4) comprehensive family-oriented child care programs, including a full range of health, education, and social services, can enhance the opportunity for children to attain their full potential;

(5) children with special needs must receive full and special consideration in planning any child care programs with priority to preschool children with the greatest economic and social need;

(6) while no mother should be forced to work outside the home as a condition for using child care programs, such programs are essential to many parents who undertake or continue full- or part-time employment, training, or education;

(7) comprehensive child care programs not only provide a means of delivering a full range of essential services to children, but can also furnish meaningful employment opportunities for many individuals including older persons, parents, young persons, and volunteers from the community; and

(8) it is essential that the planning and operation of such programs be undertaken as a partnership of parents, community, and State and local government with appropriate assistance from the Federal Government.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act (1) to provide child care centers and services of high quality to children whose parents request them, with priority for those children who need them most, (2) to recognize and build upon the experience and success gained through the Headstart program and other child care programs, (3) to provide quality child care services, with emphasis on programs for children of preschool age regardless of economic, social, and family background and full day care services for children of working mothers and single parent families, (4) to provide that deci-

sions on the nature and funding of such programs be made at the local level with the full involvement of parents and other individuals and organizations interested in child care, and (5) to establish the legislative framework for comprehensive child care services.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 3. (a) For the purpose of carrying out this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated \$1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. Any amounts appropriated for such fiscal year which are not obligated at the end of such fiscal year may be obligated in the succeeding fiscal year.

(b) For the purpose of providing training, technical assistance, planning, and such other activities as the Secretary deems necessary and appropriate to prepare for the implementation of this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated \$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973.

ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

SEC. 4. (a) The amounts appropriated for carrying out this Act for any fiscal year after June 30, 1973, shall be made available in the following manner:

(1) \$500,000,000 shall first be used for the purpose of providing assistance under titles I, II, and V of this Act for child care programs focused upon young children from low-income families, giving priority to continued financial assistance for Headstart projects;

(2) not to exceed 10 per centum of the remaining amounts so appropriated shall be used for the purpose of carrying out titles II, III, IV, and V of this Act, as the Secretary deems appropriate; and

(3) the remainder of such amounts shall be used for the purpose of carrying out Title I of this Act.

(b)(1) From the amounts available for carrying out comprehensive child care programs under Title I of this Act, the Secretary shall reserve the following:

(A) not less than that proportion of the total amount available for carrying out such Title I as is equivalent to that proportion which the total number of children of migrant agricultural workers bears to the total number of economically disadvantaged children in the United States, which shall be apportioned among programs serving children of migrant agricultural workers on an equitable basis, and to the extent practicable in proportion to the relative numbers of children served in each such program;

(B) not less than that proportion of the total amount available for carrying out such Title I as is equivalent to that proportion which the total number of children in Indian tribal organizations bears to the total number of economically disadvantaged children in the United States, which shall be apportioned among programs serving children in Indian tribal organizations on an equitable basis, and to the extent practicable in proportion to the relative numbers of children in each such program;

(C) not less than 10 per centum of the total amount available for carrying out such Title I, which shall be made available for the purposes of section 102(2)(H) (relating to special activities for handicapped children);

(D) not to exceed 5 per centum of the total amount available for carrying out such Title I, which shall be made available under section 104(f)(3) (relating to model programs).

(2) The Secretary shall allocate the remainder of the amounts available for Title I (except for funds made available under paragraphs (1) and (3) of this subsection) among the States, and within the States among local areas, so as to provide, to the extent practicable, for the geographical distribution of such remainder in such a manner that—

(A) 50 per centum thereof shall be apportioned among the States, and within each such State among local areas, in proportion to the relative numbers of children through-

age five in each such State and local area, respectively; and

(B) 50 per centum thereof shall be apportioned among the States, and within each such State among local areas, in proportion to the relative numbers of economically disadvantaged children of working mothers and single parents in each such State and local area, respectively.

For the purposes of clauses (A) and (B) of this paragraph, there shall be excluded those children who are counted under clauses (A) and (B) of subsection (b)(1) of this section.

(3) Not to exceed 5 per centum of the total funds allotted for use within a State pursuant to paragraph (2) shall be made available to enable States to carry out the provisions of section 513(a) of this Act.

(c) Any portion of any apportionment under subsection (b) for a fiscal year which the Secretary determines will not be required, for the period for which such apportionment is available, for carrying out programs under this Act shall be available for re-apportionment from time to time, on such dates during such period as the Secretary shall fix, to other States or local areas on an equitable basis, taking into account the original apportionments to the States and local areas. Any amount reappropriated to a State or local area under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its apportionment under subsection (b) for such year.

(d) In determining the numbers of children for purposes of allocating and apportioning funds under this section, the Secretary shall use the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

(e) As soon as practicable after funds are appropriated to carry out this title for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the allocations and apportionments required by this section.

TITLE I—COMPREHENSIVE CHILD CARE PROGRAMS

PROGRAMS ASSISTED

SEC. 101. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall provide financial assistance to prime sponsors and to other public and private agencies and organizations pursuant to plans and applications approved in accordance with the provisions of this title for the purpose of carrying out child care programs for children whose parents or legal guardians request them, including—

(1) preschool programs providing full-day services and activities for children when there is no parent at home to provide care;

(2) preschool programs providing part-day services and activities designed to prepare children for school in the years before they enter the elementary school grades;

(3) in-home services and consultation to assist families with children of preschool age in providing for the healthy growth and development of each child's full potential;

(4) day care programs providing services and activities (including recreation and tutoring programs) for school-age children at times when school is not in session and there is no parent at home to provide care, including after-school and, where necessary, before-school hours and during summer and other vacation periods;

(5) parent and child centers, special programs for children with identified needs (including but not limited to handicapped children), and followthrough and other supplementary services and activities, involving the participation of parents.

USES OF FUNDS

SEC. 102. Funds available for this title may be used (in accordance with approved applications) for programs including the following services and activities:

(1) planning and developing child care programs, including the operation of pilot programs to test the effectiveness of new concepts, programs, and delivery systems;

(2) establishing, maintaining, and oper-

ating child care programs, which may include—

(A) comprehensive health, nutritional, education, social, and other services to assist children in attaining their full potential and to prepare children for school;

(B) full-day and part-day child care services (including after-school and summer programs), with appropriate health, nutritional, education, social, and other services;

(C) food and nutritional services;

(D) rental, lease or lease-purchase, mortgage amortization payments, remodeling, renovation, alteration, construction, or acquisition of facilities, including mobile facilities, and the acquisition of necessary equipment and supplies;

(E) programs designed (1) to meet the special needs of minority group, Indian, and migrant children with particular emphasis on the needs of children from bilingual families for the development of skills in English and the other language spoken in the home, and (2) to meet the needs of all children to understand the history and cultural backgrounds of minority groups which belong to their communities;

(F) medical, dental, psychological, educational, and other appropriate diagnosis, identification, and treatment of visual, hearing, speech, nutritional, and other physical, mental, and emotional problems;

(G) prenatal and other medical services to expectant mothers who cannot afford such services, designed to help reduce malnutrition, infant and maternal mortality, and the incidence of mental retardation and other handicapping conditions, and postpartum and other medical services (including family planning information) to such recent mothers;

(H) incorporation within child care programs of special activities designed to identify and ameliorate physical, mental, and emotional handicaps and special learning disabilities and, where necessary because of the severity of such handicaps, establishing, maintaining, and operating separate child care programs designed primarily to meet the needs of handicapped children, including emotionally disturbed children;

(I) preservice and inservice education and other training designed to prepare professional and paraprofessional personnel and parents and other family members to provide child care related services;

(J) Dissemination of information in the functional language of those to be served to assure that parents are well informed of child care programs available to them and may become directly involved in such programs;

(K) services, including in-home services, and training in the fundamentals of child care, for parents, older family members, and others functioning in the capacity of parents, youth, and prospective parents;

(L) programs designed to extend comprehensive prekindergarten early childhood education techniques and gains (particularly parent participation) into kindergarten and early primary grades (one through three), in cooperation with local educational agencies;

(M) such other services and activities as the Secretary deems appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of this Title; and

(3) staff and other administrative expenses of Child Care Councils established and operated in accordance with this Title.

"STATE PLAN"

SEC. 103. (a) The Secretary shall approve a plan submitted by any State which sets forth satisfactory provisions for establishing and maintaining a State Child Care Council which meets the requirements of section 105 and which sets forth provisions for carrying out activities under the supervision of such Council for the purposes of—

(1) identifying child care goals and needs within the State;

(2) assisting prime sponsors other than the State in the establishment of Child Care Councils and strengthening the capability of such Councils to effectively plan, supervise, coordinate, monitor, and evaluate child care programs;

(3) providing for the cooperation and participation of State agencies providing child care and related services, including health, family planning, mental health, education, nutrition, and family, social, and rehabilitative services, in the development and implementation of the comprehensive child care plan of the State and where requested by any local prime sponsor;

(4) encouraging the full utilization of resources and facilities for child care programs within the State;

(5) disseminating the results of research on child care programs;

(6) conducting programs for the exchange of personnel involved in child care programs within the State;

(7) assisting public and private agencies and organizations in the acquisition or improvement of facilities for child care programs;

(8) monitoring and evaluating federally-assisted child care programs and projects within the State;

(9) assessing State and local licensing codes as they relate to child care programs within the State; and

(10) developing information useful in reviewing prime sponsorship plans under section 104(g) and comprehensive child care plans under section 106(b)(3).

(b) A State applying for designation as prime sponsor for geographical areas within the State which are not otherwise served by a local prime sponsor shall, in addition to the provisions required to be included in its prime sponsorship plan in accordance with section 104, set forth in its State plan adequate provisions—

(1) for designating local program areas each of which shall serve a geographical area covered by (A) a unit of general local government, or (B) units of general local government serving a total population of not more than fifty thousand persons;

(2) for establishing and maintaining with respect to each local program area a local policy council composed so that (A) not less than half of the members of each such council shall be parent members who shall be chosen initially by the parent member of Headstart policy committees where they exist, and at the earliest practicable time by the parent members of project policy committees established pursuant to section 107 (a)(2) of this title, and (B) the remainder shall be public members appointed by the chief executive officers or the governing bodies, as appropriate, of the units of general local government within the local program area;

(3) to assure that project applications shall be approved by the Child Care Council only if previously approved by the local policy council for the appropriate local program area;

(4) to assure that contracts for the operation of programs through public or private agencies or organizations shall be entered into only if previously approved by the local policy council for the appropriate local program area; and

(5) for the development and preparation with full participation and approval of the appropriate local policy council of that portion of the comprehensive child development plan to be submitted by the State which affects each local program area.

PRIME SPONSORS OF CHILD CARE PROGRAMS

SEC. 104. (a) In accordance with the provisions of this section, a State, unit or combination of units of general local government, Indian tribal organization, or public or private nonprofit agency or organization, meeting the requirements of this title may be designated by the Secretary as a prime

sponsor for the purpose of entering into arrangements to carry out child care programs under this title, if the Secretary determines that any such applicant for prime sponsorship designation has the capability of effectively carrying out child care programs under this title and has submitted a satisfactory prime sponsorship plan which—

(1) describes the prime sponsorship area to be served;

(2) sets forth satisfactory provisions for establishing and maintaining a Child Care Council which meets the requirements of section 105;

(3) provides that such Council will be responsible for developing and preparing a comprehensive child care plan for each fiscal year and any modifications thereof;

(4) sets forth arrangements under which such Council will be responsible for planning, supervising, conducting, coordinating, monitoring, and evaluating child care programs in the prime sponsorship area;

(5) in the case of an applicant which is a State or a unit or combination of units of general local government, provides for the operation of programs under this part through contracts with public or private agencies or organizations, including but not limited to community action agencies, single-purpose Headstart agencies, local public and private educational agencies and institutions, community development corporations, parent cooperatives, organizations of Indians, and employer and employee organizations, which will serve children in a community or neighborhood or other area possessing a commonality of interest; and

(6) sets forth satisfactory provisions for coordination with educational agencies and providers of educational services;

(7) provides assurances that such Council will, by contract or other arrangement with State, local, or other public or private nonprofit agencies or organizations, provide, where available—

(A) child-related family, social, and rehabilitative services;

(B) health (including family planning) and mental health services;

(C) nutrition services; and

(D) training of professional and paraprofessional personnel.

(b) The Secretary shall approve a prime sponsorship plan submitted by a State if he determines that the plan so submitted meets the requirements of subsection (a) of this section and sets forth adequate arrangements for serving all geographical areas under its jurisdiction except for areas with respect to which local prime sponsors are designated under this section.

(c) (1) The Secretary shall approve a prime sponsorship plan submitted by a unit of general local government which is (A) a city having a population of twenty-five thousand or more persons, or (B) a county or other unit of general local government having a population of twenty-five thousand or more persons (excluding the number of such persons included within the population of any city which is designated as a prime sponsor under clause (A) of this paragraph), if he determines that the plan so submitted meets the requirements of subsection (a) of this section and includes adequate provisions for carrying out comprehensive child care programs in the area covered by such unit of general local government.

(2) In the event that the area under the jurisdiction of a unit of general local government described in clause (A) or (B) of paragraph (1) of this subsection includes any common geographical area with that covered by another such unit of general local government, the Secretary shall designate to serve such area the unit of general local government which he determines has the capability of more effectively carrying out the purposes of this Title with respect to such area and which has submitted a plan which meets the requirements of subsection (a) of

this section and includes adequate provisions for carrying out comprehensive child care programs in such area.

(d) The Secretary shall approve a prime sponsorship plan submitted by a combination of units of general local government having a total population of twenty-five thousand or more persons (excluding the number of such persons included within the population of any city which is designated as a prime sponsor under clause (A) of subsection (c) (1)), if he determines that the plan so submitted meets the requirements of subsection (a) of this section and includes adequate provisions for carrying out comprehensive child care programs in the area covered by the combination of such units of general local government.

(e) The Secretary shall approve a prime sponsorship plan submitted by an Indian tribal organization if he determines that the plan so submitted meets the requirements of subsection (a) of this section and includes adequate provisions for carrying out comprehensive child care programs in the area to be served.

(f) The Secretary may approve a prime sponsorship plan submitted by a unit or combination of units of general local government regardless of population size or by a public or private nonprofit agency, including but not limited to a community action agency, single-purpose Headstart agency, public or private educational agency or institution, community development corporation, parent cooperative, organization of migrant agricultural workers, organization of Indians, employer organization, labor union, or employee or labor-management organization, if he determines that the plan so submitted meets the requirements of subsection (a) of this section and includes provisions setting forth—

(1) arrangements for serving children in a community or neighborhood or other urban or rural area possessing a commonality of interest in any area (A) with respect to which there is no prime sponsorship designation in effect, or (B) with respect to any portion of an area where a designated prime sponsor is found not to be satisfactorily implementing child care programs which adequately meet the purposes of this title, or (C) for making available special services, in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary, designed to meet the needs of economically disadvantaged or preschool children or children of working mothers or single parents; or

(2) arrangements for providing comprehensive child care programs on a year-round basis to children of migrant agricultural workers and their families; or

(3) arrangements for carrying out model programs especially designed to be responsive to the needs of economically disadvantaged, minority group, bilingual, or preschool children.

(g) The Governor shall be given not less than thirty nor more than sixty days to review applications for prime sponsorship designation submitted by any applicant other than the State, to offer recommendations to the applicant, and to submit comments to the Secretary.

(h) A prime sponsorship plan submitted under this section may be disapproved or a prior designation of a prime sponsor may be withdrawn only if the Secretary, in accordance with regulations which he shall prescribe, has provided (1) written notice of intention to disapprove such plan, including a statement of the reasons therefor, (2) a reasonable time in which to submit corrective amendments to such plan or undertake other necessary corrective action, and (3) an opportunity for a public hearing upon which basis an appeal to the Secretary may be taken as of right.

(i) (1) If any party is dissatisfied with the Secretary's final action under subsection (h) with respect to the disapproval of its plan submitted under this section or the with-

drawal of its prime sponsorship designation, such party may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such party is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary. The Secretary thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(2) The findings of fact by the Secretary, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Secretary to take further evidence. The Secretary may make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(3) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

(j) When any unit or combination of units of general government or other prime sponsor is maintaining a pattern and practice of discrimination against minority group persons, the Secretary shall approve the application for prime sponsorship of an alternative unit of government or public or private nonprofit agency or organization in the area which will equitably serve minority and economically disadvantaged persons.

(k) In the event that a State, a unit or combination of units of general local government, or an Indian tribal organization has not submitted a comprehensive child care plan under section 106 or the Secretary has not approved a plan so submitted, or where the Secretary has not designated or has withdrawn designation of prime sponsorship under this section, or where the needs of migrants, preschool-age children, or the children of working mothers or single parents, minority groups, or the economically disadvantaged are not being served, the Secretary may directly fund projects, including those in rural areas without regard to population, that he deems necessary in order to serve the children of the particular area.

CHILD CARE COUNCILS

"Sec. 105. (a) Every State and other prime sponsor designated under section 104 shall establish and maintain a Child Care Council composed of not less than 10 members as follows—

(1) not less than half of the members of such Council shall be parents of children served in child care programs under this part; and

(2) the remaining members shall be appointed by the prime sponsor to represent the public, but (A) not less than half of such members shall be persons who are broadly representative of the general public, including government agencies, public and private agencies and organizations in such fields as economic opportunity, health, education, welfare, employment and training, business or financial organizations or institutions, labor unions, and employers, and (B) the remaining members, the number of which shall be either equal to or one less than the number of members appointed under clause (A), shall be persons who are particularly skilled by virtue of training or experience in child development, child health, child welfare, or other child care services, except that the Secretary may waive or reduce the requirement of this clause (B) to the extent that he determines, in accordance with regulations which he shall prescribe, that such persons are not available to the area to be served.

At least one-third of the total membership of the Child Care Council shall be parents who are economically disadvantaged. Each Council shall select its own chairman.

(b) In accordance with procedures which the Secretary shall establish pursuant to regulations, every State and other prime sponsor designated under section 104 shall provide, with respect to its Child Care Council—

(1) in the case of the Child Care Council of a State, (A) that the parent members described in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section shall be chosen by the parent members of local policy councils established pursuant to section 104 of this title, and (B) that the public members described in paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section shall be appointed by the Governor of the State;

(2) in the case of the Child Care Council of a prime sponsor other than a State, (A) that the parent members described in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section shall be chosen initially by the parent members of Headstart policy committees where they exist, and at the earliest practicable time by the parent members of project policy committees established pursuant to section 107(a)(2) of this title, and (B) that the public members described in paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section shall be appointed by the chief executive officer or the governing body, whichever is appropriate, of the prime sponsor;

(3) for such terms of office and other policies and procedures of an organizational nature, including nomination and election procedures, as are appropriate in accordance with the purposes of this part;

(4) that such Council shall have responsibility for approving basic goals, policies, actions, and procedures for the prime sponsor, and for planning, general supervision and oversight, overall coordination, personnel, budgeting, funding of projects, and monitoring and evaluation of projects each year according to criteria established by the Secretary; and

(5) that such Council shall, upon its own initiative or upon request of a project applicant or any other party in interest, conduct public hearings before acting upon applications for financial assistance submitted by project applicants under this title.

COMPREHENSIVE CHILD CARE PLANS

Sec. 106. (a) Financial assistance under this title may be provided by the Secretary for any fiscal year to a State or other prime sponsor designated under section 104 only pursuant to a comprehensive child care plan which is submitted by such prime sponsor and approved by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of this title. Any such plan shall set forth a comprehensive program for providing child care services in the prime sponsorship area which—

(1) provides that programs or services under this Act shall be provided only for children whose parents or legal guardians request them;

(2) identifies child care needs and goals within the area and describes the purposes for which the financial assistance will be used;

(3) meets the needs of children in the prime sponsorship area, to the extent that available funds can be reasonably expected to have an effective impact, with priority to children who have not attained six years of age;

(4) (A) provides that funds received under section 103(a)(1) will be used for child care programs and services focused upon young children from low-income families, giving priority to continued financial assistance for Headstart projects by reserving for such projects from such funds in any fiscal year an amount at least equal to the aggregate amount received by public or private agencies and organizations within the prime

sponsorship area for programs during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, under section 222(a)(1) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and (B) provides that programs receiving funds under section 103(d) will give priority to providing services for economically disadvantaged children by reserving not less than 65 per centum of the cost of programs receiving such funds for the purpose of serving children of families having an annual income below the lower living standard budget as determined under paragraph (5) of section 601;

(5) gives priority thereafter to providing child care programs and services to children of working mothers and single parents not covered under paragraph (4);

(6) provides procedures for the approval of project applications submitted in accordance with section 107;

(7) provides, in the case of a prime sponsor located within or adjacent to a metropolitan area, for coordination with other prime sponsors located within such metropolitan area, and arrangements for cooperative funding where appropriate, and particularly for such coordination where appropriate to meet the needs for child care services of children of parents working or participating in training or otherwise occupied during the day within a prime sponsorship area other than that in which they reside;

(8) provides that, to the extent feasible, each program within the prime sponsorship area will include children from a range of socioeconomic backgrounds;

(9) provides comprehensive services (A) to meet the special needs of minority group children and children of migrant agricultural workers with particular emphasis on the needs of children from bilingual families for development of skills in English and in the other language spoken in the home, and (B) to meet the needs of all children to understand the history and cultural background of minority groups which belong to the communities;

(10) provides equitably for the child care needs of children from each minority group and significant segment of the economically disadvantaged residing within the area served;

(11) provides, insofar as possible, for coordination of child care programs with other social programs (including but not limited to those relating to employment and manpower) so as to keep family units intact or in close proximity during the day;

(12) provides for direct parent participation in the conduct, overall direction, and evaluation of programs;

(13) includes to the extent feasible a career development plan for paraprofessional and professional training, education, and advancement on a career ladder;

(14) provides that, insofar as possible, persons residing in communities being served by such projects will receive jobs, including in-home and part-time jobs and opportunities for training in programs under title II of this Act, with special consideration for career opportunities for low-income persons;

(15) provides for the regular and frequent dissemination of information in the functional language of those to be served, to assure that parents and interested persons in the community are fully informed of the activities of the Child Care Council and of delegate agencies;

(16) assures that procedures and mechanisms for coordination have been developed in cooperation with agencies and organizations carrying out preschool programs and administrators of local educational agencies and nonpublic schools, at the local level, to provide continuity between programs for preschool and elementary school children and to coordinate programs conducted under this title and programs conducted pursuant to section

222(a) (2) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

(17) establishes arrangements in the area served for the coordination of programs conducted under the auspices of or with the support of business or financial institutions or organizations, industry, labor, employee and labor-management organizations, and other community groups;

(18) sets forth provisions describing any arrangements for the delegation, under the supervision of the Child Care Council, to public or private agencies, institutions, or organizations, of responsibilities for the delivery of programs, services, and activities for which financial assistance is provided under this title or for planning or evaluation services to be made available with respect to programs under this title;

(19) contains plans for regularly conducting surveys and analyses of needs for child care programs in the prime sponsorship area and for submitting to the Secretary a comprehensive annual report and evaluation in such form and containing such information as the Secretary shall require by regulation;

(20) provides that services for handicapped children, at both the State and local levels, will be used wherever available in programs approved under the plan;

(21) provides assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that the non-Federal share requirements will be met;

(22) provides for such fiscal control and funding accounting procedures as the Secretary may prescribe to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the prime sponsor;

(23) provides that special consideration will be given to project applications submitted by public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations with ongoing programs; and

(24) provides assurance that in developing plans for any facilities due consideration will be given to excellence of architecture and design, and to the inclusion of works of art (not representing more than 1 per centum of the cost of the project).

(b) No comprehensive child care plan or modification thereof submitted by a prime sponsor under this section shall be approved by the Secretary unless he determines, in accordance with regulations which the Secretary shall prescribe, that—

(1) each community action agency or single-purpose Headstart agency in the area to be served previously responsible for the administration of programs under this part or under section 222(a) (1) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 has had an opportunity to submit comments to the prime sponsor and to the Secretary;

(2) the local educational agency for the area to be served and other appropriate educational and training agencies and institutions have had an opportunity to submit comments to the prime sponsor and to the Secretary; and

(3) in the case of a plan submitted by a prime sponsor other than the State, the State Child Care Council has had an opportunity to submit comments to the prime sponsor and to the Secretary.

(c) A comprehensive child care plan submitted under this section may be disapproved or a prior approval withdrawn only if the Secretary, in accordance with regulations which he shall prescribe, has provided (1) written notice of intention to disapprove such plan, including a statement of the reasons therefor, (2) a reasonable time to submit corrective amendments to such plan or undertake other necessary corrective action, and (3) an opportunity for a public hearing upon which basis an appeal to the Secretary may be taken as of right.

(d) In order to contribute to the effective administration of this Act, the Secretary shall establish appropriate procedures to permit

prime sponsors to submit jointly a single comprehensive child care plan for the areas served by such prime sponsors.

PROJECT APPLICATIONS

Sec. 107. (a) Financial assistance under this title may be provided to a project applicant for any fiscal year only pursuant to a project application which is submitted by a public or private agency and which provides—

(1) that funds will be provided for carrying out any child care program under this title only to a qualified public or private agency or organization, including but not limited to a community action agency, single-purpose Headstart agency, public or private educational agency or institution, community development corporation, parent cooperative, organization of migrant agricultural workers, organization of Indians, private organization interested in child development, employer or business organization, labor union, or employee or labor-management organization;

(2) for establishing and maintaining project policy committees composed of not less than 10 members as follows—

(A) not less than half of the members of each such committee shall be parents of children served by such project; and

(B) the remaining members of each such committee shall consist of (i) persons who are representative of the community and who are approved by the parent members, and (ii) one person who is particularly skilled by virtue of training or experience in child development, child health, child welfare, or other child care services, except that the Secretary may waive the requirement of this clause (ii) where he determines, in accordance with regulations which he shall prescribe, that such person is not available to the area to be served;

(3) for direct participation of such project policy committees in the development and preparation of project applications under this title;

(4) that adequate provision will be made for training and other administrative expenses of such project policy committees (including necessary expenses to enable low-income members to participate in council or committee meetings);

(5) that project policy committees shall have responsibility for approving basic goals, policies, actions, and procedures for the project applicant, and for planning, overall conduct, personnel, budgeting, location of centers and facilities, and direction and evaluation of projects;

(6) that programs assisted under this title will provide for such comprehensive health, nutritional, education, social, and other services, as are necessary for the full development of each participating child;

(7) that adequate provision will be made for the regular and frequent dissemination of information in the functional language of those to be served, to assure that parents and interested persons are fully informed of project activities;

(8) that with respect to child care services provided by programs assisted under this title—

(A) no charge will be made with respect to any child who is a member of any family with an annual income equal to or less than \$4,320 with appropriate adjustments in the case of families having more than two children, except to the extent that payment will be made by a third party (including a public agency); and

(B) such charges as the Secretary may provide will be made with respect to any child of any other family, in accordance with an appropriate fee schedule established by him, based upon the ability of the family to pay, which payment may be made in whole or in part by a third party in behalf of such family, except that any such charges with respect to any family with an

income of less than the lower living standard budget (as determined in accordance with paragraph (5) of section 601) shall not exceed the sum of (i) an amount equal to 10 per centum of any family income which exceeds the highest income level at which no charges would be made with respect to children of such family under subparagraph (A) but does not exceed 85 per centum of such lower living standard budget, and (ii) an amount equal to 15 per centum of any family income which exceeds 85 per centum of such lower living standard budget but does not exceed 100 per centum of such lower living standard budget, and, if more than two children from the same family are participating, additional charges may be made not to exceed the sum of the amounts calculated in accordance with clauses (i) and (ii) with respect to each such additional child;

(9) that children will in no case be excluded from the programs operated pursuant to this title because of their participation in nonpublic preschool or school programs or because of the intention of their parents to enroll them in nonpublic schools when they attain school age;

(10) that programs will, to the extent appropriate, employ paraprofessional aides and volunteers, especially parents, older children, students, older persons, and persons preparing for careers in child care programs;

(11) that no person will be denied employment in any program solely on the ground that he fails to meet State or local teacher certification standards;

(12) that programs assisted under this title will provide for the utilization of personnel, including paraprofessional and volunteer personnel, adequate to meet the needs of each participating child;

(13) that there are assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that the non-Federal share requirements will be met; and

(14) that provision will be made for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as the Secretary shall prescribe to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds.

(b) A project application may be approved by a prime sponsor upon its determination that such application meets the requirements of this section and that the programs provided for therein will otherwise further the objectives and satisfy the appropriate provisions of the prime sponsor's comprehensive child care plan as approved pursuant to section 106.

(c) A project application from a public or private nonprofit agency which is also a prime sponsor under section 103(f) shall be submitted directly to the Secretary, together with the comprehensive child care plan.

(d) A prime sponsor may disapprove a project application only if it provides to the project applicant a written statement of the reasons therefor. Such project applicant may submit an appeal to the Secretary requesting the direct approval of such application or modification thereof. Any such appeal shall include such comments, including the project applicant's response to the prime sponsor's statement of reasons for disapproval as the project applicant may deem appropriate or as the Secretary may require.

(e) A project application submitted directly to the Secretary may be approved by the Secretary upon his determination that it meets the requirements of subsection (a) of this section.

ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS FOR PROGRAMS INCLUDING CONSTRUCTION

Sec. 108. (a) Applications for financial assistance for projects including construction may be approved only if the Secretary determines that construction of such facilities is essential to the provision of adequate child care services, and that rental, lease

or lease-purchase, remodeling, or renovation of adequate facilities is not practicable.

(b) If any facility assisted under this title shall cease to be used for the purposes for which it was constructed, the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility an amount which bears to the then value of the facility (or so much thereof as constituted an approved project) the same ratio as the amount of such Federal funds bore to the cost of the facility financed with the aid of such funds unless the Secretary determines in accordance with regulations that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation to do so. Such value shall be determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which the facility is situated.

(c) All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction, remodeling, renovation, or alteration projects assisted under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a-276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

(d) In the case of loans for construction, the Secretary shall prescribe the interest rate and the period within which such loan shall be repaid, but such interest rates shall not be less than 3 per centum per annum and the period within which such loan is to be repaid shall not be more than twenty-five years.

(e) The Federal assistance for construction may be in the form of grants or loans, provided that total Federal funds to be paid to other than public or private nonprofit agencies and organizations will not exceed 50 per centum of the construction cost, and will be in the form of loans. Repayment of loans shall, to the extent required by the Secretary, be returned to the prime sponsor from whose financial assistance the loan was made, or used for additional loans or grants under this Act. Not more than 15 per centum of the total financial assistance provided to a prime sponsor under this title shall be used for construction of facilities, with no more than 7½ per centum of such assistance usable for grants for construction.

(f) In the case of a project for the construction of facilities and in the development of plans for such facilities due consideration shall be given to excellence of architecture and design and to the inclusion of works of art (not representing more than 1 per centum of the cost of the project).

USE OF PUBLIC FACILITIES FOR CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

SEC. 109 (a) The Secretary, after consultation with other appropriate officials of the Federal Government, shall within eighteen months after enactment of this Act report to the Congress with respect to the extent to which facilities owned or leased by Federal departments, agencies, and independent authorities could be made available to public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations, through appropriate arrangements, for use as facilities for child care programs under this Act during times and periods when not utilized fully for their usual purposes, together with his recommendations (including recommendations for changes in legislation) or proposed actions for such use.

(b) The Secretary may require, as a condition to the receipt of assistance under this title, that any prime sponsor under this title agree to conduct a review and provide

the Secretary with a report as to the extent to which facilities owned or leased by such prime sponsor, or by other agencies in the prime sponsorship area, could be made available, through appropriate arrangements, for use as facilities for child care programs under this Act during times and periods when not utilized fully for their usual purposes, together with the prime sponsor's proposed actions for such use.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 110 (a) In accordance with this section, the Secretary shall pay from the applicable allocation or apportionment under section 103 the Federal share of the costs of programs, services, and activities, in accordance with plans or applications which have been approved as provided in this title. In making such payment to any prime sponsor, the Secretary shall include in such costs an amount for staff and other administrative expenses for the Child Care Council not to exceed an amount which is reasonable when compared with such costs for other prime sponsors.

(b) (1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection, the Secretary shall pay an amount not in excess of 90 per centum of the cost of carrying out programs, services, and activities under this title. The Secretary may, in accordance with such regulations as he shall prescribe, approve assistance in excess of such percentage if he determines that such action is required to provide adequately for the child care needs of economically disadvantaged children.

(2) The Secretary shall pay an amount equal to 100 per centum of the costs of providing child care programs for children of migrant agricultural workers and their families under this title.

(3) The Secretary shall pay an amount equal to 100 per centum of the costs of providing child care programs for children in Indian tribal organizations under this title.

(c) The non-Federal share of the costs of programs assisted under this title may be provided through public or private funds and may be in the form of cash, goods, services, or facilities (or portions thereof that are used for program purposes), reasonably evaluated, or union or employer contributions. Fees collected for services provided pursuant to section 107(a)(8) shall not be used to make up the non-Federal share, but shall be used by the project applicant for the same purposes as payments under this section, except that, in the case of projects assisted under a comprehensive child care plan, such fees shall be turned over to the appropriate prime sponsor for distribution in the same manner as the prime sponsor's allocation under section 106(a)(4).

(d) If, with respect to any fiscal year, a prime sponsor or project applicant provides non-Federal contributions for any program, service, or activity exceeding its requirements, such excess may be applied toward meeting the requirements for such contributions for the subsequent fiscal year under this title.

(e) No State or unit of general local government shall reduce its expenditures for child care programs by reason of assistance under this title.

TITLE II—TRAINING, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, PLANNING, AND EVALUATION

PRESERVICE AND INSERVICE TRAINING

SEC. 201. The Secretary is authorized to make payments to provide financial assistance to enable individuals employed or preparing for employment in child care programs assisted under this Act, including volunteers, to participate in programs of preservice or inservice training for professional and nonprofessional personnel, to be conducted by any agency carrying out a child care program, or any institution of higher education, including a community college, or by any combination thereof.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND PLANNING

SEC. 202. The Secretary shall, directly or through grant or contract, make technical assistance available to prime sponsors and to project applicants participating or seeking to participate in programs assisted under this Act on a continuing basis to assist them in planning, developing, and carrying out child care programs.

EVALUATION

SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary shall, through the Office of Child Development unless the Secretary determines otherwise, make an evaluation of Federal involvement in child care activities and services, which shall include—

(1) enumeration and description of all Federal activities which affect child care;

(2) analysis of expenditures of Federal funds for such activities and services;

(3) determination of the effectiveness of such activities and services;

(4) the extent to which preschool, minority group, and economically disadvantaged children and their parents have participated in programs under this Act; and

(5) such recommendations to the Congress as the Secretary may deem appropriate.

(b) The results of the evaluation required by subsection (a) of this section shall be reported to the Congress not later than eighteen months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) The Secretary shall establish such procedures as may be necessary to conduct an annual evaluation of Federal involvement in child care programs, and shall report the results of each such evaluation to Congress.

(d) Prime sponsors and project applicants assisted under this Act and departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall, upon request by the Secretary, make available, consistent with other provisions of law, such information as the Secretary determines is necessary for purposes of making the evaluation required under subsection (c) of this section.

(e) The Secretary may enter into contracts with public or private agencies, organizations, or individuals to carry out the provisions of this section.

(f) The Secretary shall reserve for the purposes of this section not less than 1 per centum, and may reserve for such purposes not more than 2 per centum, of the amounts available under paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 103(a) of this Act for any fiscal year.

FEDERAL STANDARDS FOR CHILD CARE SERVICES

SEC. 204. (a) Within six months after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, after consultation with other Federal agencies and with the Committee established pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, promulgate a common set of program standards which shall be applicable to all programs providing child care services with Federal assistance under this Act, to be known as the Federal Standards for Child Care Services. If the Secretary disapproves the Committee's recommendations, he shall state the reasons therefor.

(b) The Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements, as approved by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Department of Labor on September 23, 1968, shall be applicable to all programs providing child care services with Federal assistance under this Act.

(c) The Secretary shall, within sixty days after enactment of this Act, appoint a Special Committee on Federal Standards for Child Care Services, which shall include parents of children enrolled in child care programs, representatives of public and private agencies and organizations administering child care programs, and specialists and others interested in the care and development of children. Not less than one-half of the membership of the Committee shall con-

sist of parents of children participating in programs conducted under section 222(a)(1) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and title IV of the Social Security Act and title I of this Act. Such Committee shall participate in the development of Federal Standards for Child Care Services and modifications thereof as provided in subsection (a).

DEVELOPMENT OF UNIFORM MINIMUM CODE FOR FACILITIES

Sec. 205. (a) The Secretary shall, within sixty days after enactment of this Act, appoint a special committee to develop a uniform minimum code for facilities, to be used in licensing child development facilities. Such standards shall deal principally with those matters essential to the health, safety, and physical comfort of the children and the relationship of such matters to the Federal Standards for Child Care Services under section 204.

(b) The special committee appointed under this section shall include parents of children participating in child care programs and representatives of State and local licensing agencies, public health officials, fire prevention officials, the construction industry and unions, public and private agencies or organizations administering child care programs, and national agencies or organizations interested in the care and development of children. Not less than one-half of the membership of the committee shall consist of parents of children enrolled in programs conducted under section 222(a)(1) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and title IV of the Social Security Act and title I of this Act.

(c) Within one year after its appointment, the special committee shall complete a proposed uniform minimum code for facilities and shall hold public hearings on the proposed code prior to submitting its final recommendation to the Secretary for his approval.

(d) After considering the recommendations submitted by the special committee in accordance with subsection (c), the Secretary shall promulgate standards which shall be applicable to all facilities receiving Federal financial assistance under this Act or in which programs receiving Federal financial assistance under this Act are operated. If the Secretary disapproves the committee's recommendations, he shall state the reasons therefor. The Secretary shall also distribute such standards and urge their adoption by States and local governments. The Secretary may from time to time modify the uniform code for facilities in accordance with procedures set forth in this section.

TITLE III—FACILITIES FOR CHILD CARE PROGRAMS

MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR CHILD CARE FACILITIES

Sec. 301. (a) It is the purpose of this title to assist and encourage the provision of urgently needed facilities for child care programs.

(b) For the purpose of this title—

(1) The term 'child care facility' means a facility of a public or private profit or non-profit agency or organization, licensed or regulated by the State (or, if there is no State law providing for such licensing and regulation by the State, by the municipality or other political subdivision in which the facility is located), for the provision of child care programs.

(2) The terms 'mortgage', 'mortgagor', 'mortgagee', 'maturity date', and 'State' shall have the meanings respectively set forth in section 207 of the National Housing Act.

(c) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to insure any mortgage (including advances on such mortgage during construction) in accordance with the provisions of this section upon such terms and conditions as he may pre-

scribe and make commitments for insurance of such mortgage prior to the date of its execution or disbursement thereon.

(d) In order to carry out the purpose of this section, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to insure any mortgage which covers a new child care facility, including equipment to be used in its operation, subject to the following conditions:

(1) The mortgage shall be executed by a mortgagor, approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who demonstrate ability successfully to operate one or more child care programs. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may in his discretion require any such mortgagor to be regulated or restricted as to minimum charges and methods of financing, and, in addition thereto, if the mortgagor is a corporate entity, as to capital structure and rate of return. As an aid to the regulation or restriction of any mortgagor with respect to any of the foregoing matters, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may make such contracts with and acquire for not to exceed \$100 such stock or interest in such mortgagor as he may deem necessary. Any stock or interest so purchased shall be paid for out of the Child Care Facility Insurance Fund, and shall be redeemed by the mortgagor at par upon the termination of all obligations of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under the insurance.

(2) The mortgage shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed \$250,000 and not to exceed 90 per centum of the estimated replacement cost of the property or project, including equipment to be used in the operation of the child care facility, when the proposed improvements are completed and the equipment is installed.

(3) The mortgage shall—

(A) provide for complete amortization by periodic payments within such term as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall prescribe, and

(B) bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance and service charges, if any) at not to exceed such per centum per annum on the principal obligation outstanding at any time as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare finds necessary to meet the mortgage market.

(4) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall not insure any mortgage under this section unless he has determined that the child care facility to be covered by the mortgage will be in compliance with the Uniform Minimum Code for Facilities approved by the Secretary pursuant to section 205.

(5) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall not insure any mortgage under title I of this Act comments concerning the consistency of the facility with the prime sponsor's comprehensive child care plan.

(6) In the plans for such child care facility, due consideration shall be given to excellence of architecture and design, and to the inclusion of works of art (not representing more than 1 per centum of the cost of the project).

(e) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall fix and collect premium charges for the insurance of mortgages under this section which shall be payable annually in advance by the mortgagee, either in cash or in debentures of the Child Care Facility Insurance Fund (established by subsection (h)) issued at par plus accrued interest. In the case of any mortgage such charge shall be not less than an amount equivalent to one-fourth of 1 per centum per annum nor more than an amount equivalent to 1 per centum per annum of the amount of the principal obligation of the mortgage outstanding at any one time, without taking

into account delinquent payments or prepayments. In addition to the premium charge herein provided for, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to charge and collect such amounts as he may deem reasonable for the appraisal of a property or project during construction; but such charges for appraisal and inspection shall not aggregate more than 1 per centum of the original principal face amount of the mortgage.

(f) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may consent to the release of a part or parts of the mortgaged property or project from the lien of any mortgage insured under this section upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe.

(g)(1) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall have the same functions, powers and duties (insofar as applicable) with respect to the insurance of mortgages under this section as the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development has with respect to the insurance of mortgages under title II of the National Housing Act.

(2) The provisions of subsections (e), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), and (n) of section 207 of the National Housing Act shall apply to mortgages insured under this section; except that, for the purposes of their application with respect to such mortgages, all references in such provisions to the General Insurance Fund shall be deemed to refer to the Child Care Facility Insurance Fund, and all references in such provisions to 'Secretary' shall be deemed to refer to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(h)(1) There is hereby created a Child Care Facility Insurance Fund which shall be used by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as a revolving fund for carrying out all the insurance provisions of this section. All mortgages insured under this section shall be insured under and be the obligation of the Child Care Facility Insurance Fund.

(2) The general expenses of the operations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare relating to mortgages insured under this section may be charged to the Child Care Facility Insurance Fund.

(3) Moneys in the Child Care Facility Insurance Fund not needed for the current operations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to mortgages insured under this section shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of such Fund, or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, purchase in the open market debentures issued as obligations of the Child Care Facility Insurance Fund. Such purchasers shall be made at a price which will provide an investment yield of not less than the yield obtainable from other investments authorized by this section. Debentures so purchased shall be canceled and not reissued.

(4) Premium charges, adjusted premium charges, and appraisal and other fees received on account of the insurance of any mortgage under this section, the receipts derived from property covered by such mortgages and from any claims, debts, contracts, property, and security assigned to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in connection therewith, and all earnings on the assets of the Fund, shall be credited to the Child Care Facility Insurance Fund. The principal of, and interest paid and to be paid on, debentures which are the obligation of such Fund, cash insurance payments and adjustments, and expenses incurred in the handling, management, renovation, and disposal of properties acquired, in connection with mortgages insured under this section, shall be charged to such Fund.

(5) In order to provide initial capital for the Child Care Facility Insurance Fund and

to assure the soundness of such Fund thereafter, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, in addition to any amounts which may be made available by the Secretary pursuant to section 4(a) (2) of this title.

TITLE IV—FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CHILD CARE PROGRAMS

PROGRAM AUTHORIZED

SEC. 401. (a) The Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance for the purpose of establishing and operating child care programs (including the lease, rental, or construction of necessary facilities and the acquisition of necessary equipment and supplies) for the children of employees of the Federal Government.

(b) Employees of any Federal agency or group of such agencies employing eighty or more working parents of young children who desire to participate in a program under this part shall—

(1) designate or create for the purpose an agency child care committee, the membership of which shall be broadly representative of the working parents employed by the agency or agencies; and

(2) submit to the Secretary a plan approved by the official in charge of such agency or agencies, which—

(A) provides that the child care program shall be administered under the direction of the agency child care committee;

(B) provides that the program will meet the Federal Standards for Child Care Services promulgated under section 204 of this Act;

(C) provides a means of determining priority of eligibility among parents wishing to use the services of the program;

(D) provides for a scale of fees based upon the parents' financial status; and

(E) provides for competent management, staffing, and facilities for such program.

(c) The Secretary shall not make payments under this section unless he has received approval of the plan from the official in charge of the agency whose employees will be served by the child care program.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 402. (a) Not more than 80 per centum of the total cost of child care programs under this title shall be paid from Federal funds available under this Act.

(b) The share of the total cost not available under paragraph (a) may be provided through public or private funds and may be in the form of cash, goods, services, or facilities (or portions thereof that are used for program purposes), reasonably evaluated, fees collected from parents, or union or employer contributions.

(c) If, in any fiscal year, a program under this title provides non-Federal contributions exceeding its requirements under this section, such excess may be used to meet the requirements for such contributions for the succeeding fiscal year.

(d) In providing financial assistance under this title, the Secretary shall, insofar as feasible, distribute funds among the States according to the same ratio as the number of Federal employees in that State bears to the total number of Federal employees in the United States.

TITLE V—RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION

DECLARATION OF PURPOSES

SEC. 501. The purposes of this title are to focus national research efforts to attain a fuller understanding of the processes of child development and the effects of organized programs upon these processes; to develop effective programs for research into child development; and to assure that the result of research and development efforts are reflected in the conduct of programs affecting children through the improvement and expansion of child care and related programs.

RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. 502. (a) In order to further the purposes of this title, the Secretary shall carry out a program of research and demonstration projects, which shall include but not be limited to—

(1) research to determine the nature of child development processes and the impact of various influences upon them, to develop techniques to measure and evaluate child development, to develop standards to evaluate professional and paraprofessional child care personnel, and to determine how child care and related programs conducted in either home or institutional settings affect child development processes;

(2) research to test alternative methods of providing child care and related services, and to develop and test innovative approaches to achieve maximum development of children;

(3) evaluation of research findings and the development of these findings and the effective application thereof;

(4) dissemination and application of research and development efforts and demonstration projects to child care and related programs and early childhood education, using regional demonstration centers and advisory services where feasible;

(5) production of informational systems and other resources necessary to support the activities authorized by this title; and

(6) integration of national child development research efforts into a focused national research program, including the coordination of research and development conducted by other agencies, organizations, and individuals.

(b) In order to carry out the program provided for in subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized to make grants to or enter into contracts or other arrangements with public or private nonprofit agencies (including other Government agencies), organizations, and institutions, and to enter into contracts with private agencies, organizations, institutions, and individuals.

COORDINATION OF RESEARCH

SEC. 503. (a) Funds available to any Federal department or agency for the purpose stated in section 501 or the activities stated in section 502(a) shall be available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the department or agency involved, in whole or in part, to the Secretary for such use as is consistent with the purposes for which such funds were provided, and the funds so transferred shall be expendable by the Secretary for the purposes for which the transfer was made.

(b) The Secretary shall coordinate, through the Office of Child Development established under section 602 of this Act, all child development research, training, and development efforts conducted within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and, to the extent feasible, by other agencies, organizations, and individuals.

(c) A Child Care and Development Research Council, consisting of a representative of the Office of Child Development established under section 602 of this Act (who shall serve as chairman), and representatives from the Federal agencies administering the Social Security Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and from the National Institute of Mental Health, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Labor, and other appropriate agencies, shall meet at least annually and at such more frequent times as they may deem necessary, in order to assure coordination of child care and development and related activities under their respective jurisdictions and to carry out the provisions of this title so as to assure—

(1) maximum utilization of available resources through the prevention of duplication of activities;

(2) a division of labor, insofar as is compatible with the purposes of each of the agencies or authorities specified in this paragraph, to assure maximum progress toward the achievement of the purposes of this title; and

(3) recommendation of priorities for federally funded research and development activities related to the purposes of this title and those stated in section 2.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 504. The Secretary shall make an annual report to Congress summarizing his activities and accomplishments during the preceding year under this title; the grants, contracts, or other arrangements entered into during the preceding year under this title, and making such recommendations as he may deem appropriate.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 601. As used in this Act, the term—

(1) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(2) "State" means the several States and the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

(3) "child care programs" means programs provided on a full-day or part-day basis which provide the educational, nutritional, social, medical, psychological, and physical services needed for children to attain their full potential;

(4) "children" means individuals who have not attained the age of fifteen;

(5) "economically disadvantaged children" means any children of a family having an annual income below the lower living standard budget (adjusted for regional and metropolitan, urban, and rural differences, and family size), as determined annually by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.

(6) "handicapped children" includes mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired children or children with specific learning disabilities who by reason thereof require special education and related services;

(7) "program" includes, but is not limited to, any program, service, or activity, which is conducted full or part time, in child care facilities, in schools, in neighborhood centers, or in homes, and includes child care services for children whose parents are working or receiving education or training.

(8) "parent" means any person who has day-to-day parental responsibility for any child;

(9) "single parent" means any person who has sole day-to-day responsibility for any child;

(10) "working mother" means any mother who requires child care services in order to undertake or continue full- or part-time work, training, or education outside her home;

(11) "minority group" includes, but is not limited to, persons who are Negro, American Indian, Spanish-surnamed American, Portuguese, or Oriental, and, as determined by the Secretary, children who are from environments in which a dominant language is other than English and who, as a result of language barriers, do not have an equal educational opportunity, and, for the purpose of this paragraph, Spanish-surnamed Americans include persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or Spanish origin or ancestry;

(12) "bilingual" includes, but is not limited to, persons who are Spanish surnamed, American Indian, Oriental, Portuguese, or others who have learned during childhood to speak the language of the minority group of which they are members and who, as a result of language barriers, do not have an equal educational opportunity;

(13) "local educational agency" means any such agency as defined in section 801(f) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

(14) "institution of higher education" means any such institution as defined in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

OFFICE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 602. The Secretary shall take all necessary action to coordinate child care programs under his jurisdiction. To this end, he shall establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Office of Child Development, administered by a Director, which shall be the principal agency of the Department for the administration of this Act and for the coordination of programs and other activities relating to child care.

NUTRITION SERVICES

SEC. 603. In accordance with the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall establish procedures to assure that adequate nutrition services will be provided in child care programs under this Act. Such services shall make use of the Special Food Service Program for children as defined under section 13 of the National School Lunch Act of 1946 and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, to the fullest extent appropriate and consistent with the provisions of such Acts.

SPECIAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 604. (a) The Secretary may make such grants, contracts, or agreements, establish such procedures, policies, rules, and regulations, and make such payments, in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, or otherwise allocate or expend funds made available under this Act, as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, including necessary adjustments in payments on account of overpayments or underpayments. Subject to the provisions of section 605, the Secretary may also withhold funds otherwise payable under this Act in order to recover any amounts expended in the current or immediately prior fiscal year in violation of any provision of this Act or any term or condition of assistance under this Act.

(b) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to assure that programs under this Act have adequate internal administrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel standards, evaluation procedures, and other policies as may be necessary to promote the effective use of funds.

(c) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program, service, or activity under this Act unless he determines that persons employed thereunder, other than persons who serve without compensation, shall be paid wages which shall not be lower than whichever is the highest of (A) the minimum wage which would be applicable to the employee under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206), if section 6(a)(1) of such Act applied to the participant and if he were not exempt under section 13 thereof, (B) the State or local minimum wage for the most nearly comparable covered employment, or (C) the prevailing rates of pay for persons employed in similar occupations by the same employer.

(d) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this Act which involves political activities; and neither the program, the funds provided therefor, nor personnel employed in the administration thereof, shall be engaged, in any way or to any extent, in the conduct of political activities in contravention of section 603 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

(e) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this Act unless he determines that no funds will be used for and no person will be employed under the program on the construction of so

much of any facility as is for use for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship or on the operation or maintenance of any facility other than in connection with the use of such facility for child care programs.

(f) A child participating in a program assisted under this Act shall not be required to undergo medical or psychological examination, immunization (except to the extent necessary to protect the public from epidemics of contagious diseases), or treatment if his parent or guardian objects thereto in writing on religious grounds.

WITHHOLDING OF GRANTS

SEC. 605. Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing for any prime sponsor or project applicant finds—

(1) that there has been a failure to comply substantially with any requirement set forth in the plan of any such prime sponsor approved under section 106; or

(2) that there has been a failure to comply substantially with any requirement set forth in the application of any such project applicant approved pursuant to section 107; or

(3) that in the operation of any program or project carried out by any such prime sponsor or project applicant under this Act there is a failure to comply substantially with any applicable provision of this Act or regulation promulgated thereunder;

the Secretary shall notify such prime sponsor or project applicant of his findings and that no further payments may be made to such sponsor or applicant under this Act (or in his discretion that any such prime sponsor shall not make further payments under this Act to specified project applicants affected by the failure) until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply, or the noncompliance will be promptly corrected. The Secretary may authorize the continuation of payments with respect to any project assisted under this Act which is being carried out pursuant to such plan or application and which is not involved in the noncompliance.

ADVANCE FUNDING

SEC. 606. (a) For the purpose of affording adequate notice of funding available under this Act, such funding for grants, contracts, or other payments under this Act is authorized to be included in the appropriations Act for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which they are available for obligation.

(b) In order to effect a transition to the advance funding method of timing appropriation action, subsection (a) shall apply notwithstanding that its initial application will result in the enactment in the same year (whether in the same appropriation Act or otherwise) of two separate appropriations, one for the then current fiscal year and one for the succeeding fiscal year.

PUBLIC INFORMATION

SEC. 607. Applications for designation as prime sponsors, comprehensive child care plans, project applications, and all written material pertaining thereto shall be made readily available without charge to the public by the prime sponsor, the applicant, and the Secretary.

FEDERAL CONTROL NOT AUTHORIZED

SEC. 608. No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall, under authority of this Act, exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or conditions with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational institutions.

NONDISCRIMINATION PROVISIONS

SEC. 609. (a) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this Act unless the grant, contract, or

agreement with respect to such program specifically provides that no person with responsibilities in the operation of such program will discriminate with respect to any program because of race, creed, color, national origin, sex, political affiliation, or beliefs.

(b) No person in the United States shall on the ground of sex be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, be subjected to discrimination under, or be denied employment in connection with, any program or activity receiving assistance under this Act. The Secretary shall enforce the provisions of the preceding sentence in accordance with section 602 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Section 603 of such Act shall apply with respect to any action taken by the Secretary to enforce such sentence. This section shall not be construed as affecting any other legal remedy that a person may have if on the ground of sex that person is excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, subjected to discrimination under, or denied employment in connection with, any program or activity receiving assistance under this title.

LIMITATION ON RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION

SEC. 610. The Secretary is directed to establish appropriate procedures to ensure that no child shall be the subject of any research or experimentation under this Act other than routine testing and normal program evaluation unless the parent or guardian of such child is informed of such research or experimentation and is given an opportunity as of right to except such child therefrom.

PARENTAL RESPONSIBILITY

SEC. 611. Nothing in this Act shall be construed or applied in such a manner as to infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents or guardians with respect to the moral, mental, emotional, or physical development of their children. Nor shall any section of this Act be construed or applied in such a manner as to permit any invasion of privacy otherwise protected by law, or to abridge any legal remedies for any such invasion which are otherwise provided by law.

(b) In order to achieve, to the greatest degree feasible, the consolidation and coordination of programs providing child care services, while assuring continuity of existing programs during transition to the programs authorized under this title, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended, effective July 1, 1974, as follows:

(1) Section 222(a)(1) of such Act is repealed.

(2) Section 162(b) of such Act is amended by inserting after "day care for children" the following: "(wherever feasible, through child care programs under title V of this Act)".

(3) Section 123(a)(6) of such Act is amended by inserting after "day care for children" the following: "(wherever feasible, through child care programs under title V of this Act)".

(4) Section 312(b)(1) of such Act is amended by inserting after "day care for children" the following: "(wherever feasible, through child care programs under title V of this Act)".

(c) The Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall take all necessary steps to coordinate programs under their jurisdictions which provide day care, with a view to establishing, insofar as possible, a common set of program standards and regulations, and mechanisms for coordination at the State and local levels.

(d) (1) Section 203(j)(1) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by striking out "or civil defense" and inserting in lieu thereof "civil defense, or the operation of child care facilities".

(2) Section 203(j)(3) of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out, in the first sentence, "or public health" and inserting in lieu thereof "public health, or the operation of child care facilities";

(B) by inserting after "handicapped," in clause (A) and clause (B) of the first sentence the following: "child care facilities," and

(C) by inserting after "public health purposes" in the second sentence the following: "or for the operation of child care facilities,".

(3) Section 203(j) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(8) The term 'child care facility' means any such facility as defined in 541(b)(1) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964."

AMNESTY FOR RESISTERS AND DESERTERS?

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, like a good many of my colleagues, I have been a little concerned about the hearings before a subcommittee in the other body dealing with the question of amnesty for those young men who have resisted the Vietnam war by violating the Selective Service Act or those have chosen to desert after serving on active duty for a time.

To say the least, the timing of these hearings is questionable and in that regard I was interested to read an editorial appearing in the March 3, 1972, edition of the Chicago Tribune entitled "No Time for Amnesty", and another editorial from the March 4, 1972, edition of the New Haven Register entitled "Ill-Timed Debate on Amnesty". I ask that the text of both editorials be placed in the RECORD at this point.

The articles follow:

[From the Chicago Tribune, March 3, 1972]

NO TIME FOR AMNESTY

In his eagerness to find historical precedent for granting amnesty to Viet Nam War resisters, a proposal being considered by his Senate Judiciary subcommittee's investigation of Selective Service procedures, Sen. Edward M. Kennedy told his committee members that "after the Civil War we gave amnesty to traitors."

He might as well have stabbed every southern Democrat in the heart. A fellow committee member, Sen. Strom Thurmond [R., S.C.], rose wrathfully to the occasion, saying he would never allow that word [traitor] to be used to describe his Confederate-soldier grandfather or any other citizens of states which seceded from the Union.

Mr. Kennedy's unfortunate analogy could not have been more inaccurate. Those who wore Confederate grey took up arms to fight for a cause. In the case of Viet Nam, amnesty is being sought for those who refused to take up arms, who went to prison or fled overseas to avoid the draft, or even, by some for those who deserted from the Army rather than serve in Viet Nam.

Kennedy has said that he generally favors unconditional amnesty for all at the end of hostilities in Viet Nam, a far more liberal approach than that proposed by Sen. Robert

Taft [R., Ohio]. Taft has introduced a bill granting amnesty after hostilities to all, except deserters, who would agree to serve three years in the military or accept alternative work in civilian government service.

No amnesty proposal is acceptable to Curtis W. Tarr, director of Selective Service. Tarr told the subcommittee at its opening session Monday that granting amnesty to young men who avoided the draft rather than fight in Viet Nam would wreck the military induction process and would be unfair to those who had served willingly. Even if amnesty were coupled with alternative civilian service it would seriously impair inductions, Tarr said.

It is estimated that between 30,000 and 70,000 draft dodgers are in Canada. Several hundred more, including many deserters, are in Sweden. Some 500 have been sentenced to prison for draft evasion. Another 6,000 draft registrants face possible prosecution, Tarr said.

Enactment of any amnesty law now, said Tarr, might some day prove to be an unwelcome tradition, jeopardizing the safety of the nation in future conflicts. The draft director also testified that it would set a dangerous precedent for selective acceptance of laws. Mr. Tarr is on solid ground. Amnesty is a risky measure not only until after the war but also until a durable volunteer army is established.

[From the New Haven Register, March 4, 1972]

ILL-TIMED DEBATE ON AMNESTY

This is a most unpropitious time to conduct a national debate on the issue of amnesty for Vietnam War resisters who have deserted the armed forces or violated draft laws. The emotionalism stirred by the Senate Judiciary subcommittee hearings show the climate is not favorable for dragging out the amnesty argument.

While the Vietnam War still goes on discussion of amnesty is premature. Granted. President Nixon is winding down the American involvement at a steady pace. The light at the end of the tunnel can be glimpsed. Yet the possibility of complete American withdrawal in the not-too-distant future seems even more reason for postponing the amnesty decision. Why get into this divisive, soul-searching question now if the atmosphere for calmer consideration might develop before long?

The timing of the hearings is suspect on political grounds in this presidential-election year. Doves, having been deprived of the war itself as a vital political issue, are attempting to substitute the amnesty question for it.

Discussion of amnesty is out of order with American prisoners of war being held in Vietnam. This point has been made by President Nixon, who has taken an attitude that allows all sides to strike a bi-partisan stance on amnesty.

With the U.S. trying to withdraw honorably from Vietnam, with American soldiers still dying, suffering and serving in the war, amnesty discussion can only rub salt into old wounds and revive bitterness. There will be time enough, when the war is over, to talk about amnesty more thoughtfully.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S TRIP TO CHINA

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's epochal trip to

China has aroused great interest, and captured the imagination of Americans of all ages.

Among those affected were the young boys and girls of Mrs. Cloninger's kindergarten class at the Heyer School, in Waukesha, Wis. As a tangible outlet of their interest, these young people wrote a song entitled "President Nixon" and while I cannot set forth the musical score here, I can relate the words as follows:

President Nixon is very good,
And he is strong and kind.
He took a trip to China
Love and Peace to find.

Who among their elders could more directly and simply express their feelings in relation to one of the great events of our day?

RATIFICATION OF TREATIES BETWEEN WEST GERMANY AND THE SOVIET UNION AND POLAND

HON. DAWSON MATHIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, America and the free world have a vital interest in the debate now underway in the German Bundestag over ratification of treaties between West Germany and the Soviet Union and Poland.

It would appear that Chancellor Willy Brandt's Ostpolitik brings few, if any, advantages to West Germany and her traditional allies while offering many concessions to East German, Polish, and Russian Communists. Past concessions to communism in return for future promises of security and the easing of tensions have always turned out to be in the best interests of the Communists.

We all recognize that the outcome of the treaties will quite properly be decided by the German people themselves. However, in view of the fact that we have stood side-by-side with Germany for the past quarter century, I feel it is proper for concerned Americans to make their feelings known about this country's stake in the formation of a rather precarious political policy.

So that Members of Congress and those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may be better informed on this important issue, I would like to share excerpts from a speech by Dr. Franz Josef Strauss in the German Bundestag on February 24, 1972. Dr. Strauss' remarks follow in abbreviated form:

REMARKS OF DR. FRANZ JOSEF STRAUSS

George Ball held several days ago a remarkable speech in Zurich, the Winston Churchill memorial speech. He said that the Soviet Union does not want to march into Western Europe with brutal display of military might, in order not to provoke America, but that its instrument is at present rather a slow infiltration and the psychological ensnaring of the adversary.

Is this statement not being daily confirmed by certain events in the interior of our country?

May I ask another question, not of the Government, but of all of us: Why does the

Soviet Union praise the policies of Brandt, and denunciate the policies of Kiesinger as aggressive ones, while allegedly Brandt's policy is only a continuing development of Kiesinger's policies?

The signature of the Federal Republic of Germany under the confirmation of the Soviet ownership in Europe is only a first step. The next aim is the European Security Conference which has been urged by the Soviet Union with a great energy, and propagated by her state propaganda machine in the same way as by the propaganda machines of her allies.

The European Security Conference is the next step on this way of the Soviet Western strategy. The result should be—

A European peace order,

The recognition of the Soviet status quo by all partners in the conference according to the example of the Moscow Treaty,

A total military and political-psychological control of the Soviet power sphere,

The exploitation of the economic possibilities of the individual West European partners,

The prevention of the West European unification through the deceiving alternative: "Do you want an all-European cooperation or a West European creation of blocks?"

Political and psychological assistance for the withdrawal of American troops, and

A free rear enabling a concentration against China at the same time as an expansion of our own Soviet influence into the West.

The individual elements and objectives of this policy should be once fully brought to our attention all together. This policy is logical and represents one closed whole, and the West German treaties with the East play only the role of a forerunner and opener for further steps. This should be made clear in public in our country, and only after it, we should form our judgment whether an "Aye" or a "No" for these treaties is justified.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT
OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. du PONT. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to introduce into the RECORD today the speech of the winner of the VFW Voice of Democracy Contest in Delaware, Kevin F. McCardle.

Mr. McCardle's speech is an excellent one, recognizing a simple truth that is too often overlooked today: That freedom involves responsibilities as well as rights. I would like to publicly congratulate Mr. McCardle on his success and recommend his speech to the membership:

MY RESPONSIBILITIES TO FREEDOM

Freedom is not, as some people think, made up entirely of rights. Freedom is a two-way street with both rights and responsibilities moving in both directions. No one has a greater claim to freedom than anyone else, but anyone who does work for his freedom can lay hold to his claim.

Freedom is an ideal for which I must strive, and once it is reached, I must fulfill the responsibilities it entails. Take for instance—voting, voting is a right that comes with my freedom, but it is not only a right, it is also a responsibility, a responsibility to see that the government, which gives me freedom, stays or gets into power. I must fulfill this obligation for myself, my friends, and my posterity.

Another right to which freedom entitles

me is the right to free speech. And again, this is not only a right; it is also a responsibility. I am, in fact, obligated to speak for that in which I believe; but more than that, I am obligated to speak against that which I feel is wrong. I must advocate peace, and condemn unjust war; I must stand out for freedom where unjust imprisonment reigns; and I must openly state my beliefs in honesty and truth, and do my utmost to have them prevail.

These two instances are quite specific, but freedom's rights and responsibilities are found in even the most basic concepts and ideals of human life. Thomas Jefferson shows us this in a very eloquent way in the "Declaration of Independence" when he cites our "inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." He then goes on to tell us, and all humanity, of our responsibility to see to it that a government, that will provide these rights, is put into power. In this way, he confirms the idea of having responsibilities to freedom, not only for ourselves, but for others, too.

The major problem is, though, that many people do not take advantage of the freedom they have, and thus they feel they have no responsibilities toward it. But things are different in my case, I realize what a great role freedom has played in my life, and for that reason, I feel obligated to it.

I see freedom in human life, in my ability to choose my religion, in every newspaper article, in my right to vote and right to free speech, in my "inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," and above all, I see freedom in America. For it is in America where I have realized all of the above freedoms, and I see everyone else's ability to do the same.

Henrik Ibsen, a well-known Norwegian dramatist, once wrote, "The most dangerous foe to truth and freedom in our midst is the compact majority." Maybe so, but I think this could be better paraphrased to express my feelings if it were stated, "The greatest advocate of truth and freedom is the unbound and unfettered individual." Because individualism stands out only where freedom reigns, and only an individual can fulfill his responsibilities to freedom. It is a never-ending circle—as long as freedom prevails, so will the individual; and as long as one individual prevails, just one, so will freedom. I am an individual.

I will not let freedom die.

UNDERSTANDING PRISONS AND PRISON REFORM

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, since last May, the Judiciary Subcommittee on Prison Reform, under the chairmanship of our distinguished colleague, Mr. ROBERT KASTENMEIER, has been holding hearings on the corrections crisis in America. The subject is an unusually complex one and the subcommittee has a monumental task in developing legislative solutions. In the meantime, many other Members of Congress are, I am sure, groping for a better understanding of the nature of the problem in our Nation's prisons. One of the best things I have seen for helping to get a "feel" of the problem is a series of articles on Ohio penal institutions by Ysabel Rennie, which appeared recently in the Akron Beacon Journal.

Ohio's new administration under our distinguished Governor, John J. Gilligan, is deeply concerned and is reviewing the archaic system which he has inherited. However, the problems of Ohio prisons, as outlined by these articles, are undoubtedly common to many other States and to the Federal prison system as well.

The articles raise a basic question, which we would all do well to consider in the coming months: How can we hope to create a sane, safe, humane society when our "correctional" institutions remain bastions of cruelty and anarchy? Mrs. Rennie's articles follow:

PRISON IS A WALL AROUND PROBLEMS—I (By Ysabel Rennie)

A prison, someone has said, is essentially a wall built around problems.

Ohio's prisons are seven in number, and will shortly be eight. They range from the fearsome medieval dungeons of the Mansfield Reformatory and the Ohio Penitentiary at Columbus to the campus-like openness of the Women's Reformatory at Marysville.

All of them, the best and the worst, are wastebaskets of unresolved problems: Drug addiction, alcoholism, mental illness, poverty, ignorance—all the puzzles society at large has failed to solve.

Who are the people in Ohio prisons? What are they doing there? What are we doing to them that will make some dent in this awesome problem we call Crime in the Streets?

During the year 1971 the Governor's Task Force on Corrections visited prisons and parole offices, talking to prisoners, officials, chaplains, psychologists, psychiatrists, social workers, parole officers and guards.

These articles will tell you some of the problems we found, some of the solutions we proposed.

The proposals came from all of us. This view of the prisons, however, is my own—what I personally saw and heard.

Dr. Simon Dinitz, president of the American Society of Criminology and a member of our Task Force, warned us that if we were looking for criminals we should not find most of them behind bars.

For every hundred reported felonies, he said, only 2.4 pct. in Ohio results in a prison sentence. Since only one felony in eight is ever reported to the police, this means that in Ohio, one person goes to prison for every 333 felonies committed.

How do we pick the one we punish for the hundreds of criminals who go scot-free?

One of the first things that strikes an outsider who talks to many prisoners is that most of them are poor. Rich people, by and large, do not go to prison.

Another thing you notice is how many are black. As one New York prisoner told a reporter, "How come you're always reading about the Mafia, but all you see in prison is black faces?" In Ohio you see many more—47 pct.—than can be explained by our population mix.

Finally, it is striking to anyone raised on the stereotype of the criminal, how much inmates look like people you see on the street. Take off the uniform, and you would not notice the difference.

Where they have been out of society many years, you will find them distinctly old-fashioned. One ex-forgoer of my acquaintance, who has spent most of the years since 1928 in the Ohio Penitentiary, always opens doors, lifts his hat, walks on the curb side of the walk when he is with a woman—courtesies which have disappeared from civilian life.

The older prisoners are very conservative. They disapprove of long hair, hippies and crime in the streets. One inmate wrote me from Lima: "I'm afraid to come out. Life seems so dangerous out there."

An ex-inmate, 24 years in prison, and three months on parole, was held up in a parking lot and his watch and money were stolen. After murmuring, "What a time to be without my '38," he said: "I'm beginning to see what the law-and-order types are talking about."

The older inmates may have a different profession—crime—but they accept their punishment philosophically. They disapprove of the young inmates who are today increasingly challenging the justice of our criminal justice system.

We found a generation gap in prison, not only between the old and the young, but between the young and the younger. One 30-year-old Lebanon called the 20-year-olds "hot daddies," and said: "They're nothing but trouble."

But all our prisoners are products of a special educational system supported for generations by the taxpayers of Ohio. It turns out that finely honed instrument of destruction, the professional criminal.

"When I was at Mansfield," said one former prisoner, "I locked with guys who were in my cottage at BIS (the Boys' Industrial School). When I went to the OP, the same guys were in my dorm there. And years later, when I went to Marion and Chillicothe, they were there, too. It's like going to prep school and then seeing the same faces in college. You've known them all your life."

This may, who did 24 years in Ohio prisons, started as an 11-year-old knocking down ears of corn in farmers' fields. The judge sent him to the Boys' Industrial (now Fairfield) School.

He told how, as a child, he was punished there by being made to toe a red line "until I dropped." Once he was beaten with a leather paddle six inches wide.

"They made us strip. Then they wrung out our shirts in cold water and made us put them back on. They stood us against the wall and beat us so hard I still have the scars."

This "schooling" leaves scars, not only on the flesh, but in the character as well. There are thousands of men like this in Ohio prisons.

Of the men entering the penitentiary, 60 pct. have been in prison before. One penologist has called our institutions "factories for the creation of monsters," and the evidence is strong that he is right.

Our reform schools do not reform, our correctional institutions do not correct and our penitentiaries do not make anybody penitent.

From Andrew Jackson's time to the present, Ohio has been building massive prisons with high walls and fences. Our latest, Lucasville, probably will cost \$50 million before it is through. One cynical ex-con has called it "America's most modern 15th century edifice."

We must be doing something wrong. What is it?

OHIO PRISONS HAVE ONE THING IN COMMON: ALL ARE TOO BIG—II (By Ysabel Rennie)

The first thing that strikes you when you visit our prisons is that most are in the middle of nowhere. The second is that they are too big.

The three receiving institutions, to which all felons are committed by law, are:

Ohio Penitentiary, Columbus, population 1,800. Maximum security. For males over 30. Murderers and second offenders are sent here regardless of age. Founded in 1834, it has been considered obsolete since the Civil War.

Ohio State Reformatory, Mansfield, population 2,150. Medium-minimum security. For first offenders 16-30. Opened in 1896, this gray stone fortress contains the largest single cellblock in the world—1,200 men in 600 cells, six tiers high.

Ohio Reformatory for Women, Marysville, population 290. Medium-minimum security. The only institution for women, it has no walls and in appearance rather resembles a small rural college surrounded by farms.

The remaining four prisons are transfer institutions for men from Mansfield or the penitentiary:

Lebanon Correctional Institution, population 1,450. Medium-minimum security. Opened in 1959, Lebanon is for men 16-20 from the southern half of the state who are not problem cases. All single cells.

Marion Correctional Institution, 1,150. Medium-minimum security. Built 1954. For low-risk inmates from the penitentiary. Twelve dorms, six cellblocks.

Chillicothe Correctional Institution, population 1,050. Medium-minimum security. Built in the 1920s, CCI was taken over from the federal government in 1966. It is for older offenders, and because of its openness and relatively relaxed discipline is considered the Riviera of the penal system. General population in dorms, psychiatric patients in cellblocks.

London Correctional Institution, population 1,400. Medium-minimum security. No very youthful offenders are sent here because its open dorms are an invitation to sexual attack. Formerly the London Prison Farm.

An eighth institution, Lucasville, awaits completion in Scioto County. Holding 1,650, is a maximum security prison, 22 acres under one roof. Because of its ceramic tiled walls, crushed terrazzo floors, and electronic hardware, it may be the most expensive prison ever built—about \$50 million.

Lucasville will house most of the inmates from the penitentiary, which will then become the reception and diagnostic center for the system.

These prisons are all too big. Penologists say no institution should hold more than 500 prisoners, and 300 is better. (In the Netherlands, prisons hold 80 to 100—a size at which "rehabilitation" becomes more than a word.)

With the exception of the penitentiary, our prisons are all too isolated. It is difficult for families to visit. It is difficult to recruit professional staff. Work furloughs, from such a base, will be all but impossible: the job opportunities are in the cities.

Ohio's prison exists like feudal fiefs of the Middle Ages, separate, self-contained, and owing allegiance to no one but a distant, understaffed central Division of Correction which long since abdicated all control over them.

As a result, each prison has its own philosophy, with different rules on visitation, discipline, dress, censorship, education, work and institutional life. A man transferring from one prison to another may find that his toilet articles or books, which were formerly acceptable, are now contraband.

In some prisons, the governor's task force on corrections discovered, all four grandparents were considered relatives, and could visit. At another two grandparents were considered relatives, but the other two were "friends." If the inmate had another friend on his list, they could not visit.

We found some prisons permitted an inmate three friends, some two, some one. Marysville allowed no friends except by special permission of the superintendent, or, in the case of men friends, of the Adult Parole Authority.

Until September 1971, women inmates were allowed only one two-hour visit a month. The staff explained: "Women don't really like to see visitors—it upsets them and interferes with their therapy." And when we asked why, the reply was: "Because women are different."

Each institution defended its way of doing things, no matter how bizarre it might seem. "Only a person who has spent time in cor-

rections," officials told us, "can understand why we do things as we do."

We found the inmates did not understand. This lack of understanding was a major obstacle to therapy.

Each institution has developed rules, regulations, customs and even folklore the way a ship collects barnacles. Furthermore, it considers them indispensable to navigation.

Strong leadership is needed from the top. In the central office we found one overworked commissioner, two deputies (one of whom was sick much of last year) and one harried assistant. They could barely answer their mail, let alone run the prison.

In California, by contrast, the central office has hundreds of employees—50 in research alone.

Our prison bureaucracy is not top-heavy, it is bottom-heavy: it needs a much bigger staff. The Task Force also recommended civilian advisers to give it contact with the world.

Dr. John Vermeulen, former chief of psychiatric services, once said "we who work in prisons spend so many years inside we become more institutionalized than the inmates."

It was in recognizing this problem that the Task Force recommended a civilian board or committee. It might be viewed with apprehension by officials—nobody likes kibitzers looking over his shoulder.

But civilian advisers would bring community standards to prisons because they would ask the question they would ask the question "why?"—something many administrators find difficult to answer.

NEW CONVICTS SUFFER DEGRADATION INITIATION—III

"When you go to prison," a former inmate once told me, "the first thing that happens is that you can't pay your bills."

An iron gate has slammed on a man's identity, his personality, his family, his friends, his financial responsibility and his civil rights. He undergoes what penologists call the "degradation ceremonies".

A man had a first name and a last. Now he has a last name and a number.

His hair is shorn. If he lets it grow again, he will be punished.

He is stripped to the buff, sprayed with delousing powder and examined in every orifice of his body.

"The guard was going down the line," a middle-aged man remembered. "I squatted for him to search my rectum. Then he stuck the same fingers in my mouth—and the next guy's rectum, and his mouth. I remember praying: 'Oh, God, let him wash his fingers!' But he didn't."

The new inmate is given a battery of tests—IQ, personality, scholastic aptitude. At the penitentiary they take nearly two days, and occupy 70 pct. of the staff time for the Department of Psychological Services. They are then noted in the inmate's "pocket" (file).

They may be looked at from time to time—when he goes to Classification for a job assignment, or when he goes before the Parole Board.

But they do not determine his work assignment. Institutional needs do that. Indeed, we could not find that the tests made any difference at all to his life in prison.

This is run according to the book—the rules and procedures of each institution. The "Inmate Manual" summed up the rules succinctly:

"Never ask an officer 'why,' it advised him. 'Merely do what he tells you.'"

To live by the rules, you must know the rules—but most rules are unwritten. A Lebanon inmate said: "These are rules that a child should be under—walking too slow, walking too fast, crossing the center line of the hallway, talking too loud. They're not

March 7, 1972

even posted—you learn them when you get a ticket."

The inmate might get a ticket for whistling, feeding birds, hiding dentures, wearing two-toned shoes or leaving knots in the sheet on laundry day. An inmate, chewing on a blade of grass, was written up for "grazing."

Once he has received a ticket, the inmate must stand trial. He may explain his side of the case. He may not call witnesses, and he may not contradict the officer. To do so would make him guilty of a major infraction—"lying to or about . . . a correctional officer."

Prison courts go by different names: the Rules Infraction Board (OF), Resident Behavior Committee (Mansfield), Major Court, Minor Court (Lebanon)—the names differ, but the procedures are the same. Two officers and one member of the treatment staff conduct the hearings.

I attended a hearing at Mansfield. One prisoner was charged with going to the paint shop without a pass. Said an officer, reprimanding him: "Supposing your mother came to visit and we couldn't find you?"

Another prisoner was charged with walking away from the steam table in the dining room. He explained: "I just wanted a breath of fresh air."

A third inmate who worked in the dining room, was accused of giving one inmate two helpings of pineapple. "I did," he admitted. "He was the last man in line, and we had pineapple left over. It would have been thrown out."

These solemn proceedings occupy the full time of two custodial officers and a psychologist or social worker, and they go on in every institution. Thousands of cases are heard each year—more than 6,000 at the Penitentiary alone. These are known to the inmates as "the Kangaroo Court."

At Marysville the trial comes after the punishment. The women are sent to solitary confinement by the matron who writes the ticket. Only after they have served their sentences are they called before the committee, which discusses in a motherly way how they may improve their conduct.

All Ohio prisons have what are called "correctional cells" by authorities—prisoners call them "the Hole." These are the jail-within-a-jail where troublemakers serve sentences for misbehavior.

At newer prisons, like Marion and Lebanon, "The Hole" is clean and well-lighted.

At Mansfield, "The Hole" is an area of unlighted cells in a building without windows. A dim light burns in the corridor, while in their cells, the prisoners lie, silent and in darkness, stretched out on their bunks.

When I was there, the temperature was in the 90s. All my eyes could make out were arms reaching toward the bars.

"The Hole" at the Penitentiary is also without windows. There are 36 correctional cells, two of them "strong cells" with solid steel doors. Until a year ago they contained no furniture, no bedding, no water and no toilet.

Inmates, lie on the cement floor, naked, using strips of toilet paper for a bed. They urinated through a hole in the front wall, and defecated on the floor.

All Ohio prisons had "strong cells" like this. But Bennett Cooper as commissioner of Correction ordered mattresses, toilets and running water installed in these strip cells. When we visited the prisons, this was being done.

In addition to short-term confinement, there is long-term isolation where inmates are kept in idleness for months or years. Here, they may neither work nor study. They wait, they hate. They count the days until they can get revenge on the society which keeps them there.

PRISON "SNITCHING" COMPOUNDS FEAR—IV (By Ysabel Rennie)

"No man is an island," wrote John Donne, but in prison every man is an island—alone, despairing, afraid.

Prisoners fear not only their keepers, they fear each other. It is a fear fostered by prison life, and compounded by the snitch system.

One penitentiary official told us: "Half the men in this place are compulsive finks." By this he meant that custody officials do not have to enlist informers. Their problem is to fight them off.

"When I was in the deputy's office," one former inmate told me, "we got so many anonymous 'kites' (messages), we didn't know where to put them."

Why do prisoners compound their misery by informing on each other?

For many, ratting obeys some inner psychological compulsion. In any society of captives, there are informers.

Some snitch to win favors, such as a transfer to the honor dorm, or a chance to be with the sex partner of their choice—a common reward for informers.

Some do it to get even with an enemy, or get his job. A totalitarian society breeds spies the way garbage breeds maggots—and prison is the model of totalitarianism. It takes a special kind of man to resist the pressures of the system—and all too often, he pays a special price.

There are two types of prisoners, the inmate and the "con." The con is tough, loyal and intransigent, and he despises his captors. He never snitches on another inmate. He adopts the values, good and bad, of the prison society. Some solid cons "do their own time" and stay out of trouble.

Others by their very intransigence, are in trouble all the time. These are the hardnosed "incorrigibles."

The hard-nose is the first man to be thrown in "The Hole," the last to get parole. He would rather be drawn and quartered than be caught snitching.

On the administration's scale of values, which rewards cooperation, he is at the bottom of the ladder. To fellow-inmates he is an object of fear and respect.

It is the peculiar failure of our prisons that to be "rehabilitated"—to adopt administration standards—a man must report on his fellows, while to be upright with them ties him to a criminal code of values.

Sooner or later, each inmate makes a choice between these traps. It is a choice that will leave him permanently maimed, no matter what he does.

Burrage Thorpe (not his real name) is an inmate at the O.P. During the 1968 riots he decided to help the administration—a decision which put him down on the wrong side of the snitch line. His life has been in danger ever since.

"You have no defense in here," he told the Governor's Task Force. "When Koloski was warden he protected me. Nobody does that now. I tried to see the warden. I was told: 'The Warden will see you in two and a half years.'"

Dan Osmond (also not his name) is the kind of inmate called "con." To him the administration is the enemy, and he wouldn't give any member of it the time of day. He is absolutely loyal to his friends—but during the 1968 riot at the O.P. he threw a knife at another prisoner who was running through the yard. "I had to," Dan explained. "He was a rotten snitch."

He has spent more time in "The Hole" than out of it. Once, after the riots, the guards in C & D block played Russian roulette against his temple. "Say your prayers, Osmond," they said, clicking the gun, "you're going to die!"

His crime was smuggling word out to the families of prisoners who had been stomped, maced and beaten in the "up-tight block."

It would not occur to Osmond to keep quite about this—threats would never deter him. He has himself been thrown into a strip cell naked on the bread-and-coffee diet which was standard there.

There is almost no indignity which he has not suffered. He is an "incorrigible"—but he would never betray a fellow inmate.

Osmond had fallen into one trap; Thorpe into the other. Prisons daily confront men with such choices.

Larry Conway (not his real name) was once locked in a cell with three other men. One had an annoying habit of humming to himself. One day a cellmate told Larry: "Tomorrow I'm going to kill The Hummer."

"What could I do?" said Larry. "If I told the deputy, he wouldn't believe me. If I insisted, he'd lock me up in Five Annex (the psychiatric ward of the hospital)."

The next morning, Conway's cellmate took a razor and cut the Hummer's throat. "I just turned my head to the wall and pretended I was asleep."

In a prison there are no options, only stark necessities. What prevails is the war of all against all—inmates against keepers, inmates against each other.

Outside we have laws, and sometimes they are enforced. But law stops at the gate. More crimes are committed against prisoners in penitentiaries and "correctional institutes" than against anyone else, anywhere else.

Thorpe was right when he said: "You have no defense in here."

Each prisoner makes his own peace with that fact, and men are daily destroyed by it.

SEPARATION—THE REAL ANGUISH OF PRISON—V

(By Ysabel Rennie)

"Henry Walters" (not his real name) is a young black inmate at Lebanon, Ohio's newest and one of its most isolated institutions. His grade achievement level is 3.8 years: He can barely read and write.

When the Governor's Task Force on Correction saw him, he was facing the reclassification committee made up of custody and treatment staff. The psychologist noted from his file that since arriving at Lebanon six weeks earlier, Henry had received no visits or letters.

"Doesn't your family get over to see you, Walters?" the psychologist asks kindly. How many letters and visits he receives will some day weigh heavily with the parole board.

"No, sir. My folks don't have no way to get here."

The psychologist, still kindly, presses: "I see you have not received any letters since you came to us."

There is a look of anguish on the boy's face, but he swallows hard. "No, sir," he says in an almost inaudible voice. "My mother don't write too good."

It is probable Henry's mother is not able to write at all. His family has no car. The nearest public transportation, the Greyhound bus, comes no closer than the town of Lebanon, which is miles down a country road. Henry, who is not much more than a child, may never receive any letters or visits while he is in prison.

"Jack Williams" is a white inmate at Marion, serving time for traffic manslaughter.

When Jack went to prison in 1968, his wife lost the \$12,000 home they were buying. Then she suffered a mental breakdown and was sent to the Massillon State Hospital. When she got out, she began to drink heavily, and her visits grew fewer and fewer.

"Williams" wrote anguished letters to her, but she did not reply. Instead, she filed for divorce under an Ohio law which makes imprisonment grounds for divorce. In his despair, he ran from a work detail and tried to go home to her. This cost him additional time in prison.

Separation is the real hell of prison.

I remember an inmate I met several years ago at Marysville. Shyly, she showed me the snapshots of her children who were growing up without her. The youngest, 10 years old, was born in prison and taken away from her mother at birth. As this woman spoke of her children, her eyes filled with tears.

"Don't ever let anyone tell you it is necessary to punish people in prison," she said.

"Being separated from everyone you love is punishment enough."

Under the rules then prevailing at the women's reformatory (and only modified last Fall), this mother, no matter how many children she had, could receive just one two-hour visit per month. The reasoning behind this restriction: That it would impress women with the importance of their families to their happiness and security—an importance, presumably, which they might otherwise overlook.

Only members of the immediate family may visit Ohio prisoners automatically and family is defined differently at each place.

Married women may not visit male inmates. Under this rule, a married aunt is barred. So is a sister-in-law unless accompanied by her husband.

The Task Force interviewed a black inmate at London whose wife had died. He had a two-year-old son who was being cared for by his wife's mother. Under the censorship then prevailing (and since lifted by order of Gov. Gilligan), he could not write to find out how his baby was. She still cannot bring the child to visit him: The "married woman rule" forbids it.

Under such restrictions, marriages wither, families are separated, children grow up never knowing their parent.

Prisoners coming out of our institutions are like Enoch Arden returning from the dead. For years, all they have associated with have been felons. Yet, on parole they are no longer allowed to do so. What other friends have they?

The Task Force has recommended an end to visiting lists. Any well-behaved person should be able to see an inmate. How can we complain of "unsuitable" visitors when prisoners daily associate with criminals?

Ohio made a giant step forward in August 1971, when it barred censorship of first class mail. The archaic visiting rules should go the way of the correspondence rules: They are quite simply indefensible.

We claim to value family ties, but we deliberately destroy them. As a result, at places like the penitentiary, two-thirds of all inmates never receive a visit.

We say community contacts are therapeutic, but we create an impenetrable thicket of regulations against them.

All this we do in the name of "rehabilitation"—that central mystery of the looking glass world we call "corrections".

SEX DEPRIVATION BASIS OF MOST EVILS IN PRISON—VI

(By Ysabel Rennie)

A former Massachusetts inmate called it "16 out of 24 hours of lusting in a cage." It is the inmate's most persistent problem—sexual deprivation.

Oddly enough, this worst of prison evils is the product of the first reform, when John Howard, scandalized by the mingling of male and female prisoners in 18th Century English jails, campaigned for the separation of the sexes. Howard won his point with parliament and we have had homosexuality in prisons ever since.

An ex-inmate once told me, "In prison, nine stabbings in 10 are over sex."

Every conceivable evil flows from this insult to human biology. The young man, going into prison, has only four choices, all of them bad. He can:

Fight off the homosexuals, and run the risk of killing or getting killed.

Fail to fight, and be gang-raped.

Find a lover who will protect him—hopelessly, a strong, dangerous man who can fight off other attackers.

Refuse to work and be sent to solitary confinement. This will mean no recreation, work, pay or schooling, perhaps for years. It will also go against his record for the parole board.

Jack Webster (a pseudonym) was sent to

the penitentiary at 17 to serve a life sentence for second degree murder. His life has been a hell ever since.

Once he appealed for protection. Prison officials made an obscene joke, at which "they all had a big laugh. But I didn't see anything to laugh about, so I walked out of the office."

"I am currently confined in C & D block upon my own request. I'm trying to figure the best way to solve my problem without getting additional time. So far I have not found a solution."

Children as young as 14 have been sentenced to the penitentiary by vindictive judges who had the choice of trying them as juveniles, and preferred to "throw the book at them." What happens to such children, in such a place, does not bear thinking about.

In the course of time, some of them become "jailhouse turnouts," indistinguishable from women in voice, manner, carriage and psychology.

They clean, cook and sew for their partners. Some become prostitutes, selling themselves for cigarettes or pills. The other men fight over them—sometimes they kill over them.

It is prisons which create these "girls," who are always referred to by "she." Officials seek to control them by locking them onto the "homosexual range." Some of them spend their entire prison careers in solitary confinement.

One such is a young black whom I shall call Jeremy. "I am profoundly effeminate," he confessed. Since his admission to the penitentiary in 1966 he has always been in maximum security, shut away from other prisoners.

After the 1968 riots, when inmates were terrorized by guards in C & D block, Jeremy broke down and had to be sent to the Correction Psychiatric Unit at Chillicothe. In November 1971, he was well enough that he asked for transfer into the general population at Chillicothe.

Instead, officials informed him he was going to be transferred back to C & D block at the penitentiary—that he would never be released into population. When he heard the news, Jeremy slashed his wrists. He is once again confined as a psychiatric casualty.

In California, family visiting is now permitted. At Tehachapi two small bungalows have been set aside where a prisoner's wife and children may spend 45 hours with him in a normal home environment. At other California prisons, there are apartments.

Twenty-four countries permit conjugal visitation. This includes not only wives but girlfriends. But Ohio wardens point out that letting wives visit does nothing for the unmarried inmate. That is why the governor's Task Force on Corrections has recommended home furloughs as a better solution.

When mail censorship ended, male and female prisoners began to write each other. Some even became engaged by mail, and exchanged rings.

Martha Wheeler, superintendent of the Women's Reformatory, expressed her disapproval of this correspondence "which serves to undermine their therapy and reinforces an identification with losers . . ."

"I hope these tragic and silly games will cool off," she said.

But there are pastimes more tragic than this lonely hearts correspondence. They are played out every day in every prison, where men without women, and women without men, seek relief—and sometimes lose their lives—in the covert, degrading game of prison sex.

EDUCATION GETS A LOW PRIORITY—VII

(By Ysabel Rennie)

If you look at the brochures put out by the Ohio Department of Mental Hygiene and Correction, you will get the impression of busy, industrious inmates learning new skills.

One flyer shows them in computer programming, shoemaking, tailoring and auto mechanics. There are courses in machine shop, welding, radio-TV repair, refrigeration and appliance repair.

But here are the catches:

The State provides no budget for vocational training. Equipment is obsolete—most courses, a waste of time.

Though the youth institutions have certified instructors, most others rely on guards or inmates to teach courses.

The last published figures (from 1969) showed only 7 pct. of inmates in any kind of vocational training. The commonest reason for enrolling is to impress the Parole Board.

It is almost impossible to get into a vocational course until a few months before meeting the Board. At the Penitentiary we were told: "You have to bribe the inmate clerks to get into one. You have to pay off the inmate instructors to get diploma."

This was confirmed by a man whose job is training former inmates for the job market.

"Most of the diplomas aren't worth the paper they're printed on," he told me. "OP inmates buy them from instructors. Even when the certificates are legitimate, the processes are so out of date they might as well not have taken the training."

Academic schooling is better. Most teachers are certified, although some prisons use inmate instructors, "aides." Mansfield and Lebanon have accredited high schools, and offer a few introductory college courses. Again, however, there are problems:

The State does not budget for education. Wardens equip their schools out of building maintenance funds. As a result, education and maintenance both suffer.

Except at Mansfield and Lebanon, most schooling is part-time and goes through the eighth grade.

For schooling beyond grade school, adult institutions rely heavily on the International Correspondence School, which the inmate must pay for himself. At London we were told "The ICS is handled by inmate clerks. Inmates pay clerks off in cigarettes to take care of their lessons." Wherever correspondence courses are taken, inmates sell each other school lessons.

The classes I observed were imitations of public schools, which inmates found boring—and dropped out of—as children. What prisons require is imaginative adult education.

Although the average grade achievement of Ohio prisoners in sixth grade, only literacy courses are required. If an inmate doesn't want to be educated, he doesn't have to be.

On the other hand, if he wants an education, every obstacle may be put in his path.

For example, at the Ohio Penitentiary you cannot go to school unless you have a full-time job—which runs during school hours.

At Lebanon, if you miss more than 12 days, or get four court tickets for anything, including walking across the center line of the hallway, you are dropped from school. Yet, as one official commented: "You are not kicked out of the tag shop for this."

At all prisons, putting a man in "The Hole" means keeping him from study. He may not attend school, take his books with him, or keep up with his school work.

When I questioned this sense of priorities, a prison superintendent told me: "You must remember that most inmates are in prison because of a lack of discipline in their lives. Discipline may be more important for them than school work."

Perhaps. But I have met former inmates who spent years in Ohio prisons who cannot fill out an employment application or write their names. I wonder how far this "discipline" will carry them in our modern society?

The job scene is no better than the education scene. Inmates earn a nickel an hour, of which they may spend three cents and

must put two cents away for gate money. Most jobs are housekeeping chores. As for Ohio Penal Industries, these are barred from competition in the market place. By law, they may not sell to private buyers. By federal statute, their products may not cross state lines.

The result is a concentration on such manufacturers as prison uniforms, state flags, license plates and state office furniture. Demand for such items is limited—manufacture, sporadic. This is why the Task Force saw inmates sometimes standing or sitting against the wall with nothing to do.

Idleness is the curse of prisons. Where five inmates do the work of one, nobody learns to do anything well. Inmates, who make five cents an hour, do about a nickel's worth of work. The lesson they learn is how to gold-brick.

Without a real commitment in funds, without a change in law, without a kind of public commitment we have never as a people shown, our prisons will remain dreary warehouses.

Frankly, as a Task Force we were skeptical that such a commitment is forthcoming. That is why we recommended a new direction for corrections. Prisoners, so far as possible, should be treated in the community, where they can work at real jobs and go to real schools.

There are risks involved—but nothing like the risks of turning out ignorant, hostile, unschooled men with no credentials in anything but crime.

GUARDS KEY PEOPLE IN PRISONS—VIII (By Ysabel Rennie)

Prisoners and penologists alike agree that not psychologists, not chaplains, not social workers but guards are the key people in corrections.

At the Ohio Correction Academy, a penitentiary officer asked his teacher, "If we're the key people, how come we're not treated like we're the key?"

A public opinion poll some years ago showed that on an occupational esteem index, prison guard is second from the bottom, above garbage collector.

But at Lebanon, Associate Superintendent George Stevens told my group: "In the Cincinnati suburb of Wyoming, a garbage collector makes \$3.92 an hour. My c.o.'s (correctional officers) start at \$2.77. After 11 years, they get \$3.33 an hour. After 18 years, they get \$3.65 an hour—30 cents less than the garbage collector."

In January 1971, Ohio Penitentiary guards went on strike. Talking to them, the Governor's Task Force on Corrections found pay was a lesser grievance than the indignities they suffered.

One told us: "The brass treat us like we were inmates." Talking to me privately, another said: They expect us to come in on our hands and knees, carrying our sticks in our mouths.

To inmates, guards are "hacks" or "screws." To many officials, also, they are ignorant, unqualified men—"job-hoppers and drifters," one penitentiary official called them.

Another said "only two or three in 20 are real good people who will stay."

It is ironic that the same people that destroy an inmate's morale—the contempt everyone feels for him—is the same problem that demoralizes the guard.

His is an unenviable position. He is poorly paid. He may have no more than an eighth grade education (most have never graduated from high school).

He may receive three weeks' on-the-job training in firearms and in how to shake down an inmate, or he may receive one week's training in these skills.

Then he is turned loose in the shops and cell blocks among inmates whose hatred for him is matched by his hostility to them.

It takes a psychologist—trained or natural—to manage prisoners. Some officers instinctively have the gift. Others become fearful and punitive. They fall into the "we-and-they" trap that ensnares captors and captives alike, and makes a mockery of treatment.

Guards and prisoners play a destructive game of cops-and-robbers. Prisoners lie and deceive—guards spy, harass and punish, sometimes cruelly.

Prisoners at the penitentiary showed us scars where, they said, they had been clubbed, blackjacked, kicked in the head or even dragged downstairs by the heels with their heads banging on the steel steps.

In short, what prevails between captors and captives is an adversary relationship. So long as it continues, prisons will be, not rehabilitative, but destructive to the men confined in them.

Can something be done about this relationship, or is it inherent in the prison situation?

To find out, Phillip G. Zimbardo, a professor of psychology at Stanford University, last Summer picked two dozen mature, stable college students from middle-class homes.

Half of them, by a flip of the coin, were designated "prisoners"—the other half, "guards." The "prisoners," after being picked up by Palo Alto police, were taken to a "jail" in the basement of the psychology department.

There they were stripped, deloused, put into uniform, given a number, and locked in a cell, where they were supposed to spend two weeks.

At the end of six days, the experiment had turned so grimly realistic that Zimbardo had to close down his "jail." In his own words, "In less than a week, the experience of imprisonment undid a lifetime of learning . . . We were horrified because we saw boys ('guards') treat other boys as if they were despicable animals, taking pleasure in cruelty, while other boys ('prisoners') became servile, dehumanized robots who thought only of escape, of their own individual survival, and of their mounting hatred of the guards."

If this can happen in a college lab, with educated young men, what must our prisons be like?

"Them" and "us": this is the rock on which corrections founders.

The Ohio Correction Academy, which opened with federal funds in March 1970, is trying to change this feeling.

It provides an imaginative two-weeks' course for correctional officers who have had at least six months on the job. Guards are taught about officer-inmate relations, prison management, treatment, communications, cultural differences, and many other subjects important to their jobs.

But this training began hind-side-to—with privates and sergeants, instead of "brass." "When we were finished," a guard said, "The man told us: 'Now don't go back and try this out at the Ohio Penitentiary.'"

Can this, or any other course, solve the adversary relationship that prisons breed? We simply do not know.

Prisons are a reality. So long as men are locked up, others will be assigned to guard them.

What penologist Howard Gill calls "the clinical imperative" demands that we do all in our power to make the guardians more sensitive to the ways in which they treat the captives.

The much despised, often misguided and sometimes destructive prison guard is really a normal human being, much like the rest of us. In his shoes, would we do any better?

He should be trained, paid and treated like the key man in corrections, because that is what he is. Potentially psychologist, teacher, guardian, he is the great undeveloped resource in the field today.

NO. 1 COMPLAINT: OHIO PAROLE—IX

The No. 1 complaint of Ohio prisoners is neither harassment, idleness, degradation, separation nor personal insecurity. It is the parole system.

The indeterminate sentence is one of the great "reforms" of this century. Alas, like so many others, it has turned out to be a way of to a hell paved with good intentions.

At one time prisoners served a "flat" sentence—so many years, depending on the offense. Then the concept of "rehabilitation" was introduced.

Under this model, prisoners were supposed to go to prison, not primarily for punishment, but to be reformed, so that they would come out better men.

If they had poor work habits, the theory went, they would learn to labor. If they could not read and write, they would be educated. If they were mentally disturbed, they would receive therapy.

This being so, it followed that you should keep a criminal in prison until he was reformed. Ohio, along with other states, adopted the indeterminate sentence. Thus, a man convicted of unarmed robbery was sentenced to from one to 25 years; a burglar one to 20; an armed robber 10 to 25 years.

A parole board was created to answer the awesome question: Is this man ready for society? Has he so changed his attitudes, enhanced his skills, or improved his psychological adjustment while he has been inside that it is safe to let him out? Or does he need more time?

Once a month members of our seven-man parole board visit each of Ohio's seven prisons, hearing inmates whose appointed time has come. Approximately 60 pct. of those heard are granted parole. The others are given continuances—"flops" they are called—of up to five years.

Male inmates at these hearings looked like the condemned awaiting execution. Women inmates, awaiting their turn, were openly sobbing, black and white clinging to each other for support.

But when the women's names were called, they dried their tears, threw back their heads, and marched in to the board with smiles on their faces. They were as poised (outwardly) and as frightened (inwardly) as an actress on opening night. They were, in fact, playing for their lives.

On the table before the panel of two or three hearing members were the inmates' "pockets"—dossiers which had been building since their first tangle with the law: arrest records, juvenile detention records, convictions, test scores showing education, intelligence and psychological adjustment.

How meaningful is that long institutional court record? What does "insolence" mean? "Fighting"? "Disrespect"?

How does an inmate answer hostile letters which may contain untrue information, if he does not know of their existence?

George Jackson, who at 18 robbed a gas station of \$70, spent 11 years in California prisons and was repeatedly denied parole.

The reason: a letter his father wrote to San Quentin officials in 1961, saying "he should not be released in his present frame of mind . . . Don't let him fool you with the many faces he is capable of showing."

The letter, which became a permanent, and secret, part of Jackson's file virtually guaranteed him against parole.

Our present indeterminate sentence laws are based on two fallacies:

That you can predict whether an individual will do well on parole. Research studies have repeatedly shown this is untrue.

That by leaving an inmate in prison for an additional number of years, he will become more "rehabilitated." Quite the opposite, in fact, occurs.

Over the past 30 years, California has tried more kinds of treatment programs than any prison system in the world. The conclusion:

there are no known treatment techniques which will reduce repetition or crime.

If we cannot predict parole outcome, if prisons do not rehabilitate, but in fact corrupt the men locked up in them, then the indeterminate sentence, which prolongs incarceration for years and years, is an injury, not only to the individual, but to society itself.

The Task Force concluded that sentences should be shorter, that we should let most inmates out at the end of their minimums, and that we should begin at once to seek alternatives to imprisonment.

SOCIETY MUST STOP TAKING REVENGE ON PRISONERS—X

(By Ysabel Rennie)

"It is particularly difficult to train for freedom within prisons," says penologist Norval Morris. "It is like trying to train an aviator in a submarine."

Ohio's prisons—America's prisons—are failing. We are at a crossroad when we begin to acknowledge what has been evident for nearly two centuries—that imprisonment is no answer to crime.

Would more education, vocational training and psychotherapy make a difference? In 1961 the UCLA School of Social Welfare evaluated 100 reports on correctional programs. Their conclusion: That prisoners who had undergone this "rehabilitation" were no more likely to succeed on parole than prisoners who had not.

The total of evil influences in prison is so much greater than the total of good influences, "therapy" included, that no one is better for the experience. You do not throw laundry into a sewer and expect it to come out clean. You do not put a man in prison to reform him.

We do not know at present of any form of "rehabilitation" that rehabilitates. We cannot say for sure that any form of "deterrence" deters.

America has the longest prison sentences and among the highest reported crime rates in the world. We are turning out criminals the way General Motors turns out cars.

When a man steals \$87, he is sent to the penitentiary. If he makes off with a multi-million dollar corporation; if he pollutes the Great Lakes or a river system; if he promotes a dangerous drug, manufactures defective cars or turns out a product which produces lung cancer, he has a chance of being made chairman of the board.

Ninety-nine pct. of our criminals are at large. We have so woven our net of criminal justice that we catch only the minnows. The sharks go free.

If punishment is to deter crime, it must reach all who offend—the rich, the poor, the white, the black, those who can afford good lawyers and those who cannot.

But do we really want to send all offenders to prison?

If we did, our expenditures on prisons in Ohio alone would be, not \$25 million a year, but over \$8 billion. Would the taxpayers sit still for this much "law and order"?

It costs a quarter as much to supervise a man on probation as it does to lock him up. Furthermore, when he is on probation he can work and support his family, who must now receive welfare. All studies show that recidivism (repetition of crime) is no higher for those receiving probation than for those going to juvenile or adult institutions. In fact, a major California study of juveniles showed it is 50 pct. lower.

Why, then, cling to prisons as the answer to crime? Because they meet a deep psychological need—to punish. We want to see the prisoner suffer—a feeling which runs so deep that reformers ignore it at their peril.

John Irwin, a professor of sociology at San Francisco State College, is a penologist who was once a prisoner. If the public wants "its pound of flesh," he says, give it to them. His suggestion: Short, tough sentences, for punishment only. Stop pretending to rehabilitate.

The principle of tort liability is well understood in common law. If you carelessly run into my car, you owe me restitution. Why should the criminal not make whole those he has injured?

"Ideally," writes one former Ohio prisoner, "corrections would be an ultimate form of Christianity: The 'Go and sin no more' that Christ said to Mary Magdalene. He did not tell her to pay \$25 and costs, or serve 30 days."

Since the public does demand its pound of flesh, however, the question becomes: How do we punish the offender without punishing society even more? This will require a change in our thinking, and in those deep, instinctual feelings that make us want to injure, rather than restore the criminal.

St. Augustine wrote: "No one is fit to inflict punishment save the one who has first overcome hate in his heart."

Could it be because we have forgotten this that our system of criminal justice is failing?

FEDERAL CITIZENS ANTICRIME PATROL ASSISTANCE

HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to provide Federal citizen anticrime patrol assistance grants to residents' organizations. I feel that public safety and security can best be achieved through cooperation between the general public and local law enforcement officials.

The purpose of this legislation is to encourage and assist through a program of local residents' organizations, efforts by citizens, through such organizations regularly to patrol and otherwise watch over local facilities and human activities vulnerable to crime, and to report criminal or suspicious activities to the proper law enforcement authorities and thereby to help deter or resolve crimes.

Citizen crime-fighting organizations have been in existence in some communities for a number of years, the oldest and one of the largest having been formed in Chicago in 1919.

Concern over the rising danger that crime imposes has spurred formation of innumerable neighborhood crime patrols in scores of cities in recent years. These volunteer groups attack crime in many ways, but basically they keep a protective eye on the community in which each member resides. This preventive approach of unarmed citizens acting responsibly and effectively to solve a community problem has significantly lowered criminal activity in the high-crime problem areas. The anticrime patrols put more people on the street, thus forcing the street criminal to cease his activity or be observed.

They also increase citizen involvement and concern. Yet many such patrols have

floundered for lack of financial assistance.

I am today introducing legislation—the Citizen Anticrime Patrol Assistance Act—that would permit the Federal Government to begin now to assist responsible citizen projects and to reward active community protectors. This legislation would provide direct Federal assistance to such citizen groups that qualify by submitting plans for "crime watch services." To obtain funds such groups must first demonstrate a need for assistance, consult with local police in developing the plan, and establish that the plan would not infringe upon constitutional liberties.

The act provides for special authorizations of \$50 million in 1973, \$75 million in 1974, and \$100 million in 1975 to be disbursed by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

The idea of providing aid to supplement existing police services provides needed money for the growth of such groups, and such growth would provide the community with a greater ability to control and reduce crime. The chance to provide a worthy and necessary service for one's community is often disavowed because of the helpless feeling of being one against many and that one's contribution is futile. However, on an organized basis, a new price in "community" often emerges. Such patrols would involve members who would not be too uninvolved to provide emergency assistance when a robbery was being committed against a neighbor. A protective instinct is healthy for neighbors to feel toward one another, much like the biblical Good Samaritan concept, in which one reaches out instinctively to help another in distress.

I read with great interest the recent poll taken by Life magazine concerning the fear of crime in our country. Sadly, 78 percent of the respondents from urban areas admit to being afraid in their own homes. This indicates a disastrous situation when the threat of crime causes citizens to alter their own lives, taking security measures which amount to making a fortress of their home. Window bars, watchdogs, and alarm systems are widely used.

When queried as to whether he would be willing to pay additional taxes in order to get better police protection, the response from citizens in all parts of the U.S. and from communities of every size was a resounding 70 percent "yes". Better police protection is desirable, but until the courts give police the deserved authority to perform their job, and more money is available to hire more police we cannot rely wholly on the police to stem the tide of crime.

It occurs to me that crime prevention should not be the exclusive province of the police department at any rate. Direct citizen action to assist law enforcement in fighting crime has become an absolute necessity in this day of rampant disrespect by a few for the rights of many. Anticrime Citizen Patrols may well be the answer to reestablishing a feeling of loyalty and trust within the community in which one chooses to reside.

**SERTOMAS SPEAK UP FOR
FREEDOM**

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, Sertoma International, has just completed its annual Freedom Week Activities recognizing newly naturalized Americans and focusing upon our heritage of individual liberty.

I was honored to participate in a portion of this observance in my hometown in Chattanooga, Tenn.

On this occasion, I want to commend Sertoma clubs throughout the Nation and particularly those in the Third Congressional District of Tennessee for their splendid patriotism and service to their fellow Americans.

In Chattanooga, Sertoma has distributed 25,000 copies of our Declaration of Independence to junior high school students since the freedom program was initiated in 1960. This year, club members distributed over 5,000 such copies and took time from their regular occupations to speak to students about our American heritage.

Each year, the Sertoma Club of Chattanooga also presents its Freedom Award to an outstanding citizen or institution of the community for contributions to preservation of the American way of life. This year's recipient, Luther Masingill, exemplifies the highest qualities of leadership and patriotism.

In connection with this year's activities, it was my recent privilege to judge the second annual "Speak Up for Freedom" contest sponsored by the Highland Sertoma Club of Chattanooga. Six outstanding high school orators from the Chattanooga area competed. All the entries were excellent, and the moving occasion testified to the high caliber of our youth today. As film star Chill Wills, who emceed the program, put it:

I don't think we're going to run out of leadership when we have young people like these.

The winner, Miss Alecia Scott of Red Bank High School in Chattanooga, presented an inspiring and thoughtful speech demonstrating a mature understanding of freedom and our responsibility to preserve it. I recommend it to my colleagues as worthwhile reading.

The essay follows:

WITHIN OURSELVES OUR FUTURE LIES

(By Alecia Scott)

"Freedom is a hard-bought thing—
A gift no man can give,
For some, a way of dying,
For most, a way to live."¹

In this country both concepts of freedom are true—early Americans died to insure freedom for those who were to live in the future; today, we enjoy freedom because these patriots gave their lives for liberty. The American type of freedom began back in 1776 when Thomas Paine, Benjamin Franklin, and Thomas Jefferson were ex-

pressing their desires for and ideas about freedom in documents that live and breathe today. During these Revolutionary times, the Thirteen Colonies cried out for freedom from taxes, from the King, from the Old World; and against impossible odds and insurmountable difficulties, they got what they wanted. Since those times that tried men's souls, freedom has changed from meaning that an individual has rights to meaning that each individual has his own concepts and interpretations of these rights.

The liberties outlined in the Bill of Rights in our Constitution are applicable to you and me in very personal ways. Freedom means an amending process which has changed the law to allow many teenagers to exercise their voting privileges this year. In this free society, we can choose which college we want to attend, but that college can also deny us admission. Freedom involves a respect for the government and the right to disagree with its officials. Freedom of religion means a person can go to church three times a week, twice a year, or not at all. As a part of the free enterprise system, we can choose our occupation, but we will find ourselves in competition with others who have chosen the same career.

We can read the newspapers or watch the news on television; at the same time, the freedom of the press insures the right of the journalist or commentator to interpret the news as he sees it. Freedom is the knowledge that an individual's rights and liberties end where another person's begin.

Since her very conception, America has been a beacon of freedom, guiding our leaders and setting an example for all other nations. Millions of soldiers have died to preserve our liberty, and the leaders of this government have kept the country's freedom intact. But the real mold of the past and determiner of the future is the voter, he who elects the administrators of the law. Without the voter there would be no elected government to make laws, to state policies, or to impose freezes. Only by being concerned enough and by becoming involved enough to vote can an American feel that he is doing his share for his country. Patriotism and oratory are fine qualities, but neither will be as effective as a trip to the polls on election day. With the traits of dedication, involvement, and courage instilled in each American, the United States will continue to be strong and unconquerable as the motto of Girls' State suggests: "Forward forever, backward never, within ourselves our future lies." People, the voters, America's concerned citizens—these have preserved her freedom thus far and are her security for the future.

Freedom may have a different definition to each individual, but freedom is also a universal feeling. As long as people exist, an inborn desire for personal liberties will exist. Freedom may be everyone's right, but its preservation is truly everyone's responsibility. My own concept of an individual's role in the protection of our freedom is summarized in a paraphrased contemporary song: "Let there be freedom on earth, and let it begin with me."

COASTAL CASE STRONGER

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, the Louisiana delegation and other Members of the Congress met with Ashton Phelps, the publisher, and

George W. Healy, Jr., the editor, of the New Orleans Times Picayune, to discuss the need to share with coastal States the revenue of mineral production on the Outer Continental Shelf.

At the present time, the Federal Government rightly shares with inland States 37½ percent of the revenues generated by mineral production on lands within their borders. Coastal States, which provide the public services which make offshore mineral production possible, are not afforded the same treatment.

The Times Picayune, led by its able editor, George W. Healy, Jr., has directed its editorial attention to the inequities of the present treatment of inland States. I am inserting a recent column by Mr. Healy, and calling it to the attention of my colleagues:

COASTAL CASE STRONGER

(By George W. Healy)

As more facts become available, the more it becomes obvious that sharing by the federal government with coastal states of its growing revenues from offshore lands is a necessity.

That is our opinion—confirmed by new information becoming public practically every day.

Desirability of revenue sharing with the coastal states to end inequities which have penalized those states long has been apparent.

Now, developments indicate that this sharing is essential if the nation's mounting need for energy is to be met.

Atlantic Coast states, understandably, have expressed opposition to exploration and production from the Outer Continental Shelf beyond their shores, despite acute needs for energy in those states.

There are two reasons, we believe, for this opposition. They know less about offshore production than do Texas, Louisiana and other states which have gained valuable experience in the past quarter century. Also, and probably more important, there is no incentive for them to encourage production of riches from federal lands off their coasts if that production will cost them dearly and if those riches will not be shared with them to compensate for their added costs.

Inland states which have received substantial funds from revenues produced on inshore federal lands are concerned, rightly, that cancellation of mineral lease sales which already have affected offshore federal lands production may spread.

Abandonment of exploration for and production of oil and gas from inshore federal lands would adversely affect states which during the four years 1968-1971 received \$217,584,900.28 as their share of revenues produced from these lands.

Figures obtained recently from the Bureau of Land Management of the United States Department of the Interior show that Wyoming in these four years received \$75,722,939.53 as its share of revenues from inshore federal lands; New Mexico, \$48,779,079.30; Alaska, \$32,492,099.29, and other states amounts ranging from \$13,505,058.39 downward.

During the same period federal lands off the Louisiana coast produced revenues in excess of \$3,000,000,000. None of this revenue was shared with Louisiana.

The inland states which share federal lands revenue, in our opinion, deserve every dollar which they receive. They provide services which make possible productivity of these federal lands. They also forgo collection of taxes from these lands.

¹ "Song of the Settlers," by Jessamyn West.

Coastal states perform many governmental services which make possible production of oil, gas, sulphur and other minerals from offshore lands. They also forego tax collections. Had they been collectible, severance taxes on natural resources extracted from federal lands off the Louisiana coast 1955-1968 would have placed \$397,356,668.42 in this state's treasury.

Louisiana is not alone in being discriminated against by the existing revenue-sharing policy of the federal government. Texas, Florida, California, Oregon and Washington also have received no part of the substantial revenues which have been produced from federal lands off their coasts.

Other coastal states will suffer, we predict, unless the Congress passes laws treating offshore federal lands as inshore federal lands are treated for purposes of revenue sharing.

The growing demand for energy already has led to extensive exploration in the Outer Continental Shelf off coastal states which now have no offshore production.

Litigation has not righted the wrong being done coastal states. The time is here for Congress to act.

Federal inshore revenue-sharing—Division of Receipts: 1968-71

Alabama	\$42,842.93
Alaska	32,492,099.29
Arizona	781,634.93
Arkansas	78,121.02
California	12,958,508.67
Colorado	12,688,575.20
Florida	67,525.35
Idaho	1,025,023.22
Indiana	2.00
Kansas	652,440.37
Louisiana	1,660,368.21
Michigan	62,926.20
Minnesota	549.48
Mississippi	61,239.69
Missouri	18.00
Montana	11,926,881.77
Nebraska	14,696.35
Nevada	2,014,283.73
New Mexico	48,779,079.30
North Dakota	842,189.68
Oklahoma	708,601.70
Oregon	682,479.15
South Dakota	767,126.74
Utah	13,505,058.39
Washington	49,651.98
Wisconsin	37.40
Wyoming	75,722,939.53
Total	217,584,900.28

THE ALTERNATIVES TO BUSING

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the idea of busing schoolchildren to achieve an artificial racial balance has troubled me since its inception, and my concern has grown as my district has struggled with the terrible problems it causes.

I realize that in every argument against a particular policy there must be workable solutions offered in its place. In the case of busing, I have long argued that we must not saddle our children with finding solutions to our own problems of bigotry and prejudice—we must attack the problems by insuring equality in jobs, in pay, in housing, and every other aspect of our society.

At the same time, we must work to provide quality education rather than

concentrate on artificial and unworkable schemes of racial balance.

The Evening Star recently published an editorial entitled "The Alternatives to Busing" stressing the importance of quality education over "dysfunctional schemes" of racial balance. While I do not agree with their arguments against a constitutional amendment to block racial busing, I do think they have made some excellent points regarding other possible legislation to insure equality in education. I now insert the editorial into the RECORD:

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 18, 1972]

THE ALTERNATIVES TO BUSING

Professor Charles V. Hamilton, a Negro scholar, has written in the Harvard Educational Review that segregationists must be fought at every turn. Then he added: "But in our determination to defeat them, let us not devise plans that are dysfunctional in other serious ways."

His comment goes to the heart of the great dilemma and current political furor over school busing. For some 18 years, this country has labored to comply with the Supreme Court decision that the races may not be separated by law in the public schools. We have nearly reached the point where de jure segregation, Old South style, with its dual facilities, is dead. And many communities are very happy with the result. Meanwhile, however, the courts have kept raising the ante, forcing school districts to go ever farther to integrate the schools. The Mehrige ruling in Richmond, requiring wholesale city-suburban shifts of black and white students, is the latest example. Pending cases in Detroit and Denver could require even more sweeping schemes.

And with it all has come the reaction. Opposition to busing involves many different sorts of feelings and considerations. Chief among them though, are some very valid concerns among both white and black parents. They fear what Professor Hamilton called the "dysfunctional," the upsetting of personal life and normal school practice to the point of more than canceling out the purported educational gains that come from integration.

Clearly, something must be done. But it is of paramount importance that the right thing be done, that the balance be struck is morally and intellectually right.

At this point, the burden of initiative is with President Nixon. For he has pledged to move against busing as a device to achieve racial balance. And he has told conservative congressmen he will study several anti-busing alternatives, including a constitutional amendment. Any number of such amendments are now before Congress. The important point, though, is that the success of the amendment tactic could well depend on whether the President decides to support or reject it.

We believe he should reject it. Not because such an amendment would, as some say, "trivialize" the Constitution. In fact Representative Norman F. Lent's proposed amendment, banning school assignments on the basis of race, simply would constitutionalize the ideal inherent in the 1954 Supreme Court decision.

Yet it would have a negative effect. It would undercut some of the desegregation already achieved, perhaps resulting in the rollback of successful school plans in both North and South. Even at best, it would appear pro-segregationist, and this is something the administration and Congress should want to avoid. On such a sensitive front, appearance is part of reality.

Legislation is by far the better route. In the first place, as Vice President Agnew recognized, it is more flexible. Second, it

means Congress would do what it should have done long ago—play a role in this issue side by side with the courts.

But what kind of legislation? The proper congressional committees might well start with the bill suggested by Professor Alexander Bickel of Yale and Representative Richard Preyer of North Carolina. It avoids discrimination or conflict with the Supreme Court. It would seek to combat racial isolation, and would give any student the right to transfer from a school in which his race is in the majority to one in which his race is in the minority. But by far its most important provision aims squarely at equalizing the resources of schools and school districts.

It has long been our view that the key to dealing with the inadequacies of inner-city and other predominately black schools is to so improve those schools that quality education can, and does, take place. This can only be done, of course, at great financial cost. Yet whatever that cost, decisive action has become imperative. If the drift to ever bigger busing plans is to be checked, and we agree it should, the only feasible alternative is to preserve racial justice, which is quite different from racial quotas, and to assure truly equal educational opportunity.

GIUSEPPE MAZZINI, 1805-72

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, next Friday, March 10, will be the centennial of the passing of the patriot, Giuseppe Mazzini, who devoted his entire adult life to the cause of Italy's unification. The 67 years of his earthly pilgrimage between his birth at Genoa in 1805 and his death at Pisa were crowded with varied experiences, but his lifelong goal was the incorporation of the conglomeration of Italian states, most of which were dominated by Austria, into one nation.

The account of the long journey from fragmentation to unification is largely the story of four men, each of whom played a significant role in the drama. Vittorio Emanuele II, the King of Sardinia, was the leader; although Mazzini desired a republic, he settled reluctantly for a monarchy. Cavour was the politician, Garibaldi was the soldier, and Mazzini was the patriot; all were essential to the cause of securing independence from foreign domination and domestic jealousies.

Mazzini overcame the handicap of delicate health, he surrendered his literary ambitions, he endured long exile in foreign lands, he was well acquainted with poverty, he underwent imprisonment, and was for a time under sentence of death. In the end the cause to which he gave his all triumphed gloriously.

Let me close my remarks by reading two tributes, one from Thomas Carlyle, the other from Garibaldi. In a letter to the London Times, written on June 15, 1844, the historian said, in part:

I have had the honour to know Mr. Mazzini for a series of years, and whatever I may think of his practical insight and skill in worldly affairs, I can with great freedom testify to all men that he, if I have ever seen one such, is a man of genius and virtue, a man of sterling veracity, humanity, and

nobleness of mind, one of those rare men, numberable unfortunately but as units in this world, who are worthy to be called martyr souls; in silence, piously in their daily life, understand and practise what is meant by that.

A score of years later, at a luncheon in London, Giuseppe Garibaldi, who was famous throughout Europe and the Americas as "the Liberator," acknowledged his debt to his fellow countryman in these eloquent words:

I am going to make a declaration which ought to have been made long ago. Among us here is a man who has performed the greatest services both to my native land and to freedom. When I was young and had nothing but aspirations, I looked for a man who could counsel and guide my young years. I sought him as a thirsty man seeks water. I found him. He alone had kept alive the sacred fire; he alone watched while others slept. He has always remained my friend, filled with the love of country, filled with love for the cause of liberty. This man is my friend Giuseppe Mazzini. I drink to him, to my friend, to my teacher.

Mr. Speaker, Mazzini's devotion to the cause of human liberty, while expended in behalf of his native land, was unbounded. We in America, who have enjoyed freedom for almost two centuries and who have done so much to advance freedom elsewhere, can well spare a moment to pay tribute to a great patriot—Giuseppe Mazzini.

HARTKE-BURKE BILL DESERVES DEFEAT

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, the Minneapolis Tribune editorial of February 17 contained an analysis of the potentially disruptive effect which the Burke-Hartke bill would have on our Nation's economy.

In the March 2 Tribune, Harry Heltzer, chairman of the board of Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing, responded with an excellent letter to the editor outlining the positive effect on domestic employment that the multinational efforts of his company have produced.

I commend these two articles to my colleagues:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Feb. 17, 1972]

HARTKE-BURKE BILL DESERVES DEFEAT

Never in recent years has the debate between trade-liberalization advocates and protectionists been so sharply focused as now. For the first time since 1967 there is concrete evidence of progress toward international reduction of trade barriers. A precedent of the opposite kind is the trade-restriction bill introduced in Congress by Sen. Vance Hartke, D-Ind., and Rep. James Burke, D-Mass.

Among many other retrogressive provisions, the bill would set quotas to reduce imports some 40 percent from 1971 levels. The Emergency Committee for American Trade calls the proposal "the most sweeping attack against the international operations of business ever introduced in Congress." If the Hartke-Burke bill has any virtue, it is that of sharply defining one issue: A prerequisite to trade liberalization and economic growth is the bill's defeat and replace-

ment, in the next year or so, with a trade act restoring to the President negotiating authority lost when that provision of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 expired five years ago.

Legislation similar to Hartke-Burke (although not quite so restrictive) was defeated in 1970 by common sense and warnings of the retaliatory measures that other countries could take against American exports. The same arguments apply now, reinforced by positive signs that appeared last week. From Japan on Wednesday and from the Common Market Friday, the United States gained concessions to increase U.S. exports in several categories. The concessions were nominal; more significant was the agreement by the Europeans, Japanese and Americans to enter into worldwide trade negotiations in 1973.

According to William Eberle, President Nixon's chief trade negotiator, the agreements are an expression of "political will" to reduce inequities and barriers to trade. We think he is right in expressing hope that trading partners are becoming aware that liberalization is in the best interests of all and right, too, in warning of the painstaking preparations necessary to give such negotiations a chance of success. An essential bit of preparation, as well as a means of demonstrating the U.S. political will on trade, would be decisive congressional rejection of the Hartke-Burke bill.

THE HARTKE-BURKE BILL

I agree with the conclusions expressed in your editorial of Feb. 17 "Hartke-Burke bill deserves defeat." The sponsors and supporters of this proposed legislation have identified a serious problem—that certain U.S. industries are hard-pressed to compete with products from other countries—but their proposed solution falls far wide of the mark.

The solution lies not in protectionist policies that are sure to lead to retaliatory measures by other governments, but through controlling inflation, negotiating agreements for a freer flow of goods between countries and increasing our rate of growth in productivity. We will all benefit through increased job opportunities and lower prices paid by consumers.

The Hartke-Burke sponsors have charged that multinational companies are "exporting jobs." A recent survey of 158 multinational firms by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce indicates that during the decade of the 1960s these companies grew 31 percent in terms of new U.S. jobs, compared to the national average growth of just 12 percent. Similar surveys by the National Foreign Trade Council, the Emergency Committee for American Trade and others support these findings.

Our own experience at 3M also supports this: Since 1951, when we entered international markets, our employment has grown from 12,000, with only a handful of jobs dependent upon export activity, to some 40,000 persons employed in the United States. We estimate that one out of eight of our U.S. employees owes his job to 3M's overseas operations.

That means that a lot of jobs for employees in and around Alexandria, Cottage Grove, Fairmount, Hutchinson, New Ulm, Northfield, Pine City and St. Paul are dependent on our global business, as are others in Brookings, S.D., and Cumberland, Nekeosa, Wausau and Prairie du Chien, Wis.

In addition, we consider ourselves a kind of "export department" for many of our suppliers, who may not recognize the extent to which they are engaged in international trade.

You can see why we are alarmed—as all U.S. consumers should be—by proposals such as Hartke-Burke, which would turn back the clock to the days of the Smoot-Hawley Act by encouraging the raising of protectionist walls by our trading partners.—Harry Heltzer, chairman of the board, 3M Co., St. Paul.

FACTIONAL DIVISION OF THE NORTH OF IRELAND: A REPORT

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the violence in Northern Ireland continues to take lives, on both sides of the conflict. As of February 28, 1972, 252 people had lost their lives since August of 1969.

I have been extremely active in trying to bring about a solution to the tragic situation in Northern Ireland. I have introduced legislation calling for an end to hostilities, the withdrawal of British troops, and the holding of a plebiscite of all of Ireland to determine the question of national reunification.

I have also introduced legislation to provide 25,000 emergency refugee visas for residents of Northern Ireland. This would provide speedy entry into the United States in time of emergency in much the same way as this Nation provided for the Hungarians and the Cubans in the past.

Just last week I testified at hearings on the problem before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Subcommittee on Europe.

In order that my colleagues may be fully aware of the information on the situation in that strife torn nation, I am including for the record a report written by Mr. Fred O'Briain. Mr. O'Briain completed his undergraduate work in 1965, his law degree in 1969, and a master's degree in 1971. He is currently employed by the U.S. Government as an attorney in the Bureau of Customs.

I believe that my colleagues will benefit from reading this report.

The first half of the report follows:

FACTIONAL DIVISION IN THE NORTH OF IRELAND

(By Fred O'Briain)

Problems exist today in Ireland because they were left unsolved in 1921 when the two Irelands were created to appease opposing religious and political factions. Religious bigotry has been the tool utilized by the ruling elite in the North of Ireland to polarize the Catholic and Protestant working class citizens. There has been an ingrained religious prejudice in Ulster dating from its establishment in 1921 and extending from 1689 when the Protestant William of Orange defeated the Catholic King James at the Battle of the Boyne.

This traditional prejudice is important in understanding the people of Ireland since it plays such an important role in their everyday life. Both religious groups conjure up past heroes and martyrs whenever there is an outbreak of violence and there have been a multitude of them since 1921.

The Prime Ministers of Ireland, Northern Ireland, and Great Britain are meeting to discuss the problems of Ulster. Their meetings have temporarily ended but will be renewed and this is quite an accomplishment. The three had never come together in the past and the fact of their meeting will hopefully bring necessary concessions from all parties, but it will take time. Fifty years of partition can't be erased by a few conferences. Long range solutions can be worked out, but there is a need for some temporary measures otherwise Ireland will have a civil war that could permanently damage any hopes for a settlement. From

my own opinion that I garnered during a stay in Belfast this past August, I would say that the people would rather have a neutral peace-keeping force deployed in their country rather than the British Army that is now there. They have become despised by both religious factions. The Ulster Police can't maintain order because they are overwhelmingly Protestant and the Catholics won't accept them. The British Army has failed to stop terrorism by both the Irish Republican Army and the various Protestant counterparts. Perhaps a neutral United Nations Peace-Keeping Force could be brought in to the Province by consent of Britain and also stationed on the border of the two Irelands to stop illegal use of the border. I believe that the people would be more receptive to an impartial third party.

The partition of Ireland in 1921 was the one single incident that the people of the North of Ireland could point their finger at as the spark that kept burning and erupted again in August, 1971. "Ever since 1921, when the Irish Free State (which later became the Republic of Ireland) got its independence and the six largely Protestant counties of Ulster elected to remain within Great Britain, there had been fierce and intermittent protests from the outnumbered and underprivileged Catholics."

The Government of Ireland Act, 1921, established a separate parliament for the six counties of Antrim, Armagh, Derry, Down, Fermanagh, and Tyrone. This area, slightly less than a fifth of the island in extent, but with about a third of the population, was designated Northern Ireland in the Act.

In the area selected for inclusion in Northern Ireland, there were about two Unionist (pro Britain) votes for each anti-Unionist vote, but the distribution of these was very unbalanced. Most Unionist votes were centered in the industrial area around Belfast, the provincial capital. Anti-Unionist were disseminated around the six counties.

Political allegiance remained closely linked to religious persuasion; in other words, the pattern of political opinion still followed closely the real patchwork of the two opposed cultures dating to the plantation days when English settlers were brought in to rule the native Catholics. Protestant elites ruled under the Unionist party with the working class being exploited especially the Catholics. The elite used religious bias to polarize poor Catholics and Protestants.

What most people do not realize is the fact that the Government of Ireland Act was not expressly designed to create a permanent partition of Ireland. After its opening clause, which provided for the establishment of the two parliaments in the country, it went on to provide for the establishment of a council of Ireland, with a view to the eventual establishment of a parliament for the whole of Ireland, and to bringing about harmonious action between the parliaments and governments of Southern Ireland and Northern Ireland and to give powers to the two parliaments to establish a parliament of all Ireland.

This provision aimed at the ultimate unification of Ireland or at least at a federal solution which would bring about harmony between the two governments and allow administration of certain common services affecting the whole country.

No group in Ireland was enthusiastic about the act: Ulster Unionists regarded it, they said, as the "Supreme Sacrifice," though it is true that they soon became very attached to the settlement, which can best be described as Unionist Home Rule. Nationalists (pro-Republic) in Ulster still hoped for union with the Republic, but in the meantime they would have preferred government from Westminster, while Southern Unionists were naturally opposed to partition which left them a tiny minority in the Republic.

The problems that exist today in Ulster

are not really different from the ones that existed in 1922. They were merely postponed 50 years, and if they are not settled now, the violence and repressive tactics of the government will persist and never abate. Solutions or at least concrete steps to solutions must be taken.

Among both Catholics and Protestants the creation of a perfect impenetrable bigotry begins just beyond infancy. It is a mighty barrier against nonviolent solutions. Before they learn nursery rhymes, Catholic children mouth Republican verses, and Protestants take active pride in King Billy, the same William III who defeated James II at the Battle of the Boyne. Children speak ugly epithets with angelic smiles, and enthusiastically accept the crippling burdens of the past. The bigotry between the two religious factions has led Catholics to lean on the Irish Republican Army (IRA) for protection against gun-toting Protestants and the British Army.

Serious outbreaks of violence occurred in 1969 in Ulster when Catholics and Protestants scuffled daily. The Catholics protested intolerable conditions which Protestants wished to keep them in to maintain dominance. The troubles of 1971 are a continuation of 1969. The violence of 1969 was so serious a threat to peace in the North of Ireland that British troops were brought in to keep the peace and to insure minority Catholics their rights, but this set of circumstances has been altered and Catholics consider the troops their oppressor as do the Protestants. Concessions were made by the ruling Unionist government to Catholics and were put on the Statute Books and are as follows:

1. one-man, one-vote was instituted to apply to local council elections, as it has always applied in Parliamentary elections.
2. the proposal for re-organization of local government are being considered from recommendations of an impartial review body.
3. a local ombudsman has been appointed to deal with grievances against local council and public bodies. The ombudsman is entirely independent of the government.
4. a ministry of community relations has been set up.
5. as well as a development commission to study improvements in impoverished areas.
6. and a housing authority to deal with the creation of a control housing organization.
7. the re-shaping of local government is being considered.

Catholics have inferior housing and a higher rate of unemployment than their Protestant counterparts. In conjunction with these reforms it was stated that the old rule that required an individual to write his religion on his application for employment was abolished.

These reforms were on the books, but in practice an applicant was verbally asked his religion so the reform was not put into practice by employers and abuse was not prosecuted by the government. Extensive unemployment was rampant in Catholic areas as high as 48% in one. This leaves many people ripe for violence with time on their hands. Violence broke out in August 1971 because reforms were ignored in practice and it should have been expected.

Ordinary Catholics in the ghettos of Belfast will tell you they would have felt themselves defenseless without the support of the IRA. They may express their horror at the methods employed by the IRA, but there is no doubt about their gratitude. This goes back to the troubles of the summer of 1969, when a mob of Protestants swarmed into the Ardoyne, one of the worst ghettos, drove families from their homes at gunpoint and burned down rows of homes. On that night, the frightened Catholics went to the homes of known members of the IRA Regulars (the less violent branch) to seek aid, but did not

find them able or willing to help so they went to the IRA Provisionals and received the protection they sought.

The Provisionals see their role as a defensive one, to protect Catholics from attack by British troops. They kill without regret because the British Army now has orders to kill rioters. One Provisional said: "We must match gun for gun. This is what people rely on us to do. It is our duty." This alienates the Protestants and incites riot.

To maintain their standing with the people the IRA need issues to bargain with the populace. They have those issues; the desire of most Catholics and many Protestant Republicans to unite with the Republic of Ireland in the South; the number of "Rifle Clubs" in Ulster (all are Protestant controlled); and the absolute exclusion of Catholics from reasonable participation in the Stormont Government.

Fear of the British troops because of their change in role has been exploited by the IRA. The British troops in Ulster are no longer a peace-keeping force; they have become an army of occupation. Internment has clinched it. The measures which were to have prevented civil war have, in fact, created it. The British Army has become an instrument of Stormont's policy, doing Stormont's dirty work. The troops should be withdrawn and let the chips fall as they may is the opinion of a lot of people in Great Britain. The soldiers in Ulster have lately faced an impossible situation. There is a limit to the length of time you can use troops as policemen, partly because it is not what troops are trained for: partly because they earn public contempt. A soldier with a gun he may not use is a fool, and he knows it. Today, the soldiers look frightening, as they are intended to look. They also look partial, where they were intended to be impartial.

WRIGHT BAZEMORE OF VALDOSTA, GA., NAMED "COACH OF THE YEAR"

HON. DAWSON MATHIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, few men are recognized as a legend in their own lifetime. But one such man is Coach Wright Bazemore of Valdosta, Ga., who is being honored by the Valdosta Touchdown Club on March 9.

Recently named "Coach of the Year" and inducted into the Georgia Athletic Hall of Fame, Coach Bazemore has retired with a 290-43-6 record—one not likely to be matched by a mere mortal.

He ended his 31-year career as head coach at Valdosta High School with a team that brought home his 15th State championship title—eight in the past 11 seasons. Valdosta defeated Avondale, a suburb of Atlanta, 62-12 in the finals of State AAA playoffs.

Wright Bazemore's remarkable career started in Fitzgerald, just 60 miles as the crow flies from where he now calls home. He earned the maximum number of letters in four sports at Fitzgerald High, an on two occasions he scored 10 touchdowns in a single football game. This record still stands, of course, in Georgia Prep sports.

As a coach, Wright Bazemore has won every award there is to win at the State and national levels. Last year he was named National Prep Coach of the Year. He is the only person inducted in the

Georgia Sports Hall of Fame as both a coach and player. In addition to winning 15 State championships, Coach Bazemore has won two State runners-up and his Wildcats have finished No. 1 in the country four times.

These statistics and honors tell us a great deal about the man. Yet, they do not tell the whole story. They do not tell how much Coach Bazemore has meant to the youth of Valdosta. His contributions are immeasurable.

No other man has earned the admiration and respect of so many young athletes.

No other high school coach has made it possible for so many boys to attend college on a football scholarship.

No other adult has recognized and developed so much potential in high school students.

Since the coach's decision to retire was announced to the public, his telephone has been ringing constantly. Many of the calls are from parents who want their sons to have the opportunity to play football for Wright Bazemore.

That, in itself, tells you a lot about the reputation and character of the man. But Coach Bazemore said something recently that impressed me even more. When asked why he never accepted one of the many offers to coach college football, he answered:

I am cocky enough to think I could have succeeded in college, but I couldn't stand the thought of having to go through all that recruiting, being forced to tell fibs and do all the things that are necessary to get the good boys.

A man who feels that way thinks about more than winning. Yet he wins. I, too, wish that my sons could play for him.

To say that Coach Bazemore will be missed is the understatement of the year. To say that he will be long remembered is obvious.

Coach Bazemore has fans all over the country. But his most loyal fans are the people of Valdosta, Ga. I join my friends of "Football City" in wishing Coach Wright Bazemore good health and much happiness in his retirement.

A CRAM COURSE IN AMERICAN GOVERNMENT

HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, about 50 seniors from Cincinnati high schools are in the Nation's Capital this week for what could be termed a cram course in American government.

This is not the typical sightseeing jaunt which lives on in memories but does not add much to knowledge about the way our Government operates.

These students are scheduled to meet with Speaker CARL ALBERT, Minority Leader GERALD FORD, Minority Whip LESLIE ARENDS and numerous other Members of Congress. They will attend congressional committee hearings and have opportunities to talk with members.

On Wednesday, they are scheduled to tour the Supreme Court and are to meet

with Justice Potter Stewart who is from their hometown of Cincinnati. They will discuss legislative procedures with Senators ROBERT TAFT, JR. and WILLIAM B. SAXBE, of Ohio, and talk with congressional staff members about office routines.

Friday, they will go to the White House and, following a tour, they will meet with officials there about operations of the executive branch of our Government.

From this, you can readily see why I have described this to be a cram course in American government. I believe these young people will be better citizens for what they do, see, and talk about here this week.

This is the first year for this type of program which is being coordinated by the greater chamber of commerce. My office and that of my Cincinnati colleague, Congressman WILLIAM J. KEATING, have been in charge of arrangements here.

We feel that these are above average high school students who have the potential for being leading citizens in the future. They were selected on the basis of scholarship, civic interest, good citizenship, and leadership. They and their schools are:

Greg Calloway, Woodward High School; Edward Cole, Wyoming; Michael Phelps, Lockland; Dick Sammis, Mariemont; Eileen Davis, St. Ursula; Eloise Louis, Taft; Karen Siebel, Taylor; Rhonda Beckman, Ursuline Academy.

Sandra Ingram and Tim Maas, Walnut Hills; Michael Vilardo and Deborah Rose, Withrow; Michael Conroy, Purcell; Patricia Bill, Seton; Tikie Hamman, St. Bernard; Linda Espelege, Mother of Mercy; Paul Thiemann, St. Xavier.

Janet Droste, Mount Notre Dame; Michael Bowman, Norwood; David Brown, Oak Hills; Patty Donohue, Our Lady of Angels; Marianna Beale, Donna Grant and Steve Sexton, Princeton; Arthur McAdams, Indian Hill.

William Schmitz, LaSalle; David Davis, Madeira; Mary Ann Buescher, McAuley; Jon Riehle, McNicholas; Ted Lagregren; Mount Healthy; Lori Breiner and Guy Mally, Aiken; Ralph Keil and John Robeck, Anderson; April Laskey, College Preparatory.

Thomas Diamante and Casper Budde, Elder; David Haberstroh, Harry Rosenbluth and George Morton, Finneytown; Thomas Kitchen, Deer Park; Mark Naschang, North College Hill, and Robert Haas, Greenhills.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 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?

DR. SAMUEL M. GENESKY: TRIUMPH OVER ODDS

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the President's Committee on Employment for the Handicapped has made a laudable choice in honoring Dr. Samuel M. Genesky, of Santa Monica, Calif., as an outstanding handicapped individual. Truly, this gentleman has distinguished himself as an innovator, a scholar and, most importantly, a humanitarian.

"Blind" since birth, Dr. Genesky's left eye is totally useless while the vision in his right eye is approximately 8/500. In fact, of the 400,000 Americans classified as legally blind, 60 percent have better vision than Sam Genesky.

Yet for the past 14 years, Dr. Genesky has been a mathematician and systems analyst with the Rand Corp. where his myriad contributions include organizing Rand's research on domestic problems and, under an HEW grant, developing "Randsight," a unique functional classification system to recognize differences among the visually handicapped which, when adapted and supported, can greatly upgrade opportunities for this disabled minority. Randsight is the first important aid to the visually handicapped since the invention of eyeglasses.

Sam Genesky's singular achievements are in great part due to his avoidance of all self-indulgence by refusing, since childhood, to see himself as handicapped. This perseverance, coupled with the love and support of his mother and, later, his wife and children, has enabled him to overcome what for others would be an insuperable hurdle.

Education, to Sam, was the keystone of a full and productive life. While he attended special education classes in the lower grades, his achievements were such that he was admitted to public high school in New Bedford, Mass. Of this education he says:

I took my exams in better light, otherwise I asked no quarter.

For, by his ingenious methods of study and particularly his discovery of the usefulness of binoculars—now, at Rand, his binoculars require a special security clearance when he travels on classified business—Sam Genesky compiled a remarkable academic record. From high school, he went on to graduate magna cum laude from Brown University, then receiving his MA in mathematics from Harvard University and, in 1958, his Ph. D. from Brown.

Because he knows the importance of the "things unseen," Sam Genesky is dedicated to showing the way to other visually impaired persons. The inspiration of his personal experiences has been disseminated through written articles in professional journals, by lobbying efforts with schools and medical institutions, and by scores of personal contacts with the handicapped to help them plan their future education and long-range vocational goals.

By honoring Sam Genensky, the President's Committee on Employment for the Handicapped recognizes his determination, intelligence, and compassion while also recognizing the need for improved moral and financial support for research into the education and training of the "handicapped" for useful positions in our society. And, by means of this award, the Rand Corp. is indirectly cited for its foresight in employing men like Dr. Genensky; certainly, Rand's confidence has been more than justified. For, while we can do everything possible to prepare the handicapped for productive lives, unless industry opens the door of opportunity to these valuable persons, we will have nothing but a stalemate.

Dr. Samuel Genensky can certainly be an example to all that it is not what we are born with that shapes our lives, but rather what we do with what we have. His success is not so much measured by the position he has attained, but by the obstacles he has overcome on the way.

GIRLS IN ACTION

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, March 12 commemorates the 60th anniversary of the Girl Scouts of America, and it is with great pleasure that I take this opportunity to commend this wonderful group for its many fine achievements. Brought over from England in 1912 by Juliette Low, Girl Scouting has obtained great heights over the years. More than 3½ million girls, aged 7 through 17, actively participate in a wide range of activities geared to instill them with patriotism and a sense of service.

Scouting has spread throughout the world enriching over 75 countries with its high ideals and numerous contributions. Through international foreign exchange programs and as part of their Action '70 plan, young girls all over the world learn from each other and exchange ideas, heritages, and cultures thereby helping to bridge the dark chasm of prejudice caused by ignorance and fear. An understanding and an appreciation for the differences of the background and customs of various nations are promoted and the girls gain a mutual insight into each other's problems. Their expressions of peace, good will, and trust set forth a fine example for all to follow.

While Action '70 focuses on improved relations among people, Eco-Action focuses on man and his environment. The program, which is just beginning, is designed to make the girls aware of their environment and of their relationship to their surroundings. They learn the interdependence and interrelation of elements within the environment and the necessity for preserving the balance of nature. Their activities are adjusted to remedy a particular problem in a community and their projects are geared

specifically to that need. Ideally, involvement encompasses everyone from the individual on through the troop and the community. The Scouts work toward preserving and improving the land and providing a framework in which their programs can be continued.

Scouting is not necessarily limited to the young. The Girl Scouts reach out to people of all ages and give them an opportunity to participate in their programs. They also provide a wide variety of services to the elderly. They visit them in hospitals and nursing homes and do all that they can to help brighten the day of someone less fortunate than they; they organize shopping and delivery services for those unable to leave their homes; they "adopt" older persons as grandparents and give them the attention and affection to which every human being is entitled. This association with our older Americans is by no means one-sided. The beauty of age is that it provides one with hindsight and knowledge. The Girl Scouts know this and greatly appreciate the opportunity to learn from these people, many of whom serve as teachers and consultants in creative arts, nature-study ecology, citizenship, and health and safety programs. Together, these two generations help prepare America and Americans for a better tomorrow.

I am extremely happy to see the continual rise in the membership of the Girl Scouts of America. The Second Congressional District of Kentucky has greatly benefited from the activities of these dedicated young girls who have initiated a paper recycling project. The girls man newspaper pickup stations one Saturday every month. This successful project has received the full cooperation of the general public throughout the entire council and the girls' enthusiasm and willingness to work have greatly bolstered the community spirit.

Mr. Speaker, for 60 years the Girl Scouts have honorably served their country and helped improve the lives of many Americans. These young girls have learned and taught others the joy, satisfaction, and pride derived from service and achievement. I wish them every success and hope that they will continue to grow so that they can expand their influence to reach the lives of those who have not yet been exposed to their high ideals and many worthwhile programs.

WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES BACKS INSURRECTION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, several reports which appeared in the Reader's Digest in October and November 1971 again point out the need for reform in tax-exempt foundations.

Many dedicated Christian missionaries return from their world ministry disillusioned that Christianity is losing in

the war against communism. Judging from these reports it is little wonder that Christianity has lost its appeal when the tithes, offerings, and contributions of church people are being used to further communism, be it labeled Marxism, socialism, or a dozen other more palatable terms.

The author of the articles, Clarence W. Hall, raises the questions:

Preaching the gospel of racial justice, the World Council of Churches is using church power and church funds to back insurrection in the United States and Africa. Is this what Christ taught? Has this 'ecclesiastical United Nations' become just another platform from which Communists seek to flay the free world?

I include the articles by Clarence W. Hall in the RECORD at this point:

MUST OUR CHURCHES FINANCE REVOLUTION?
(By Clarence W. Hall)

In 1948, the World Council of Churches was born in a burst of ecumenical euphoria. To many Christians the event promised to end, once and for all, the "scandal of division" that for centuries had divided Christendom into hundreds of competing and sometimes hostile sects.

During its 23 years of operation, the WCC's achievements have been considerable. It has managed to bring into common fellowship some 252 denominations in 83 countries committed to "study, witness, serve and advance the common unity." It has helped settle tens of thousands of displaced persons and feed millions of the world's hungry. And it has, quite properly, insisted that Christians have a duty to bring their Christian ethic to bear on their society. Lately, however, the council not only has involved itself in issues that many consider outside its rightful realm, but has entered into actions that are rapidly destroying the very unity it professes to support.

One such action was the launching in September 1970 of a "Program to Combat Racism." Using a special WCC fund to aid 19 "liberation" movements, most of them in southern Africa fighting to wrest power from ruling white minorities, the program seemed laudable enough. But when old African hands read the list of recipients of this WCC largess (the first \$200,000 taken from Council reserve funds), they blinked in disbelief. Of the 19 beneficiaries, 14 were known to be engaged in guerrilla activities, many of them terrorist. Worse, four of the most generously financed groups are avowedly communist. At least three of the four, according to the London Institute for the Study of Conflict, are receiving arms from the Soviet Union. All four have records of bloody terrorism not only against whites but against those black Africans who repudiate their terrorist methods.

With announcement of the grants, the world press erupted in condemnation. The London Times declared: "Christian authorities have no business to support organizations avowedly engaged in the use of terror, whatever their grievances and however sincere they may be. Militant Africans will now claim their activities have church backing and blessing." Germany's *Die Welt*, blasting the "theologians of revolution," said flatly: "Christian faith and terrorist power are incompatible."

Perhaps the most acid reaction came from Malcolm Muggeridge, distinguished British commentator: "What is objected to in the contribution made to the freedom-fighters is not their cause, but the association of the name of Christ with it. The freedom-fighters seek to overthrow the white oligarchies now ruling over South Africa, Rhodesia and the Portuguese colonies. A perfectly laudable

enterprise. What, however, have such upheavals to do with advancing the Kingdom of Christ—presumably, the essential purpose of the World Council of Churches? Is Kenya more Christ-like because Jomo Kenyatta now rules over it? Or the Congo because President Mobutu is in charge? Chuck it, World Council of Churches!

But the WCC showed no intention of chucking it. Instead, it took a second action that raised hackles even higher. Late last year, the WCC, a longtime opponent of the Vietnam war, launched a campaign to raise \$210,000 in support of American draft-dodgers and deserters in Canada and Sweden. While the Council piously disclaimed any intention to encourage evasion of military duty—which would be perilously close to inciting treason—its youth division was circulating an issue of the magazine, *Risk*, dedicated to the virtues of doing precisely that. "You must go beyond the question of conscientious objection," the editors told their young readers. "The just men desert." One author asserted that any commanding officer who gave orders offensive to the objector was "a criminal. The courage of those who openly and fearlessly resist men who issue such commands merits supreme commendation."

INCENDIARY IMPRECISION

The storm whipped up by these two actions shows no signs of abating. Thoughtful Christians everywhere are asking: Is it the churches' business to finance revolution, support violence, incite to civil disobedience?

Out of its long commitment to the "social gospel," the WCC counters: "It is not enough for Christians to seek to save souls and improve individual characters, Christians must be concerned for the structures of society." This, to the WCC, means changing the structures by whatever means are most effective. "As Christians," says the Council, "we are committed to working for the transformation of society. In the past, we have usually done this through quiet efforts at social renewal, working through established institutions. Today, a significant number of those who are dedicated to the service of Christ and their neighbor assume a more revolutionary position."

Reaching out to establish theological backing for their views, some churchmen reach absurdity. One freely quoted in WCC circles is William Stringfellow, an Episcopal lay theologian, who wrote: "According to the gospels, Jesus was not a non-conformist, not just a protester. He was a criminal revolutionary." Another, Harvey Cox, Harvard professor of divinity, recently commented that Jesus "died the death reserved for those guilty of insurrection."

Although church liberals talk glibly of revolution, they becoming vague when pressed to spell out what they mean by the incendiary word. "Revolution means one thing to church leaders in one area," a WCC spokesman at its Geneva headquarters told me, "and quite another elsewhere. People in a given situation must figure out for themselves what form it should take." Such imprecision leaves the door wide-open everywhere. If violent action can be mandated to South Africa, then why not to any social order, including the American, which one might deem inequitable?

NATURAL CHOICE

The World Council's progression from peaceful change to revolution first became plain at a "World Conference on Church and Society," which it sponsored in Geneva in 1966. To this two-week meeting came 420 participants representing 164 churches in 80 countries. The usual clerics and theologians were there. But, in addition, a number of the economists and political "experts" present were of such a stripe that the conference became, as one observer noted, "a debate between leftists and extreme leftists."

Speakers called for a fundamental "re-

structuring of the world economy," a shifting of millions of employed workers from developed countries to those in the developing stage, even though such forced migration would "necessarily imply temporary dislocation and possible suffering for a large number of people." All this was to be financed by an "international tax" levied on the "have" nations, of at least two percent of their gross national product. Examining these grandiose suggestions, one observer commented: "If this is not a call for world socialism, what is it?"

By the time the 1966 conference was over, the WCC was firmly committed to aiding revolutionary change. But where to start? Bogged down in the complexities of "restructuring" the world economically, socially and politically, yet chided by radicals to get going on some clear-cut issue, the conference settled on racism. To WCC activists, the choice was a natural, since in their view racial injustice is society's worst evil today and is largely at the root of lack of economic development.

BLACKMAIL AND BOMBAST

The methods used to engineer acceptance of the Program to Combat Racism provide sharp insight into the World Council. First, the Council's secretariat submitted a summons to action at the 1968 General Assembly in Uppsala, Sweden. Heavy emphasis was put on what WCC staffer Baldwin Sjölema (now the Program's director) called "the church's complicity in benefiting from and furthering white racist oppression." Though nobody explained how the church had so benefited, the assembly contritely agreed to the development of a "crash program" of unspecified nature.

With this mandate, the WCC staff and a "committee on race" heated up the issue by sponsoring a "consultation" at London's Notting Hill in May 1969. Its purpose: "To advise the WCC on an ecumenical program of action to eradicate racism." Its chairman, Sen. George McGovern. Participants included a number of black-power militants.

Red-hot rhetoric prevailed, one of the most "moderate" speeches being that of a black minister, the Rev. Channing E. Phillips, who said: "We believe that if the church is to attack racism significantly, then it must be willing to be not only an institution of love but an institution of power. Where a society does not permit restructuring power, the church ought not to shy from aiding and abetting the development of the only other power available—the power of violence."

Even this, however, was talk too tame for the militants. A Negro identified as George Black leaped to the platform to demand from white churches millions of dollars in "reparations" for ills done to Negroes—\$12 million to defend such "political prisoners" as Huey P. Newton, Eldridge Cleaver, H. Rap Brown; \$77 million to support various "liberation" movements; \$48 million to establish a propaganda publishing house dedicated to Malcolm X and Che Guevara. Quoting Mao Tse-tung—"Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun"—Black ended: "We shall have our freedom, or your Christian society, your Christian banks, your Christian factories, your Christian universities, and your fine churches will be leveled forever."

Amazingly, this bombastic attempt at blackmail was taken seriously. The delegates spent nine hours discussing it, finally putting to the WCC a recommendation that it "support the principle of 'reparations' as a way of producing a more favorable balance of economic power throughout the world."

Another recommendation by the "consultation" included the demand that the WCC and member churches apply economic boycotts against corporations and institutions doing business in countries considered racist (such as South Africa) and that "all else failing, the churches should support resistance movements, including revolutions."

The WCC's next step was to present the Notting Hill recommendations, with only a little cooling down of the more inflammatory phrases, to the WCC's 120-member Central Committee, whose function it is to set council policy. The committee soon set up a special fund to support the program as then developed, the only important change being to drop the demand for "reparations" (Asian and African delegates had made it plain that they felt no obligation to award big money to the relatively well-off Negroes of the United States).

During the next months the committee on race worked out specifics and decided on which African "liberation" groups were to get Council funds; no mention was made of approving violence. With no further reference back to member churches, the WCC's 15-man Executive Committee rubber-stamped the formal Program to Combat Racism. "I've never seen a smoother job of steam-rolling," one insider at Geneva told me.

Only in September 1970 was the program announced publicly. The controversy that then boiled up was the most acrimonious the WCC had ever faced. Church leaders who had given the ambiguous "crash program" their blessing two years before now insisted they had no idea the WCC would go this far. Resentment was especially strong among West German churches, which, because they pay approximately a fourth of the Council's operating budget (U.S. churches pay 50 percent), feel they should have some say as to how its funds are used. Typical was the reaction of one parishioner in Munich who wrote his bishop: "I respectfully warn that if church funds are given to this cause, I must leave the church. I cannot reconcile it with my conscience to support terrorism and violence."

The backlash was vitriolic in Great Britain, too. Even the Archbishop of Canterbury, a former WCC president and outspoken crusader against racism, denounced the program as "counterproductive," certain to harden the apartheid stance of white government authorities in Africa. But the decision stood.

WRONG BUSINESS?

The mood set by the World Council has spread to individual denominations in this country, and parishioners are deeply disturbed. For example, many thoughtful Presbyterians were roused to loud protest last May when the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. contributed \$10,000 to the defense fund for Angela Davis, awaiting trial on charges of murder and conspiracy in the August 1970 attack by black militants on California's Marin County courthouse—an attack that left Judge Harold J. Haley and three others dead.

Similar outrage has recently shaken the Presbyterian clergy and laity over a church gift of \$25,000 for the bail and defense of a Black Panther accused of plotting public bombings. Controversy among Episcopalians was set off by their church's \$40,000 grant to the "Alianza de New Mexico"—an organization dedicated to virtual guerrilla war aimed at establishing a separate Chicano nation in the southwestern United States—and again by the church's gift to the "Black Manifesto" movement. Chief agitator of the movement is black militant James Forman, who, on a Sunday morning in May 1969, forced his way to the pulpit of New York's Riverside Church to demand from churches and synagogues \$500 million as "reparations" to black people—a figure he later raised to \$3 billion. In an introduction to the printed Manifesto, Forman made plain the aims of the movement by saying: "We are dedicated to building a socialist society inside the United States, where the total means of production and distribution are in the hands of the State—led by black people." Four months later, at a special convention described as "one of the most turbulent in

church history," the Episcopal Church voted \$200,000 to Forman's movement.

Such actions, usually railroaded through by small cliques of radicals within denominations, have sparked a growing "pocket-book revolt" among the laity. The result, top church officials admit, has been widespread withholding of contributions and even alarming losses in membership.

Concerned Christians the world over are asking: Does the present ardor of the World Council and some member churches for political, social and economic revolution merely betoken errors in judgment made by well-meaning but naïve Christian leaders? Or are these the moves of desperate men who are no longer sure what their mission is, and have lost faith in orderly change and in the potency of Christianity's age-old weapons—reconciliation and love—which over the ages have again and again transformed both men and their societies?

In 1968 the University Christian Movement voted itself out of existence. Vacating its offices in New York's Interchurch Center, it posted a sign on the doorway: "Gone Out Of Business . . . Didn't Know What Our Business Was."

That could happen to the church. And it would be a tragic loss.

WHICH WAY THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES?

(By Clarence W. Hall)

An event rated by the World Council of Churches as among its most important milestones occurred at the Council's Third General Assembly in New Delhi, India, on November 20, 1961. It was the reception of the Soviet-approved Russian, Rumanian, Bulgarian and Polish Orthodox churches into full membership in the WCC. After years of Soviet abuse of the Council as a "facade for Western imperialism," the Kremlin was allowing its state-controlled churches to join this ecclesiastical United Nations.

Jubilant WCC leaders forecast a great Christian advance. To them it meant that the Council was on its way to becoming, at long last, truly "ecumenical"—a word which in the WCC lexicon means "the whole household of faith, embracing all races, all nations, all branches of the Church."

To ensure that nothing would mar the historic moment, no speeches were allowed when the Eastern churches were voted in. The ballot was secret, and nobody challenged the new members' statistics when they claimed a total membership of 70 million—a patently inflated figure, but one that assured them outsized representation in the assembly and on committees deciding WCC policy. The occasion was one for rejoicing, not for heeding such dour predictions as that of the Cincinnati *Enquirer*, which warned that receiving these churches would only give "international communism yet another platform from which to assail the free world."

One especially beaming man at New Delhi that day was Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, now general secretary of the WCC. A heavy-set, hearty man with an expansive friendliness and a stubborn devotion to his aims, Blake first rolled U.S. public opinion in 1954 when he wangled official government permission to bring to the Council's Second Assembly at Evanston, Ill., a delegation of Czech and Hungarian theologians. Heading the delegation was Dr. Josef Hromadka of Prague, a hostile critic of everything American who, at the convention's close, returned behind the Iron Curtain to launch malicious attacks on America. One of his mildest descriptions of the United States was "a nation of gangsters."

Then, in June 1956, Blake arranged for a visit to America for a covey of Russian churchmen led by Boris Dorofeyevich Yarushevich, known as Metropolitan Nikolai,

the second-ranking prelate of the Russian Orthodox Church. Nikolai's venom toward the United States had been made plain earlier in East Berlin, where he delivered a diatribe on U.S. action in Korea, citing as incontrovertible facts such alleged U.S. atrocities as "executions without trial and inquisitions secret and public; dreadful tortures of victims—the cutting off of ears and noses and breasts, the putting out of eyes, the breaking of arms, and legs, the crucifixion of patriots, the burial alive in communal graves of women with children at their breasts, the scalping of Korean patriots for 'souvenirs.'"

It was Nikolai who, five years later, shepherded the Russian Orthodox representatives into WCC membership.

A LOSS OF IMPARTIALITY

Since then, what has been the extent of Soviet-bloc influence on World Council policy and program? Has it been as sinister as many conservative Christians claim, or are these troubled people only "religious reactionaries who see communists under every bed," as WCC staff members claim?

There is no denying that the admission of the Soviet-bloc churches brought a swift change to the Council's balance of powers; their presence on WCC commissions and committees gave them a virtual veto over decisions not to their taste. As one dissenter grumbled: "Until now we've boasted that 'the world dictates the agenda.' Now the dictating is being done by the Russians."

Moreover, it is plain that their presence has resulted in the WCC's loss of whatever international impartiality it once had. Never notably supportive of Western-style democracy, the Council now appears to side always with the views of those whose nations are anything but free. In its early days, the WCC was given to lumping capitalism and communism together as equally anti-Christian, equally socially pernicious. Lately, however, belittlement of free-world society has increased to a steady roar; that of communism is muted to a whisper. Says John P. Roche, former chairman of the Americans for Democratic Action: "Anti-Americanism has become a substitute for the Nicene Creed as the focus of Christian unity."

Covering the 1968 WCC conference for *Christian Century*, the acknowledged voice of liberal Protestantism in America, editor Harold E. Fey wrote that he was "profoundly shocked" by the viciously anti-American talk heard there. What shocked Fey most was the fact that our representatives would not fight back. Indeed, many of them joined in the diatribes. While other WCC delegates almost always spoke in concert with the policies of their respective governments, those from America, in an excess of "penitence," seemed bent on outdoing their country's detractors.

"CURIOUS SELECTIVITY"

Although students of World Council activities may disagree as to whether the presence of the Russian churchmen actually dictates anti-West positions, there are few who will not agree that it heavily influences them. As William C. Fletcher, a Soviet expert at the University of Kansas, points out in a forthcoming study financed by the Royal Institute of Financial Affairs, London: "The primary objective which Soviet foreign policy hoped to achieve from Russian participation in the World Council of Churches was, of course, to influence its activities in such a way that the Council's decisions and actions would be conformable to Soviet interests."

How conformable these have been recently, say WCC critics, is seen in what one called the "curious selectivity" reflected in Council political action and humanitarian concern. The Cuban missile crisis, for example. In 1962, only a few months after the Eastern churches were seated, officers of the WCC issued a statement expressing "grave concern and regret" over the "unilateral military

action taken by the United States." The statement contained not a word about the Soviets' unilateral military action in putting the missiles in Cuba in the first place. And later, while pretending to stand against economic blockades anywhere that brought hardships to people, it called for an immediate end to the boycotts of Castro's Cuba, at the same time demanding boycotts, both governmental and private, against Rhodesia and South Africa.

The WCC hesitates to blame Russia for anything. Consider the Czech crisis. Within 24 hours after the Soviet move into Prague on August 21, 1968, virtually every free church body in the world had publicly condemned the brutal aggression. Not the Council. A week later, after Soviet goals had been achieved, Blake issued a tepid and scarcely noted objection.

The Council's "curious selectivity" also becomes highly visible in its choice of those it helps. For example, a sizable community of Christians in the southern Sudan have long been fighting for the survival of their community against a government determined to do them in. Repeated appeals to the WCC for help have been ignored. But while the Council could find no money or public sympathy for the plight of the Sudanese, it was able, in April 1970, to scrape together \$25,000 toward a shipment of 16 tons of medical supplies and equipment to the Vietcong in South Vietnam—saying it had made the gift out of "concern for all those who suffer."

CAPITULATION

Nowhere has the World Council been more delinquent than in its refusal to champion the tens of thousands of persecuted religionists in the Soviet Union—those minority religious groups outside the Soviet-approved churches. In the WCC Geneva files are exhaustive documentations from these groups who have refused to bow to Moscow; evidence abounds of wholesale closing of churches, of thousands of Christians harassed or sent to labor camps for nothing more than having Bibles, opening their homes to religious services, instructing their children in religion.

Concerning the Council's last General Assembly—at Uppsala, Sweden, in 1968—the Rev. Knut Norberg, president of a consistory of the Lutheran Church in Sweden, said indignantly: "Problems related to race, violence and oppression were discussed freely and passionately. But as soon as prevailing conditions behind the Iron Curtain became the order of the day, stony silence reigned." Asked Norberg: "How can an ecclesiastical universal assembly refuse to take notice of the ever-growing appeals from deportation camps, prison cells and torture chambers where fellow-Christians are suffering and even dying? Is it a matter of tactics? If so, it means total capitulation to the Soviet Union and its Marxist-Leninist religion."

Are the Iron Curtain country churches in the Council, whatever the sincerity of many of their representatives, being used to further Soviet aims? After months of hearings in a 1960 case involving an attempt by the Moscow Patriarchate to regain control of St. Nicholas Cathedral in New York City, which in 1924 had renounced Moscow's jurisdiction, the New York State Court of Appeals concluded that "no other view is possible than that the Russian Church is a tool exploited by the communist rulers." Similarly, a defected Soviet secret-police officer testified before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security that "it is impossible in the Soviet Union to serve God without serving the state security." In the mid-1960s, the same committee made public a heavily documented series of studies on "Church and State in the USSR." The Senate studies stated: "In every communist country, the governments have established committees to

exercise surveillance over all religious activities. . . ."

MURMURS

Today, one of the World Council's plays in seeking more togetherness with the communists has been its initiation of "Marxist-Christian dialogues"—promptly hailed by communists as "a development of vast importance in the rise of new liberalizing currents in the world of religion." While such talkfests between clergy and communists in many countries have produced no visible evidence of Marxist mind-changing, the increase in Marxist thinking among Christian liberals has been considerable. And that, says Martin E. Marty, professor of modern-church history at Chicago University's divinity school, despite the fact that "the 20th century has seen many thousands of Christian martyrs at the hands of people who called themselves Marxists." Marty also notes that many American theological facilities now contain "Marxian analysts and sympathizers," adding that this "evokes little stir."

A considerable stir, however, was evoked recently when a busload of tourists, visiting the WCC's Ecumenical Center in Geneva, found a roomful of Marxists diligently propounding their theories in one of the dialogues held there. Listening at the door, one tourist angrily demanded: "Isn't this taking ecumenism a little far?" Murmured another: "I wonder who's converting whom."

Both are good questions. Answers to them are of the deepest concern to Christianity's billion adherents the world over.

ECOLOGY PLUS COMPUTER SCIENCE EQUALS CAR POOL

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, an article in the February 24 issue of the Fullerton, Calif., Daily News Tribune describes a project undertaken by the students of California State College at Fullerton deserving of recognition and commendation. At this point in the RECORD, the article is included to illustrate just what can be done to harness modern technology to ecological concern given sufficient ingenuity and group commitment. The article follows.

[From the Daily News Tribune, Feb. 24, 1972]

ECOLOGY PLUS COMPUTER SCIENCE EQUALS CAR POOL

FULLERTON.—Ecology and computer science have joined hands at California State College, Fullerton, where students have initiated a computerized car pool.

The pool, which will help combat smog and cut down on the expense of operating a car, has already attracted more than 300 students, faculty and staff at the Fullerton commuter campus.

"We're really excited about the potential," said Robert Religa, coordinator of the project. "We set up a table for signups earlier this month, and we already have enough concerned persons to begin the pool."

The idea behind the computerized car pool (CCP) is to bring Cal State's commuter population together in car pools with the help of a computer, Religa said.

GIVEN SUPPORT

The idea was first discussed during the summer. During the fall, Religa received the support of the associated Students' Ecology Commission and the housing office,

and the cooperation of the college's computer center.

Religa, a computer science student from Whittier, then developed maps of the area showing concentrations of students in Orange, Los Angeles and San Bernardino counties.

Each prospective participant's home is found on one of four maps. The coordinates of each commuter's homes are considered, along with class or work schedules and transportation needs, Religa said.

This data is then fed into a computer, which will feed out the most logical matchups.

COORDINATE RIDES

"We're equipped to match up as many as six persons per car," he said. "But, more realistically, we will probably end up with about three per car."

Rides will be coordinated as far away as Burbank. Most of the riders, though, will come from Long Beach, Pomona, South Orange County, Santa Ana and Whittier.

"Our service is not just limited to Cal State students, faculty or staff," he said. "We hope to get participants from businesses and shops near Cal State, since we're all in this fight for ecology together."

There is no cost to participate in the CCP.

"Besides, the computerized car pool will save people money, since they will share costs. With this project, they can save money and help the environment at the same time," he said.

Persons interested in joining the CCP may contact Religa at the college's housing office, 870-2168.

A RESPONSIVE GI BILL

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, we have before us a comprehensive bill to increase and improve veterans' GI bill benefits, H.R. 12828. The Veterans' Education and Training Amendments of 1972 provide needed assistance increases and program improvements to keep the GI bill responsive to the needs of our veterans to whom we owe so much. I commend the Veterans' Affairs Committee and the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, for the innovative and progressive bill which they have reported. This is only a further example of the Veterans' Affairs Committee's fine efforts over the years on behalf of our veterans.

Over 3 million veterans have received training under the GI bill programs, and in December 1971, 1.1 million beneficiaries were in training. This is a program of which the Congress can well be proud. However, changing times present new problems which require new solutions. It should be our goal to provide an up-to-date, responsive GI bill so that both our veterans and our country may benefit. I believe H.R. 12828 provides this type of needed improvement.

The education and training amendments provide a 14-percent increase in assistance across the board. This increase reflects the increase in the cost of living, and rising costs of tuition and books. At the present time, a single vet-

eran attending school full time receives \$175 monthly assistance. H.R. 12828 would increase this to \$200 per month. The bill also provides corresponding increases for those veterans with dependents.

In order to accelerate the impetus for our veterans to enroll in apprenticeship and on-the-job training, H.R. 12828 increases the financial assistance for these programs by 48 percent. Experience derived from implementation of the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966, which H.R. 12828 extends, indicates that this is the area where the greatest need has occurred, and it is anticipated that the 48-percent increase will be helpful in stimulating job opportunities for our veterans.

This bill provides a new program of advance payments to enable veterans to receive advance assistance at the beginning of the term to cover the extra expenses which arise at that time. This is the kind of program which keeps the GI bill responsive to the needs of our veterans.

Another important improvement in the GI bill proposed in H.R. 12828 is the expanded program for the eligible wives and widows of our veterans. These women need the opportunity to pursue secondary level training as is provided to veterans in apprenticeship and on-the-job training and correspondence courses. These women are in most cases supporting the children of our loyal veterans who have died in service to their country, and they need all the help that we can give them.

These amendments also remove the inequitable dependency restrictions for women veterans to receive dependency allowances for their husbands. This change will place women veterans on an equal basis with those they have served with as equals.

The changes proposed by H.R. 12828 have a central theme—to make veterans' education and training benefits more responsive to the needs of this country's deserving veterans. H.R. 12828 is a comprehensive proposal to change veterans' benefits for the better. We have, over the years, put together a good solid program of education and training for those who have served their country well. This bill will keep that valuable program up-to-date and will realistically respond to the needs of our veterans.

I support the Veterans' Education and Training Amendments of 1972. I believe our veterans deserve nothing but the best.

THE USE AND ABUSE OF AMPHETAMINES OR "SPEED"

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, according to testimony presented early in February to the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on which I serve, by the Commissioner of

the Food and Drug Administration and the Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, up until the middle of last year American drug manufacturers were producing 10 pills containing amphetamines—known to its illicit users as “speed”—for every man, woman, and child in the United States each year. Under new regulations adopted by the Food and Drug Administration a few months ago, that total is reduced to six of these pills for every American per year.

That is still far too much of a dangerous, habit-forming, stimulant drug, especially when we realize that it has only three uses that are even claimed to be medically legitimate—and that two of these claims are open to grave challenge.

The most common medical use of amphetamines is in treatment of overweight, or obesity—the so-called diet pills. This use grows out of a side effect of these drugs: along with temporary stimulation, they depress appetite. But the testimony before our committee cast serious doubt on the need for large-scale use of amphetamines in obesity cases, especially in light of the danger of addiction which would make the cure much worse than the disease.

By far the least common use of amphetamines is the only one that appears wholly justified—as a treatment for narcolepsy, a kind of sleeping sickness. It is estimated that there may be as few as 25,000 narcoleptics in the entire country.

But the most peculiar and disturbing legal use of amphetamines is on young children said to be hyperactive because of minimal brain dysfunction, a disorder hardly definable since its very name indicates that no brain impairment can be found. When given to young children, amphetamines act opposite to their effect on adults—instead of stimulating, they depress the child and make him drowsy. No one knows why the effect in children is reversed, or exactly how long it remains reversed and when and how the effect switches to that so eagerly sought after by the adolescent “speed freak.”

Yet despite the rapid spread of amphetamine abuse and addiction and the virtual impossibility of defining how active a child has to be in order to be deemed hyperactive, the use of these drugs on children in the lower grades in school is becoming increasingly frequent. It was first exposed in Washington at hearings held by Congressman CORNELIUS J. GALLAGHER's Special Investigating Committee on the Invasion of Privacy, of the House Government Operations Committee, on September 29, 1970.

Testimony at this hearing brought out evidence of substantial dosage of children with an amphetamine pill called Ritalin in public schools in Omaha, Nebr., and Little Rock, Ark. In both cases the testimony seemed to indicate an informal but very real collaboration between public school authorities and local medical personnel and clinics involved in the study and distribution of amphetamine-containing drugs. The result of this collaboration, according to the testimony, was to cause comparatively large numbers of schoolchildren to take

Ritalin regularly, with heavy pressure brought to bear on parents reluctant to agree—including threats of retaliation upon their children in school.

There does seem to be an actual disorder involving hyperactive behavior in some children. But clearly there is great potential for abuse in a diagnosis like this, which lazy or incompetent public school teachers and administrators can so easily apply to any child causing problems they cannot handle because of their own shortcomings—problems which they may think, or be persuaded, can be solved by this drug. Every parent knows how active some perfectly normal young children are, or can be in an environment where discipline is lacking and their minds are not challenged.

In a special statement presented to the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee, I pointed out the particular dangers of the growing use of Ritalin on children in the lower grades of our public schools, describing in detail a case brought to my attention from a source I know from personal experience to be trustworthy. It involved a 7-year-old boy whose tests showed him to be in the highest 1 percent in intelligence of the whole State of Maryland, and who was found by both a psychiatrist and a pediatrician to be perfectly normal, but nevertheless, at the insistence of his public school, was put on Ritalin for a period of several months while learning almost nothing. When his mother finally transferred him to a private school and took him off the drug, he progressed rapidly and is now doing outstanding work.

When adults and public institutions set examples like this, is it any wonder that a destructive drug culture flourishes among our young people?

NEW YORK STATE CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES AWARD PRESENTED TO AN OUTSTANDING AMERICAN, LUCILE DeGEORGE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a very dear friend of mine and an outstanding American, Mrs. Lucile DeGeorge.

Mrs. DeGeorge was recently presented the New York State Civil Service Employees Award, by the New York State Employees Brotherhood Committee. This organization represents 16 State employees organizations throughout my State. The award is presented annually to the State career employee whose daily life exemplifies the true spirit and sincere dedication to the principles of brotherhood.

This fine lady was presented the award this year for several reasons. She has devoted a lifetime of service to her country and community. Her forceful leadership in many social and philanthropic causes is well worth this commendation.

Let me briefly outline some of her

noble deeds in the interest of her fellow man and the awards which have already been bestowed upon her.

One of the most distinguished ladies in Italo-American circles, Mrs. DeGeorge was the recipient of the Star of Solidarity by the Republic of Italy in 1968, which was presented by the Consul General of the Government of Italy. She was also a recipient of the Brotherhood Award from the Queens branch of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. Moreover, she is the founder of A.M.I.T.A.—American Italian Awards for Women of Achievement—the Montessori Lodge of the Sons of Italy Order and the Women Columbians, a group affiliated with the Grand Council of Columbia Associations in Civil Service.

In addition, she received the “Woman of the Year” award from the Ladies Auxiliary of the Esca Club and the Certificate of Appreciation from the Department of the Army. Being a woman of outstanding drive and dynamic leadership she still finds the time to be an active member of the Queens County Chamber of Commerce. It is not surprising, therefore, that Mrs. DeGeorge is listed in “Who's Who of American Women.”

Mr. Speaker, this is the first time that an Italo-American has been selected by the New York State Employees Brotherhood Committee, Inc., to be presented with this outstanding award. But this is only one of many firsts accomplished by this elegantly courageous woman. For example, she was the first woman from a lodge of the Order of the Sons of Italy in America, Inc., to have been designated for this honor from the State of New York. Another is that Mrs. DeGeorge is the first member of any Columbia Association to be singled out for this award.

Indeed, the list of accomplishments and awards received by this lady is too extensive to list here. But it is an honor and privilege to know Lucile DeGeorge, and to see her rewarded for her imaginative and tireless involvement on behalf of her fellow man, especially children. She has been instrumental, for example, in helping to provide scholarships for gifted and deserving students of all races, religions and ethnic origins.

Once again I wish to commend Mrs. DeGeorge for all that she has done to foster brotherhood amongst her fellow man and to congratulate her on receipt of this particular award. She certainly deserves it.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, 54 years ago, Estonia declared her independence. Twenty-two years later she was to lose her freedom once again as did all the Baltic countries during World War II when the Soviet Union signed the Non-aggression Pact with Germany. Today we commemorate the anniversary of free Estonia, and renew our hope that Estonia will one day again be free.

Throughout the history of Estonia, there has been a continuing struggle by the Estonian people to maintain their own culture and identity. They have repeatedly asserted their own culture against that of the nations which have occupied their country.

In 1905, the Estonian people participated in the Russian Revolution in order to overthrow the existing Russian regime which was repressing any Baltic and specifically Estonian nationalism. Demands were made but not answered until 12 years later when the Provisional Government ascended to power in Russia. In November 1917, a Communist puppet regime was established and maintained in the cities by martial law. However, Estonian nationalism continued in the countryside.

On February 23, 1918, the Germans drove the Communists out of Estonia on their march into Russia. The Estonians had no desire to be governed by the Germans either, however, and on February 24, 1918, Estonia symbolically proclaimed her independence. Despite the German refusal to accept the proclamation of independence and the suppression of Estonia which followed, a provisional government was established in secret and operated throughout the German occupation.

In November 1918, the Germans withdrew from Estonia. Once again the Soviet Union attempted to occupy and control Estonia. With the mobilization of forces by the Provisional Government, Estonia was able to maintain her independence. On February 2, 1920, a peace treaty was signed between Estonia and the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union voluntarily and forever renounced any sovereign rights over Estonia.

Estonia remained free and independent until the advent of World War II. The Nonaggression Pact signed by Germany and the Soviet Union in 1939 left Estonia in the Soviet sphere and by July 1940, Moscow once again controlled Estonia. On August 6, 1940, Estonia was incorporated into the Soviet Union.

During the 22 years of freedom, Estonia was a prosperous and growing nation carving out her own destiny. Now under the control of the Soviet Union, Estonia has not only lost her national independence, but under the intense pressure of Russification, is in danger of losing her national culture and identity.

On this anniversary of Estonian Independence, let us in America remember this small, valiant nation and hope for the future when Estonia will be free to grow as an Estonian state once again.

AVONDALE SHIPYARDS

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I have noticed in the public press the past few days several attacks which seem to me to be entirely irresponsible on one of the leading shipyards in the United States—the

Avondale Yard. This yard has built hundreds of millions of dollars worth of ships, both for private enterprise and the Government. Most, if not all, of these contracts have been obtained as a result of competitive bidding.

To attack the competence of the yard or the integrity of its officials is most unfair.

If there is to be any type of investigation I will insist that all parties be heard and that other shipyards engaged in the construction of the Navy destroyer escort vessels be required to testify as well.

It is my information that settlements substantially higher than that offered to Avondale have already been paid to at least one other American shipyard for comparable work.

Avondale Shipyards, located 1½ miles up river from the Port of New Orleans, was founded in 1938 primarily as a barge repair company. With better than 11,000 employees the company is now the principal manufacturing employer in the State of Louisiana and a major contributor to the economy of the State and to the Nation.

Several years ago Avondale completed a \$38 million, privately financed, expansion program which has made the shipyard one of the most modern and competitive in the United States. Today, at a time when the Nation is endeavoring to revitalize our decaying American flag merchant marine, this yard is turning out both commercial and military ships at a fantastic rate.

The first step in the program was the acquisition of additional land adjacent to the original shipyard. This new area of approximately 100 acres was used to provide modern steel storage facility, a sophisticated shop for the cutting and preparation of steel plate, and a larger prefabrication area. Removing these functions from the original building site also made possible a more efficient layout in the hull erection and launching area.

Once prepared, engineering drawings and other information are forwarded to the numerical control section of the mold loft for programming. Here information taken from the drawings is plotted mathematically.

After lofting has been accomplished, this information is sent to the computer section where a paper tape is prepared. Information extracted by the mold loft is readily converted to tape form, after which the tape is returned to the engineering department for checking. The computers, all operated by competent technicians, are housed in a specially constructed building to assure positive and accurate operation at all times.

Avondale's tape controlled drafting machines are among the most precise instruments of their kind ever built and include the largest machine of this type in the world. In normal operation under tape control, a pen details the tape fed information in drawing form. Such drawings vary in complexity from a simple plate nesting to a drawing which may show both left and right hand details of a specific element.

Steel is received on the Avondale yard either by ship, rail, or barge and is delivered, by rail, to the vast storage facil-

ity. Here it is identified and stored horizontally. Two massive stock cranes, with a magnetic beam, straddle the 240-foot wide storage area and deliver the plate to either stand-by storage or to the conveyor line.

Servicing the structural shop is a tracked captivator machine which lifts one end of a preselect plate from the line, by means of a traveling overhead hoist, and as the car moves under the plate a magnetized set of rollers lifts the plate onto the captivator. The plate is then carried to a cross-traveling conveyor which directs it through a rotary shot blast machine, a washing device, a drying oven, a paint spray machine, and another drying oven before delivering it to the plate shop for cutting and forming.

The primed plate is lifted, again by electromagnetic cranes, onto the cutting platens where tape controlled burning machines cut them to the desired dimensions. Multiple burning heads, synchronized with the tape program allow cutting of multiple plates to identical dimensions. The speed of operation, as well as the accuracy of cutting, makes this method particularly adaptable to shipbuilding.

After they have been cut, the steel shapes are then moved to the prefabrication area for use in the construction of hull modules or other sections.

Various ship sections are prefabricated in a large building area after which they are moved to the assembly platens through the use of specially designed wheeled vehicles. Bow and stern sections, each of which is fitted to the hull at a particular stage of construction, are normally fabricated in close proximity to the assembly line.

In its modernization and expansion program Avondale has considered all segments of its operation. The machine shop, for example, has been specifically designed for the machining of parts and assemblies essential to ship construction. From taper boring to the turning of line shafts, from the grinding of a locking pin to the facing of a flange, precision has been the guiding factor.

All shops are laid out to facilitate a logical flow of materials and all production schedules are keyed to the master plan. Mechanization is here also in tape controlled machines.

The automatic handling and cutting equipment are being used in conjunction with a radically new method of ship construction. This "shipbuilding machine" is used for the mass construction of destroyer escorts. It consists of five basic positions. In the first position the hull is assembled in an inverted position to allow the advantages of downhand welding. Once assembled the hull is moved sideways into a series of massive turning rings where it is rotated to an upright position, the virtually complete vessel is ready for launching.

During the past year Avondale delivered six massive commercial cargo vessels and three high endurance cutters for the U.S. Coast Guard. The yard also delivered six destroyer escorts for the U.S. Navy. In addition, during this period, Avondale Shipyards laid the keels for three more cargo vessels and three

Navy escort ships and launched five more destroyer escorts.

Contracts signed in 1971 included seven more LASH type cargo vessels and five giant offshore drilling rigs. Three of these rigs are for American oil production companies, two others are for Norwegian interests and will be used for exploration and drilling in the North Sea.

The LASH vessels—a total of 18 attained in competitive bidding or through negotiation—are the only ones of this class to be built by an American shipyard. The destroyer escorts, involving multiple ship contracts for the years 1964 and 1966, total 27 vessels. The high endurance Coast Guard cutters represent 11 such ships to be contracted by the shipyard.

Building two offshore drilling rigs for foreign interests is a breakthrough in being competitive with overseas builders and is a plus factor toward our Nation's balance-of-payment interests.

During the lean times the management of Avondale, poised to meet the challenge that now faced them, elected to keep the Avondale team intact and channeled its skills and know-how into such peacetime pursuits as constructing dredges, fishing boats, offshore oil rigs, components for locks and dams, sugar mill equipment, and marine repair. Once again, Avondale's role in the national economy became clear.

Today, Avondale boasts many times the number of employees who were on the payroll at the close of World War II. There is, however, a considerable difference in the size and type of craft being turned out today at Avondale than in 1945, and the volume of production has increased in greater proportion than the increase in the number of employees. Today a multiplicity of machines and tools, coupled with the same type of know-how, special skills and that "something extra" that gave birth to the old Avondale Marine Ways, helps keep a steady parade of ships marching across the yard to the barge for launching in the Mississippi River.

Service Foundry Division, like its parent company, prides itself on being a specialist on the one hand, but truly diversified on the other. A list of products, other than marine, includes lock and dam machinery, valves and manifolds, bearings, sugar mills and numerous foundry products in both ferrous and nonferrous metals. A further breakdown reveals that for the sugar industry alone, a complete range of products from a single cane knife to a complete mill is available, including mill housing, mill and crusher gearing, mill roll bearings, feed rolls, intermediate carriers, mill rolls and shafts, bedplates, crown wheels, and all other mill components.

All items manufactured at Service Foundry are designed with the customer in mind, and only materials that insure a prolonged life are used.

The Bayou Black Division, is strategically located in the middle of the "Oil Patch," 12 miles east of Morgan City and 20 miles west of Houma, La., on some 200 acres. The primary function of Bayou Black is to serve the offshore oil industry and its prime location is enhanced

by its access to multiple transportation facilities. The yard is bounded to the north by U.S. Highway 90 and Bayou Black to the east and south. Bayou Black ties into the intracoastal waterway system 3½ miles from the yard, providing ready access to the Gulf of Mexico. In addition, the yard is also served by a spur track from Southern Pacific railroad's main line.

While the facility is set up primarily to serve the offshore oil industry, it is equipped to, and does accomplish steel fabrication of any industrial nature. The tools and equipment, including two of the most modern pipe mills in the Gulf South are the latest—permitting the utilization of the most up-to-date and efficient methods of steel fabrication. Specialized work areas, strategically located in the yard, are used to prepare the various steel components prior to assembly or erection. From the first step, cutting steel plate to size, prior to rolling and welding to make the pipe sections, to the loadout of the completed structure, all phases of fabrication and erection are handled with maximum efficiency.

The fabrication of ocean-going barges, floating oil storage units, drilling structures—both fixed and mobile—(submersible-floating)—types, attest to the diversity of Avondale's Bayou Black Division.

Repair work at Avondale is handled primarily at either the Main Yard or at the Harvey Repair Yard, with the facilities of each geared to provide 7 day a week round-the-clock service. The Harvey Repair Yard provides maximum repair facilities by means of its well equipped shops, five drydocks and a complete propeller manufacturing and repair department.

At Harvey the machine shop, electrical and electronic shop and the drydocks offer the most complete repair service in the Gulf South. An awareness of down time cost to an operator is evident and a quick turn around on any job from a propeller repair to a replacement of a single chock is stressed.

The Harvey Yard is proud of its reputation as the most complete one-stop repair facility in the Gulf South and, as the Main Yard continues to produce major ships, the repair facilities of both the Harvey Yard and the Main Yard increase in direct proportion.

Marine Paint & Varnish Co. and Standard Paint & Varnish Co., situated on 22 acres on the West Bank River Road about a mile upriver from the Harvey Canal, have the most complete paint manufacturing process in the South. Standard and Marine Paints manufacture and stock complete lines of products for architectural, trade sales, and contractor uses. Emphasis is also placed on paints and coatings for the marine, industrial, and product finishing fields.

Avondale's Industrial Division is a major supplier of doors, hatches and scuttles for ships under construction at the main yard, and the Westwego facility, as well as other shipyards throughout the world.

An expansion program now under way at this division will enable them to build

barges on a production line basis in the near future.

In conjunction with the expansion program Avondale also obtained and developed another area at Westwego, La. This shipyard has turned out high endurance Coast Guard cutters, barges 300 feet in length and, in 1971, completed almost 500 lighters for the LASH system. Presently on hand are orders for 921 of these lighters. This yard is also building the superstructures for the offshore drilling rigs now under construction.

A floating drydock at the Westwego yard handled 249 vessels of various types during 1971.

The Steel Sales Division, established just 4 years ago, is already one of the major steel suppliers in the Southeastern part of the United States. Customers range from small welding shops to major fabrication and manufacturers.

There are four departments within the division. Brokerage sales are handled for direct shipments from the mill to the larger users. The mill depot department operates on large orders from stock and the machine department handles the smaller runs. A newly added aluminum and stainless steel department is beginning to show progress and a steady growth is anticipated during the coming year.

The Avoncraft Division of Avondale Shipyard is a manufacturer of pre-engineered porcelain enamel on steel buildings. It also fabricates prepainted galvanized and raw steel including steel for the oil, utility and chemical industry.

Avoncraft builds primarily light gage, high quality buildings such as gasoline service stations, car wash tunnels, and truck stops for the oil industry. They also do extensive remodeling of old buildings for the same group.

This division is also a leader in the manufacture and installation of porcelain enamel covers for outdoor electrical generating units.

Somehow, Avondale has gathered the most talented and productive people that the shipbuilding industry has ever known into one organization.

These are not all production people or engineers or supervisors, but a multiplicity of talents ranging from the lowest paid to the highest—each one a valuable individual, endowed or trained to the particular skills of his craft and with the ability to work safely.

It is these craftsmen—the willing worker with the rudimentary skills necessary to learning his craft and the desire to excel—that has set the corporation apart from others in the shipbuilding industry.

Avondale has found these persons—in the swamplands of Louisiana, among the overflow of the big cities, and in allied industries where initiative was stifled—and many of them have moved rapidly through the ranks to positions of greater pay and added responsibility.

In keeping with the laws set up by God and man, the value of each employee is in direct proportion to his overall contribution. No contract that Avondale has attained can be completely successful without a sincere effort on the part of every person within the corporation.

As the corporation profits, so does each individual and the result is evidenced in more jobs and the security of steady work, the financial return in which the individual's wages and benefits are the major share.

Yes, Avondale has a billion assets in its people who have a wholesome attitude toward their work, people who give an honest day's work, people whom the corporation would not trade for any other working group in the world.

CREDIT FRAUD

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to close a loophole in our Code of Crimes and Criminal Procedure that became evident in the Second U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals' decision on February 23 dismissing the indictment against a Harlem furniture company for fraudulent collection practices. The Court of Appeals' action reversed a previous conviction by a lower court.

The ruling, U.S.A. against Boneparth, written by Judge Wilfred Feinberg, while acknowledging that the appellants' practice was unconscionable, held that the Federal statute did not apply to merchants collecting their own debts.

The bill H.R. 13579, I am introducing would clarify section 712 of title 18 to specifically bring persons attempting to collect their own debts under its prohibition against misusing official sounding names in order to convey the false impression that any agency of the Federal Government is involved in the collection. The Court of Appeals' decision limited the application of this section to collection agencies.

The Harlem furniture company involved in the case that has pointed to the need for corrective legislation used financial disclosure forms purportedly issued by the U.S. Funds Bureau headquartered in Washington, D.C.

Judge Feinberg is quoted by the New York Law Journal of February 24, 1972, as having stated in his decision:

We reached this conclusion with a heavy heart because the record reeks from the unconscionable practices of (the) appellants.

The company operated a furniture and appliance store in Harlem. Most of the sales were made on credit, so that liquidation of accounts receivable was a constant problem.

The company did not use a collection agency but collected its own bills. Collections were pursued with understandable persistence. But when all else seemed to fail the company chose to resort to sheer trickery.

Mr. Speaker, while the present law, enacted in 1959 may have originally been aimed at unscrupulous practices of collecting agencies, there surely was no intent to give immunity to those making their own collections. It is important that the Congress act promptly to close this loophole.

The text of H.R. 13579 follows:

H.R. 13579

A bill to amend section 712 of title 18 of the United States Code, to prohibit persons attempting to collect their own debts from misusing names in order to convey the false impression that any agency of the Federal Government is involved in such collection.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 712 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" immediately before "Whoever, being in the business of collecting"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Whoever, in order to collect his own debts or obligations, employs in any communication, correspondence, notice, advertisement, or circular the words 'national', 'Federal', or 'United States', the initials 'U.S.', or any emblem, insignia, or name, for the purpose of conveying and in a manner reasonably calculated to convey the false impression that any such communication, correspondence, notice, advertisement, or circular upon which any such word, initials, or emblem, insignia, or name appears is an official document of any department, agency, bureau, or instrumentality of the United States or in any manner represents the United States shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both."

RALPH L. QUESINBERRY OF CHAGRIN FALLS, OHIO, NAMED ATHLETIC DIRECTOR OF YEAR FOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to announce that one of my constituents, Ralph L. Quesinberry of Chagrin Falls, has been named national winner of the Athletic Director of the Year Award on the secondary school level.

He has the honor of being the first winner of what will be an annual award program sponsored by the National Council of Secondary School Athletic Directors and the Schering Corporation, a pharmaceutical firm.

More than 30,000 secondary school athletic directors throughout the country were invited to submit applications. Ralph Quesinberry was selected from among six regional finalists by an independent selection committee composed of former outstanding athletes who have distinguished themselves in their chosen professions.

In addition to a cash award presentation on Saturday, March 25, in Houston, Tex., Mr. Quesinberry will also be honored by national distribution of a 16 mm. color documentary film in which he plays a feature role. Filmed on location, the motion picture will be shown to thousands of his colleagues who play a vital role in using sports as a catalyst in uplifting and improving their schools and communities. The film will then be shown across the Nation on television and before school and civic organizations.

Mr. Quesinberry spent his entire childhood in Tiffin, Ohio, where he was graduated from the Tiffin Junior Order Home. He showed such great promise as an athlete there that he received a football scholarship to Bowling Green University and later became captain of the team. He graduated in 1946 and seven of his classmates became coaches.

After receiving his Bachelor of Science degree, he went to Kent State University where he earned his Masters in 1953.

It was during those formative years at Tiffin and Bowling Green that he developed a warm and intense interest in helping young people and in student participation.

Mr. Quesinberry served in the U.S. Army, spent 2½ years overseas, and was honorably discharged on Christmas Day, 1945. He took his coaching credentials to Chagrin Falls, where he soon found his niche in life.

He has spent 26 years teaching at Chagrin Falls High School while at the same time putting in 16 years as football coach, 3 years as basketball coach, 20 years as a track coach, 5 years as a golf coach, 2 years as swimming coach and 10 years as athletic director. He also served as a volunteer and later as a paid staff member of the community recreation program for 18 years.

During his first year at the coaching helm, Quesinberry produced an undefeated, untied team which tallied 233 points to its opponents 22. It was a great football year. That was in 1947.

Over the 16 years of Ralph Quesinberry's head coaching career his Tigers won 83, lost only 35 and tied 10 games. This works out to a .704 win average, one of the highest among active grid coaches in Greater Cleveland.

No matter what caliber of football material Quesinberry had to work with, his squads always reflected fine coaching and superb conditioning.

HONORED BY CITY FATHERS

When Quesinberry stepped down as coach with an eye to the athletic directorship, the city fathers, then headed by Mayor James H. Solether, honored him with a proclamation and a "Ralph Quesinberry Day."

He was honored at a civic banquet, and many former students sent him letters and wires. One wire came from Marshall R. Jennison, M.D., Columbus. It read:

Dear Coach: there are many present tonight who played well for you and your school and have much to thank you for. As one whose contributions were more modest and mostly from the sidelines, let me say that I also consider it a privilege to have been a member, however small, of one of your teams.

Today, at Chagrin Falls High School, it is the zest for sports and fitness which Quesinberry instills in the whole program he directs. During the summer it is the Blooper League, the Little League and Pony League. He has initiated such sports as intramural volleyball, tumbling, and Saturday morning basketball and fitness classes.

HE LOVES AND HELPS YOUNG PEOPLE

Many townspeople attest to the warm and personal interest he takes in students, both boys and girls.

Wrote Charles D. Barber of Chagrin Falls:

The highest compliment that I could pay Ralph would be to say that there is no man I would rather have coach my own son than Ralph Quesinberry because of the favorable impact and influences he has on young people. Fortunately, for our family, our three youngsters have had the privilege of knowing and being positively influenced by Ralph Quesinberry. Our community has enjoyed the fruits of this man's labor of love for competitive sports.

Over the years, he has arranged for countless college interviews, written hundreds of recommendations, and has given unstintingly of his own time and money visiting college campuses with prospective students. For summer-time jobs, he is literally a walking employment agency.

Not too long ago, he bought a vacant lot adjacent to his home, had it black-topped, and turned it over to children in the neighborhood for a playground.

He organized numerous community projects to help with unusual cases or problem children.

He has opened the gymnasiums of the community and has given his own time freely to participating students in the community, as well as black students from neighboring communities.

In 1962, he was honored by the Jay-Cees as "Man of the Year" for his contributions to school children.

Only this last fall, Mr. Quesinberry helped organize a public dinner honoring two outstanding members of the community for the giving of their time and financial support to many community projects.

Mr. Quesinberry is married to the former Marjorie (Peg) Hagadorn, whom he courted while a student at Bowling Green. They have three children, David, 22, who holds a Bachelor of Science degree in Health and Physical Education from Bowling Green; Tom, 19, a freshman at Ohio University, majoring in Health and Physical Education; and Susan, 15, a high school sophomore and a candy stripper at Highland View Hospital.

CHINA TRIP

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, we have all had the opportunity to read the comments of the Washington and New York media with respect to the President's recent trip to China but I think it is also helpful and instructive to read the impressions of newsmen and editors back at the grassroots.

In that regard, I read with interest three editorials in the Peoria Journal Star dated February 24, 27, and 29 entitled, respectively, "The Great Turnaround," "The Second Impressions," and "We Didn't Do All the Giving." These editorials provide some insights and impressions which may be of interest to my colleagues and I include the text of these editorials in the RECORD at this point:

THE GREAT TURNAROUND

One of the most intriguing things about the whole China episode is the coverage of it, which has had a shattering effect on the former mind-sets of so many journalists.

Our own "stable" is the most dramatic example.

William F. Buckley, the "conservative" columnist, has been in the business for three years, largely, of defending Richard Nixon from the assaults of the left-wingers.

Josep Kraft, the "liberal thinker," has spent the same three years, generally, finding a rigid, selfish, short-term, expedient and mistaken purpose in just about anything Nixon does.

Three days in China, and our "anti-Nixon" and "pro-Nixon" columnists seem to have traded places!

Buckley remains hung up on "shaking the bloody hands" of the old Communist killer-chiefs and sees the camaraderie of the meeting with apparent horror and disgust—so far.

Kraft, true to form, first calculated that the whole trip was a meaningless, empty farce with no real function or purpose other than political showmanship. The "cool reception" in terms of street crowds he interpreted as evidence that the Chinese would treat Nixon at arm's length, and put him in the humiliating position of a beggar at court.

But after the prompt meeting of Nixon and Mao and the sudden splurge of coverage on Chinese press and radio and television Kraft was dumfounded and reversed himself completely. (Read Kraft's column on this page today.)

Finally, Kraft has perceived what President Nixon has been saying for two years as the real reality: that the future of America and China is in a future world in which both will inevitably be among the "Big Five." (Nixon has been pointing this out in "view-of-the-world" press briefings for background ever since he started such special briefings across the country years ago. And Nixon has been repeatedly telling us his goal was not "peace, now" but "a generation of peace.")

Those like Kraft with a stereotyped self-view of Nixon refused to listen and kept looking for the "instant expediency" and the "rabbit from the hat trick."

Now, Joe Kraft sees the point. Whether or not this trip means anything to America's problems this year, it makes a massive change for posterity.

The facts of life are that a Communist regime, which came to power amid rivers of blood, rules 800,000,000 people and is establishing its own "base" of philosophy and world view and its own "mind-sets" for a long time to come.

For 20 years, part of that legend-building has included a fixed and virulent hatred of the United States.

The central figure of the whole modern and probably future Chinese "legend"—the Lenin of China—is Mao, and Mao is nearly 80 years old.

The question affecting posterity is whether it will develop based on "inevitable" and eternal hatred toward the U.S., or whether the new generation of leaders, generating Mao and Maoist traditions, will come to power with a reasonable future attitude toward what the U.S. is and possible accommodation with it in a peaceful manner.

Crudely put, the question is how rigid will China's future tradition be—or how flexible.

Mao's public seal on the Nixon visit and the resulting broad publicity and smiling, warm "imagery" being blasted at the Chinese people is a long step toward making sure that Chinese youth and American youth do not enter the future already mortgaged to enmity.

The past is bloody, indeed, but we serve nobody by dealing in a past whose chief

leaders—Chiang Kai-shek, Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-Lai are all very elderly men today.

There is a service to posterity, at least, by the remarkable and apparently successful move that Nixon has made to "tear up the mortgage" and change the basic attitude toward America of a major section of the world's people—not just a regime.

In three days, with a massive assist from the whole Red China propaganda machine, Nixon has changed the "image" of the United States in Chinese modern tradition and legend-building.

And if Joe Kraft is an example, he may have made his first dent in that much more difficult task—changing the "image" of Richard Nixon that has been as stereotyped and self-inflicted on many U.S. intellectuals, newsmen, and others as were the Chinese myths about us all.

Now we wait to see if William Buckley will take his eyes off the horrid past, too, to see the future potential involved which is where the action is. The past is too late to change.

In the past 13 years, we have pointed out, again and again, that what is said on the world stage by Communist leaders is totally unreliable and often pure "tactics"—and that the place to look for what is "real" is in the controlled propaganda that they direct at their own people.

Too often, the soft words spoken by Red leaders and blazoned in the Western press were not even reported to the home folks.

(I was in Russia when the first high Russian official visited the U.S. and his every remark was a headline in America, and his every word "analyzed" for great significance about future relations. Yet, in Russia, none of these things were told the Russian people where anti-American propaganda continued to dominate the media.)

The splurge of friendly and warm publicity deluging the people of China now is the real measure that means something.

This time, at least, the "double game" we have watched Communist diplomacy playing so often is not being played against us.

It does open the door of the future—even if that is the future involving other Chinese inheritors and other American administrations.

That door appeared to be slammed, locked and bolted a very short time ago.

We ought not go overboard as to what this means in our relations there tonight . . . but it gives posterity a much freer hand to solve problems which otherwise threaten the most massive loss of human life in history.

Responsibility requires that we now concern ourselves more about that possible future blood-bath than those of the past.

C. L. DANCEY.

REALITY IN CHINA: THE SECOND IMPRESSIONS

The contingent of newsmen in China do not get much exposure to the "common man" there, but even though they are reduced to interviewing their official interpreters and talking to their official drivers while the private real business of the trip goes forward, it is having an impact.

It is hard to get realistic impressions in a strange country in one week. I recall vividly that "first impressions" of a series of activities in the Soviet Union a few years ago were exciting and even almost entrancing—for a while. That is because they were so "new," and one did not yet realize the difference between the new experience and what the same thing is like as an external standard. Later some of the same "charming" practices assumed as opposite impact—as near intolerable.

"It's a nice place to visit but I wouldn't want to live there," is a saying that is commonplace amongst us that grows from this very important time difference.

A Reuters correspondent who was in Peking for some years in the late 60's (and ended up in solitary confinement simply as

blackmail against British policy in Hong Kong) described how exhilarating and impressive it was in the midst of the Cultural Revolution to see the masses of Chinese carrying Mao's "Little Red Book" with them wherever they went and chanting Mao's saying with great enthusiasm.

After a couple of weeks of this, however, he began to get tired of it. After a couple of months of it, he began to realize how horribly sickening it must actually be for those mobs who were so obviously obliged to do it, day in and day out, with slavish, humiliating and boring monotony.

Things change with prolonged exposure to truer dimension than they have in the first burst of experience.

But even in a week, tidbits of the Chinese reality are emerging for many of the visiting reporters. One catches the flavor of a driver who looked incomprehending when asked what happens if you break the speed limit, and could only reply, "You don't understand, that IS the speed limit."

Another catches the papered-over pathos of a Peking intellectual who was arbitrarily yanked from his job and plunked down in a commune three years ago, his family split up, while he worked as a peasant among peasants. He was yanked out again, temporarily, to meet the interpreter needs of this visit—and will be sent back again when it's over.

He has still not seen his children, and has no idea when, if ever, he will see them again or be allowed to leave the commune and his peasant chores to resume a more "normal" life for his own background, training and abilities.

We see him, on top of this sad situation, earnestly proclaiming that he doesn't mind a bit and that peasant work is a "great opportunity."

It will not hurt future reporting attitudes here in the United States that these commentators and correspondents have discovered a human frame of reference in the controlled society as well as a broadly intellectual concept of that way of life.

It is one thing to have a basic "understanding" and theory that "they do things differently . . . which is their right" and thus a surface comprehension at the intellectual level of the idea of a controlled or totalitarian society. It is another thing to see it even by the smallest glimpses, through the eyes of individual human beings who must do as they are told, who have no say over their future, who know nothing but what is carefully selected as suitable, and who must give verbal approval of whatever is done to them whether they like it or not.

Russians and Chinese, like any other human beings, once we contact them at the personal and social level, are not hohgoblins. They are people like us.

After that real awareness and the shock that they aren't all that different comes the second realization (if one experiences anything like a real "immersion" in a Communist culture) that, as human beings like us, the pervasive tyranny imposed on their daily and personal lives is horribly humiliating, endlessly depressing, and often tragic.

Their feelings are what anybody's feelings would be—except that their feelings must be suppressed and "proper" "official" attitudes loudly expressed.

Part and parcel of this endless repression is the confusing fact that any startling break in the routine is so exhilarating it can be almost intoxicating—and a Westerner may see Communist citizens animated, laughing loudly, and, indeed, at times acting as if under the stimulus of "pep pills." I have experienced this many times in Russia.

The "pep pill" is the presence of an American. It can be like a visit from a man

on the moon. It provides a rare holiday atmosphere.

This is less true in Russia today than a few years ago—depending somewhat on where you go. It is, apparently, very true in China today at a "stage" much like Russia or East Germany a few years ago.

It ought to serve as a "balancing" experience of the human realities of this level of regimentation—together with the hopeful reality in terms of international affairs that the future may be rendered more peaceful than the past.

There are grounds for enthusiasm about the China development—and grounds for sobriety. We ought not confuse the two realities.

We are going to have to deal intelligently and realistically with both.

C. L. DANCEY.

WE DIDN'T DO ALL THE GIVING

With tunnel visions (and some political prejudice) a good many U.S. observers seem to insist on "analyzing" the Chinese communiqué as if the "generalizations" about China's policy are meaningless and the U.S. is doing all the "giving."

Far from it, it seems to me, if you keep in mind the constant and significant "double-play" of controlled societies as to what they in the past have often told us and the world as compared to what they have described as policy to their own people in their own controlled media.

When you look at what China has been preaching through all its propaganda media for 20 years and see that they now come forward with a public pledge, likewise broadcast by all their own controlled media throughout China as the policy of Mao and Chou, it is a very significant change.

They have publicly pledged that both China and the U.S. will not seek hegemony over any other Asian nation, and that they will respect the territorial integrity of existing small nations, and that their formal policy is one of peace not conquest.

The other fact of life ignored by those who blandly skip over China's commitments in this communiqué is the fact that unless China proceeds to act as promised we are not "giving away" a single thing!

Every promise we have made, large or small, by the terms of the communiqué is contingent upon their good behavior.

Even the removal of a mere 10,000 U.S. military still doing odd jobs in Taiwan is a gradual, long term, stretched out commitment depending on China's future actions.

Even such little things as "cultural" and "journalistic" exchanges are pushed into a slow developing future process depending on China's future actions.

Even the simple development of normal, de facto, diplomatic relations between nations such as we have long carried on with the Soviet Union and a host of distasteful governments, left and right, is pushed into a cautious, long-term future activity depending on future Chinese actions in keeping her pledges.

If China does "behave," no U.S. policy would be sacrificed, because it has always been our policy to resist expansion and nothing more. Indeed, it would mark the success of that policy.

If China does not behave, we will have lost nothing because the whole deal will be just another broken contract which binds nobody. We will just be back at the beginning.

It must be presumed that there were powerful forces involved to oblige China to seek out this display of new association with the U.S. and this drastic change in her internal propaganda and policy vis a vis the United States and regarding the communization of Asia.

It must be presumed that China thinks it to her advantage—or necessity—to behave

for a few years. Doubtless that intention is temporary.

But a few years are very important, because who knows what changes or conditions may develop during such a hiatus?

In a few years the leadership in China, for example, must inevitably change . . . and there is significance in Nixon's insistence on exchanging a toast or shaking the hand of every Chinese official in reach at every formal affair.

In the odd intensities of internal Chinese politics, he sought to involve every possible future power personally in this contact and this activity.

It is easier to get into these things than it is to get out of them, and Nixon did all that can be done to make it difficult for the future echelon of China to restore the full "bogeyman" image of the United States—that prevailed for 20 years—as an instrument of politics in the Chinese Communist party in future power struggles.

He has gone an amazingly long way to give the future, there and here, more fluidity.

The task will be to make the most of that . . . but it simply puts us on the playing field with more room to move—it doesn't tie us down. It frees us.

It does the same for the Chinese.

And this added fluidity both places is an improvement over the rigid images of the past which locked us onto a collision course.

C. L. DANCEY.

MONTHLY CALENDAR OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to insert in the RECORD the Monthly Calendar of the Smithsonian Institution. The March Calendar of Events follows:

1972 KITE CARNIVAL

Under the direction of Paul E. Garber, Historian Emeritus, National Air and Space Museum. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates and Parks for All Seasons, National Capital Parks.

March 18: Illustrated lecture entitled *The History and Design of Kites*, by Paul E. Garber. 1:30 p.m., Natural History Building Auditorium.

March 26: Kite Day. Open flying for all kite enthusiasts. The Park Service will provide entertainment, free kites (bring tails!), and a Kite Clinic for repair. 12 Noon-5 p.m. Washington Monument Grounds.

April 1: Kite Competition (No recreational flying will take place this day). Rain date will be April 2. Washington Monument Grounds.

Washington Area Competition. 10 a.m.-1 p.m.—registration and flying (registration closes at 12 Noon). 1:30 p.m.—awards presentation.

National Kite Competition. 2-3:30 p.m.—flying. 4 p.m.—awards presentation.

For detailed information on competition rules and eligibility, write Kites, the Smithsonian Associates, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560.

MARCH AT THE SMITHSONIAN

MARCH 1, 1972

Exhibition: Second Floor Gallery, National Collection of Fine Arts, devoted to American landscape painting and opening in honor of the American park system's centennial. Works range from early 19th century through

the years of exploration and establishment of the Yellowstone area and include artists Moran, Leutze and Bierstadt. Permanent exhibition.

Concert: *Danzi Woodwind Quintet* in a program of works by Cage, Denzov, Escher, Haydn, and Reicha. 8:30 p.m., Baird Auditorium, Museum of Natural History. For ticket information call 381-5395. Presented by the Division of Musical Instruments and Resident Smithsonian Associates.

Free film theatre: *Annanacks*—A group of Eskimos faced with extinction and its successful struggle to establish the first Eskimo cooperative in Canada; *Eskimo Artist Kenojuak*—the daily life of Kenojuak and her people. Two-film program at 12:10 and 1:10 p.m. Natural History Building auditorium.

Design film: *The Music Rack*. Artist Wendell Castle is shown making a complex plywood music rack. Continuous half-hour showings from 11 a.m.; last showing 2:30 p.m. Grand Salon, Renwick Gallery.

MARCH 2, 1972

Creative screen: *Symmetry*—Mathematical ballet of symmetries in controlled progression from simple to complex figures; *Magic Machines*—Excellent photography, glockenspiel musical background and commentary by artist-sculptor Robert Gilbert on his ingenious kinetic sculpture contraptions. Continuous half-hour showings from 11 a.m.; last showing 2:30 p.m. Lecture Hall, National Collection of Fine Arts.

Seminar in Origin of Life, Genetic Engineering and Evolution: *Gene Therapy: The Need, Experimental Approaches and Social Implications*. Lecturer: H. Vasken Aposhian, University of Maryland. Sponsored by the Consortium of Universities of the Washington metropolitan area and the Smithsonian Institution. 7:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium.

Free film theatre: *Annanacks: Eskimo Artist Kenojuak*. Repeat. See March 1 for details.

MARCH 3, 1972

Seminar: *Man's Predicament in the 1970's*, by Governor Rolf Edberg, Swedish statesman and humanist. Gov. Edberg's book, *On the Shred of a Cloud* prompted the forthcoming U.N. Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment. 10:30 a.m., Baird Auditorium, Natural History Building. Public is invited. Sponsored by the Office of Seminars and the Office of Environmental Sciences.

MARCH 4, 1972

Creative screen: *Symmetry; Magic Machines*. Repeat. See March 2 for details.

MARCH 5, 1972

Exhibition: *Art from D.C. Public Elementary Schools*. Paintings, drawings, papier maché constructions, batiks, and ceramics by elementary school students. National Collection of Fine Arts, through April 10.

MARCH 8, 1972

Luncheon forum: *F-4 Phantom II—Most Successful Jet of All Time*. Informal discussion led by F. Michael O'Brien, President, University College Students Association. Room 449, Smithsonian Institution "Castle" Building. 12 Noon—Bring your lunch.

Free film theatre: *The Unexplained*—Documentary on investigations into unexplored frontiers of knowledge; including communicating with dolphins in their own language, and the Continental Drift theory. 12:10 and 1:10 p.m., Natural History Building auditorium.

Design film: Corning Museum of Glass films on the design and manufacture of glass. Continuous half-hour showings from 11 a.m., last showing at 2:30 p.m. Grand Salon, Renwick Gallery.

MARCH 9, 1972

Seminar in Origin of Life, Genetic Engineering and Evolution: *Use of Bacterial*

Genes in Human Cells. Lecturer: Carl R. Merrill, National Institute of Mental Health. 7:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium. Sponsored by the Consortium of Universities of the Washington metropolitan area and the Smithsonian Institution.

Free film theatre: *The Unexplained*. Repeat. See March 8 for details.

Smithsonian adventure: CBS-TV. *Ninety Days to Survival*. Second program in the "Smithsonian Adventure" series. This hour-long documentary is based on the Colorado River explorations of the late John Wesley Powell. In the Washington, D.C., area, the program may be seen on WTOP-TV, Channel 9. 9 p.m. EST.

MARCH 11, 1972

Lecture: *Contemporary American Painting and Sculpture*, by Adelyn D. Breeskin, Curator of 20th Century Painting and Sculpture. National Collection of Fine Arts Lecture Hall, 3 p.m.

MARCH 14, 1972

Illustrated lecture: *Spode—The Creator of Bone China*. Robert Copeland of Spode Ltd, discusses the development of Spode china and its manufacture as a mirror of taste over 170 years. 8:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium. Presented by the Resident Smithsonian Associates.

MARCH 15, 1972

Design Film: *The Music Rack*. Repeat. See March 1 for details.

Free film theatre: *The Pink City*—The history, architecture and art of Jaipur, India; *The Dot and the Line*—Academy Award winning cartoon. Two-film program at 12:10 and 1:10 p.m. Natural History Building Auditorium.

MARCH 16, 1972

Audubon lecture: *Our Glorious National Parks*. Edward M. Brigham, Jr., former Director, Kingman Museum of Natural History in Battle Creek, Mich., presents his color film of the wilderness, waterfalls and many other unique features of our National Parks. 5:15 and 8:30 p.m., Natural History Building auditorium. Sponsored by the Audubon Naturalist Society.

Seminar in Origin of Life, Genetic Engineering and Evolution: *Alteration of Maize Protein Synthesis by Mutual Genes*. Lecturer: Edwin T. Mertz, Purdue University. 7:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium. Sponsored by the Consortium of Universities of the Washington metropolitan area and the Smithsonian Institution.

Creative screen: *The Responsive Eye*—The explosive excitement of an art opening at the Museum of Modern Art. Continuous half-hour showings from 11 a.m.; last showing 2:30 p.m. Lecture Hall, National Collection of Fine Arts.

Free film theatre: *The Pink City; The Dot and the Line*. Repeat. See March 15 for details.

MARCH 17, 1972

Lecture: *Bell Canto in Jazz and Popular Singing*. A lecture with recordings, by Henry Pleasants, a distinguished music critic and author of numerous books and articles praising popular music at the expense of contemporary "art" music. History and Technology Building, 2nd floor; 8 p.m. Presented by the Division of Musical Instruments.

Illustrated lecture: *The Great Dismal Swamp of Virginia*, by William E. Ashley, Isaac Walton League and Alvah Duke, Lake Drummond Tours. The program combines a color film and an account of the historical and biological importance of the area, including a discussion of current efforts for preservation. 8 p.m., Natural History Building auditorium. Sponsored by the National Parks and Conservation Association.

MARCH 18, 1972

Creative screen: *The Responsive Eye*. Repeat. See March 16 for details.

MARCH 21, 1972

Illustrated lecture: *The Three Laughers of the Tiger Valley*, by Professor John Rosenfield, Harvard University. One of a series on oriental art. The Free Gallery of Art. 8:30 p.m.

The film and the producer: Portions of *The Everglades and The American Prairies*, together with a new film, *The Power Crisis*, presented by Craig Fisher, Independent documentary film maker. Natural History Building auditorium, 8:30 p.m. Sponsored by the Resident Smithsonian Associates.

MARCH 22, 1972

Luncheon form: *Progress Report on Skylab*. Informal discussion led by John H. Disher, Deputy Director of Skylab Program, NASA. Room 449, Smithsonian Institution "Castle" Building. 12 Noon—Bring your lunch.

Exhibition: *Jack Lenor Larsen Retrospective*. One of the major innovators in the field of weaving, Larsen created the first woven wool stretch fabric and introduced such oddities as ribbon and nylon horsehair to power looming. He also wove the theater curtain at Wolf Trap Farm. The Renwick Gallery, through May 31.

Design films: To be announced. Continuous showings from 11 a.m.; last showing at 2:30 p.m. Grand Salon, Renwick Gallery.

Free film theatre: *Nehru*. Nehru, at age 73, talks of his past and India's history. 12:10 and 1:10 p.m., Natural History Building auditorium.

MARCH 23, 1972

Seminar in Origin of Life, Genetic Engineering and Evolution: *Cloning—Recent Advances in Embryo Transplantation*. Lecturer: E. S. E. Hafez, Wayne State University. 7:30 p.m., History and Technology Building auditorium. Sponsored by the Consortium of Universities of the Washington metropolitan area and the Smithsonian Institution.

Free film theatre: *Nehru*. Repeat. See March 22 for details.

National capital shell club: *Study group* conducted by staff members of the Smithsonian's Division of Mollusks, 7:30 p.m. *Monthly meeting and slide program*, 8:15 p.m. Room 43, Natural History Building. Public is invited.

MARCH 25, 1972

Music from Marlboro. Selections by Mozart, Schumann, and Schubert performed by Nerine Barrett, piano; Isidore Cohen, violin; Anle Kavafian, violin; Nancy Cirillo, viola; Timothy Eddy, cello; and Julius Levine, double-bass. 5:30 p.m., Natural History Building auditorium. For ticket information, call 381-5395.

Lecture series: *Underwater History and Treasure Discoveries*. Speakers are scheduled from 9 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. in the History and Technology Building and include Mendel Peterson, Smithsonian Curator of Historic Archeology, discussing "Cannons as Clues to Sunken Ship Identification." For detailed schedule of speakers and topics, call Mrs. Bennett, 659-8800.

MARCH 28, 1972

Free film theatre: *India—The Bewildered Giant*. This film, made last year, faces the problems of India today. 12:10 and 1:10 p.m. Natural History Building auditorium.

MARCH 29, 1972

Free film theatre: *India—The Bewildered Giant*. Repeat. See March 28 for details.

MARCH 31, 1972

Exhibition: *WW II Fighters*. This remarkable era of air and space history is depicted in a unique exhibit that includes the recreation of a front line fighter airfield. Visitors may "eavesdrop" on crew conversations and see mechanics repairing aircraft. Uniforms, medals and aircraft models of the period are among the many other items displayed. Arts and Industries Building. Closing indefinite.

MUSEUM TOURS

Highlight Tours, conducted by Smithsonian volunteers, begin at the Info Desks by the Mall entrances, on the following schedule:

Museum of History and Technology: Monday through Friday, 10:30, 11:30 a.m. Saturday and Sunday, 10:30, Noon, 1:30, 3 p.m.

Museum of Natural History: Saturday and Sunday. By appointment, call 381-6471.

Arts & Industries Building (Air & Space Museum): Saturday, 10:30, 11, 11:30 a.m., 1, 2, 3 p.m. Sunday, 1, 2, 3 p.m.

National Collection of Fine Arts: Saturday and Sunday, 2:30 p.m. (Tour begins at 9th Street entrance.

THE FRENCH COOK

Julia Child—A Triple Entente for the Ides of March. Demonstration of French cooking. March 7, 1:30 or 8:30 p.m.

Plain and Fancy Gourmet—A Basic Four: Meat, Fowl, Fish, and Pastry. Cooking series under the direction of Edith Vanocur, author and gourmet chef of national newspaper and television. Four weekly sessions on Wednesdays at 8 p.m. or Thursdays, 1 p.m. (beginning March 8 or 9).

Attendance by prior registration only. Julia Child demonstration only—\$10. Entire series, including Julia Child demonstration—\$30. For further information and application, call The Smithsonian Associates, 381-5157.

FOREIGN STUDY TOURS

For members of the National and Resident Associates. For further details on tours, listed below, write to Miss Schumann, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560.

Australia and New Zealand: March 24-April 28.

Mexico and Guatemala: April 3-22.

No-Tour: Dulles-Paris-Dulles. May 29-June 19.

Eastern Turkey: May 30. Waiting list only.

Greece and Yugoslavia: June 12-July 10.

No-Tour: New York-Amsterdam-New York. July 17-Aug. 17.

King Arthur's England: July 12-Aug. 2.

The Pilgrimage Road: Sept. 11-Oct. 9.

No-Tour: Dulles-London-Dulles, Sept. 11.

Russia: Sept. 12-Oct. 13.

Pakistan and Afghanistan: Oct. 9-Nov. 8.

CONTINUING EXHIBITIONS

ANACOSTIA NEIGHBORHOOD MUSEUM

The Evolution of a Community. The history of Anacostia from 1608 through World War II. Through May.

ARTS & INDUSTRIES BUILDING (AIR AND SPACE MUSEUM)

Ballooning: Man's First Aeronautical Adventure. The entire story of ballooning from earliest ideas to a modern science. On display indefinitely.

Reading Is Fundamental. This exhibit describes an action program to make books a way of life for all of America's children. Through Jan. 1973.

FREER GALLERY OF ART

2500 Years of Persian Art. Decorative work from manuscripts, metalwork, ceramic objects and architectural decorations. Through December 1972.

MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND TECHNOLOGY

Music Machines—American Style. As part of this exhibit, films are shown continuously as follows:

Mar. 3-9 MGM Musicals

Mar. 10-16 Musicals of '30s II

Mar. 17-23 MGM Musicals

Mar. 24-30 Musicals of the '30s I

NATIONAL COLLECTION OF FINE ARTS

Contemporary Paintings and Sculpture. Works from the permanent collections, including some never-before displayed. Through March 8.

NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY

Washington in the New Era (1870-1970). Portraits, manuscripts and photographs depicting the history of Washington's black community. Through June 2. For group tours call 381-6347.

THE RENWICK GALLERY

Woodenworks. Through July 9.
Design Is . . . On Display indefinitely.
James Renwick in Washington. A study of the architect's career. On display indefinitely.
Selections from the Index of American Design. Through Jan. 1973.
The Glass of Frederick Carder. On Display indefinitely.
Pueblo Pottery. Through Jan. 2, 1973.
American Architecture. Photographs by the late Frank Roos. Through March 24.

HOURS

Smithsonian museums: 10 a.m.-5:30 p.m., 7 days a week.
(The Smithsonian "Castle" Building will be closed March 2.)
National Zoo buildings: 9 a.m.-4:30 p.m., 7 days a week.
Anacostia Neighborhood Museum: 10 a.m.-6 p.m., weekdays; 1-6 p.m., weekends.

DEMONSTRATIONS

MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND TECHNOLOGY

Musical Instruments, from the Smithsonian's collection. Monday, Wednesday, Friday, 3 p.m. Hall of Musical Instruments, 3rd floor.

Music Machines—American Style. Mechanical and electronic music machines. Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Sunday, 1:30 p.m., 2nd floor.

Spinning and Weaving. Tuesday, 10:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.; Wednesday through Friday, 10:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m. and 1:30-3:30 p.m.

RADIO SMITHSONIAN

Radio Smithsonian, a program of music and conversation growing out of the Institution's many activities, is broadcast every Sunday on WGMS-AM (570) and FM (103.5) from 9-9:30 p.m. The program schedule for March:

5th—*Concert.* Malcolm Bilson plays music for the fortepiano.

12th—*A Conversation with Dr. Edward Teller.*

19th—*How Birds Communicate,* with Dr. Gene Morton of the Smithsonian Chesapeake Bay Center; *The Art of John Held, Jr.* Mrs. Held talks about her late husband, the creator of the flapper cartoons of the '20's.

26th—*Science at the Smithsonian.* An interview with Dr. David Challinor, Smithsonian Assistant Secretary for Science; *Israel: An Archeologist's Dream,* with Dr. Avraham Biran, Director of the Department of Antiquities and Museums of Israel, and Dr. Gus VanBeek, Smithsonian Curator of Old World Anthropology.

SMITHSONIAN PUPPET THEATRE

Eureka!—The story of a small boy, Murphy, his unusual friend Worm and their travels through time and ideas. A new fantasy performed by Allan Stevens and Company and presented by the Division of Performing Arts. Wednesday through Friday, 10:30 and 11:30 a.m.; Saturday and Sunday, 10:30 a.m., 12:30 and 2:30 p.m., in the History and Technology Building auditorium. Admission: \$1 children; \$1.25 adults; group rates available for 20 or more. Tickets are on sale at the box office, or call 381-5395.

DOMESTIC TOURS

A Musical Weekend in Washington: April 28-30. Splendid music, tours of the Smithsonian, Kennedy Center, Filene Cen-

ter, and social events in private Georgetown homes, and historic houses. A tour for people who love music. Sponsored by Friends of Music at the Smithsonian and the Division of Musical Instruments. For information and reservations write to Mrs. Lois Howard, Division of Musical Instruments, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560. Reservation deadline: April 1.

The Smithsonian Associates sponsor tours listed below. For further details, write Mrs. Kilkenny, Smithsonian Associates, Washington, D.C. 20560.

Death Valley: April 14-20.

Northern Pueblo Indians: June departures.

Navaho Land: June departures.

Windjammer Cruise: June 25-July 1.

Solar Eclipse: July 5-11. Prince Edward Island.

Archaeology Dig: August 6-12. New Hampshire.

(NOTE: Trips are also available for instructors and advanced students in archaeology, anthropology, geology and ecology who desire exception field experience.)

THE PRESIDENT'S CHINA VISIT:
"A SINGLE STEP"

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following could, with but few variations, have come from the White House newsroom recently:

In this critical posture of affairs in China it is deemed appropriate to define the attitude of the United States as far as present circumstances permit this to be done. We adhere to the policy initiated by us in 1857, of peace with the Chinese nation, of furtherance of lawful commerce, and of protection of lives and property of our citizens by all means guaranteed under extraterritorial treaty rights and by the law of nations. . . .

... The purpose of the President is, as it has been heretofore, to act concurrently with the other powers, first, in opening up communication with Peking and rescuing the American officials, missionaries, and other Americans who are in danger; secondly, in affording all possible protection everywhere in China to American life and property; thirdly, in guarding and protecting all legitimate American interests; and fourthly, in aiding to prevent a spread of the disorders to the other provinces of the Empire and a recurrence of such disasters. It is, of course, to early to forecast the means of attaining this last result; but the policy of the Government of the United States is to seek a solution which may bring about permanent safety and peace to China, preserve Chinese territorial and administrative entity, protect all rights guaranteed to friendly powers by treaty and international law, and safeguard for the world the principle of equal and impartial trade with all parts of the Chinese Empire. . . .

With a very few minor changes, this could have been a statement from the White House, upon President Nixon's return from Peking. It was issued under the administration of another Republican President—William McKinley—but there the resemblance stops. Those words make up the major part of Secretary of State John Hay's circular letter of July 3, 1900, to the U.S. embassies in Berlin, Paris, London, Rome, and St.

Petersburg, and to our missions in Vienna, Brussels, Madrid, Tokyo, The Hague, and Lisbon. It spells out in more detail Hay's "open door" policy toward China, first initiated in 1899. It also serves as a reminder of the first major premise that must be considered when evaluating President Nixon's recent trip, and for that matter in any consideration of United States-Chinese relations: There is no real hard-core, long-term reason why the United States and China cannot be friendly.

A word about Hay and "open door"—there is more pertinence to that part of our diplomatic history than we realize. After Japan had annexed Formosa, and occupied Korea, in the last decade of the 19th century, Russia, England, and France had begun to secure permanent leases on important harbors from a weak and unsteady Chinese central government. The country was in very real danger of being sliced up and parceled out in various forms to the European powers and Japan.

This would have been a military menace, it would have had a very adverse effect on Chinese-American trade, and, last but not least, there was the very real and warm feeling on the part of the American people for China and the Chinese, fostered by medical and Christian missionaries. For that matter, I believe the feeling is still basically there. I do not maintain that this country is ready to ignore nor forget the points of conflict between the United States and China over the past 20 years. But I am saying this feeling of closeness, that I do not believe the United States has ever really had for any other country, has never died. Perhaps it explains to some degree the high level of curiosity that we have always had for China, and the equally high level of excitement and interest over President Nixon's recent trip.

John Hay, who began his career in public life as secretary to Abraham Lincoln, and closed it by serving as Secretary of State under both McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt, came up with the "open door" policy in 1899 to try and head off this threatened disintegration of China. It could have foundered on the Boxer Rebellion, of 1900, an ill-fated attempt on the part of Chinese radicals and fanatics to throw all foreign devils out of China. The United States did take part in the expeditionary force to relieve the besieged legations in Peking, but Hay sent the note quoted above to the European powers most directly concerned with China to try and avert any new attempt to divide and rule.

It worked; to what degree is still argued. Some say Europe and Japan accepted it with their fingers crossed, just to please Hay and the American public. China was still weak, and, it is true, the empress dowager, last "strong" ruler of the dying Manchu dynasty, permitted the navies of the various powers to patrol Chinese territorial waters. But, it should be noted, these same navies spent a lot of their time and energy in suppressing the Chinese pirates, who preyed on oriental and occidental alike.

I do not say for a moment that all of

our relations with China, or with any other country, for that matter, have been totally blameless. There is not a nation on earth that could claim this. But, on balance, we tried to get off to a good start. We are making the attempt again, now.

We are dealing today, as we dealt then, with a nation completely unlike any other on earth. Barbara Tuchman, in her "Stilwell and the American Experience in China," summed it up in words I have never seen equalled:

Throughout her history China had believed herself the center of civilization, surrounded by barbarians. She was the Middle Kingdom, the center of the universe, whose Emperor was the Son of Heaven, ruling by the Mandate of Heaven. Convinced of their superior values, the Chinese considered that China's greatness was owed to principles of social order formulated by her sages and administered benevolently by a learned elite over a harmonious whole. All outsiders whose misfortune was to live beyond her borders were "barbarians" and necessarily inferiors who were expected, and indeed required, to make their approach, if they insisted on coming, bearing tribute and performing the *kowtow* in token of humble submission.

From Marco Polo to the eighteenth century, visiting Westerners, amazed and admiring, were inclined to take China at her own valuation. Her recorded history began in the third millennium B.C., her bronzes were as old as the pyramids, her classical age was contemporary with that of Greece, her Confucian canon of ethics predated the New Testament if not the Old. She was the inventor of paper, porcelain, silk, gunpowder, the clock and movable type, the builder of the Great Wall, one of the wonders of the world, the creator of fabrics and ceramics of exquisite beauty and of an art of painting that was sophisticated and expressive when Europe's was still primitive and flat.

This is worth remembering. It is quite true that, during the great cultural revolution of the middle and late sixties, the Chinese Communists seemed to go out of their way to destroy or denigrate a good many things from China's past. But a national attitude, a cultural attribute, cannot be blotted out overnight—and overnight, in the chronicle of countries, means possibly decades. There is a lot evident in Communist Chinese attitudes and pronouncements of today that stem quite directly from the attitude of that country which did not even have a ministry of foreign affairs before 1898. They felt they did not need, and they certainly did not want, any outside interference. All contact by aliens was dealt with by the Hall for Governance of Barbarians.

Now, when it comes to evaluation not only of the President's trip, but of any future United States-China contacts or activities, this country could quite easily lose its head—literally and figuratively. Already a distressing imbalance is noticeable. The left shrieks that the whole trip was solely political and the results have been disappointing, and Henry Kissinger should be made to explain his role before committees of Congress. I would only point out here that the custom of bypassing the Department of State more or less began with Woodrow Wilson, became an art under Franklin D. Roosevelt, and was further developed by John F. Kennedy.

At the other end of the spectrum, we

hear "sell out" and "Munich"—bad reasoning and worse history.

As is so often the case, neither extreme is remotely close to the reality of the situation. And, as is equally often the case, there is danger of the extremes of opinion swamping reality to the point where future developments can be badly crippled.

The Department of State has used the term "aberration" to describe the last two decades of United States-Chinese relations, and I believe to a great degree this is accurate. "A deviation from the normal or the typical" is one definition of the word, and what could have been more of a deviation from relations up until 1949 than the situation since that time?

We are also inclined to forget that negotiations have been going on directly between the two countries since 1954 in Geneva and Warsaw. At that time Chinese and American officials began talks on settling the Korean war; general questions of bilateral relations followed. An agreement on repatriation of citizens was signed 17 years ago, in which each country permitted citizens of the other, wishing to do so, to return home.

First, dispel the idea that the President, somehow, went to Peking in a kowtow position, hat in hand, as a supplicant, seeking Mao's and Chou's favor. Now, to be sure, he has had the idea in mind for a long, long time—probably before he was elected, and, although it was not commented on nor realized at the time, he alluded to such a visit in his January 1969 inaugural address, with these words:

We seek an open world . . . in which no people, great or small, will live in angry isolation.

And, I may ask, what great people, at that time or since, were living in "angry isolation," except the Red Chinese?

No—Peking wanted him. The risks to Peking in extending the invitation were far greater than any to the President, at least as far as the Orient is concerned. Consider: Red China, just late last year, had gone through its second great internal shake-up in 5 years, with the as-yet-unsolved mystery of the disappearance of Lin Biao. The first was the great cultural revolution and the Red Guard madness of 1966-68.

The Lin Biao case is one of those mysterious incidents of inner turmoil peculiar to Communist countries. The sudden fall from grace and disappearance of Lin, hailed for years as Mao's "close comrade in arms," and the accompanying removal, by some means, of other top officials, meant a power struggle of major proportions had rattled the Peking government. Some China observers think that it may have been a Mao-Chou move against the military. Eliminated with Lin, the Defense Minister, were also the chief of staff of the Red Chinese Army, the commander of the Air Force, the naval commissar and logistics chief, and half the active members of the highest decisionmaking body of China. It is equivalent to sudden removal—and disappearance—of Secretary of Defense Laird, Gen. William Westmoreland, Gen. Thomas Ryan, and

Adm. Elmo Zumwalt plus half the top brass of the Pentagon—with no explanation given out for domestic or foreign consumption.

Mao had more or less unleashed the military against the Red Guard, back in 1968, to curb the excesses of his youthful rioters. Rumors had reached the West that the Army, under Lin, took a delight in its job of getting things quieted down again, and had in more than one instance resorted to the firing squad and machine-guns to show the Red Guard that they were not yet masters of the country. Following this, the growth of the military, plus Lin's penchant for saber-rattling, may well have meant Mao decided Lin's usefulness was at an end.

Also, American bombers continued to hammer North Vietnam, and there were 8,600 American military men on Taiwan. Given all of these factors, given the importance of "face" in the Orient—and it is, most certainly, a wonder that the President was allowed to go at all. He would not have, unless China did not need us.

Remember—what civil defense and armaments measures China has taken since early 1969 have been aimed at the Soviet Union. The massive air raid shelter and tunnel program of 1969 was from fear of Russian attack. Russian manpower had doubled along China's western frontier; there were new airfields being built in Mongolia; nuclear missiles were concentrated along the Manchurian border, and the March 1969 clashes between Chinese and Russian troops had sounded the alarm in every village of China. In June 1969, we know now, Soviet long-range bombers had been redeployed from Europe, to stage exercises which simulated attacks on major targets in North China, including key nuclear facilities. And some of the heaviest Russian troop concentrations on China's western borders are where the Chinese Eastern Railway goes from Russian soil onto Chinese soil, at the Manchurian frontier, heading for Harbin and Vladivostok. This is the same area where the Russo-Japanese War began over 70 years ago.

All this merely underscores for the present and future what the past has made into cold historical fact: there is no real long-term reason for enmity between China and the United States, but there are a good 20 centuries crammed full of reasons why China and Russia hate each other.

Some would have it that the Chinese did not take President Nixon's visit seriously. But the London Economist noted:

The unexpected reception by Mao a day earlier than scheduled was a gesture of respect to the leader of the world's most powerful nation by the leader of the most populous.

This, and the subsequent manner in which the Nixon/Mao visit was handled by China's official daily, *Jenmin Jih Pao*: this paper has not yet reported manned moon landings, deposition of Lin Piao, entry of Britain into the Common Market, nor the India-Pakistan war, yet two of its six pages of pictures and announcements were given over to pictures of President Nixon and Mao, and accounts of the visit. This was Mao's way—and

this evaluation is shared by long-time China watchers—of telling the people of China that the anti-American slogans did not mean much anymore, and also that the President's visit had the old man's blessing.

Much is said, incidentally, about what will happen when Mao dies. He is not dead yet. Until he does, he is a very real force to be reckoned with, and to all intents and purposes, he is still running the country.

And, to underscore what significance the Chinese give to it all, my latest edition of *Peking Review*, 7-8 for February 25, 1972, is outstanding in all the hundreds of issues I have received since I began taking this weekly—mailed directly from Peking—around 6 years ago: There is not one anti-American article, slogan or word in it. The first page carries the pictures of the Nixon-Mao meeting, and four more pages of pictures and text deal with the visit. To be sure, next week's might go back to something closer to the old practice, but, as they told their own people by the way *Jenmin Jih Pao* treated it all, they are telling the world through *Peking Review* that this is something to be taken seriously.

And do not forget the slogans that were up at Peking Airport to greet Chou when he returned after seeing the President leave at Shanghai:

Resolutely Support Chairman Mao's Revolutionary Line in Foreign Affairs.

This had, I venture to say, two purposes: to underscore yet again the points made, which I have cited, in *Jenmin Jih Pao*, and *Peking Review*, and also to serve notice to any enemies Chou might have made as a result of the President's visit, or anything else, that Mao was backing Chou, and what Chou did. So, in effect, oppose Chou and you oppose Mao. And you do this at your own risk.

There has also been a major structural shift in world power politics. U.S. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER spelled it out in his March 1, 1972, statement of support for the President's China visit:

... this is not 1960; it is 1972, and the world situation which we now confront is an entirely new ball game. Where before there were only two superpowers—ourselves and the Soviet Union—to consider, we now have five power blocs to consider in the development of foreign policy. In addition to Russia and the United States, there is Red China, which is a growing nuclear power; there is Japan, which is rapidly becoming the most important economic power in the Far East; and there is the community of western Europe, which is beginning to solidify its aim and objectives. . . .

And, as a result of the President's visit, the United States is now the only major world power of the five blocks Senator GOLDWATER enumerated which can deal on more or less cordial terms—and I use that word guardedly—with the other four.

Now, that alone and by itself will not prevent conflict. The idea that contact between two peoples will mean peace is totally wrong. The American Civil War should have demonstrated that. But we have moved into a much more favorable position, vis-a-vis other countries.

WHAT'S AHEAD FOR TAIWAN?

In the short run, no change. In the long run, very probably the same: no

change. To say there was a "sellout" or "betrayal" simply does not take account of the facts of the case.

First, Taiwan is a long ways from being a weak country that cannot defend itself. Its own army is around 540,000 men. It still receives military aid from the United States but on a diminishing scale—as do most other countries. For fiscal year 1970, Taiwan got \$37.9 million in direct aid—down from \$115 million in 1968—and \$63 million in excess military hardware. Taiwan's booming economy also enabled it to buy \$37 million worth of U.S. military supplies, up from only \$1.2 million worth in the whole period 1950-64.

Second, there is much misunderstanding over what "withdrawal" of U.S. forces means. The communiqué says:

... (the U.S.) affirms the ultimate objective of the withdrawal of all U.S. forces and military installations from Taiwan. In the meantime, it will progressively reduce its forces and military installations on Taiwan as the tension in the area diminishes.

Mark this well: there is no final date set, and the last part of the above statement, "as the tension in the area diminishes," refers, no doubt at all, to Vietnam. At the end of the Vietnam war our forces there will be reduced. But total withdrawal? That could be years ahead.

U.S. naval patrols of the Formosa Strait were discontinued in 1969. Reconnaissance flights over the Chinese mainland, by planes based on Taiwan, have also been over with for some time but this is due primarily to vastly better spy satellites. There is not space here to go into new developments of this type of reconnaissance, but one expert put it this way, talking about a new satellite:

It could snap a picture of Chairman Mao lighting a cigarette in Peking, and the picture would be on the President's desk in Washington before Mao had time to blow out the match.

That is not too much of an exaggeration.

We have now, on Taiwan, in terms of men, 8,600 troops and 6,500 dependents. The main unit is a transport aircraft wing of C-130's with a theaterwide role. As U.S. involvement in Vietnam dies down, this wing would have been phased out, or moved—as would well over half the troops there, who are connected with Vietnam, directly, and went there for that reason in the first place. We have no fighter-bombers there, and no nuclear weapons. There have never been at any time since the 1955 mutual defense treaty was signed any more than 10,000 men—and never were there any ground combat troops.

The first Formosa Straits crisis in 1956 saw only 2,665 U.S. military advisers and technicians on the scene, and this number was cut back as the Nationalists were trained and reequipped. There have been—and no doubt will continue—frequent joint United States-Chinese air and naval maneuvers.

Really, it is odd enough that Peking would sign any statement of common principles with the United States, of any sort, while U.S. planes continued to bomb North Vietnam and U.S. troops remained

on Taiwan, and especially if this statement did not give a definite date for a pullout. Also, we may be quite certain that Henry Kissinger had made it clear to Chou, in advance, that the United States would continue to uphold its treaty commitments. But Peking has never made an issue of the treaty, anyway. It is the U.S. presence on Taiwan that is the sore point.

To say that U.S. withdrawal gives the green light to Peking infers an immediate, mammoth air-sea assault against Taiwan by Peking. How anyone can conceive of this happening is beyond me, for some very good reasons.

First, the Red Chinese do not have the amphibious capacity for such an operation. I do not know right offhand the ratio of attackers to defenders, for an effective amphibious assault, but it is quite high. In terms of men, yes, Peking has men; in terms of ships and landing-craft, no, absolutely not.

Second, and even more important, the Red Chinese know full well that such a move on their part would be welcomed by the Soviet Union. It would mean Peking's attention would be given to the East—with the Soviet Union poised in the West, for what? A preemptive first strike against Peking? This is talked of in Soviet military circles. Given the situation of a couple of million Red Chinese troops all crowded onto the coastline facing Taiwan, with their supplies and equipment, and all of the Red Army's time and attention given to hammering at Chiang Kai-shek—just what sort of a temptation would that be to the Soviet general staff?

An attack on Taiwan by Peking at this time—or at any time in the foreseeable future, as long as Peking and Moscow are at each other's throats—is almost totally out of the question. Chiang Kai-shek was allied with the Soviets once before in his career. If he chooses to follow the old dictum that "The enemy of my enemy is my friend," then he may well take up that position again. Peking knows it, and Peking fears it. Peking, I am sure, is not going to do anything to tip him in that direction any sooner than he might normally move.

THROUGH A GLASS, DARKLY . . .

This country will get a close, firsthand, on the spot look at a society run and guided in ways we cannot dream of. To be sure, it has been relatively easy enough over the past two decades to get a good idea what was going on inside Red China. Reading accounts of visitors, and reading Red Chinese publications themselves, made it absolutely clear that Chinese society was being changed and restructured at a truly hideous cost in human life and dignity.

A lot of persons failed to believe, or refused to believe, or just plain ignored the facts. But there were incidents during the President's trip, now being reported and mulled over, that have given a lot of persons pause for thought.

For instance, the oddly unsettling affair at the Ming tombs; there were, the Americans noticed, many well-dressed families around on what seemed to be an ordinary holiday outing. Almost every family had a transistor radio; the chil-

dren were well-dressed; there were badminton sets and jump ropes.

But it was a Potemkin Village illusion. Remember your history—how Prince Grigori Potemkin, a Russian nobleman, had built fake villages, seemingly inhabited by happy peasants, to show to and thereby impress the Empress Catherine the Great?

The families at the tombs had been placed there by local authorities. After President Nixon's party left, Chinese officials were seen collecting the radios and the toys, and the little girls were removing the bright ribbons from their hair. According to one account, Chou himself was asked about this, and replied:

You know, we don't claim we are perfect and we make mistakes. This was a mistake that we made, which was wrong and which we shouldn't have done.

On one hand, the highly popular Red Chinese ballet "Red Detachment of Women," which was given for the Presidential party, is a good indicator of how far apart we are in some respects. The ballet is thoroughly political, in every aspect, and making the arts completely subservient to political themes, motives, and objectives is something that does not have complete and total acceptance in the West. But before we dismiss it too hastily, let us remember that "Richard III," one of Shakespeare's most famous historical plays, is less history than political propaganda. Shakespeare and the writers he used for source material were intent on one thing: glorifying the reigning house of the day in which he wrote, the Tudors. And the Tudor dynasty had been established only by the first of them destroying Richard III and seizing the throne. So, so much for "politicization" of the arts.

Admitted, though, the theme of the ballet grates rather harshly on our ears, whether we care for ballet or not. A slave girl is tortured by a wicked landlord, and left for dead. Revived by rain, she joins the Red Army and falls in love with a political commissar. Together they attack the evil landlord, but her hatred makes her shoot at him too soon, and he escapes. She sees the error of her ways in that she has confused her desire for personal vengeance with the need for party discipline. After self-criticism, she matures. When her lover, the commissar, is killed, she replaces him as leader of the company.

From official program notes for the ballet, with translation provided by Peking:

After the battle is over, Party representative Hung Chang-ching teaches the fighters that revolution is not a matter of taking personal revenge, but of emancipating all mankind. Her class consciousness raised, Wu Ching-hua follows the company commander in energetically practicing marksmanship and grenade throwing.—Arriving at the revolutionary base and seeing the red flag, Wu Ching-hua cannot hold back her tears: "Red flag, oh, red flag, today I've found you at last!" . . . Wu Ching-hua angrily denounces to her dear ones the towering crimes of the tyrant of the South . . .

Granted, this is pretty hard to take. But let us never forget that we also have, in translation from that same

language, such phrases in English as Opener of Brightness—for the Morning Star; Lengthener of Roads, for the Evening Star; Far-Off Cloudy River, for the Milky Way; Jade Scales, for the first three stars that form the tail of the Great Bear—(or the Handle of the Big Dipper, whichever you wish)—Lady of the Han River, for the star Vega and two others in the constellation Lyra. Also these terms: The Mountains of Nine Sorrows, the Peak of Returning Joy, the Song of the Rainbow Skirt and the Coat of Feathers—(which was composed by Emperor Ming Hua after a visit to the Paradise of the Moon)—the Glory of Purity Palace, the Palace of Endless Days, and the Peak of Returning Joy.

The examples I have given do not come from contemporary Communist Chinese writings. They are from the classics. But they are there; they exist; they are part and parcel of that country's history. And, cultural revolution and Red Guard notwithstanding, there is nothing to suggest that they have been totally eliminated from China's cultural heritage. After all, consider the paradox of the Ch'in Emperor, Shih Huang-ti, who ruled in the second century, B.C., and unified the country as it had never been before. He brought peace, stability, order, abolished feudalism, and built the Great Wall. He also ordered destruction of all books of significance, except the authorized version of Ch'in history. The only works exempted were those of a technical nature, and reading in general was disapproved. Shih Huang-ti is remembered by the Chinese for nothing, except as "He Who Burned the Books."

No one is being asked to forget nor ignore the darker sides of Chinese history, whether under the Communist or not. This would be foolish; it would be equally foolish to pretend that Communist China did not exist and could be ignored.

AND WHAT GOOD CAME OF IT AT LAST?

These things are measured in decades and can only be evaluated long after the initial moves that put events in motion. The visit did not herald instant peace in the world, for one thing. Our defenses are strong, and staying that way; we are not disarming. As one example, there is the new arming of our B-52's and F-111's with SRAM—short-range attack missiles. Able to travel for 3 minutes at several times the speed of sound, once they are launched 75 miles from target, there is practically no defense against them.

Neither are the Communist Chinese asleep. They will probably have an ICBM by 1974, with a range of 3,000 to 6,000 miles. For the present, they are deploying new ones with 1,500 to 2,500 mile ranges, with storable liquid propellant, meaning it can be kept underground and not be susceptible to sneak attack, such as the old ones that were fueled with kerosene and liquid oxygen.

Are we going to get big trade bonanzas? Mao himself said in 1949 that "Wherever there is business to do, we shall do it" but if we think there is an instant market of 700 million in China, then we are following a myth. Com-

munist China has followed a hard and shrewd trade and bargaining line. There is no indication this will change. The highly respected English newspaper, the Manchester Guardian, asked how the Chinese could reconcile their concern for pollution with their option to buy three of the new supersonic Concorde planes. But, as the Guardian observed, concerning President Nixon's visit and trade chances:

It illustrates the temptation which must face the Chinese as they welcome to Peking the most powerful salesman of the biggest trading company in the world.

It is true that the administration relaxed restrictions on trade with Red China, not long ago. It is also true that we are not about to compromise national security over it. Two requests to ship products to China have been denied, on national security grounds. One dealt with vibration testing equipment, which could be utilized for missile testing. The other item is not even named.

Will an instant settlement of the Vietnam war result? Not instant, that is for sure. The North Vietnamese have not cared much for Chinese advice ever since 1954, when Chou En-lai talked Ho Chi Minh into accepting terms at Geneva which denied Hanoi sovereignty over the South. China is not above thinking of its own interests first, however, and to Peking, right now, an understanding with the United States on Soviet Russia very probably comes ahead of caring for the sensibilities of Hanoi.

There is precedent for this. During the height of the Soviet-Chinese border war, in 1969, Soviet arms and supply trains that had to cross China to get to North Vietnam were stopped intermittently by the Communist Chinese. This move was aimed at Moscow, but its most immediate and deadly effect was on Hanoi. I doubt if Hanoi has forgotten—or forgiven—this.

What effect will there be on our relations with the rest of Southeast Asia? That remains to be seen. The simple fact of the matter is that the President is trying to wind down the cold war—and not at the expense of anyone else. I happen to believe him when he says of the trip, and the communique, that—

We have done all this without giving up any U.S. commitments to any other country.

And, I might add, I think reaction of some countries, like Japan's is in especially bad grace, when you consider the amount of American treasure and/or blood expended on behalf of these countries since 1945.

A SINGLE STEP

The President did not go to Peking in a spirit of appeasement, nor of truculence. If someone still wants a definition, well, then, let us say that at the least it was a cautious attempt to get off dead-center the most nagging and crucial and also the largest foreign policy question facing us—what to do about Red China. At the most, perhaps we can say that he was magnanimous. And before anyone faults that, I would refer him to this comment by the great political conservative Edmund Burke, the English statesman:

Magnanimity in politics is not seldom the truest wisdom, and a great empire and little minds go ill together.

Half of all Chinese literature is poetry. It sometimes seems the other half is all proverbs. "Confucius say" has become a standard phrase for the English language, and while I do not know if Confucius said the following or not, it is a Chinese proverb remarkably appropriate for the President's visit:

The journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step.

And make no mistake about it. The journey, figuratively, will be in the neighborhood of a thousand miles. But, also, make no mistake: That first step had to be taken, and it has been taken; probably it can date from the instant the President's feet touched Chinese soil at Peking airport.

No one is going to be so foolish as to say with certainty where this will lead. It may make things better. It may not change them at all. One thing for certain, it cannot make them any worse. We must remember Walt Whitman's injunction:

Now understand me well—it is provided in the essence of things that from any fruition of success, no matter what, shall come forth something to make a greater struggle necessary.

This merely means that there is no end to solving the world's problems. There is no philosopher's stone for statesmen to rub, and create instant peace and tranquility for all nations, for all time.

In all the centuries of recorded human history there have been very few years with the world totally free of war or some conflict. Yet, the fact that mankind has always sought an end to war is in itself encouraging.

The following poem was written some time in the eighth century A.D., during the early T'ang dynasty, by Li Po, one of China's greatest lyric poets. Titled "Fighting on the South Frontier," it has about it a certain timeless quality; the last two lines are from Confucius:

Last year we fought by the springs of San-kan River,

This year we fight on the Tsung-ho roads,
We have dipped our weapons in the waves of Chia-chi Lake,

We have pastured our horses in the snows of the T'ien mountains,

We have gone into battle ten thousand li away,

Our three armies are utterly exhausted.
The Huns think of slaughter as a kind of ploughing,

From of old they have seen only white bones in the yellow sands.

Where the Ch'in Emperors built walls against the Hun barbarians,

The sons of Han burn beacon fires.
The beacons burn without ceasing.

There is no end to war!
On the field of battle men grapple each other and die,

The horses of the fallen utter lament to heaven.

Ravens and kites peck men's guts,
And flying away, hang them on the boughs of dead trees.

So men are smeared on the desert grass,
And the generals return empty-handed.

Know that weapons of war are utterly evil—
The virtuous man uses them only when he must.

CONGRESSMAN LENT ON NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, because I have had so many requests both from my colleagues and from citizens across the Nation on the question of forced busing, I enter here my recent testimony before the House Judiciary Committee on House Joint Resolution 620, my proposed constitutional amendment relative to neighborhood schools.

In the statement, I have attempted to broadly cover the question of involuntary busing, its legal and legislative background, and its effect on education in America. I am hopeful that my constituents, my colleagues in the House, and the many people who have written me on this troubling problem will find it useful.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE NORMAN F. LENT ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 620 BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE No. 5, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, MARCH 1, 1972

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the subcommittee, I appreciate your affording me this opportunity to testify on behalf of my proposed Constitutional amendment, House Joint Resolution 620, which now has the overt support of nearly 150 Members of the House.

House Joint Resolution 620, as you are aware, provides for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to neighborhood schools. It reads as follows: "Sec. 1—No public school student shall, because of his race, creed, or color, be assigned to or required to attend a particular school."

"Sec. 2—Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." Mr. Chairman, communities throughout this Nation are in a state of turmoil or are being threatened with turmoil because of numerous court orders calling for the achievement of "racial balances" in our public schools. The Nation's traditional "neighborhood school" system is being systematically dismantled in an effort to attain the utopian goal of racially numerical exactitude in public schools. It is my firm belief that if remedy is not forthcoming, these rulings will succeed in making a complete shambles of the Nation's public school systems.

The most far-reaching court decision to date, the so-called Richmond decision, has required the consolidation of all school districts in three counties into one entity, charged with the responsibility of achieving a relative racial balance throughout.

Los Angeles is facing the most massive and costly busing order yet imposed on any city—one that would transport 240,000 youngsters for distances ranging up to 25 miles and at an estimated cost of \$180 million over the next eight years.

Other cities confronted with court orders to forcibly bus include Kalamazoo, Indianapolis, Seattle, Denver, Tulsa, Oklahoma City, Detroit, Las Vegas, Nashville, Jacksonville, Corpus Christi, Mobile, Norfolk, Savannah, New Orleans and San Francisco.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to relate to the subcommittee a typical citizen complaint. As the sponsor of this legislation which has received much attention, I have received literally thousands of similar letters:

"DEAR SIR: I am the wife of a Fayetteville attorney, the mother of two school-age chil-

dren, and a former public school teacher. I was educated in the public schools of New York City and believe very strongly in the neighborhood school concept and freedom of choice.

Next week, my seven-year-old daughter, a second-grader, is to be bused to a distant school on the other side of a dangerous highway. We live just five minutes away from our neighborhood school. I can't believe that this is being allowed to happen in the United States of America." (From a letter dated 10/17/71, signed by Mrs. Joe H. Morris, Fayetteville, N.C.)

Clearly, Mr. Chairman, the public is looking to the Congress for relief from these sweeping, court-ordered busing edicts. The purpose of House Joint Resolution 620 is to return control of education to local school boards, to preserve the neighborhood school system, and to eliminate forced busing and the threat of school district consolidation to achieve purely arbitrary racial balances.

THE LEGAL BACKGROUND

In *Brown vs. Board of Education*,¹ the U.S. Supreme Court held that Negroes cannot be "denied admission to schools attended by white children under laws requiring or permitting segregation according to race." This ruling has been universally understood to mandate the elimination of racially-separate public schools established and maintained by state action.

In the second *Brown* case,² the Supreme Court instructed the District Courts to proceed "with all deliberate speed" to admit the parties to the cases "to public schools on a racially nondiscriminatory basis..." (emphasis mine).

Under this decision, little Miss Linda Brown, who had been previously required to attend an all-black school several miles from her home in Topeka, Kansas, was permitted entrance to her neighborhood school without regard to her skin color.

The principle enunciated in the *Brown* decisions was that the Constitution requires that states must not, on the basis of a child's race or color, designate where he is to attend public school. To do so, said the court, violated the Equal Protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

For twelve years after the *Brown* decisions, no court suggested seriously that *Brown* did anything more than condemn racial segregation in the public schools. Indeed many decisions³ specifically so stated; the cases holding that *Brown* condemned segregation but did not compel integration. It was not until *U.S. v. Jefferson County Board of Education*,⁴ that any circuit court suggested that *Brown* did more than prohibit segregation; yea, that it compelled integration. It was in *Jefferson* that the concept of a school board's "affirmative duty" to eliminate the "last vestiges of a dual school system" and establish a "unitary" system, found its inception.

From *Jefferson*, Mr. Chairman, followed a proliferation of irreconcilable individual decisions culminating in *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education*⁵ which held that the same Fourteenth Amendment requires that States must, on the basis of a child's race or color, designate where he is to attend public school. Indeed, we have come full circle from the *Brown* cases.

House Joint Resolution 620 is intended to restore the rule of the *Brown* cases to our Constitution, our laws and our institutions and to reverse *Swann* and other departures from the *Brown* mandate of color blindness imposed by the Fourteenth Amendment's guarantee of equal protection of the laws.

I have been somewhat amused that the very clear and unambiguous language of H.J. Res. 620 should have been the subject of such an excess of scholarly attack by a bevy of law professors who have variously described the amendment's language as

"misleading", "delphic", and "devastatingly simple".

Interestingly enough, many of these very same critics are ardent supporters of the Civil Rights Law of 1964, which, at Section 2000c (b) defines "desegregation" in Title IV of that law:

"Desegregation" means the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, color, religion or national origin, but 'desegregation' shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance."

Indeed, it is difficult to square the many critics' snipings at H.J. Res. 620 with their vehement support and acclaim of the 1964 Civil Rights Law.

The fact is that H.J. Res. 620 utilizes the typical language of most all of our anti-discrimination statutes in the fields of fair housing,⁶ financing of housing,⁷ public accommodations,⁸ Federally-assisted programs,⁹ equal employment opportunity¹⁰ and voting rights.¹¹

As you are well-aware, Mr. Chairman, we now have laws on the books which condemn virtually every aspect of discrimination based on race, color or creed.

But none of these laws presume to mandate any form of forced integration or to establish any sort of a quota system—for this would be just as repugnant to the American system as is state-enforced segregation.

The *Brown* decision's mandate pioneered this policy of colorblindness in the field of education, and I believe it should continue to be retained in our law. The principal thrust of the Court, in *Swann*, on the other hand, is to require the assignment of students to the public schools in this Nation on the basis of race, in order to achieve racial balances or quotas.

I believe it is difficult to reconcile these two cases. Where is the line to be drawn between allocating people by law to schools or other institutions or facilities according to color to promote segregation, and doing the same thing to promote integration? The underlying principle in both cases is racism! If it was wrong in 1954 to assign a black child to a particular school on the basis of race, it is just as wrong to do the same thing to other children in 1972. This "Jim Crowism" in reverse, as practiced by our courts, is what H.J. Res. 620 is aimed at stopping.

WHY AN AMENDMENT?

The reason I have proposed an Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, as opposed to a statute, lies in the fact that all previous statutes to accomplish the very same end have been proven ineffective or they have been stricken down as unconstitutional.

The New York State neighborhood school law which I authored as a State Senator in 1969,¹² containing language much the same as H.J. Res. 620, was held unconstitutional by decision of a three-judge Federal panel in Buffalo.¹³ This decision was affirmed without opinion by the U.S. Supreme Court on May 3, 1971.¹⁴

A similar North Carolina statute was held unconstitutional in *Board of Education vs. Swann*¹⁵ on similar grounds—that is, it violated the Equal Protection requirement of the Fourteenth Amendment. The court noted that "(t)he legislation before us flatly forbids assignment of any student on account of race".¹⁶ The court, however, went on to strike down the provision because race was an indispensable factor needed to desegregate the schools and statutory bars prohibiting it absolutely interfered with the "Constitutional obligation to eliminate existing dual school systems".¹⁷

Federal statutory limitations directed against busing, which appear in Title IV of the Civil Rights Law of 1968,¹⁸ have been completely disregarded by the courts and have proven totally ineffective. The U.S. Supreme Court has taken the position that the

statute does not take away is historic equitable powers to remedy conditions of alleged *de jure* segregation by massive cross-busing plans.

Indeed, the distinctions which formerly existed between *de jure* and *de facto* segregation appear to be disappearing at the hands of lower Federal Court judges who have literally tortured obvious cases of *de facto* segregation into "findings" of *de jure* segregation.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I believe that any further statutory efforts by Congress to restrict busing would meet the same fate as the New York and North Carolina statutes. The Constitution is what the judges say it is, and they have said the Equal Protection Clause overrides such statutes. The only way to "cure" the judges' interpretations is to present the Court with a principle having equal footing with the Fourteenth Amendment, a principle of law similarly enshrined in the U.S. Constitution.

THE EDUCATIONAL QUESTION

Now that I've touched on the legal niceties, gentlemen, the real policy question in this entire matter should be: "Do we want quality education for all children?" I only wish, Mr. Chairman, that we could come to agreement today on the fact that forced busing had produced some really substantive results in upgrading education in this Nation—then these hearings could take a positive tone.

But the fact is that forced busing has not proven to be a substantive educational tool in improving our children's achievement or learning capacity.

At a time in our history when schools across the country find themselves going to split shifts just so all children can go to school; when numerous school districts are in such dire financial straits that they are forced to cut back on the number of teachers rather than hire additional ones; when many school systems face such austere budgets that they have been forced to decimate or drastically curtail sports programs and other extracurricular activities that contribute so much to the total development of our children—then what possible reason on earth can there be to require hard-pressed taxpayers to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to hire or buy buses and employ bus drivers so our children might have a daily bus ride to a more distant school.

There are those children, to be sure, who are educationally-deprived. They need extra help. But I think it is ludicrous to suggest that one hour or two hours per day of traveling across town in a bus is going to enhance their education. Learning problems, Mr. Chairman, are student problems. They know no social, racial, or genetic heritage.

The artifacts of busing—district consolidation, destruction of the neighborhood concept of education, and the like have not been, and in all likelihood will not be, successful if the goal is to improve the quality of education.

If, on the other hand, the object is to get complete social and racial integration ratios, then the numbers game can be attained, but it will be attained at a sacrifice neither economically nor educationally sound. Children should not be subjected to the hazards of crosstown busing regardless of their race solely to permit the attainment of a desired racial quota any more than they should be required to give up their identity as individuals within a school that, because of the size of its enrollment treats them as computerized subjects rather than responsive human beings.

I am positive that the people of this country would much rather part with their hard-earned tax monies to go toward meaningful educational programs to help deprived youngsters acquire the missing elements of culture that middle-class pupils take for granted.

I'm well-aware, Mr. Chairman, that witnesses will follow me here championing

forced busing as the only way to remedy unequal educational opportunities. But just as many critics of this amendment have mistakenly appraised its intent as "racist", so have many civil rights leaders who have not experienced first-hand the resulting educational disruption that comes with busing mistakenly seized on busing as another milepost to be achieved in the onward march for full civil rights. Largely because of continuing monetary deprivation in the inner city schools, they have cast their lots with busing as the only foreseeable savior of education for the ghetto child.

But we need only take a close look at our native New York, Mr. Chairman, to see how that thought has deteriorated after years and years of trial and experience.

As you well know, in 1969, at the urging of New York City civil rights leaders, the New York City School System was "decentralized" into more than 20 "community controlled" school systems. The experiment in forced busing, which had begun nearly 10 years earlier, was largely acknowledged as a failure.

Martin Mayer, an authority on public schools and American education authored an article in the New York Times entitled "Close to Midnight for New York Schools" (May 2, 1965). Mr. Mayer's thoughts emerged in the midst of ongoing busing plans in New York, and I recall when I read them how much respect I had for Mr. Mayer because he was big enough to admit that forced busing had been a failure after championing it for so long:

"Not long ago, many of us felt that a large share of the Negro failure in these (New York City) schools was itself a product of segregation, but almost nobody whose opinion is worth considering believes it today. Public confidence in the New York City school system is fearfully low and dropping. White children are leaving the city's public schools at a rate of 40,000 a year and the Allen Report, in a little-known passage, predicated a rate of 60,000 per year in the near future.

"Of the leaders of the school system itself, the nine-member Board of Education and the 20-odd deputy and associate superintendents, only a handful have children who attend or ever did attend the New York City public schools. Even worse, the Negro middle class has almost entirely disappeared and of the Negro leaders of the integration drive, the Wilkinsons and the Clarks, the Farmers, the Joneses and the Rustins, the Youngs and the Galamisons, not one has or ever had a child in the New York City public schools."

Mr. Chairman, there are numerous other authorities which I could cite and you could certainly counter with appraisals of forced busing's educational value or lack of it. I think that is pointless, for an impasse would surely result.

But one of the most convincing impressions on my thought came just two weeks ago when the National officers of the Congress of Racial Equality requested a meeting with me to determine how they might assist in backing my amendment. That meeting was an extremely fruitful one and the CORE officers reiterated their opposition to forced busing. CORE rejects the concept that, in order to learn something, a black child must ride across town in order to sit next to a white schoolmate. I think we can all imagine why this notion is viewed as both condescending and arrogant by blacks.

In essence, Mr. Chairman, I think it is imperative that we return to a position of mutual trust where local school boards are charged with education; where legislators are charged with making our laws—and the judiciary must cease assuming both roles in absentia.

I am hopeful, Mr. Chairman, that this subcommittee will see fit to report my proposed amendment to the full committee as written so a truly effective remedy for this educa-

tional deterioration can be offered to the American people.

Thank you.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ 347 U.S., 483 (1954).
- ² 349 U.S. 294, 300-301 (1955).
- ³ Bell v. School City of Gary, Indiana, 324 F.2d 209 (7th Cir. 1963), cert. denied, 377 U.S. 924 (1963); Deal v. Cincinnati Board of Education, 369 F.2d 55 (6th Cir. 1966), cert. denied, 289 U.S. 847 (1967); Briggs v. Elliott, 132 F.Supp. 776 (E.D. S.C. 1955).
- ⁴ 372 F.2d. 836 (5th Cir. 1966), *aff'd en banc*, 380 F.2d. 385, cert. denied 389 U.S. 840 (1967).
- ⁵ 402 U.S. 91 S. Ct. 1267 (1971).
- ⁶ Public Law 90-284, Title VIII, Fair Housing. Sec. 804 . . . it shall be unlawful . . . to refuse to sell or rent . . . a dwelling to any person because of race, color, religion or national origin."
- ⁷ Public Law 90-284, Title VIII, Fair Housing. Sec. 805—" . . . it shall be unlawful for any bank . . . to deny a loan or other financial assistance to a person . . . because of the race, color, religion or National origin of such person . . ."
- ⁸ Public Law 88-352, Title II, Public Accommodations. Sec. 201(a)—"All persons shall be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of all the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations . . . without discrimination or segregation on the ground of race, color, religion or national origin."
- ⁹ Public Law 88-352, Title VI, Nondiscrimination in Federally-assisted Programs. Sec. 601—"No person . . . shall, on the ground of race, color or national origin, be excluded from participation in . . . any program receiving Federal financial assistance."
- ¹⁰ Public Law 88-352, Title VII, Equal Employment Opportunity. Sec. 703(a)—"It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer (1) to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge an individual . . . because of . . . race, color, religion, sex, or national origin; or (2) to limit, segregate or classify his employees . . . because of . . . race, color, religion, sex or national origin."
- ¹¹ Public Law 89-110, Voting Rights Act of 1965. Sec. 2—"No voting qualification or requisite to voting . . . shall be imposed . . . by any State or political subdivision to deny or abridge the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color."
- ¹² New York Unconsolidated Laws. (Ch. 342, L. 1969)
- ¹³ Lee v. Nyquist, 318 F. Supp. 710 (D.N.Y. 1970), *aff'd* 402 U.S. 935
- ¹⁴ Nyquist v. Lee, 402 U.S. 935 (1971)
- ¹⁵ 402 U.S. 43 (1971)
- ¹⁶ *id.*, at 45.
- ¹⁷ *id.*, at 46.
- ¹⁸ 78 Stat. 241, 246; 42 U.S.C. 2000c.

IN MEMORY OF COMFORT A. BERRY

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I was profoundly saddened to learn that a very dear friend of mine, Miss Comfort A. Berry, recently passed away. I first had the pleasure of meeting Miss Berry when she was an Army captain serving as a nurse in a field hospital at Cerignola, Italy, where she ministered to many of the flying units then engaged in the Italian campaign. I was one of the recipients of her professional care for which I am eternally grateful.

After the war, Miss Berry returned to

California where she continued with her nursing profession until her death on January 5, 1972. I knew her and will always remember her as a gracious lady, an excellent nurse, a most cherished friend and a fine American. She will be missed by all who knew her, but her memory will live on.

A tribute has been paid to Miss Comfort Berry by the Concord, Calif., Community Hospital where she practiced her nursing profession, and I would like to include it at this point in my remarks:

Miss Comfort A. Berry, who passed away after a short illness, will long be remembered by all here at Concord Community Hospital.

Her long, faithful service here at the hospital has touched many lives. She had been with Concord Community Hospital for 25 years, and was the only recipient of a 25 year pin at our last Christmas party where she was also given a standing ovation.

Her dedication, devotion, and loyalty was evident throughout the growing years of the hospital. The traits that "Miss B" has should inspire all of us to carry on—as she did—to help bring about the Medical Center that she envisioned and was working toward!

H.R. 256—REQUESTING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FIRST NATIONAL MEMORIAL IN THE UNITED STATES TO GEN. THADDEUS KOSCIUSZKO

HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am gravely concerned relative to the disposition of H.R. 256 and similar bills requesting the establishment of the first national memorial in the United States to Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko. On January 25, 1972, John W. Larson, Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Interior sent a report to Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the above bills stating that the Department of the Interior could not recommend enactment of the bills because of the report from the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments.

Commissioner Edward Pinkowski of the Philadelphia Historical Commission has challenged this report and in a communication states the following:

I want to challenge this report and show you that it is nothing more than a trick to sacrifice a hero of the American Revolution.

There were three points in the Advisory Board's report. Each one was designed to deceive the American people and to hide the historical significance of the house that Kosciuszko occupied at 301 Pine Street in Philadelphia. They might be listed as follows:

1. Short Stay.
2. Unrelated to American Revolution.
3. Alterations of house.

SHORT STAY

The first objection of the Advisory Board to U.S. ownership of 301 Pine Street was that "Kosciuszko's association with this house lasted only 6 months."

Actually it was 8 months, not 6, but the length of time is not critical to its

historical significance. President Abraham Lincoln was in the house across the street from Ford's Theater in Washington, D.C., only a few hours, but that did not make the house less significant. What happened there makes it significant.

It also does not matter how long Kosciuszko stayed at what is now known as 301 Pine Street in Philadelphia.

The Advisory Board said that he did not live there long enough to give it historical significance.

Tommyrot.

Members of the Advisory Board apparently do not know the rich and varied heritage of America that lives on in houses from its past.

There is no doubt that Kosciuszko lived at 301 Pine Street. Here is a house you can see and touch. This is physical evidence of a man who helped to achieve American independence. Kosciuszko left clues to his military service, his personal life and his accomplishments in the dwelling that survived him. Small things may, like the relics of saints, help to nourish our gratitude to Kosciuszko for his services in the cause of American independence, and keep his name alive and warm in our affection.

If the Advisory Board had applied the same argument against the house in which Lincoln died from an assassin's bullet as it does to General Kosciuszko's last residence in America, it would have been condemned for dehumanizing one of the greatest Presidents we ever had.

I think that Nathaniel A. Owings, chairman of the Advisory Board, and John W. Larson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, have stooped pretty low in their efforts to dehumanize Kosciuszko.

No matter how long Kosciuszko lived there, no other place can tell the story of his life as well as the small, three-story house he occupied in Philadelphia. The Advisory Board failed to grasp the significance of the house. During the fighting for freedom of the 13 American colonies Kosciuszko was content to sleep in a tent. It is amazing that I discovered the house 6 years ago and that it is the only house the Nation could call the general's.

The Philadelphia Bulletin, one of the largest newspapers in the country, recently observed that "for lack of a shrine to commemorate his services," Kosciuszko strides through American history like a hero without a home. It editorialized that the country needs "a place for General Kosciuszko to put away his spyglass and maps, within sight of Independence Hall where the Declaration he fought for was signed. It made the restoration an eminently proper measure for Congress to approve."

When the Senate Committee on Interior Affairs held public hearings on similar legislation, Senator VANCE HARTKE said that the argument of the Advisory Board that Kosciuszko lived at Third and Pine Streets only briefly deserved no more than a simple retort, "So What?" He said:

The point is that he did live there, and because he did live there, the home has become a monument and symbol to more than 12 million Americans of Polish descent.

George B. Hartzog, Jr., director of the

National Park Service, was one of the witnesses who followed Senator HARTKE on January 26. After making his statement, Hartzog was questioned by Senator FRANK CHURCH on Kosciuszko's stay in this house. It turned out that Hartzog had no strong arguments against 301 Pine Street as a Kosciuszko shrine other than to condemn it as a boarding house and Kosciuszko as "a transient occupant."

If the Department of the Interior wants to kill the efforts of many U.S. Senators and Representatives to make 301 Pine Street a fitting memorial to General Kosciuszko because it was a boarding house and took in roomers, what about another boarding house, located at Seventh and Market Streets, in Philadelphia, where the Declaration of Independence was written by another boarder, none other than Thomas Jefferson?

Thomas Jefferson, who came to Philadelphia as one of the delegates from Virginia to the Continental Congress, rented rooms in the boarding house at Seventh and Market Streets from Jacob Graff, in May 1776, just as Kosciuszko did at Third and Pine Streets from Mrs. Ann Relf in October 1797. What difference did it make that either Jefferson or Kosciuszko was a transient occupant.

The difference is that the Department of the Interior has asked President Nixon to set aside \$557,000 in his next budget for the reconstruction of the boarding house in which Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence but not one cent for a shrine to commemorate Kosciuszko's services. How long, oh, how long, will the Department of the Interior practice double standards in its historic preservation program?

UNRELATED TO AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Another false claim of the Advisory Board is that Kosciuszko did not live on Pine Street until 15 years after the time of his principal significance in American history.

If the Advisory Board or the Department of the Interior judged other historic houses on the same basis as it has General Kosciuszko's residence in 1797-98, it would be laughed right out of Washington, D.C.

If it considered the restoration of Frederick Douglass' home in Anacostia under the same guidelines, for example, the Nation would not have today a symbol of the achievements of one of its greatest abolitionists because Douglass rose to greatness before he made his home there in 1877.

Just as Douglass became a world figure in the endless struggle for human rights, so did Kosciuszko before him. When Kosciuszko was at Mrs. Relf's boarding house in 1797-98, he could not afford anything better. His only means of livelihood was the pension he received from the Federal Government for his military services during the American Revolution. The small, three-story house at 301 Pine Street is symbolic of Kosciuszko. The Nation apparently does not have another house so closely identified with him.

To argue that the house is unrelated to the American Revolution is pure bunk. Anyone who knows the story of Kosci-

uszko's life is familiar with his personal motto: "For your freedom and ours." He came to America in 1776 to fight for the freedom of the inhabitants of the Thirteen Original Colonies. He devoted his life to helping all men and women realize their freedom.

Many authorities of the Declaration of Independence know that not all the provisions Thomas Jefferson wanted in it were adopted by Congress. The abolition of slavery was one of them.

When Kosciuszko was at Mrs. Relf's place in 1797-98, Thomas Jefferson, then Vice President of the United States, was his most frequent visitor. Incidentally, Jefferson, while he was presiding over the Senate, was, as Hartzog would call him, a transient occupant in a boarding house on Fourth Street, between Market and Chestnut Streets, where he remained much of the time he was Vice President. The conversations and lifelong correspondence between the two men form one of the most unusual friendships in the world.

The talks that the two held at Mrs. Relf's picked up part of the original draft of the Declaration of Independence and transformed it into a personal document. One day in April 1798, when John Dawson, a congressman from Virginia, and John Barnes, Jefferson's banker, were present, Kosciuszko wrote on a piece of rag paper:

I beg Mr. Jefferson that in case I should be without will or testament he should by out of my money so many Negroes and free them. That the restant sums should be sufficient to give them education and provide for their maintenance, that is to say each should know before; the duty of a citizen in the free government, that he must defend his country against foreign as well as internal enemies who would wish to change the Constitution for the worst, to enslave them by degree afterwards, to have good and human heart sensible for the sufferings of others. Each must be married and have 100 acres of land with instruments. Cattle for tillage and know how to behave to neighbours, always with kindness and ready to help them to themselves frugal; to their children give good education, I mean as to the heart and the duty of their country, in gratitude to me to make themselves happy as possible.

After signing his name, T. Kosciuszko, and passing it to the two witnesses for their signature, he sent what he wrote to Jefferson and asked him, when he had "a quarter of an hour, to finish what I have" begun. Jefferson was pleased with the document because it reflected, in a personal way, the provision which was left out of the Declaration of Independence in 1776. It was part of the unfinished business of the American Revolution. Undaunted by the misspelled words, the crudeness of style, and other imperfections, Jefferson changed the words in the will to meet legal requirements and returned it to Kosciuszko for another copy in his own handwriting.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and other publications is the text of the will and testament that Kosciuszko turned over to his close friend, Thomas Jefferson, on May 5, 1798, when he left the dwelling at Third and Pine Streets to undertake a secret mission to France. It does not hurt to read it again and again and again. It shows that the General's

involvement with American history did not end when he put away his boots, sword, spyglass and maps. It is ironic that both the Declaration of Independence and this will were created in 18th century boarding houses.

It is important to remember that the following statement came out of the small house at Third and Pine Streets in Philadelphia:

I, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, leaving America, hereby dispose and declare, on my failure to return, my friend Thomas Jefferson authorized to use all my possessions in the States of America to buy any of his slaves and the slaves of others and in my name to give them freedom and the opportunity in education; prepare them for their new life by training them in their moral obligations that they might become good neighbors, good fathers and mothers, husbands and wives; that by training them in their civic duties, they might become defenders of their own freedom and their country; and, in general, teach them anything that might make them happier and useful. I name the above mentioned Thomas Jefferson as the executor of my Will.

THADDEUS KOSCIUSZKO.

There is no doubt that the man who stood out as a military engineer at Saratoga, West Point, Yorktown and other defenses and his compassion for all mankind was a true American patriot. The Advisory Board itself admitted that he was a figure of such significance in American history as to merit appropriate memorialization.

Mr. Larson, however, shocked me when he wrote in his report that "Kosciuszko has been memorialized in a fitting manner." What does he mean? Is the rock garden at West Point a symbol of Kosciuszko's achievements? Would the stone on the site of the Saratoga battlefield explain the impact of Kosciuszko's military planning on the outcome of the battle? The statue of Kosciuszko in Lafayette Park, across the street from the White House in Washington, is not a living memorial.

What all of us expect for a patriot of such importance is a tangible and living memorial in which to keep the mementoes of his active and satisfying life—the will and testament which shed his concern and support of the emancipation of slaves in America, paintings that he made and presented to his friends, letters signed by General Washington, his correspondence with Jefferson, the sword he used in the War of Independence, and many other valuable items.

Now, in bills sponsored by a number of Members of Congress, we have a chance to turn the house where Kosciuszko lived in 1797-98 into a national treasure, a tangible form of recognition, a shrine to this man who fought and worked all his life for the freedom of mankind.

ALTERATIONS OF 301 PINE STREET

The third objection raised to this legislation by Nathaniel A. Owings and members of the Advisory Board is that the house at 301 Pine Street has been greatly altered since Kosciuszko lived there.

This objection is as fallacious as a counterfeit bill.

Whatever changes were made, they did not destroy the original shape of the

small, strongly constructed brick dwelling and many distinguishing characteristics of 18th century architecture. Its original floor joists support the walls, and most of the old floor boards, the same ones that Kosciuszko walked on, are still intact. The brick chimney on one side of the roof, the two windows in the attic, the roof, and the sheltering eave over the front windows and door look practically the same as when the house was built by Joseph Few in 1775. The changes can be readily traced. The plan of the house made in 1796 is available so that as a whole the house can be made to look as it was in Kosciuszko's time.

I am afraid that Larson and other officials of the Department of the Interior did not read President Nixon's budget for the next year before rejecting the legislation to save the Kosciuszko house on the basis of the Advisory Board's report.

In the President's budget, for example, more than \$1 million is set aside to rebuild the brick house where Benjamin Franklin died on April 17, 1790. The house was demolished in 1812. The Kosciuszko house has been continuously occupied from 1775 to the present time. Why this discrimination?

The budget also provides about \$950,000 for reconstruction of the Old City Tavern at Second and Walnut Streets in Philadelphia. Unlike the Kosciuszko house, the Department of the Interior does not have any plans which show its use in the 18th century. The upper floors of City Tavern were burned out in 1834 and the rest of the building was torn down in the 1850's. How can the Department of the Interior spend almost \$1 million for a fake tavern and reject the restoration of the Kosciuszko house because of its alterations? Why this discrimination?

The budget has \$557,000 for the reconstruction of the Graff House on Seventh Street, where Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence. The site is now occupied by a hot-dog stand. How can the Department of the Interior spend this money for a replica of a boarding house in which Jefferson was a transient occupant and still turn down the Kosciuszko house because it was a boarding house and Kosciuszko one of its lodgers? Why this discrimination?

There is only one Kosciuszko, and there is only one place left in America to commemorate his services to the cause of American independence in a fitting manner. That's 301 Pine Street in Philadelphia.

I certainly trust that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will report favorably on H.R. 256.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BENEFITS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has often

shown his desire to spend increasing sums on the American military budget, on wasteful technical experiments like the SST, and on ever more beautiful frills for the White House guard.

Yet, as the following letter indicates, the President has shown himself to be consistently opposed to providing similar benefits to men and women who work for the Government, for private industry, and in this case for the American transportation industry.

We now must await the report of the Presidential appointed Railroad Retirement Study Commission. But while we wait, we should remember the past record of the administration on this issue. And we should remember the motivations which led to the demand for this report.

With this in mind, I would like to enter the letter of Mr. Edward Hubbard of Alamo, Calif., into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letter follows:

ALAMO, CALIF.,
February 18, 1972.

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE,
Congress of the United States,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a retired member of the United Transportation Union, I would like to recall the heated debate, which concerned the financial status of the railroad retirement fund, when Congress enacted legislation to increase benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act by fifteen percent (15%) in 1970.

The White House presented testimony against the increase in benefits unless it was financed by an increase in taxes, as did the Bureau of Budget, and the Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, Mr. Habermeyer.

U.T.U. proposed at that time to change the investment procedures used by the Secretary of the Treasury to invest railroad retirement funds because the Department of the Treasury was allowing us only the average minimum rate of interest return on our funds, which by law are invested in United States Treasury Notes. U.T.U. insisted that we were entitled to the highest rate of return available on investments. The house passed an amendment allowing us this new rate.

The White House, Bureau of the Budget, and the Treasury Department immediately unleashed a massive lobby attack against us in the United States Senate. Their excuse for opposition to our amendment was that it would then be necessary to change the investment policies of all trust funds handled by the Treasury Department at a cost of \$2.5 billion.

Our answer was, we have been subsidizing the Federal Government long enough. If this continues, then the Federal Government should subsidize our pension plan.

The Administration, through their lobbying campaign, was able to prevail in the Senate by using the \$2.5 billion scare. Some of our friends on the committee were misled by this huge figure.

Before the joint Conference Committee, we managed to get a compromise which will yield about \$7 to \$8 million more in interest to our railroad retirement fund over the next few years, thanks to Chairman Harley Staggers. During the House and Senate Committee hearings, there was considerable conflict in the testimony presented about long-term financial viability of the railroad retirement account.

Spokesmen for the Treasury Department, Bureau of the Budget, and Chairman Habermeyer of the Railroad Retirement Board,

painted a bleak picture for the future of railroad retirement.

They say the system must have continued increases in taxes from the parties to survive, and the rate now being paid may in some cases be prohibitive. This was the pitch used by the Administration, of course, as a reason to merge railroad retirement into Social Security. Habermeyer said that the deficit after passage of this legislation would be \$83 million per year. Mr. Nell Speirs, member of the Railroad Retirement Board for labor, testifies that passage of the bill would leave an actuarial deficit of about \$30 million per year. Mr. Lester P. Schaene, former counsel for the Railroad Retirement Board and Attorney for the Congress of Railway Unions, testified that we have never had a deficit of income as against out-go. He also testified that our bill was self-financing and that there would be no impact, and, that we have always added to the reserve in the account. We agree with Mr. Schaene. It is said that the Congress became confused, as a result of considerable conflict of testimony. Why should they? Most of the members are prominent attorneys, therefore well educated. Why should it become necessary, for Congress to create a study commission to study such a simple matter as the Railroad Retirement System?

What about the cost of this particular commission? Will it be deducted from the Railroad Retirement Fund?

I hasten to explain that the Congress did not create this study commission. It was created by President Nixon. In a recent interview on CBS Television, in answer to a question by Walter Kronkite, former President L. B. Johnson answered, quote L.B.J. "All this talk and rumors that you hear about Congress being to blame for this, and for that, is a lot of hog-wash. Congress can do nothing without the approval of the President, who has oodles of power." Now more about this study commission; if there was such a large deficit in the retirement service fund, and the future picture of the entire retirement system was so bleak, as pointed out by the President's henchmen, why did he wait until Congress enacted legislation granting a fifteen percent (15%) to retire to start action against the entire retirement system?

Now the personnel of this study commission will be hand picked by Mr. Nixon. Congress will have no say at all, much less the retired members. Nixon will know in advance what the result will be, when they report to Congress on June 30, 1972.

There is quite a divergence between a deficit of \$83 million per year, as testified by Mr. Habermeyer, and that of \$30 million per year, as testified by Mr. Speirs, or that of \$00 as testified by Mr. Schaene.

In my youth, I received much less than a common school education, yet I can instantly detect that the testimony of one of the above three men is spurious. A strong sense of perjury comes over me.

The study commission was charged to do the following:

1. Conduct a study of the railroad retirement system and its financing for the purpose of recommending to the Congress on or to prove adequate levels of benefits therebefore June 30, 1972, changes in such system under on an actuarially sound basis.

2. Such study shall take into account—eight (8) separate parts of the retirement system under title of—A. B. C. D. E. F. G. H. Of course the railroad retirement system obviously includes the Railroad Retirement Board itself, yet not one time in any item, from A to G, mentions the Retirement Board.

The same thing applies to the small interest rate, which the Treasury pays us on our reserve fund, in contrast to the maximum

high rate which they charge the railroads, Industry, agriculture, many business firms, as well as many foreign countries, not a word about this shall come from the study commission.

How can the Treasurer claim a deficit in the retirement fund when he is taking in more money than he is paying out.

I call upon the entire membership of both houses of Congress, to contemplate the date of June 30, 1972, when the Railroad Retirement Study Commission will make their report to Congress. Be prepared to combat the Administration forces who will be on hand to defeat all legislation beneficial to retired railway employees.

I implore you to support, and lend your influence, in passing H.R. 8065 by Representative Harley Staggers. Also H.R. 8733 by Congressmen Dingell and Carney. Also strive to retain H.R. 6444 or better.

In the above three bills, if enacted into law, they would add millions of dollars to our reserve fund, with practically no expense to the Federal Government.

According to White House Henchmen, there are one million and fifty thousand persons, drawing benefits from Railroad Retirement. Most of them have no other income. Thousands of them are ill and in and out of hospitals at regular intervals. With the cost of living rising day by day, they are having a hard struggle to stay alive, as all of them are old and decrepit.

In 1970 Congress, with compassion for the suffering of others, enacted legislation to increase benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act by fifteen percent (15%).

Why did the White House act so quickly and so vehemently in opposition to this amendment? Simply because Congress failed to consult him first. The President mustered all of his forces to combat the increase and although it became effective January 1, 1971, he delayed the signing until Congress would assure him that they would create a study commission to study the entire Railroad Retirement System. His aim at first was to have the study commission report back to Congress on or before July 1, 1971. A Senate amendment changed it to June 30, 1972. We got our first increase check in July, 1971.

This delay gave the President plenty of time to gather and instruct his hand picked study commission, and to let them know the nature of their report when returning before the Congress. Does Mr. Nixon think for a moment that the Congress and the one million fifty thousand annuitants are naive enough to think this study commission will render a report not favorable to the Administration?

By way of recompense, for appointment to this study commission, each member represents a potential block of votes in the coming election. The total number of votes could be in the thousands. But if the one million and fifty thousand annuitants vote against him, it will mean an inglorious defeat.

In view of the President's outrageous, scandalous action against the Railroad Retirement System, how can he expect to receive the annuitants vote? Verily, without a substantial labor vote, how can he expect to be re-elected?

All of this political noise and intrigue brought about by a supposed deficit in the Railroad Retirement Reserve Fund, which does not exist, according to Lester P. Schaene, former counsel for the Railroad Retirement Board.

In all of this action, against the Railroad Retirement System, neither the President or any of his henchmen have said one word about the enormity of our national deficit.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD D. HUBBARD.

GEN. HERBERT D. VOGEL

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, recently the Tennessee Legislature adopted a resolution expressing appreciation for the work of Gen. Herbert D. Vogel as Chairman of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority from 1954 to 1962. This was a most fitting gesture on the part of the legislature.

General Vogel was indeed an outstanding Chairman under whose guidance TVA made great progress.

I insert in the RECORD at this point the resolution paying tribute to General Vogel:

RESOLUTION

A resolution to express appreciation to General Herbert D. Vogel for his work as Chairman of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority from 1954 to 1962.

Whereas, General Herbert D. Vogel served from September 1, 1954, to June 20, 1962, as Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority; and

Whereas, During his service on the TVA Board of Directors, he contributed a great deal to the benefit of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the State of Tennessee; and it is fitting that the General Assembly of Tennessee take official recognition of his contribution; and

Whereas, During his chairmanship, the 1959 amendment to the TVA Act was passed giving the agency the authority to issue revenue bonds to finance construction of its power facilities. This legislation has been of immeasurable value in enabling TVA to meet the growing demand for electric power across the region, thus contributing to the progress which has taken place in the area generally; and

Whereas, TVA's local flood damage prevention programs gained national prominence during the time General Vogel was Chairman of the Board. Under his direction, TVA in 1959 submitted to the President and the Congress a report outlining the importance of such programs to the overall development of the region and suggesting its application nationally; and

Whereas, One of the nationally significant TVA actions under General Vogel's chairmanship was its stand against identical bidding on TVA contracts. Investigations of the practice by the Justice Department opened the door to the prosecution and conviction of major electric manufacturing companies and some of their officials for antitrust violations; and

Whereas, During his tenure TVA also proposed development of the area between Kentucky Lake and Lake Barkley in western Tennessee and Kentucky as a national recreation and conservation education area. This is the project which became the nationally-recognized Land Between the Lakes; and

Whereas, As TVA Chairman, General Vogel placed great emphasis on the concept of total water resource development. He believed that a lake should be developed not only for flood control, navigation, and electric power, but that in addition the shorelines should be used for industrial growth and recreation development. TVA's Melton Hill project, which was proposed and begun during his administration, is an excellent example of this concept of water resource development. It was his views along these lines which led to his support of the Tellico project; and

Whereas, General Vogel was born in Chelsea, Michigan, on August 26, 1900, the son of Lewis P. and Pearl M. (Davis) Vogel. He married Loreine Elliott on December 23, 1925, and they have two sons, Herbert D. and Richard E. Vogel; and

Whereas, He attended the University of Michigan from 1918-1920 and received his B.S. degree at the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, New York, in 1924. He also holds the following degrees: M.S. in Civil Engineering, University of California, 1928; E.D., Berlin Technical University, 1929; C.E., University of Michigan, 1933; and

Whereas, He was appointed Second Lieutenant in the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, in 1924 and advanced through the grades to Brigadier General in 1954; and

Whereas, He was founder and Director of the U.S. Waterway Experiment Station at Vicksburg, Mississippi, from 1930-1934; and

Whereas, During his military career, he served in the following places and capacities: Fort Leavenworth, Kansas; Hawaii; Fort Belvoir, Virginia, 1934-1940; District Engineer, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 1940-1943; Southwest Pacific (G-4, USASOS; Chief of Staff, Intermediate Section of Oro Bay, New Guinea; Commanding Officer, Base M, Philippines), 1944-1945; District Engineer, Buffalo, New York, 1945-1949; Engineer of Maintenance, Panama Canal, 1949-1950; Division Engineer, Southwest Division, Dallas, Texas, 1952-1954; and

Whereas, He was Lieutenant Governor of the Panama Canal Zone from 1950-1952; and

Whereas, He also served as Vice President and Director of the Panama Railroad Company from 1949-1950 and of the Panama Canal Company from 1950-1952; and

Whereas, In addition to his TVA service, he served on the following boards and committees: Beach Erosion, 1946-1949; Mississippi River Commission, 1952-1954; Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, 1952-1954; Chairman, Arkansas-White-Red Basins Inter-Agency Committee, 1952-1954; and

Whereas, He was a member of the Permanent International Commission of the Permanent International Association of Navigation Congresses from 1957-1964 and was named an Honorary Member in 1967. He is also a Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts; a member of the U.S. Commission of Large Dams, the American Power Conference; a life member of the American Society of Civil Engineers; a member of the National Board of Directors of the Society of American Military Engineers; and a member of the Order of the Caraboo.

Whereas, He has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal and the Legion of Merit; was an instructor at the Army Engineering School from 1938-1940, where he taught River and Harbor Engineering, Flood Control Engineering, and Public Speaking; has written numerous technical articles and papers on the subject of Experimental Hydraulics, appearing in Civil Engineering, Engineering News-Record, Military Engineer, Proceedings and Transactions, ASCE—1930-1940; he was an advisor to the World Bank from 1963-1967 and became its resource development engineering consultant in 1967; he is listed in Who's Who in Engineering (1931), American Men of Science (1933), and Who's Who in America (1954); he is affiliated with the Army and Navy Club in Washington, D.C., and the Downtown Club, Dallas, Texas; he is a Registered Professional Engineer in New York, Texas, Tennessee, and the District of Columbia; now therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-Seventh General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, the Senate concurring, That deepest appreciation is expressed to Herbert D. Vogel for his tireless efforts in behalf of TVA and the people of Tennessee.

Be it further resolved, That copies of this Resolution be sent to General Herbert D.

Vogel, 3033 Cleveland Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C.; Mr. A. J. Wagner, Chairman of the TVA Board of Directors, Knoxville, Tennessee; and all members of the Tennessee congressional delegation.

LEGISLATION PROGRAM OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the national officers and other distinguished leaders of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. appeared before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the U.S. Senate and presented their legislative program for the year 1972. It was my privilege to preside at this meeting on February 10, 1972.

Among those present were: National commander, J. B. Koch; national senior vice commander, A. O. Soderholm; national claims director, Elliott Nefflin; national legislative director, Herbert M. Houston, and members of the national legislative committee.

The editor of the Torch, Dallas Halverstadt; the national president of the ladies auxiliary, Fairy Harrell; the senior vice president, Bess Johnson; junior vice president, Emma Walla; and the treasurer, Elva Miller were also present.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Mr. Herbert Houston, the chairman of the Legislative Committee of the Veterans of World War I be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

STATEMENT BY HERBERT M. HOUSTON

Mr. Chairman and Members of this Distinguished Committee: We wish to thank you for the privilege of appearing before you today to present the views of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., as expressed in the resolutions from the departments of our organization to our last National Convention on legislation.

We wish also to express our appreciation for the time contributed and efforts made in your behalf for veterans benefits.

You have been instrumental in obtaining benefits for America's veterans beginning with World War II and continuing to include the Veterans of Vietnam which is a tribute to you and to this nation. No such benefits or comparable benefits were accorded the Veterans of World War I, and it is this gap in our pension benefits laws we continue to call to your attention. It was because of this neglect that World War I Veterans united in pressuring the Congress to pass legislation which would prevent the returning veterans from World War II from experiencing the hardships they experienced after World War I. The experiences of this effort by World War I Veterans in lobbying in behalf of the G.I. Bill reads like an adventure story. They were determined that their sons would have greater consideration than they received.

There were hundreds of thousands of Veterans of World War I who became casualties of the post war conditions. Far more casualties resulted from the by-products of the war than were suffered on the battlefield. This we feel has not been realized by the victims, nor the Congress and our citizens.

Thousands of so-called shell-shock victims were the result of the psychological shock resulting from the battlefield, plus an equal shock of indifference when they faced civilian life. Had there been some provision in benefits to enable them to adjust to civilian life many of them could have been more useful citizens and made a greater contribution to our national life.

Thousands of others were equally casualties of the war who, because there was no way for them to obtain an education or to obtain technical skills, have been deprived of their potential as citizens because of their wartime service.

Had there been similar benefits to the G.I. Bill of later years, these thousands of veterans who have been, and now are in dire privation, could be compared to the veterans of later wars who have become business men, lawyers, doctors or other more productive citizens, because of rehabilitation.

Mr. Chairman, we realize it is too late to recompense these veterans for their loss, for thousands have died; however, for those who remain we feel that special consideration can and should be made for them so they may have benefits in their latter years to at least partially compensate them for what they feel has been discrimination for the past 50 years.

These, the less fortunate of World War I Veterans, according to a survey in 32 of the 50 States reveal that 27% of them are in a welfare status, and 40% in the poverty class.

We are aware that for some, their plight can be attributed to their own responsibility; however, the far greater majority are the responsibility of the government for neglect to them that was provided for others.

These World War I Veterans have been told down through the years that there was just not enough money to grant their request for equal consideration with veterans of other wars; namely, a general pension for prior wars, and the G.I. Bill for World War II and subsequent wars, while at the same time billions of dollars have continued to be spent in foreign aid, year after year for 53 years, amounting to more than 175 billion dollars.

If it was a question of economy, the Veterans of World War I would gladly render their wholehearted support but since the Public Laws pertaining to veteran's benefits portray the situation clearly attesting that this is not the case, we continue to petition the Congress for special consideration.

PENSIONS

Mr. Chairman, a Resolution was adopted at our National Convention in September, 1971 giving us a mandate to work for a general pension for the Veterans of World War I, H.R. 3650 was selected for this. A Resolution was adopted giving us a mandate to work for the program in effect the previous year. On this we are supporting H.R. 12504, and companion Bills H.R. 12622 and H.R. 12636, S-3070 and we earnestly urge your consideration of these Bills.

COMPENSATION

The Veterans of World War I are very much concerned that compensation payments for those veterans whose disabilities resulted from active duty service in war time.

Anyone who assumes that the Veterans of World War I, of the U.S.A. is only concerned in pension benefits are wrong.

For many thousands of World War I Veterans, the compensation payment which were awarded for disabilities incurred in the line of duty were later cut off as a result of the Economy Act are, and have been one of the evidences of discrimination against the World War I Veterans down through the years. Many of these aging veterans on the pension rolls today are service connected drew compensation until they were cut off in the lower classification by the Economy Act.

Since no other generation of veterans have been affected in this manner, we wish to use our influence in whatever way we can to prevent similar action being taken to the veterans of any subsequent war.

Another concern of our organization is the down grading of the uniformed services of our country by so many in our society today including the news media, many of our colleges and far too many civic organizations, even including some of the clergy. We feel it is time for a renewal of the patriotic spirit which made us the great country we are. In this connection, it is our feeling that increased emphasis be placed upon respect for our national honor, respect for veterans who wear the uniform in defense of our country and proper consideration be given those who bear the marks of battle.

Our government finds funds to support foreign governments and their peoples to the tune of billions of dollars. Some of this goes to those nations we have fought in previous wars and some to nations who are our enemies today. All those billions of dollars are expended while the veterans of war who have sustained our nation down through the years by their service are asked to survive on a meager recompense for the time and sacrifice they have made.

It is our opinion, Mr. Chairman, that compensation payments are badly out of line with respect to the consideration they purport to represent.

And it is our opinion that it is time to bring the compensation tables of percentage payments more in line with the current cost of living standards. Therefore, we recommend the following increase in all percentage classifications as follows:

Percent:	
10-----	\$45
20-----	90
30-----	135
40-----	180
50-----	225
60-----	270
70-----	315
80-----	360
90-----	405
100-----	495

In our opinion the present tables of percentages are ambiguous and we strongly recommend the increase.

HOSPITALS

Our experience in the conversations with those involved and by letters reveals that there exists many improvements to be desired in our veterans hospitals. We continue to have complaints regarding those who are denied admittance into Veterans Administration hospitals. These come from the most deprived cases where they are direly in need of World War I for your consideration.

of nursing home care, and cannot get into a nursing home unless through a Veterans Administration hospital. These cases we refer to are those without funds for a private nursing home, and, or funds for hospitalization.

NURSING HOMES

It has been the opinion of our organization for years that the time limit be eliminated regarding the time a patient may stay in a Veterans Administration nursing home, or a nursing home under contract with the Veterans Administration. Some, though the numbers be small, have no where to go, and no one to care for them when they are released from a nursing home.

These are denied admittance to the Veterans hospital because there is no room. They are put on a waiting list, with no where to wait. We urge legislation to correct this.

Our recommendation is that the hospitals be required to admit these cases, or that patients be admitted to a nursing home upon the recommendation of their family physician.

CEMETERIES AND BURIAL ALLOWANCE

Our organization received resolutions from five States asking that National Cemeteries be provided for their States, these were adopted.

We recommend that action be taken to provide National Cemeteries in areas when investigations have proven a shortage in burial space for veterans.

For those who desire to be buried in a cemetery other than a National Cemetery, we recommend that the burial allowance be \$400.00 with an additional \$150.00 to go to the veteran's family to apply toward the purchase of a lot.

Our organization adopted a resolution at our last National Convention asking for the erection of a suitable monument to General John J. Pershing in our nation's capital.

We solicit the influence of this distinguished committee to implement this, and have it in place for the 1976 sesquicentennial.

On the subject of non-service connected pensions, we made request for a special consideration for the Veterans of World War I.

We would like to make the following recommendations, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the pension law now in effect:

On income limitations, for the veteran and widow, \$3,000.00 per year.

On income limitations, for the veteran with dependents income limitations be increased to \$4,200.00 per year.

With regard to the spouse's income, we recommend the first \$2,500.00 of the spouses income not be charged against the veteran in determining income for pension purposes.

We thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the privilege of presenting the views of the Veterans

NORTHERN VIRGINIA QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 8, 1972, I announced to the House my intention to submit a questionnaire to all of the estimated 170,000 registered voters of the 10th Congressional District of Virginia. An exact copy of the poll I intended to make was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the following day. The questionnaire was mailed out to the registered voters on the weekend of February 11 and 12.

The results from the poll were completed and computer tabulated on March 1.

I obtained a wealth of information from the 32,291 replies I received to my questionnaire. Those responding represent a sample of 18.5 percent of the approximately 170,000 questionnaires I mailed out.

In my view this is an important poll. Northern Virginia voters, because of their average high income per capita and because of the high educational level of its citizens, constitute perhaps the most sophisticated congressional constituency in our Nation. Moreover, in presidential elections since 1956, the 10th Congressional District of Virginia has reflected an almost exact percentage of the votes cast nationwide for the Office of the President of the United States. The views expressed by the citizens of the area I have the pleasure and good fortune to represent, therefore, are important to me and are, in my judgment, important to each Member of the Congress.

The poll results below show a percentage response to each question submitted in my questionnaire by five separate age brackets, including the 18- to 20-year-old group, each age bracket by sex, and whether the respondent is a Federal or non-Federal employee. The poll also shows totals for each break-out and grand totals for each question.

The detailed results of my poll follow:

FEBRUARY 1972—BROYHILL QUESTIONNAIRE

Federal and non-Federal									Federal									Non-Federal									
All			Male			Female			All			Male			Female			All			Male			Female			
Yes	No	Unde- cided	Yes	No	Unde- cided	Yes	No	Unde- cided	Yes	No	Unde- cided	Yes	No	Unde- cided	Yes	No	Unde- cided	Yes	No	Unde- cided	Yes	No	Unde- cided	Yes	No	Unde- cided	
1. DO YOU FAVOR FORCED BUSING OF SCHOOL CHILDREN ACROSS CITY AND COUNTY BOUNDARIES TO ACHIEVE A RACIAL BALANCE?																											
Unknown.....	6	81	13	6	81	13	6	82	12	7	81	12	7	84	9	7	78	15	5	81	14	5	80	15	5	83	12
		978			503			475			207			119			88			771			384			387	
18 to 20.....	14	75	11	15	72	13	14	78	8	13	80	7	10	83	7	16	78	6	14	74	12	15	71	14	13	77	10
		710			396			314			104			49			55			606			347			259	
21 to 26.....	18	75	7	19	74	7	18	76	6	20	76	4	21	76	3	19	76	5	18	74	8	18	73	9	18	75	7
		2,067			964			1,103			582			267			315			1,485			697			788	
27 to 35.....	14	81	5	16	79	5	13	82	5	17	77	6	20	76	4	14	80	6	12	82	6	13	82	5	12	82	
		4,547			2,233			2,314			1,609			1,015			594			2,938			1,218			1,720	
36 to 55.....	5	91	4	6	90	4	5	91	4	6	90	4	7	90	3	5	92	3	5	91	4	5	91	4	5	90	5
		14,031			7,183			6,848			5,757			3,768			1,989			8,274			3,415			4,859	
Over 55.....	2	94	4	2	94	4	2	93	5	3	94	3	3	94	3	2	95	3	2	93	5	2	95	3	2	92	6
		9,958			5,328			4,630			2,782			1,878			904			7,176			3,450			3,726	
All.....	7	88	5	7	89	4	6	88	6	8	88	4	8	88	4	7	89	4	6	88	6	6	89	5	6	88	6
		32,291			16,607			15,684			11,041			7,096			3,945			21,250			9,511			11,739	

FEBRUARY 1972—BROYHILL QUESTIONNAIRE—Continued

	Federal and non-Federal									Federal									Non-Federal								
	All			Male			Female			All			Male			Female			All			Male			Female		
	Yes	No	Unde- cided	Yes	No	Unde- cided	Yes	No	Unde- cided	Yes	No	Unde- cided	Yes	No	Unde- cided	Yes	No	Unde- cided	Yes	No	Unde- cided	Yes	No	Unde- cided	Yes	No	Unde- cided
2. DO YOU FAVOR THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN FOR TROOP WITHDRAWAL FROM VIETNAM?																											
Unknown.....	64	11	25	66	9	25	62	14	24	69	12	19	73	10	17	62	14	24	63	11	26	64	9	27	62	13	25
			978			503			475			207			119			88			771			384			387
18 to 20.....	60	24	16	60	24	16	60	25	15	66	25	9	69	22	9	63	27	10	59	24	17	59	25	16	59	24	17
			710			396			314			104			49			55			606			347			259
21 to 26.....	60	29	11	59	31	10	60	27	13	61	29	10	64	29	7	58	28	14	59	28	13	58	31	11	60	26	14
			2,067			964			1,103			582			267			315			1,485			697			788
27 to 35.....	68	21	11	69	21	10	66	20	14	67	22	11	69	22	9	63	23	14	68	20	12	69	21	10	67	19	14
			4,547			2,233			2,314			1,609			1,015			594			2,938			1,218			1,720
36 to 55.....	76	15	9	77	15	8	75	14	11	76	15	9	76	16	8	75	14	11	76	14	10	78	14	8	75	14	8
			14,031			7,183			6,848			5,757			3,768			1,989			8,274			3,415			4,859
Over 55.....	77	12	11	79	13	8	75	12	13	78	15	7	78	15	7	76	14	10	77	12	11	80	12	8	75	11	14
			9,958			5,328			4,630			2,782			1,878			904			7,176			3,450			3,726
All.....	74	16	10	75	16	9	72	15	13	74	17	9	75	17	8	72	17	11	73	15	12	75	15	10	72	15	13
			32,291			16,607			15,684			11,041			7,096			3,945			21,250			9,511			11,739
3. DO YOU FAVOR AMNESTY FOR DRAFT EVADERS?																											
Unknown.....	13	61	26	9	65	26	16	57	27	14	70	16	10	79	11	20	57	23	12	58	30	9	60	31	15	57	28
			978			503			475			207			119			88			771			384			387
18 to 20.....	44	40	16	47	37	16	40	44	16	37	52	11	36	53	11	38	52	10	45	38	17	49	35	16	40	42	18
			710			396			314			104			49			55			606			347			259
21 to 26.....	36	54	10	34	55	11	37	53	10	34	56	10	33	59	8	35	52	13	36	53	11	35	53	12	37	53	10
			2,067			964			1,103			582			267			315			1,485			697			788
27 to 35.....	24	65	11	24	67	9	24	63	13	26	65	9	27	64	9	25	67	8	23	65	12	22	69	9	24	62	14
			4,547			2,233			2,314			1,609			1,015			594			2,938			1,218			1,720
36 to 55.....	13	77	10	11	81	8	15	73	12	12	80	8	12	81	7	13	77	10	14	76	10	10	81	9	16	72	12
			14,031			7,183			6,848			5,757			3,768			1,989			8,274			3,415			4,859
Over 55.....	9	81	10	8	85	7	11	76	13	10	83	7	9	85	6	11	78	11	9	80	11	7	85	8	11	75	14
			9,958			5,328			4,630			2,782			1,878			904			7,176			3,450			3,726
All.....	16	74	10	14	77	9	17	70	13	15	77	8	14	79	7	17	73	10	16	72	12	14	76	10	17	69	14
			32,291			16,607			15,684			11,041			7,096			3,945			21,250			9,511			11,739
4. DO YOU SUPPORT THE ADMINISTRATIONS WAGE-PRICE CONTROL PROGRAM?																											
Unknown.....	55	15	30	57	13	30	54	17	29	60	17	23	62	15	23	57	20	23	54	14	32	55	13	32	53	16	31
			978			503			475			207			119			88			771			384			387
18 to 20.....	53	22	25	53	23	24	54	20	26	57	29	14	55	32	13	60	27	13	53	20	27	52	22	26	53	18	29
			710			396			314			104			49			55			606			347			259
21 to 26.....	58	26	16	58	26	16	58	26	16	58	29	13	61	29	10	55	30	15	58	25	17	56	25	19	59	24	17
			2,067			964			1,103			582			276			315			1,485			697			788
27 to 35.....	62	24	14	63	25	12	61	22	17	62	25	13	63	25	12	61	26	13	62	23	15	62	25	13	62	21	17
			4,547			2,233			2,314			1,609			1,015			594			2,938			1,218			1,720
36 to 55.....	68	18	14	69	19	12	68	18	14	68	20	12	68	20	12	68	19	13	68	18	14	70	18	12	68	18	14
			14,031			7,183			6,848			5,757			3,768			1,989			8,274			3,415			4,859
Over 55.....	73	13	14	76	13	11	70	13	17	73	16	11	74	16	10	71	17	12	73	12	15	76	12	12	70	12	18
			9,958			5,328			4,630			2,782			1,878			904			7,176			3,450			3,726
All.....	68	18	14	69	18	13	66	18	16	68	20	12	69	20	11	66	20	14	67	17	16	69	17	14	66	17	17
			32,291			16,607			15,684			11,041			7,096			3,945			21,250			9,511			11,739
5. DO YOU SUPPORT THE ADMINISTRATIONS GOAL OF AN ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMY?																											
Unknown.....	49	21	30	49	21	30	50	20	30	62	21	17	62	22	16	62	20	18	46	20	34	45	21	34	47	20	33
			978			503			475			207			119			88			771			384			387
18 to 20.....	78	12	10	80	9	11	75	15	10	72	19	9	75	16	9	69	21	10	79	11	10	80	8	12	76	14	10
			710			396			314			104			49			55			606			347			259
21 to 26.....	68	21	11	70	20	10	66	22	12	69	22	9	71	23	6	67	21	12	68	21	11	69	19	12	66	22	12
			2,067			964			1,103			582			267			315			1,485			697			788
27 to 35.....	59	29	12	58	31	11	59	26	15	57	32	11	59	32	9	56	32	12	59	27	14	57	31	12	61	24	15
			4,547			2,233			2,314			1,609			1,015			594			2,938			1,218			1,720
36 to 55.....	63	25	12	61	28	11	64	22	14	60	29	11	60	30	10	62	27	11	64	23	13	63	26	11	65	21	14
			14,031			7,183			6,848			5,757			3,768			1,989			8,274			3,415			4,859
Over 55.....	58	26	16	60	28	12	57	25	18	59	30	11	58	31	11	60	26	14	58	25	17	61	26	13	56	24	20
			9,958			5,328			4,630			2,782			1,878			904			7,176			3,450			3,726
All.....	61	25	14	61	27	12	61	23	16	60	29	11	60	30	10	61	27	12	61	24	15	62	25	13	61	22	17
			32,291			16,607			15,684			11,041			7,096			3,945			21,250			9,511			11,739
6. WOULD YOU VOTE FOR RICHARD NIXON FOR A SECOND TERM AS PRESIDENT?																											
Unknown.....	43	20	37	46	17	37	40	24	36	47	26	27	52	23	25	39	29	32	42	19	39	44	15	41	40	23	37
			978			503			475			207			119			88			771			384			387
18 to 20.....	33	36	31	33	36	31	34	37	29	40	29	31	34	30	36	45	29	26	32	37	31	32	37	31	31	38	31
			710			396			314			104			49			55			606			347			259
21 to 26.....	35	40	25	37	39	24	33	41	26	36	42	22	42	36	22	31	46	23	34	39	27	36	39	25	34	39	27
			2,067			964			1,103			582			267			315			1,485			697			788
27 to 35.....	43	32	25	45	31	24	41	33	26	38	38	24	40	37	23	35	40	25	45	29	26	49	27	24	43	31	26
			4,547			2,233			2,314			1,609			1,015			594			2,938			1,218			1,720
36 to 55.....	51	24	25	52	23	25	50	25	25	47	27	26	48	26	26	47	28	25	53	21	26	57	19	24	51	23	26
			14,031																								

	Federal and non-Federal									Federal									Non-Federal								
	All			Male			Female			All			Male			Female			All			Male			Female		
	Yes	No	Un- decided	Yes	No	Un- decided	Yes	No	Un- decided	Yes	No	Un- decided	Yes	No	Un- decided	Yes	No	Un- decided	Yes	No	Un- decided	Yes	No	Un- decided	Yes	No	Un- decided
7. DO YOU FAVOR COMPLETION OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAY 66 FROM THE BELTWAY I-495 TO WASHINGTON, D.C., TO HELP SOLVE NORTHERN VIRGINIA'S TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM?																											
Unknown.....	56	12	32	59	11	30	54	12	34	63	18	19	67	20	13	57	15	28	55	10	35	57	9	34	53	11	35
18-20.....	52	30	978	48	31	503	57	29	475	57	36	207	55	40	119	60	32	88	51	29	771	48	29	384	56	29	387
21 to 26.....	56	31	710	58	29	396	54	32	314	59	31	104	58	34	49	59	28	55	55	31	606	58	27	347	52	34	254
27 to 35.....	61	28	2,067	64	28	964	59	29	1,103	60	31	582	62	30	267	57	33	315	62	27	1,485	65	25	697	60	28	786
36 to 55.....	73	17	4,547	77	15	2,233	68	19	2,314	74	17	1,609	76	17	1,015	70	19	594	72	16	2,938	77	13	1,218	68	15	1,720
Over 55.....	71	15	14,031	76	14	8	66	16	13	73	16	9	76	15	7	67	18	10	72	16	12	75	13	10	66	15	14
All.....	69	19	9,958	72	17	7,183	65	20	6,848	71	20	5,757	73	19	5,768	66	22	1,989	68	18	8,274	72	16	3,415	64	20	4,859
			32,291			5,328			4,630			2,782			1,878			904			7,176			3,450			3,726
			12			11			15			9			8			12			14			12			16
			16,607			15,684			11,041			7,096			3,945			21,250			9,511			11,739			

8. DO YOU FAVOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF LOW AND MODERATE-COST, TAX-SUPPORTED HOUSING IN EACH NORTHERN VIRGINIA COMMUNITY TO REDUCE THE NUMBER OF SUCH HOUSING UNITS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA?

Unknown.....	15	52	33	14	54	32	16	50	34	19	61	20	17	66	17	21	55	24	14	50	36	13	51	36	15	49	36
18 to 20.....	32	44	978	24	31	43	26	33	45	22	42	51	25	24	53	23	23	50	27	33	43	24	32	42	26	35	385
21 to 26.....	35	50	710	15	32	53	15	37	48	15	34	55	11	29	63	8	38	49	13	36	48	16	34	49	17	37	257
27 to 35.....	32	56	2,067	12	31	57	12	32	55	1,103	13	34	54	12	36	53	11	32	55	315	13	30	57	13	28	61	789
36 to 55.....	20	67	4,547	13	20	68	2,233	12	21	66	2,314	20	69	11	20	69	11	19	70	594	11	21	66	13	19	68	1,728
Over 55.....	14	72	14,031	14	14	74	7,183	12	14	69	6,848	17	14	74	12	15	75	10	14	73	1,989	13	14	71	13	14	4,850
All.....	21	65	9,957	14	20	67	5,327	13	22	63	4,630	21	67	12	21	68	11	21	66	904	13	21	64	15	19	66	3,729
			32,290				16,606				15,684				11,041				7,096								11,738

9. SHOULD THE UNITED STATES CONTINUE TO EXTEND ECONOMIC AND MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO OTHER NATIONS?

Unknown.....	24	37	39	26	37	37	22	38	40	30	43	27	35	44	21	23	43	34	22	35	43	23	34	43	21	36	43
18 to 20.....	39	38	978	23	42	37	21	35	41	24	40	47	13	42	48	10	38	45	17	39	37	24	42	35	23	35	25
21 to 26.....	42	38	710	20	43	37	20	41	38	21	45	37	18	46	37	17	45	37	18	41	38	21	42	37	21	40	21
27 to 35.....	49	32	2,067	19	53	30	17	45	34	1,103	21	54	29	17	59	26	15	47	34	315	19	46	34	20	48	33	788
36 to 55.....	41	39	4,547	20	45	37	18	36	41	2,314	23	43	39	18	47	37	16	36	43	594	21	40	39	21	44	37	2,220
Over 55.....	32	46	14,031	22	35	45	7,183	20	28	46	6,848	37	46	17	40	44	16	31	50	1,989	19	30	46	24	33	46	4,859
All.....	39	40	9,957	21	42	39	5,327	19	35	41	4,630	39	46	18	46	37	17	37	43	904	20	37	40	23	39	40	3,726
			32,290				16,606				15,684				11,041				7,096								11,739

10. DO YOU FAVOR COMBINING ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE WITH FULL CARRY-OVER PROVISION?

Unknown.....	63	28	9	61	31	8	65	26	9	63	28	9	61	31	8	65	26	9	63	28	9	61	31	8	65	26	9
18 to 20.....	75	17	207	8	73	22	5	78	12	88	10	75	17	8	73	22	5	78	12	88	10	75	17	8	73	22	88
21 to 26.....	68	23	104	9	67	24	9	69	22	55	9	68	23	9	67	24	9	69	22	55	9	67	24	9	69	22	55
27 to 35.....	70	21	582	9	71	20	9	68	22	315	10	70	21	9	71	20	9	68	22	315	10	70	21	9	68	22	315
36 to 55.....	67	25	1,609	8	67	25	8	67	25	594	8	67	25	8	67	25	8	67	25	594	8	67	25	8	67	25	594
Over 55.....	60	33	5,757	7	61	33	3,768	6	59	33	1,989	6	60	33	7	61	33	6	59	33	1,989	6	60	33	7	61	33
All.....	66	26	2,782	8	66	27	1,878	7	66	26	904	8	66	27	8	66	27	8	66	26	904	8	66	27	8	66	26
			11,041				7,096				3,945				11,041				7,096								3,945

This poll clearly indicates that northern Virginians will again firmly support Richard Nixon for President in 1972; are adamantly opposed to forced school busing to achieve a racial balance; favor the President's troop withdrawal plan from Vietnam, 3 to 1; oppose amnesty for draft evaders, 3 to 1; support the administration's wage-price control program by substantial numbers; are fairly enthused with the goal for an all-volunteer army; by well over a two-thirds majority, want Interstate Route 66 in northern Virginia completed; are emphatically opposed to construction of low- and moderate-cost, tax-supported housing in their communities to reduce ghetto housing problems in the District

of Columbia; are opposed to foreign economic and military aid programs as presently administered; and Federal employees favor combining their annual and sick leave as one leave system, providing they are permitted to fully carry over their total leave from year to year.

Some interesting impressions of the poll results follow:

First, 18- to 20-year-olds generally appear more conservative than the 21- to 26-year-old age group. This could indicate that this 18- to 20-year-old group is less inclined to radicalism than were their counterparts in the sixties. It could also indicate a more thoughtful and pragmatic approach to problems and less emotionalism in making decisions

and taking actions on problems. An exception, which was expected, is shown with respect to amnesty for draft evaders and support for an all-volunteer army.

Second, both 18- to 20- and 21- to 26-year-old groups appear less interested in the poll than other more adult age groups, indicating at this time that younger voters will most likely continue to vote in smaller numbers than older age groups. This analysis is commensurate with this group's participation in past elections. I find this trend disappointing. I had hoped that a higher percentage of the younger voters would express their opinions on these vital questions in this poll.

Third, the poll also indicates that the 18- to 20-year-old age groups led the poll with the largest number of undecided answers in most all categories.

Fourth, with few exceptions, the overall poll shows little variance from past voting patterns. It reinforced the old political theory that the older the voter the most conservative he votes. Of significance, over 74 percent of those responding to the poll were above 36 years old.

Fifth, although males slightly outnumbered females in responding to the poll, females invariably were generally less conservative than males.

Sixth, also, Government employees appear to be slightly more liberal in their views than non-Government employees.

NOMINEE LIST AVAILABLE FOR PURCHASE

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce that the American Society of Corporate Secretaries has decided to market one of its principal products. Heretofore the society refused to sell its annual nominee list, a document most helpful to persons who wish to decode the street names by which many banks, insurance companies, and other institutions hide their control of the votes in major corporations, especially in the energy industry.

After the society refused, last year, to sell the nominee list to a newspaper editor, and to an attorney in a rate case, I placed the 1971 edition in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—June 24, 1971, part II.

Last month I asked the society for a copy of its 1972 edition. I have received that copy, along with a letter from Executive Director John S. Black, Jr., stating that:

This list is available now by action of our board of directors to anyone who wishes to purchase a copy.

The purchase price, according to the society, is \$20.

Mr. President, I compliment the society upon its decision to make this important information available. It should be most useful to stockholders, rate case participants, the Justice Department, regulatory commissions, and academic communities.

Until the regulatory commissions decide to require reporting companies to answer the questions asked of them regarding common stock ownership, the commissions can, by use of the nominee list, easily advise Congress and the public as to the identity of the institutions which are now listed as street names.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the February 28 letter I received from Mr. Black and with his letter to members of the society, which appears in the 1972 edition of the nominee list, and which describes the material therein.

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

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF
CORPORATE SECRETARIES, INC.,
New York, N.Y., February 28, 1972.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: In response to your letter of February 21, we are pleased to send you a complimentary copy of the 1972 edition of our Nominee List. You will be interested to know that this List is available now by action of our Board of Directors to anyone who wishes to purchase a copy. Previously, it was available for distribution to our members and for purchase by any bank or broker for their use in stock transfer work and in proxy solicitation.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN S. BLACK, JR.,
Executive Director.

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF
CORPORATE SECRETARIES, INC.,
New York, N.Y.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY: This Nominee List is for the benefit of members and will be invaluable in proxy solicitation and stock transfer work.

Part I contains an alphabetical listing of nominees with their employer identification numbers. Part II is arranged by state, and by custodian or principal within the state. Part III is an alphabetical list of investment funds and foundations, etc., with custodial banks and the nominees which they use.

Through the cooperation of many banks, investment funds and members of the Society, we have been able to learn the nominees which custodial banks use for these funds. In many, if not most cases, custodial banks use these nominees for other beneficial owners and they should not be considered an exclusive nominee for the particular fund listed.

Some banks use different nominees for various departments and relationships. The Society, in an effort to increase the value of the Nominee List, has endeavored to learn the purposes of a given nominee. The areas of relationship are:

- (a) Estates.
- (b) Living and testamentary trusts.
- (c) Pension trusts.
- (d) Investment management accounts.
- (e) Corporate trust accounts.
- (f) Safekeeping or custody accounts (domestic).
- (g) Safekeeping or custody accounts (foreign).
- (h) Legal and common trust funds.

Nominees for which one of the above descriptions is applicable are coded with the appropriate letter immediately after the nominee name.

During the year an updated desk copy of the Nominee List is on hand at the National Office of the Society. Since it is to the benefit of all concerned to eliminate the use of duplicate nominee names, it is suggested that any proposed names be checked against this list, by phone or mail, before the nominee is formed.

Every effort is made to keep the Nominee List up to date. In the latter part of 1971 all users of nominees herein listed were asked to verify the information in our files. All resulting changes have been processed and will appear in this edition. If members note any new nominee names, the National Office would appreciate receiving word so that the names may be kept on pending record and confirmed for future editions.

JOHN S. BLACK, JR.,
Executive Director.

ALPHA KAPPA STATE TO PUBLISH
"PIONEER WOMEN TEACHERS OF
CONNECTICUT"

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, over the years, women teachers have made countless contributions to the development of education in Connecticut. It is most admirable and fitting that the Alpha Kappa State society of Connecticut's women teachers has recently published a wonderful tribute to the foresight and accomplishments of the women who laid the foundation for the State's splendid school system.

"Pioneer Women Teachers of Connecticut, 1767-1970," edited by talented Helen M. Sheldrick of Winsted, chronicles the teaching careers of 23 women whose impact on the profession is still profoundly felt. From Sarah Pierce and Prudence Crandall to Ellen Porter Hubbel of Bristol and Mrs. Isabelle Pearson of Winsted, each pioneer had her own hopes, dreams, ambitions and achievements in the challenging field of education. "Pioneer Women Teachers of Connecticut, 1767-1970" is a most worthy achievement. Alpha Kappa State members prepared each chapter of this project which was begun in 1946.

Included in the book which is divided into three parts are the following: Part I—Early Pioneers—Sarah Pierce, Emma Willard, Lydia Sigourney, Catherine Beecher, and Prudence Crandall; Part II—The Pioneers: Maria Sanford, Caroline Hewins, Dr. Marietta Kies, Dr. Marion Parker Whitney, Fannie Smith, Ida Keigwin, Mary Hooker, Dr. Alice Hamilton, Ellen Porter Hubbell, Benita Virginia Slocum, Dr. Katherine Blunt, and Mary Kingsbury; and Part III—Modern Pioneers: Mrs. Isabelle Pearson, Prof. Edna Baxter, Grayce E. Long, Vina M. Aherne, Elizabeth C. Sonier, and Sister Mary de Lourdes.

The book, published by Dowd Printers in Winsted, Conn., is well worth reading, for it is a splendid commentary on the State's colorful women educators. For the interest of my colleagues, an article regarding the book which appeared in a recent issue of the Keynote, the Alpha Kappa State publication, follows:

ALPHA KAPPA STATE TO PUBLISH "PIONEER WOMEN TEACHERS OF CONNECTICUT"

Alpha Kappa State has dreamed of publishing a book about the Pioneer Women Teachers of Connecticut ever since its members began to search the archives and discovered that Connecticut Educators had accomplished so many "firsts".

In the beginning, back in 1946, the members were content to have a chapter member write-up such early educators as Fannie Smith, Prudence Crandall, or "the dancing teacher", Benita Virginia Slocum. These manuscripts were carefully prepared for "the book" which would sometime be published, and meanwhile some were published in *The Connecticut Teacher* with the carbon copy and a figurine of the teacher concerned placed on file in the Connecticut College Library at New London.

The first pioneer teacher to be reviewed was Miss Fannie Smith whose biography was written by Miss Lucy S. Curtiss of Bridgeport, and appeared in the January 1946 issue of the *Connecticut Teacher*. Gradually several more biographies were added to the file, including the life of Mrs. Isabelle Pearson of Winsted who retired from active service in June 1956, after a long record of service. But for one reason or another she declined to have a figurine dressed to resemble her. Her autobiography, however, formed a part of the Alpha Kappa State exhibition at the International Delta Kappa Gamma Society convention, conducted that year at Bal Harbour, Florida. Then as the time and effort involved seemed prohibitive the project was dropped but not forgotten.

However, in 1969, when Alpha Delta State, Ohio; Beta Beta State, Hawaii; Alpha Rho State, Oregon; and several others began to publish books on their Pioneer Teachers, Alpha Kappa State members again raised the question concerning the *Pioneer Women Teachers of Connecticut*.

State President Josephine Bree appointed Hannah Griswold, chairman of the committee, to be assisted by Helen Hogan, Harriet Foley, and Helen M. Sheldrick, the editor, with Josephine Bree serving in an *eff-officio* capacity.

The committee decided to divide the book into three sections: Early Pioneers, Pioneers, and Living Pioneers. The complete manuscript now at the Dowd Printers, Winsted, contains the biographies of twenty-three Connecticut Women Pioneers in Education and it is expected it will run about 350 pages. The copy is written in an informal style by the members of Alpha Kappa State who either knew these Pioneers personally or were well-acquainted with their relatives or descendants.

Two of the Pioneers are direct descendants of early settlers of Connecticut who with the Reverend Thomas Hooker journeyed down the Pioneer Valley Trail to settle Hartford in 1636. Miss Ellen Hubbell of Bristol, and Mrs. Mary Mather Hooker of Hartford can claim this honor. Miss Sarah Pierce wrote her own textbooks and founded the first institution in the United States for the higher education of women, in Litchfield, in 1792. Miss Catherine Beecher, who attended that school, founded a similar school for young ladies known as the Hartford Seminary. Emma Willard who also founded a school for girls, was forced by the mothers to paste heavy brown paper over pictures of the heart, arteries, and veins to "preserve the girls' modesty and frequent agitations". Prudence Crandall established the first school for Negro girls in Canterbury in 1833. Fannie Smith founded the first kindergarten in Bridgeport. Dr. Marietta Kies was the first woman to receive a doctoral degree in Philosophy, 1889, at the University of Michigan; Dr. Alice Hamilton was the first woman to be permitted to attend classes at the University of Leipzig, Germany, provided she did not make herself "conspicuous". And back to Mrs. Mary Hooker, the mayor of Hartford's wife, she has the distinction of being the first woman to speak in the House after being elected to the Connecticut Legislature in 1921. These are only a few of the highlights achieved by the Pioneer Women Teachers of Connecticut whose lives represent a continued service to the state and cover a period of over 200 years of active service.

But, if there is one thing which the book proves, it is that education has come a long way since the days when a member of the local school board counted out the sticks of wood to be burned in the cast iron stove during the week for Miss Ellen Porter Hub-

bell, for these are the women who have been the trail blazers.

TRIBUTE TO JOE HEAVEY: EARTHQUAKE HERO SUCCUMBS

HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, one of California veterans' greatest friends died in San Diego, Calif., on February 6, 1972.

He was Joseph F. Heavey, who, just exactly 1 year before his death, performed heroically during the devastating February 9, 1971, earthquake which struck VA's San Fernando Hospital with a loss of 46 patients and employees.

Joe Heavey, who began his distinguished civil service career with VA in 1946, was the acting hospital director at San Fernando at the time of the earthquake.

It was a tragic time and would have been more tragic, except for Joe Heavey. He performed personal acts of heroism, he worked around the clock for several days to help save more patients and employees caught in the debris, he was everywhere where help was needed.

Rescue operations were under his superb direction, and the phrase, "uncommon dedication," took on a new meaning from his efforts. He was tireless in his efforts following the earthquake. He was everywhere at the site, helping and directing the evacuation and transfer of patients, the treatment of the injured, and the recovery of bodies.

His sure hand was effectively evident in the immediate post-earthquake days in helping to bring order and cohesion in taking care of patients and employees, and in arranging hundreds of procedural remedies so that the job of caring for sick and disabled veterans could go on.

Joe Heavey received the highest honor the Veterans' Administration can award. Administrator of Veterans Affairs Donald E. Johnson presented him with VA's Exceptional Service Award with Gold Medal. At the time of the presentation, Mr. Johnson said:

Joe Heavey has the rare quality of personal dedication, and service to veterans has been his guiding principle for 25 years. I am proud that he is a member of the VA family.

At the time of the earthquake, Joe Heavey was himself recovering from a heart attack. Yet he gave of himself in a totally unselfish way without regard to his own precarious health. I cannot help believe that Joe Heavey's heroism shortened his own life. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Hospitals of the Veterans Affairs Committee and a Californian, I know I speak for all members of the committee and the entire Senate in paying special tribute to this highly dedicated, truly brave man. We are all lessened by his passing, and we mourn his tragic death.

NAMIBIA: RACE ISSUES SIMMER IN REMOTE TROUBLE SPOT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Namibia—South-West Africa—is administered by the Republic of South Africa even though its 1920 League of Nations Mandate has been revoked by the United Nations. Frederic Hunter, a staff correspondent of the *Christian Science Monitor*, has written an excellent article examining the present political situation in Namibia. This appeared in the *Monitor*, March 1, 1972. An article by Peter Youngusband was printed in the March 6 issue of *Washington Post*. It, too, provided a good look at Namibia and at U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim's trip to South Africa. I insert both articles in the RECORD.

SOUTH-WEST AFRICA: RACE ISSUES SIMMER IN REMOTE TROUBLE SPOT

(NOTE.—South Africa has administered South-West Africa under a League of Nations mandate since 1920. Last year that mandate was revoked by the World Court—a decision which helped spark a political awakening among the area's nonwhites. Now, with the forthcoming visit of UN Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim, observers are wondering what the next act will be in a little-known but important race-relations drama involving the UN and South Africa.)

(By Frederic Hunter)

WINDHOEK, SOUTH-WEST AFRICA.—South-West Africa is one of the world's remotest regions, a broad expanse of dry, sparsely populated, desertlike flatland broken by occasional hills. It is the last place one would expect to find news of global significance.

But important things are happening here.

And the coming visit to South-West Africa by United Nations Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim could well bring them to a climax.

His visit could also pave the way for an eventual settlement of the long-standing UN-South African dispute over this territory—although the history of that dispute offers bleak prospects for a settlement.

MANDATE RIGHTS MAINTAINED

South Africa maintains its right to a 1920 mandate over the territory, bestowed by the League of Nations and since revoked by the United Nations. A settlement would almost certainly involve long, detailed negotiations which the UN might still eventually reject.

But there appears to be greater flexibility in the South African position than is generally supposed. Whether this appearance translates into reality remains to be seen.

Settlement of the South-West dispute would undoubtedly lead to dismantling the more onerous examples of white exploitation of blacks.

The Ovambo (black) compound in Katutura Township outside Windhoek is one such example. This compound symbolizes the worst aspects of South Africa's presence in South-West Africa.

Katutura has played an important role in sparking the political awakening and economic rebellion of the territory's nonwhite peoples.

Looking like a prisoner-of-war camp, the Ovambo compound is enclosed by high brick walls with shards of glass embedded in the top. Conditions like these led 13,000 Ovambo contract workers to strike in mid-December,

crippling South-West White Africa's economy.

SLAVERY COMPARISON

South-West's contract-labor system has been likened to slavery. Contracts range from 12 to 18 months during which workers are separated from their families.

Pay is low. Employers and white administration officials insist that few workers receive just the minimum legal wage of 30 South African cents (about 45 cents U.S.) per day. But at least some receive no more than that.

Moreover, employer attitudes are clear. There is, for example, the view of J. P. Ratledge, general manager of the Tsummer Corporation, in which 58 percent of the shares are owned by two American firms, Newmont Mining and American Metal Climax.

In a telephone interview, Mr. Ratledge commented: "I do not subscribe to the attitude that if a company—by its initiative, skills, and so on—makes big profits, it's necessary to distribute them to labor."

It is not yet entirely clear exactly what sparked the black labor strike. In a customary reaction, the South African Government has blamed foreign agitators and meddling clerics.

But most observers who have been to South-West Africa, talked to nonwhites and their spokesmen, and seen the nonwhite labor conditions regard this view as an indulgence in wishful thinking.

On-the-spot observations suggest that labor grievances themselves sparked the strike—combined with a series of catalytic events stimulating nonwhite political awareness.

Among the grievances are low wages, bad living and working conditions, strained employer-employee relations, inability to change jobs freely, and long periods of separation from families.

Further, the system itself is a grievance. It has tended to treat the Ovambos as mere labor units whose youth and strength could be exploited for the increase of white wealth.

SETTLEMENT SOUGHT

The South African Government moved to settle the strike in mid-January. But, it did so in a manner consistent with its overall Bantustan (black homelands) policy by negotiating an agreement with its own appointed Ovamboland Legislative Council (OLC).

The agreement resembled an international treaty. At no time did the South African Government or the white employers actually negotiate with the black strikers.

Yet the new agreement does offer some substantial improvements on the former contract system. It transfers labor recruiting operations to the OLC.

This marks a progressive step—even though the strikers reject the council as their legitimate bargaining agent. Under the earlier recruiting system, an organization controlled by employers handled all recruiting functions, including determination of wages.

Under the new system, a contract worker now may change jobs outside Ovamboland without being forced to return home and without liability to criminal prosecution for leaving his original employer.

But the new system ignores basic worker grievances. It initiates no tangible moves toward bettering living conditions or permitting families to accompany workers.

It gives Ovambos no effective bargaining power with employers. Ovambos must approach employers individually while employer groups can organize—and have done so—to keep wages at a low level.

Despite South African Government claims to the contrary, it is not yet clear that the new agreement has, in fact, solved the labor problem. The government claims that more than 6,000 workers from South-West's north-

ern territories have taken jobs since the settlement. That is less than half the total number of strikers.

But no agreement would settle the Ovambo strike—if it sought exclusively to resolve labor grievances.

The strike is most significantly a political act. It has triggered extensive political activity inside Ovamboland by men who oppose the OLC's exclusive hold on political decisionmaking.

To control the potentially explosive situation, the South African Government has reinforced its police and military units in Ovamboland. Clashes between police and political activities have resulted in the death of at least eight Ovambos. In early February, the South African Government placed Ovamboland under what amounts to emergency regulations.

A political awakening has also occurred outside Ovamboland. It has taken the form of growing contacts between the territory's various indigenous peoples. In November and mid-February conferences were held in Rehoboth, 50 miles south of here.

At the first conference, the territory's non-white peoples affirmed their common desire for an independent South-West Africa. In February they discussed federal forms of government by which they would jointly rule the territory.

Even with these new disruptive factors, it is UN Secretary-General Waldheim's visit that possesses the real potential to bring change to the territory. The visit springs from a Security Council mandate requesting Dr. Waldheim to make contact with the South African Government about its equivocal position in South-West.

The Waldheim visit is generally regarded in South Africa as coming at an inopportune time. Nonetheless, the official position is that the republic has "nothing to hide" in South-West Africa. Indeed, it considers Ovamboland itself a showpiece of enlightened development.

It seems clear that South Africa had more to lose by withholding an invitation to Dr. Waldheim than by extending one. According to prominent Afrikaner Nationalist editor Piet Cillie, the visit should at least produce a "lowering of temperatures" between the UN and South Africa.

Hopes are expressed in Cape Town, where the South African Parliament now is meeting, that Dr. Waldheim will act in the European tradition of a civil servant, coming to the republic without the political preconceptions which South Africans generally ascribe to his predecessor U Thant.

Some observers believe that South Africa possesses little room to maneuver on the South-West issue. They regard the territory as vital to South Africa's defense. They argue that South-West Africa provides the republic's heartland with a sizable buffer under South African control. It also offers South Africa a territory on which to maintain forward military bases close to the black-ruled north.

CREDIBILITY FACTORS

These are considered important factors lending credibility to the South African Government's campaign to emphasize the threat posed by the African liberation movements and the Communist Chinese presence in Tanzania and Zambia.

Some analysts believe that South Africa could not afford to make concessions over the physical control of South-West Africa until at least Zambia and Zaïre proved themselves neutral in terms of South Africa's position on the continent.

Some observers contend that concessions to the UN over the physical control of South-West would lead to the downfall of South African Prime Minister John Vorster. His popularity has already waned due to economic difficulties and his failure to pursue a coherent race-relations policy.

But other analysts, including government officials both here and in the republic, see possibilities for compromise.

There is a surprising amount of speculative talk—much of it on a "don't-quote-me" basis about means by which the South-West impasse could be overcome.

Although difficult to evaluate, this talk suggests that more basis for compromise exists than is generally supposed. Indeed, according to analysts in South Africa, the republic and the UN are agreed on the principle of self-determination for South-West.

But the two differ on approach. The UN favors self-determination for the territory as a geographical unit. South Africa espouses self-determination for the territory's individual population groups.

This latter approach deserves particular consideration in a vast, sparsely populated, desertlike territory like South-West. South African analysts claim. They emphasize that the costs of establishing and maintaining an effective administration over so large an area, populated by less than 1 million people, could be considerable.

This is especially true, they stress, when one considers that the ethnic and cultural differences between the population groups suggests a potential for serious conflict if the territory achieves independence as a geographical unit.

OPEN-MINDED OUTLOOK

South African spokesmen give the impression that their government would open-mindedly consider any proposals which sought to resolve the South-West problem "on the basis of the factual situation and of practicalities."

One official notes that South Africa has felt for some time that a useful purpose would be served if "you could sit around a table and look at the South-West situation coldly."

Speculative talk repeatedly returns to the possible revival of a partition plan suggested by the UN Good Offices Committee in 1958. The plan envisages dividing South-West Africa into two roughly equal parts by creating a border along the 22nd parallel.

South Africa would surrender control of the northern territory to the UN. This contains most of the areas presently designated as Bantustans for the Ovambos (population: 342,000), Okavangos (50,000), Hereros (49,000), Damaras (65,000) and others. Such a surrender would constitute a major concession by South Africa.

The future of the southern territory thus created remains less clear. It would include virtually all South-West's white population, some 90,000 persons.

Since the whites outnumber the other main southern groups, the Coloreds (28,000), the Namas (33,000) and the Rehoboth Basters (16,000), their self-determination objectives could not be ignored.

The whites might well desire links with or incorporation into the republic. Other arrangements could be made, however, including continued South African control by virtue of either a fixed or indefinite extension of the mandate.

POLITICAL ROADBLOCKS

While the basis for compromise may exist, practical political problems reduce the likelihood of its actually taking shape.

Both sides in the dispute—South Africa and the UN's Afro-Asian bloc—approach the problem from fairly rigid positions. Both justify their stances from standpoints of legality and morality.

In supporting a partition-plan compromise, both sides would open themselves to sustained criticism. It could undermine their positions, even trigger unsought political change.

There must be serious doubt about the South African Government's ability to educate its Afrikaner constituency to accept

such a concession if the government were actually willing to offer it.

There is also serious question about the willingness of South Africa's more outspoken opponents to accept a compromise which might place the republic in a favorable light.

But gradual steps toward a compromise might eventually defuse a nagging world trouble spot. They would almost certainly foster better black-white relations on the continent.

That, in turn, would improve the prospects of both black-African development and white-African survival.

WALDHEIM TO TACKLE NAMIBIA PROBLEMS

(By Peter Younghusband)

CAPE TOWN, SOUTH AFRICA, March 5.—U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim arrives in South Africa Monday for a close-up look at one of the world organization's most prolonged and emotional issues—the 25-year-old wrangle by Afro-Asian nations to wrest the trust territory of Southwest Africa away from South African control.

Waldheim's arrival coincides with the Southwest African problem reaching a new crescendo of bitterness. The territory (called Namibia by the United Nations) faces industrial chaos as the result of labor unrest which has affected the rich fishing and mining industries.

Among the hardest hit are copper mines at Tsumeb, about 200 miles from the Southwest African capital of Windhoek, which are largely owned by the American Newmont Mining Corporation.

Ovamboland, the northernmost and most populous region of the territory, is in a state of near rebellion as dissatisfied strikers sent home from the industrial areas further south spread their discontent.

The South African government has flown in police reinforcements and troops to maintain order in the area, but eight Ovambos have died in recent clashes with police patrols.

The Anglican bishop in Southwest Africa, the Rt. Rev. Colin O'Brien Winter, his secretary David de Beer and a local priest, the Rev. Stephen Hayes, have had deportation orders served on them by the South African government, which alleges that they have helped to incite the strikes and the Ovambo uprising.

Hotly denying the charges, Bishop Winter intends to petition Waldheim immediately on his arrival in Cape Town with claims that the unrest in Southwest Africa is due entirely to the oppression and injustices of the South African government's racial segregation policy.

It is now Waldheim's unenviable task to probe this maelstrom.

Southwest Africa, a little larger than the state of Texas, has a sparse population of only 700,000. Of these about 70,000 are whites. The Ovambos (population 350,000) are the largest indigenous tribe and provide most of the territory's industrial and farm labor.

Other ethnic groupings include the Kavan-gos, Damaras, Hereros, Namas—and a tempestuous half-breed community, about 16,000 strong who rejoice in the name of the "re-boboth bastards."

Southwest Africa was a German colony until World War I when occupied by South African troops. Trusteeship of the territory was then granted to South Africa by the old League of Nations.

South Africa has continued to administer the territory ever since, refusing to relinquish control to the United Nations which it does not recognize as the legal and logical successor to the League of Nations where Southwest Africa is concerned.

Incensed at the fact that the South African government extends its apartheid race ideology to Southwest Africa, the Afro-Asian bloc at the United Nations has long called for South Africa's expulsion from the territory and for it to become the independent state of Namibia. The General Assembly approved a resolution calling for South Africa's expulsion from the territory in 1966.

Last year these demands were heavily underlined by a World Court advisory opinion that South Africa's continued presence in the trust territory was illegal.

The South African government clings to its mandate to control the territory for two important reasons. One is that Southwest Africa is fabulously rich in diamonds, copper and other minerals, has a strong cattle industry and its coastline possesses one of the world's biggest and richest fishing grounds.

The other reason is purely a strategic one: The handing over of Southwest Africa to U.N. control and allowing it to become, ultimately, an independent black-governed state would expose South Africa's flank to a 1,500-mile border across which African nationalist liberation movements could launch guerrilla attacks.

The government claims, in fact, that African nationalist political organizations, with support from the Anglican and Lutheran churches, are behind the mass strike over the Christmas period by 13,000 Ovambo workers and the more recent strife in Ovamboland.

The South African government points out, too, that it has poured millions of dollars into the development of Ovamboland and the other tribal homelands in its own recipe of bringing the nonwhite peoples to independence—by the creation of several mini-states based on their ethnic and territorial groupings.

But the government has also admitted that the main grievance stated by the strikers—the migratory labor contract system by which they are recruited and employed—held sufficient injustice to merit their walk-out.

Under this system some laborers have been paid as little as \$5.22 and \$2.12 a week, provided with inadequate food and housing and not permitted to bring their families with them to their place of work.

The government has taken steps to improve these conditions, but not yet to the satisfaction of all the strikers. Although most of the 13,000 have returned to work, industrial unrest continues.

Waldheim's visit was authorized by the U.N. Security Council session held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, last month. His mandate was: "to initiate contacts with all parties concerned with a view to enabling the people of Southwest Africa to exercise their right to self-determination and independence."

The secretary general has no illusions as to the difficulty of the task ahead of him. Before leaving New York he said: "A majority of states have voted to remove South African control over the mandated territory. It is clear that one cannot solve such a difficult question in a few days, but I hope we can make progress."

South Africa's Premier John Vorster announced his willingness to receive Waldheim in Cape Town to discuss "the self-determination of the non-white peoples" and to allow him to proceed to Southwest Africa.

He added: "However, if he wants to come to South Africa to act as the mouthpiece of the extremists of the Organization of African Unity and others, and to put across resolutions taken in that connection, he will still be very courteously received by us, but I can tell him in advance that he will be wasting his time."

JOHN KEMP, A SUCCESS DESPITE MULTIPLE HANDICAPS

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I was real pleased and interested to read a feature story in the Washington Daily News of March 1 about a very good friend of mine, Mr. John Kemp, formerly of Bismarck, N. Dak.

The story dealt with Johnny's remarkable accomplishments despite the fact that he is a congenital quadruple amputee. This young man, who was the National Easter Seal Child in 1960, when still living in Bismarck, has refused to let these multiple handicaps keep him from making a career for himself. He is currently a student in the School of Law at Washburn University, Topeka, Kans.

Mr. President, Johnny Kemp is one of the nicest and most personable young men I have ever known. He accomplishes more with his handicaps than most people who have no handicaps. He cannot help being a tremendous inspiration, not only to handicapped people, but to everyone who comes to know him. I have followed his career with great pride ever since he was a young boy. He was president of his high school class and vice president of the 1971 graduating class of Georgetown University before entering law school. He is also the youngest member of the board of directors of the National Easter Seal Society and is currently serving as chairman of their national youth action committee. These are but some of the things Johnny Kemp does as he conquers what would be an insurmountable problem for most people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

A HEADSTRONG REJECTION OF HANDICAP

(By Nancy Roberts)

When John Kemp was born without arms or legs, a doctor advised his parents to take him home, place him in a basket, and make him as comfortable as possible for the rest of his life.

Fortunately they chose to disregard this bit of advice. And because they did, John Kemp has accomplished more in 22 years than many of his peers. Today he uses his mind rather than his body.

Vice president of the 1971 graduating class of Georgetown University, he was also president of his high school senior class. Now studying law at a mid-western university, he's also the youngest board member in the 53-year history of the National Easter Seal Society.

Prime mover in the success story of this young man is his father, who convinced him that despite being a congenital quadruple amputee, he was not handicapped. Fitted with artificial arms at age 2 and artificial legs at age 3, John is convinced there are not absolute limits to his abilities. He can't manage a conventional ice cream cone, but, loving sports, he throws a great fast ball and learned early to catch a baseball well. Tying

a necktie is one of his biggest problems, but he was marble champ of his block in Bismarck, North Dakota, and operated one of the largest paper routes in his community. Altho he never could manage to ride a bicycle, he now skillfully drives an automobile.

While his personal achievements in adapting his condition to everyday situations are outstanding, so are his efforts to help people. He was named "National Easter Seal Child" in 1960 and followed up his tour by serving as a page at the World Congress of the International Society for the Rehabilitation of the Disabled.

In December, 1970, he served as a delegate from Kansas to the White House Conference on Youth, and at the Youth Committee of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

His most recent efforts to help the handicapped center around galvanizing the youth of the nation to help those who are less fortunate. Toward this goal, he is serving as chairman of the Easter Seals National Youth Action Committee of which he is a very active charter member.

EVILS OF FORCED BUSING BEING EXPOSED—JUDICIARY COMMITTEE CONTINUES HEARINGS ON ISSUE

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, "quality education" is being used as a favorite smokescreen by politicians who support forced busing, but are afraid to face the wrath of public resentment being registered against this form of tyranny.

The real truth is that improved quality of education is not involved. Every educator who is honest about it knows that the quality of public education is deteriorating, because of this monstrous policy of dragging schoolchildren away from their local schools, often located across the streets from their homes, and forcing them to be transported long distances on the invalid and unsupported theory that by some magic they will absorb more education by being mixed with youngsters who happen to be of a different race, religion or color.

How utterly absurd can they get? Experience refutes this strange theory. I am convinced American parents are unimpressed. Only the naive, the uninformed, and the gullible will be fooled by this crude display of duplicity.

A subcommittee on the judiciary is currently holding hearings on a proposed constitutional amendment which would outlaw forced busing and at the same time restore the traditional integrity of the neighborhood school in this country. Under leave to extend my remarks I include testimony I recently presented to that committee:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE O. C. FISHER

Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to testify in behalf of proposals which would amend the Constitution by providing that no public school student shall be assigned to or required to attend, or forbidden to attend, a particular school because of his race, creed, color, or economic class.

I would hope the resolution, if and when reported by this committee, will make crystal clear this prohibition shall be binding on all federal agencies, bureaus, departments, and courts.

Because of the projection of the forced

busing concept, we face in this country an anomalous situation, which has become too intolerable for the people to bear. Every national and local poll I have seen, including the Gallup poll, confirms the fact that some 80 percent of all Americans are opposed to this form of tyranny—and they demand, and are entitled to have, something done about it.

Mr. Chairman, as you well know, there has been a lot of side-stepping and double-talk on this issue. There are those who say, "Yes, of course, I'm against busing, but this is not the way to do it." Another one says, "I'm against busing, unless it's done to provide 'quality' education."

Now, these excuses are invalid. They are used by those who are apparently afraid to take a firm stand on the issue and are unwilling to do something about it. They blow hot and cold at the same time. So often we hear the voice of Esau but we see the hand of Jacob. We have reached the point where you are either for or against the forced busing concept period. In my opinion the American people are in no mood to accept phony excuses.

If a particular school is below the educational standard of another school located 10 miles away, the answer is not in buying a bus, hiring a driver, and hauling a bunch of the children to the more favored school, and vice versa. The answer and the only proper answer lies in actions to improve the standards of the school which may be deficient in some respect.

The fact is that forced busing is for one purpose only—not to improve educational opportunities but for racial mixture purposes. Indeed there is much evidence that the forced busing lends itself to the lowering of educational standards, along with other undesirable effects.

Busing has nothing to do with neighborhood integration; we already have that. Today no child is denied admittance to any public school because of that child's race, creed, or color.

When you talk about taking children out of their neighborhood schools and forcing them to travel 10, or even 20 miles, you are tinkering with the health and safety of those youngsters. You are striking a blow at a basic American freedom. You are attacking the neighborhood school concept, so dear to the hearts of all Americans, regardless of race. You are undermining the integrity of the public school system in this country.

Mr. Chairman, forced busing has become not only a national issue but a national scandal. Busing costs money—vast amounts of money—money that should be used for educational purposes, and to improve any schools that need it for that purpose. The courts have made it clear that the only real and permanent answer to this problem is a constitutional amendment—unless, of course, this committee should prefer legislation to limit the jurisdiction of the courts as applied to pupil assignments.

I am confident this committee will recognize the urgency of this matter and will proceed to report a resolution which will allow every member of the House to vote on it—one way or another. Surely it is recognized that the American people are entitled to this consideration.

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE
LESLIE ARENDS AT 12TH ANNUAL AMERICAN LEGION CONGRESSIONAL BANQUET

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on March 1, 1972, the Honorable LESLIE C.

ARENDS, of Illinois, spoke before the American Legion's 12th Annual Congressional Banquet. I am very much impressed by his remarks and would like to bring his speech to the attention of the Senate.

Representative ARENDS and I are active members of the American Legion. Because of his vantage point, he can well appreciate the flexible legislative programs which the Legion has evolved, year after year, to meet the changing conditions and needs of our country. The Legion, through its various proposals, have done much for a better understanding and appreciation of what it means to be an American. This is particularly true at local community levels where our veterans' problems must be approached.

In the words of Representative ARENDS:

Of course America is not perfect. Perfection means completed, and we have only begun. We will always be striving for a better tomorrow for all Americans.

I stand with Representative ARENDS that to be an American is not a right, but a privilege. Further, it is an obligation that goes hand in hand with citizenship and should be borne with honor. These interesting remarks deserve the attention of Congress.

Representative ARENDS is looked upon as one of the most distinguished statesmen in our country today. He has served in the House of Representatives for 37 years and has an outstanding record. He is a credit not only to his constituents but to the entire Nation. As a man of great ability and staunch character, he is courageous in his actions and truly a great American.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

REMARKS BY HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

I cannot possibly convey to you how proud I am to have been selected by such an outstanding organization as The American Legion for this coveted distinguished public service award.

When I consider the national stature and prestige of The American Legion, and the contribution you have made for the preservation and promotion of our American ideals of liberty and justice...

And, when I consider the nature and extent of the service rendered by those previously honored with this award—I am made humble in my pride. I wish I could be as worthy.

To have my name inscribed in this manner on the public service "honor roll" of The American Legion is much more meaningful to me personally than you realize. What makes it so meaningful is that I would not have become a Member of Congress, much less be standing here this evening, had it not been for the vigorous, tireless support I received from Legionnaires and the Ladies of the Auxiliaries when I first ran for Congress.

As a World War I veteran I had been active in Legion affairs and was privileged to serve as the District Commander in my area. In the 1934 Congressional election it was suggested that I become a candidate for the Republican nomination for the seat in Congress then held by a Democrat.

I had never been a candidate for public office. I was young and inexperienced and had meager financial resources. My home was in one of the smallest towns in the smallest county in the District. Relatively few, except

for my Legion comrades, thought I had much of a chance.

But we took that chance! And, thanks to the tireless efforts of the Legionnaires and thanks to the persistent efforts of their Ladies, I won the Republican nomination by the slim margin of less than 500 votes and went on to win a seat in Congress.

The honor you bestow upon me this evening thus has special significance to me. It was my friends in The American Legion of the 17th District of Illinois who launched me on my Congressional career. Receiving this award means to me that I have not betrayed the confidence they first placed in me as a fellow Legionnaire many years ago.

I must say that I have had no regrets to have made service in the Congress my life work. It has for me been a rewarding experience, and by that I do not mean financially. While the demands are great, I can think of nothing more stimulating and more satisfying than being a spokesman for the people you represent and having a voice, however small, in your country's destiny.

But service in the Congress is not without its frustrations and disappointments, and I suspect I have had more than most Members. You will know what I mean—and I hope sympathetically—when I remind you that during my nineteen consecutive terms since 1935 only two of them have been in Republican controlled Congresses.

Needless to say, over the years I have been well acquainted with the legislative programs of The American Legion as they evolved, year by year, to meet changing conditions and circumstances, and presented to the respective Congresses. No one could be more aware of the long continual fight you have waged, and continue to wage, for the welfare of our deserving veterans and their dependents.

Nor can anyone be more appreciative than I of all that you have accomplished.

The accomplishments of The American Legion go beyond making certain that we, as a Nation of free people, discharge our obligation to those who sacrificed in defense of our freedom. Through various programs, particularly at the local community level, you have done much for a better understanding and a deeper appreciation of what it means to be an American.

To be an American is not a right, either by birth or by acquisition. It is a privilege. It is more than that. It is a life-long obligation to an ideal, with duties and responsibilities. To wear the uniform of the United States is an honor.

This is the doctrine which The American Legion has enunciated since its inception 53 years ago. And this will be the doctrine upon which I will evaluate any proposal of amnesty for those who evaded military service. When our distinguished American Legion Commander testified this morning on amnesty legislation before the Kennedy Subcommittee on the Senate Judiciary Committee he expressed my views, and I am sure yours, when he said that this is not the time to be considering amnesty for draft evaders when our American boys are held as prisoners-of-war and when our boys are still fighting in Vietnam and there is no peace.

And to those who persist in pointing out what is wrong with America, ignoring all that is right with America, I would say: of course, America is not perfect. Perfection means completed, and we have only begun. We will always be striving for a better tomorrow for all Americans.

What of this better tomorrow for which we are striving. It would not be worth the living—however well-fed, well-clothed, well-housed and well-educated we all may be—if we are not safe and secure in our freedom. As President Nixon stated in his recent "State of the Union" address: "There could be no more misguided priorities than one which would tempt others by weakening America,

and thereby endanger the peace of the world."

It is written in the Good Book, "What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul." We might ask our liberal friends who complain so vigorously about defense expenditures when there are so many social needs, "What would the American people have profited if every social need is met, and we lose our own freedom."

We recognize there are many social needs to be met and there are budgetary limitations on what the Federal Government can do to meet these needs. We are realistic enough to recognize that expenditures for social programs have much more popular appeal than expenditures for national defense.

And, I might add, we also understand the realities of politics, particularly in an election year.

This may explain, but it does not justify, the attacks some of our social planners—in and out of Congress—have been making in our defense budget. It would be no exaggeration to say that some of them would have us disarm unilaterally to make more funds available for social purposes. I have yet to hear any of them advocate an increase in taxes to meet what they consider to be neglected needs.

All of us recognize there are these social needs. I have supported programs to meet those needs.

All that I ask—and all that The American Legion has ever advocated—is that a sufficient portion of our national resources—a sufficient portion, no more and no less—be committed to our national defense to assure our freedom.

Let us take a look for a moment at this defense budget that they consider so excessive.

The fact is, for the first time in 20 years defense spending has been brought below the level of human resources spending.

The fact is, the new budget for next fiscal year allocates, for the first time, more money to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare than to the Department of Defense.

The fact is, our defense spending in the current fiscal year has fallen to 7 percent of our gross national product and will be down to 6.4 in fiscal year 1973, compared to 9.5 percent in 1968.

The fact is, there has already been a re-ordering of the priorities, and there should be no higher priority than our country's safety and security.

Those are the facts, and yet the social planners complain. They try to create the impression that we are under the insidious influence of a military-industrial complex, whatever that is. The mere fact that 60 percent of our defense budget represents personnel costs belies any influence by a mythical military-industrial complex for unnecessary weapons procurement.

In considering the size of our defense budget it should be borne in mind that we have entered upon a costly program for phasing out the draft and the establishment of an all-volunteer force. A recruit, for example, with less than one year of service received \$78 a month in July of 1963. As of January of this year his pay became \$288 a month, and this does not include numerous fringe benefits.

Our program for the establishment of an all-volunteer force is expensive. But it is what the American people want, and the American people must be prepared to pay the price.

It may be that in raising the level of pay of recruits and young servicemen to comparability with private employment we will still not get an all-volunteer force. Even if we do not, to pay comparable salaries to our servicemen is, in my judgment, the only fair and equitable thing to do. It is something

we should have done a long time ago. If we are going to be in a position of requiring some men to be subject to a draft, we do not want to be also in a position of forcing them to accept unjustly low pay because of that draft.

It should also be borne in mind that inflation has had a tremendous impact on the size of the defense budget in terms of dollars.

Like everything else, a gun, a ship, an airplane, a tank and all other weapons, cost more than three or four years ago. In terms of constant dollars—that is making allowance for inflation—our defense budget is 30 percent less than for fiscal year 1968, which was the wartime peak and 8 percent less than the 1964 prewar level.

There is no denying that a defense budget of \$83.5 billion is a tremendous sum. But I am confident the vast majority of the American taxpayers are willing to bear this burden as long as it is necessary for our country's security, and provided we get a dollar's worth of defense for each dollar expended.

In a "State of the World Report" President Nixon said: "It is essential that the United States maintain a military force sufficient to protect our interests and meet our commitments."

The measure of sufficiency is not the number of dollars we spend annually on our defense establishment. The measure is whether it is sufficient to ensure the continued safety and security of our country and to maintain peace. Our objective is not to make war, but to deter war.

In keeping with this objective, the size and nature of our national defense is necessarily dictated by the nature of the world in which we live, by the threat and potential threats we face.

The size and nature of our national defense is also dictated by our treaty commitments and by what our allies contribute to our mutual security.

I am constrained to add parenthetically that in my opinion our allies have been contributing all too little and we have been over-committed.

It is on these premises—not what the military might like to have, be it Army, Navy or Air Force; nor what industry might want, be it aerospace or shipbuilding; nor what any of the Presidential aspirants may advocate, be he hawk or dove—it is on a basis of actual need that our Committee on Armed Services makes its evaluation of our defense posture and a determination of what should be authorized.

Our Committee is currently engaged in making such an inquiry into our defense needs. And in this connection I should like for you to know that I have always been proud of the non-partisan manner in which our Committee has dealt with all matters pertaining to our national defense.

This has been, and continues to be, our Committee policy, whoever is President and whatever the political complexion of the Congress.

It is hardly necessary to tell you that Soviet Russia continues to be the principal threat to our national security and to the maintenance of peace. But I do not believe the American people are fully aware how grave that threat has become. In the field of nuclear arms Soviet Russia has caught up with us. Their development and deployment of strategic nuclear weapons has been faster than we anticipated.

In testifying before our Committee a couple of weeks ago, Secretary of Defense Laird said something to which I am sure we would all subscribe to:

"The American people may perhaps be willing to accept parity in regard to the deployment of strategic nuclear weapons; but, in my view, they will never accept a position of inferiority."

As we all have known, Soviet Russia is far ahead of us in total number of submarines and has been engaged for several years in a large ship-construction program. We, however, have placed great reliance on our lead in a ballistic-missile type submarine, such as the Polaris. Last year we estimated that the Soviet ballistic-missile submarine force will probably not equal ours until 1974. We now find that they will equal our ballistic-missile submarine force next year and by the end of the year could have a force larger than ours.

We are building no new ballistic-missile submarines.

We cannot permit Soviet Russia to gain control of the seas and to have such nuclear strategic superiority as to be able to blackmail us. It is imperative that we maintain a strategic sufficiency as a deterrent to this growing threat. And above all, it is imperative that we maintain a technological superiority.

Many of the weapons systems Soviet Russia is now producing are the product of its stepped up research and development efforts. As Defense Secretary Laird stated before our Committee, "The USSR has now reached a position where—unless we take appropriate action—there could be new surprises and new 'sputniks'."

You will recall how shocked we were and how panicky we became when Russia launched its "Sputnik" in 1957.

It is because of this threat that the President has recommended an increase in defense spending, with the emphasis on research and development that we can maintain technological superiority. We are determined to have now, and in the future, a national defense of such size and nature that no one dare risk an attack on us. To be safe and secure in our freedom and maintain peace is our sole objective. Our military strength is our guardian.

But we all recognize that a peace based solely on the off-setting military might of great powers is an uncertain one, and a costly one. We seek a peace founded on better understandings, mutual respect and mutual trust and an end to the cold war.

That was the purpose of our President's historic trip to China where, after more than 20 years of isolation and hostility, he has brought about better understandings between two peoples of different ideologies. He has paved the way for future accords.

We pray that his forthcoming trip to Russia will be as successful a journey for peace.

For my part I am proud of our President. Mark you that I say our President, for he is the President of all of us, he has given new direction to our foreign policy. He is bringing an honorable end to the war in Vietnam that the sacrifices made there will not have been entirely in vain. He has emphasized in 1969 that while we will honor our treaty commitments, we cannot and will not undertake all the defense world.

These past three years have been years of transition: from an era of containment and confrontation to an era of conciliation and negotiation.

Our defense plans depend upon our foreign policy. One implements and supplements the other. Both relate to our national security. The President is also Commander-in-Chief of all our armed forces.

With this separation of powers, as between the President and the Congress, it logically follows that it is imperative there be maximum cooperation between the two, whoever is the President and whatever the political complexion of the Congress. It is my view that politics should stop at the water's edge. And it is my view that at no time should partisan considerations enter into our decisions with respect to foreign policy or with respect to our national defense.

If we are to achieve a generation of peace for which we aspire, it is essential that we

give our President the maximum cooperation and support. And it is essential that we make certain that we have a national defense second to none. As President Nixon said in his "State of the Union" Address, "Strong military defenses are not the enemy of peace. They are the guardians of peace."

Let the world know that while the American people love peace, want peace and will work tirelessly for peace, we love freedom even more. I commend you, The American Legion, for your own tireless efforts in behalf of the peace we love and the freedom we cherish even more. In receiving this award at your hands I am both proud and humble. I pledge my best efforts to prove myself worthy.

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD'S DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVICE RECORD

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, for more than 24 years I have had the pleasure to serve in the House with the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD). During those years I have at all times found him to be fair in his dealings with his colleagues, forceful and well-prepared in debate and diligent in meeting his committee responsibilities. It is apparent as well that his efforts have been approved by the people of his 19th Congressional District in California.

Because of his moderate but progressive approach to issues, Congressman HOLIFIELD holds the respect of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. He is a man of principle and commitment, and his commitments are as good as his word. He has also refused to "soapbox" issues of fleeting but popular appeal, preferring to work in areas of less glamor but much greater importance to the Nation. His contribution in the field of nuclear energy will come to be recognized, in my opinion, as "statesmanlike" in the classic sense of the word.

Congressman HOLIFIELD is the dean of the California congressional delegation, which will be the largest State delegation in Congress in 1973—45 members. This prestigious position has been held by only a handful of men over the years. It is a tribute to a man who has worked hard and long for California and the Nation. These few men like the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) who have made the House the great institution that it is, have made singular contributions to the Nation through their tenure and committee positions. I think it would be fitting at this point in the RECORD to insert a summary of Congressman HOLIFIELD's distinguished public record:

BIOGRAPHY OF CONGRESSMAN CHET HOLIFIELD OF CALIFORNIA: CONGRESSIONAL SERVICE AND COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Congressman Chet Holifield, who represents the 19th Congressional District of California, resides in Montebello, California. He was born in Kentucky, educated in the public schools of Arkansas, and has lived in Montebello, California since 1920. He has been engaged in the retailing of men's clothing for over 40 years. He is a member of the Christian Church and various Fraternal and civic organizations. Chet Holifield, and his popular and

attractive wife, Cam, have four daughters and 15 grandchildren and one great granddaughter.

He was elected to the 78th Congress in 1942 to represent the newly formed 19th Congressional District and has served his constituency continuously since then. He has been re-elected by overwhelming majorities of votes in each of his 15 elections. Because of his 15 terms in Congress, he is in the eighth seniority group in rank. Congressman Holifield's work for his constituents and state has won approval and commendations from substantial organizations such as the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors, city councils, the Metropolitan Water District, and his efforts have been endorsed by countless scientific and civic groups, labor unions, veterans groups, government employees associations, consumer groups and business organizations. His record on behalf of civil liberties for all citizens regardless of race, color, national origin, or creed is unsurpassed.

Congressman Holifield is now serving as Chairman of the important House Committee on Government Operations, and as Chairman of that Committee's subcommittee on Legislation and Military Operations. He served for ten years as Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, and now serves as the ranking House of Representatives Member on that Committee.

An indication of the respect for his integrity and judgment that his colleagues in Congress have for Congressman Holifield, was his appointment by the Speaker of the House to serve on the committee on Congressional ethics, the Committee on Standards of Official conduct.

Congressman Holifield's Committee on Government Operations has for years investigated waste and inefficiency in the Federal Government. As a result of those investigations, Congressman Holifield introduced a bill to establish a blue-ribbon commission of 12 members to make a study of all Federal procurement practices and procedures in order to eliminate waste of the taxpayers' money. That bill became law and Mr. Holifield now serves as Vice-Chairman of the Commission on Government Procurement.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, since its beginning in 1946, Congressman Holifield has been outstandingly active in the field of atomic energy legislation. Hearings that he has held as a member of this committee have developed the most far-reaching information on the effects of radiation on man, the environmental effects of producing electrical power, and the problems of civil defense in case of an atomic war.

Congressman Holifield always has insisted on civilian rather than military control of the atom. He is a constant and vigorous proponent of a strong program of research to develop the peaceful uses of atomic energy including its use as a clean, cheap, non-polluting source of electrical energy. The Congressman has always insisted that the benefits of atomic research and development be safeguarded for the benefit of the private citizens of the United States whose taxes have been invested so heavily in this huge enterprise.

As the Chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations he has been responsible for some of the most important developments in good government over the past century. He authored the legislation which established the General Services Administration, that body which does most of the purchasing for civil departments of Government. The G.S.A. also has custody over all Federal buildings and the disposal of Federal properties.

He served on the Hoover Commission which recommended 45 Presidential reorganization plans, and he helped in the passage of 39 of these plans into law. During the 89th

Congress, Congressman Holifield held hearings and managed a bill which created the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In the 89th Congress he also authored a bill which created the Department of Transportation, another Cabinet-level department. Thus, he became the only Representative in our history to manage legislation creating two Cabinet-level departments in a single Congress. These departments have allowed the Government to modernize itself and keep up with our rapidly changing times.

In 1967 Mr. Holifield managed the President's Reorganization Plan for the District of Columbia, creating a mayor-council form of government, the first major reform of the National Capital's governmental machinery in over 90 years. He has personally handled more than 45 reorganizations plans of the Federal Government, including the Environmental Protection Agency, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Consumer Protection Agency.

Congressman Holifield also authored and obtained passage of a bill which established the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for the Spanish Speaking People within the Office of the President. The purpose of this Committee is to assure that citizens of Spanish speaking origin have access to, and fully share in Federal educational, health and job opportunities programs. The first two directors of the Committee were residents of Los Angeles County.

PUBLIC SERVICE AWARDS AND RECOGNITION

The California Congressional Recognition Plan, a privately endowed, nonprofit educational organization, has cited Congressman Holifield eleven times as an outstanding Congressman.

The academic world has honored Congressman Holifield three times by awarding him honorary degrees: Whittier College, doctor of laws; East Los Angeles College, associate of arts; Lynchburg College, doctor of laws. In 1967 he received the coveted Congressional Distinguished Service Award of the American Political Science Association. This honor is given only every other year to two Congressmen, one from each party, for exceptional and outstanding public service.

Chairman Holifield is known as "a Congressman who does his homework," and because of his hard work, attention to detail, and expert knowledge, he has been signally honored. He has been appointed to numerous National Commissions and Advisory Committees by five Presidents, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon. He has served as Congressional Advisor to the U.S. Delegation at the international conferences on the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Geneva, Switzerland. He also has been chosen to represent the United States at several of the General Conferences of the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna, Austria, and Tokyo, Japan. He has served as Advisor to the U.S. Delegation, First International Symposium on Water, Desalinization, and the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva, Switzerland, five times, most recently in 1971. He was also a delegate to the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) in 1971 in Helsinki, Finland.

In 1965, President Johnson requested Mr. Holifield to chair an ad hoc committee of Western Senators and Representatives to develop an agreement between privately and publicly owned utilities to use, in California and Arizona, the excess electrical power from the Bonneville Dam in Washington State. Because of this work, for which he was commended by the President, California and Arizona now receive about 3 million kilowatts of cheap, smog-free, electricity from Bonneville Dam through Pacific Intertie.

Congressman Holifield's 30 years of service in the House of Representatives have earned him a position of leadership. The honors and responsibilities which have come to Mr. Holifield have given him wide knowledge and experience and have earned him the respect and confidence of his colleagues, the other leaders of Congress and of the Executive Departments.

CONGRESSIONAL SENIORITY AND SPECIFIC SERVICES TO CONSTITUENTS IN THE 19TH DISTRICT

Congressman Holifield is Dean of the California Delegation and because of his leadership ability he has been in an excellent position to guide legislation of importance to California and to the Nation through difficult debates on the Floor of the House of Representatives. During the 90th and 91st Congresses, he was instrumental in winning a major victory in the battle against air pollution. Aided by his skillful leadership, the Congress voted to permit California to set air pollution standards which are stricter than those imposed by the Federal government. Mr. Holifield mapped the strategy for the Floor fight on the California amendment, and with the help of his California Colleagues, secured passage of the legislation.

The 19th Congressional District, which he is privileged to represent, has always been Mr. Holifield's foremost concern. As a result of his efforts, the district has benefited in many ways. He was able to obtain over a million dollars for flood control in the district; he has helped all of the school districts obtain Federal funds for bilingual educational programs and other special projects. He helped obtain funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity for the Rio Hondo Community Action Council. He has obtained funds for the Rio Hondo College Police Training facility, the Flood Ranch renewal project in Santa Fe Springs, the Montebello Transit System, Montebello and Cerritos public libraries, Whittier College science buildings, and many other worthy district projects. Through his help, Norwalk has acquired park land and Pico Rivera, a municipal golf course. Mr. Holifield was credited by the former Secretary of Transportation as being largely responsible for obtaining 90 percent of the funds for the new Century Freeway.

Mr. Holifield has been a staunch advocate of Federal grants to the schools of his district and has secured many thousands of dollars in administrative educational facility grants and student loans under Federal guarantees.

Mr. Holifield has had a continuing concern for the American consumer. In 1943, he was fighting for grade labeling of food. Since that time, he has voted and worked for more than 90 consumer protection laws dealing with product safety, truth in packaging, truth in lending, low interest rates, housing and many more items used by consumers. He has never voted against a consumer protection law.

Lately, many public officials have discovered pollution of the air and water and have publicly stated their concern. Mr. Holifield has been speaking out on the problems of pollution for many years. His voting record shows that he has supported more than 200 environmental and conservation laws during his Congressional service.

His positive leadership has resulted in projects to bring excess water from Northern California to the water short areas of the South, the release of beach lands from military control, and the establishment of hundreds of parks and recreation areas. In November of 1965, Congressman Holifield spoke before the American Association for Contamination Control on the dangers and hazards of contamination of man's environment. For years he has been urging the pollution-free production of electrical energy by means of atomic generators. His work on the 1967 Air Quality Act has been noted. These are just a few indications of his foresight and concern for the public welfare.

In addition to obtaining Federal funds for Post Offices, hospitals, libraries, community

facilities and his work to obtain a clean environment, Congressman Holifield has assisted many thousands of people in his district in the problems that they have had with the various branches of the Federal government. His competent full-time local staff in Pico Rivera, consisting of Bill O'Donnell and Florence Odemar, have provided assistance to people who had problems with the Veterans' Administration, Social Security, the Armed Forces, Internal Revenue, Immigration Services, and almost all branches of the Government. He has also provided assistance to many individuals and businessmen who were contracting with the Federal government. Numerous letters of appreciation from grateful residents indicate the importance and effectiveness of this kind of Congressional work.

Congressman Holifield's Congressional career has been characterized as one of hard work, integrity and leadership. A National figure recently said of him, "He knows what his goals are at all times, and he has the ability, the experience, the determination, the strength of character combined with high resolve and patriotism, to perform his duties in the best interest, as he honestly conceives it, of this nation."

THE PROPERTY TAX GYP

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks Ralph Nader's March 4 article regarding property taxes, published in the New Republic. This subject is to be considered this spring by Senator MUSKIE's Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations.

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

THE PROPERTY TAX GYP

(By Ralph Nader)

The local property-tax controversy is beginning to boil up. Presidential candidates are giving us their ideas for relief. The President is considering asking Congress to enact a "value added tax," better named a national consumer tax, to lighten the property-tax burden. Exactly how this is to be done hasn't been explained. Nor do we know how a consumer sales tax, which leans hardest on folks who aren't rich, is going to do anything more than fool the small taxpayer into thinking he's come out ahead.

Little attention is being given to the enormous revenues lost to local governments because many large property holders, mostly corporations, are grossly underpaying or avoiding this tax. The administration of the property tax is riddled with political and patronage interference. Dozens of citizen-taxpayer reform groups in cities and towns know that the rich pay less, the poor pay more, and schools and other municipal services that rely on such revenues are cut back or deteriorate. Late last year some school systems shut down temporarily because they ran out of money.

Among the candidates, only Senator Muskie, who intends to open hearings on property taxes next month, has put his mind to these problems. Other candidates are talking about exchanging one tax for another or boring more holes into an already swiss-cheese tax system.

Based on recent studies from various states and the detailed information sent to our

property tax newsletter by local citizen-researchers, an estimated \$7 billion per year, at least, is being denied local communities because many corporations don't pay their fair share of property taxes under existing state law.

Through underassessment of large commercial, industrial, and natural resource property and through special low-tax zones, which shelter industries from the tax burdens but not the services of the nearby community, the small home owner and businessman take on a heavier load. Furthermore, a kind of tax blackmail has been practiced by large corporations who play off one jurisdiction against another in order to exact tax concessions as the price of remaining in or entering a community. Here are some samples of the abuses:

1. Underassessment of oil and gas properties belonging to such firms as Atlantic Richfield and Texaco in Ector County, Texas, has cost the county school board \$7 million in the past seven years. Similarly, timberlands in East Texas are extraordinarily underassessed, with the windfall millions going to such giants as International Paper, Boise Cascade and Champion-US Plywood.

2. Another huge company, Union Camp, escapes paying over \$3 million annually in property taxes to the city of Savannah, Georgia, largely due to a special industrial zone it rammed through the state legislature when the city was on its economic knees during the depression.

3. A 1970 study by law students at the University of Texas found that industrial and commercial properties in the Houston area were assessed at around 13 percent of fair market value, while residential properties were assessed at 31.9 percent.

4. In the coal-rich regions of Appalachia, the coal companies, already enjoying federal depletion allowances, present their own assessments to most tax commissioners. Even if a commissioner wants to check the figures, he lacks the technical know-how and the backing of his superiors, who are often tied to the coal industry. Self-assessment by the highly profitable coal companies drains millions of dollars from the coal-rich but revenue-starved mountain counties with their impoverished school systems. Acres of coal land conservatively worth \$200 to \$500 per acre are assessed at \$10 per acre. Other large coal acreages have not even been reported to the assessors.

5. The vast US Steel plant in Gary, Indiana is under-assessed by anywhere from \$100 million to \$500 million. The township's assessor says that the company in effect presents its own tax bill by refusing to provide information on its capital investments. US Steel has even refused to take out city building permits in order to preserve the secrecy of its property values. As a company town, Gary has neither the staff nor resources nor political courage to fight big steel in the courts, especially when badly needed city revenues can be tied up indefinitely pending litigation. In Chicago, the Citizens Against Pollution have estimated that underpayment of property taxes to that city amounts to \$16.4 million per year.

Many other special privileges, stemming from raw political power, or sheer illegality, reduce by many millions of dollars the rightful taxes due from rural-areas in California held for speculation, from timber regions in Maine, and from new commercial buildings in the large cities. In Chicago, the assessor got contributions for his recent reelection campaign from several very wealthy realtors. Several of those realtors owned new buildings, which were given preferential assessments by the assessor.

Reforms of the property-tax system have been urged in studies dating back to the 19th century. Now that the financial bind pinches, it's time to carry out those old

recommendations. Assessors must be properly trained, given adequate resources, insulated from politics and required to operate openly with full disclosure of assessment decisions. Realistic assessments regularly updated and the abolition of preferential exemptions, reductions and industry zones will close many loopholes. There is also no reason why a progressive property tax, as used in Australia, can't be used to help smaller property owners. Finally, procedures for easy and quick property-tax appeals should be established.

The Muskie hearings will explore how Washington can lend technical and financial assistance to put these reforms into effect. The federal government could also provide more revenues to state and local units if it closed the gaping holes in federal tax laws that let corporations and millionaires escape the payment of billions of dollars.

PLIGHT OF AMERICA'S FARMERS

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the American farmer is not well known to the general public. Perhaps this is to be expected because the bulk of our citizens live in urban areas and come from non-farm families.

Since the majority of my colleagues also represent nonfarm districts, it is only natural that their interests are centered on the problems of their constituencies rather than on the problems faced by the Nation's farmers.

It should never be forgotten, however, by any of us that agriculture is the single most vital industry in this country. If the problems of the farmer are not effectively dealt with the ultimate result will be that we will awake some morning to find that there is nobody left down on the farm.

I need not explain the calamity that would befall the United States if that should happen.

The Department of Agriculture recently compiled some figures that illustrate dramatically that the farmer is the forgotten man in today's economy, and is not receiving a fair return on his investment.

I include the Department's summary for insertion at this point in the Record:

FARM PRICES AND FOOD PRICES

FARM PRICES ARE NOT HIGH

The 5% to 6% increase expected in farmers' realized gross income in 1972 is a reasonable figure.

Realized gross income from farming in 1971 was \$58.6 billion. The United States Department of Agriculture is forecasting a \$3 to \$3½ billion increase for 1972, bringing the figure to \$61.6 to \$62.1 billion, an increase of 5% to 6%.

Farm meat prices are not high.

Broiler prices at the farm are about the same as last year, and less than the 1967-69 average.

Average farm hog prices in January were 13% less than in January two years ago, and 17% less than in January six years ago.

Farm beef cattle prices recently reached the level of 20 years ago, but what other prices are just getting up to the levels of 20 years ago? The cost of many things people

buy have set a record high every one of the last 20 years. And if you deflate present beef prices in line with today's cheaper dollars, today's beef prices are a long way under the level of 20 years ago.

Meats are free to respond to market demands and meats are very competitive with one another. There are no price supports on meat and no production controls.

Cyclical production of livestock deals with farm prices, often harshly.

Livestock prices are very cyclical and seasonal. Hog prices were low just a few months ago. These cyclical and seasonal forces cause wide fluctuations in livestock prices completely apart from general conditions in the economy. Hog prices dropped 35% in four months in 1970. Farm production responds to higher prices. Ceilings on farm prices are counter-productive because they reduce production rather than increase supplies.

Live cattle futures prices from April through December this year are \$2 to \$4 per hundred lower than present live prices, indicating that the trade is expecting lower prices in the months ahead.

Live hog futures prices from April through December range from the present live price level to more than \$2 per cwt. lower.

Prices received by farmers for food are not inflationary.

Farm prices for food products are up only 6% from 20 years ago.

Wholesale food prices are up 20% from 20 years ago.

Retail food prices are up 43% from 20 years ago.

The increase in food prices is primarily because of higher wages.

Average wage rates per hour of production workers in manufacturing are 2.3 times higher than 20 years ago. They were \$1.56 per hour in 1951 and \$3.57 for 1971.

The average hourly earnings of food marketing employees is 2.5 times higher than 20 years ago—\$1.31 then, and \$3.24 in 1971.

The largest increases in the cost of food are for food eaten away from home where labor and services are the main ingredients of food cost. Total food expenditures away from home have risen 79% in the last 10 years and the price index for food away from home has increased more than 50% in the last 10 years.

Farmers receive only 38¢ from the dollar consumers spend for farm-raised food; this is down from 49¢ 20 years ago.

Food is one of the most reasonable buys available.

Production of farm food is a very competitive business and this keeps margins low.

Retail food prices have not advanced as much as the other main categories in the cost-of-living index.

Twenty years ago people paid 23% of their take-home pay for food; in 1971 they spent 16% of their take-home pay for food; and in 1972 they are expected to spend less than 16% of their take-home pay for food.

BEEF PRODUCTION HAS EXPANDED TREMENDOUSLY

Total beef production is 2½ times higher than 20 years ago.

Farmers produced and marketed 8.8 billion pounds of beef in 1951 and 21.9 billion pounds in 1971.

Beef supplies per capita are twice as large as 20 years ago.

Beef consumption per capita was 56.1 lbs. in 1951 and was 114.3 lbs. in 1971, an increase of 2.0 times.

Production of Choice grade beef is nearly 4 times larger than 20 years ago.

One-third of our beef was Choice grade beef in 1951; now 60% of our beef produced is Choice grade. Thus the total production of Choice beef is 4.0 times larger than 20 years ago.

Imports of beef have risen even faster than U.S. beef production.

Imports of beef and veal are 1.7 times

larger than 10 years ago and are 3.7 times larger than 20 years ago.

FARM PRICES HAVE NOT REACHED FAIR LEVELS

Output per man hour on farms is an example for the nation.

Output per man hour on farms is 3.3 times higher than 20 years ago; while in manufacturing industries, output per man hour is 1.6 times greater than 20 years ago. Thus output per man hour on farms is increasing twice as fast as in industry—an unmatched efficiency.

One farm worker is supplying three times as many with food as 20 years ago.

In 1951 one farm worker supplied 16 people with food; now he produces enough for 51 people, which is more than three times as many as 20 years ago. This is unmatched anywhere else in the world, or before in history.

High farm productivity has released people to produce other wealth.

In 1951 one person out of 7 was living on a farm producing agricultural products; now one person in 21 lives on a farm. This has released people to produce other wealth and services and is primarily responsible for the unequalled affluence of the nation.

Farmers' costs have gone up sharply.

Farmers are paying 2.3 times higher wages for help than 20 years ago.

Farm machinery price levels are nearly double what they were 20 years ago (1.9 times higher).

The level of all prices that farmers pay has gone up nearly 50% from 20 years ago, and farmers' total production costs have nearly doubled (1.9 times higher).

Farm real estate taxes per acre are 3.8 times higher than 20 years ago.

Farmers are less able to pass along their costs than other major economic groups. Farmers are unprotected by franchises, patents, territories, licenses, and by size. They do not enjoy industry-wide contracts, nor escalator clauses, nor the economic ability to force higher prices and hold them.

Farm investments have doubled in 20 years.

Farm investment in the food and fiber producing plant of the nation (land, buildings, livestock, etc.) has risen from \$152 billion in 1951 to \$335 billion on Jan. 1, 1972, which is 2.2 times larger.

This plant's resources must be conserved and the growing investment must be capitalized from farm net income, which has increased only 6% from levels of 20 years ago.

Farm debts are nearly five times larger than 20 years ago.

The amount of debt owed by farmers has risen from \$13.1 billion in 1951 to \$65.5 billion in 1972 (5.0 times larger).

The per capita disposable income of farm people is only three-fourths as much as the per capita disposable income of non-farm people.

Farm people have only three-fourths as much income per capita as non-farm people, even though farmers' income must cover both their rate of return on a \$335 billion farm business as well as representing the hourly return on their labor.

Farm people have to rely on off-farm income for half of their total net income, which even then brings their income up to only three-fourths of the per capita disposable income of non-farm people.

SPEAKER ALBERT AND MISS DUBROW HONORED BY DOORMEN'S SOCIETY

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House have ample reason to

CXVIII—469—Part 6

appreciate the good service of the doormen who serve this representative body ably and effectively. Their courteous and constant efforts reflect credit upon them and upon the House. It probably is known to most Members of the House that there is a Doormen's Society which has been in existence for a year and a half. The society is the organization of the men who man the doors at the House Chamber—men who must know the names and faces of hundreds of Congressmen, congressional aides and news reporters. The president of this society is the Chief Doorman of the House, Mr. Warren H. Jernigan. Last week Mr. Jernigan presided over a reception and buffet given by the Doormen's Society in the Rayburn House Office Building. On that occasion, awards were presented to the society's designees for man of the year and sweetheart of the year.

Speaker of the House, the Honorable CARL ALBERT of Oklahoma, was named man of the year and Miss Evelyn Dubrow, who is legislative representative of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, AFL-CIO, was selected as sweetheart of the year. They were selected by secret ballot by a bipartisan committee. The honorees were awarded plaques at ceremonies last week on Capitol Hill. Former Speaker John W. McCormack made the presentation to Representative ALBERT. It is interesting to note that Mr. McCormack was the first recipient of the man-of-the-year award.

In accepting the award Speaker ALBERT praised the doormen for their professional skills in knowing the ins and outs of the House Chamber.

It was my privilege to bestow the award on Miss Dubrow as the first winner of the sweetheart award. Miss Dubrow has served in a labor liaison capacity with Congress for 13 years. She also is vice chairman of the Labor Advisory Committee of the Office of Economic Opportunity. She is a charter member of the Doormen's Society. In addition to the plaque she was given a bountiful heart-shaped box of candy.

A number of Members of Congress were on hand for the event, including several committee chairmen, such as Representative GEORGE H. MAHON, of Texas, Appropriations; Representative W. R. "BOB" POAGE, Texas, Agriculture; Representative THOMAS E. "DOC" MORGAN, Pennsylvania, Foreign Relations; and Representative GEORGE P. MILLER, California, Science and Astronautics.

VETERANS' EDUCATION AND TRAINING AMENDMENTS OF 1972

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House voted favorably upon H.R. 12828, Veterans' Education and Training Amendments of 1972, of which I am a cosponsor. I would like to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues for

their valuable support for this important piece of legislation.

Over the years, the GI bill has given millions of veterans a unique opportunity to pursue a higher education. There is surely no question that the GI bill has been a resounding success for those who, for financial reasons or otherwise, would have been prevented from going on to college or learning a trade, and the evidence has been the growing numbers of veterans who have taken advantage of the benefits the program offers.

Since the Congress enacted the original Veterans' Educational Assistance program, however, the costs for tuition and related expenses have risen considerably, to the point where the existing provisions for educational benefits became inadequate to meet the growing needs of the veteran. The legislation passed by the House yesterday recognizes and meets this need, I am happy to say, by raising the basic educational allowance for a single veteran from the present \$175 to \$200 per month, a 14-percent increase over the existing allowance. The rates for veterans with dependents would also be increased proportionately. Additionally, this legislation, for the first time, would equalize benefits under the education and training programs for spouses of male and female veterans.

Clearly, this expanded program will go a long way toward meeting the need for more liberal benefits for vocational rehabilitation, special training and educational assistance allowances for this Nation's veterans. I am indeed proud to have cosponsored this important and far-reaching piece of legislation, and I call upon my colleagues in the House to join me in urging for speedy action on this bill in the other body.

BELOIT, WIS.: ALL-AMERICAN CITY

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 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 great honor and distinction of being designated one of the All-American Cities of 1972. It is an honor and recognition that is richly deserved.

Beloit has a reputation in my congressional district 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 to interlocking action groups that have been able to come up with possible solutions to the problems of race relation and pollution.

I think it would be fair to say that Beloit citizens have found that no community mission is impossible as long as it is understood that everyone connected with a problem has a chance to partic-

ipate 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 and 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 should go to Mr. Gus Nelson, the leader of the committee that has pulled together what was done and presented it to the reviewing committee for the All-Americans Award in Atlanta.

The 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."

LOUISVILLE INTERNATIONAL JETPORT

HON. GENE SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in the continuing controversy over the proposed Louisville International Jetport, I wish to provide my colleagues and the public with some additional information which bears heavily on the proposed jetport. These figures, obtained from the U.S. Department of Transportation, deal with the size, in acres, of jetports currently serving communities of over 1 million in population. The Louisville metropolitan area is well under 1 million—826,553, according to the latest census.

These statistics, which are the most recent the Department can furnish, are further evidence of the fact that the proposed 35,000-acre Louisville Jetport is totally unrealistic in size.

The figures, which follow, include some of the biggest cities and the busiest airports in the world:

New York:	Acres
J. F. Kennedy	5,200
LaGuardia	647
Newark	2,167
Chicago, O'Hare	7,200
Los Angeles, International	3,600
Philadelphia	2,500
Detroit	4,800

Boston	2,003
Pittsburgh	360
St. Louis	1,850
Washington:	
National	650
Dulles	9,980
Cleveland	1,650
Baltimore, Friendship	3,231
Buffalo	704
Minneapolis	2,930
Greater Cincinnati	3,500
Milwaukee	1,888
Kansas City	600
San Diego	487
Dallas	1,878
Atlanta	2,307
Miami, International	2,699
Proposed Louisville International Jetport	35,000

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE W. FRED DUCKWORTH

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, on Friday evening, March 3, 1972, Norfolk, Va., lost a great man, and I lost a neighbor and good friend.

The Honorable W. Fred Duckworth, former mayor of the city of Norfolk, was shot down just a few blocks away from his home in a vicious, senseless attack, and we all mourn his loss.

It is not often that a man can leave a city as his memorial, but in the case of Fred Duckworth, this is true. In his 12 years as mayor, Mr. Duckworth saw our city grow and develop dramatically under his leadership, and we are all in his debt.

Mayor Duckworth was a man to whom duty was all important, and he was never deterred by adverse criticism or swayed by public opinion in the course of doing what he believed was best for the city. He was a man of great integrity and outspoken honesty, and he will be greatly missed.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing at this point in the RECORD several of the fine tributes paid to him by the Norfolk newspapers. Mrs. Whitehurst joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Duckworth and their daughter, Mrs. Philip Farrand.

The tributes follow:

[From the Ledger-Star, Mar. 4, 1972]

BLUNT, DYNAMIC MAYOR LED NORFOLK
FORWARD

(By Gene Owens)

NORFOLK.—He wasn't your ordinary striped pants, silk-hat wearing, baby-kissing, ribbon-cutting mayor, this blunt-spoken man who was shot down on the streets of the city whose modern face he helped to shape.

W. Fred Duckworth, mayor of Norfolk from 1950 to 1962, was a man who "breaks all rules for a successful politician with outspoken frankness and a drive to get things done," as a contemporary newspaper reporter wrote in 1958.

It was Duckworth who infused a ceremonial office with the force of his personality and made the mayorship of Norfolk one of the weightier offices in Tidewater.

He also plugged hard for area-wide cooperation—so hard, in fact, he sometimes alienated those he was trying to unite.

At the time of his death he was president of Tidewater Virginia Development Council, whose formation he had promoted vigorously.

"He picked it up when it was falling apart," remarked Roy B. Matrin Jr., Duckworth's successor as mayor of Norfolk. "He's held it together through the years. It may not have accomplished all the things he wanted it to, but I'm afraid it may pass out of the picture with Fred Duckworth gone."

Martin was first appointed to City Council while Duckworth was mayor. Although younger than Duckworth by some quarter of a century, Martin shares some of his characteristics—his blunt, outspoken manner and his aggressive approach to the office.

Martin credits Duckworth with bringing "the teamwork concept into being in the city of Norfolk in modern times," and ranks that as one of Duckworth's major contributions.

Duckworth was the fourth in a line of post-war mayors who had sought to remove politics from the functioning of city council.

Martin further cites Duckworth's advocacy of the massive urban renewal program, which put tall buildings and public housing back where slums and a sleazy tavern district once had been.

The "teamwork concept" has survived into the Martin era, although it has been weakened to an extent by the election of three men who are not counted on the Martin "team."

"I think for years we had a team that, although they differed on various issues . . . there was no question they were working as a team," the mayor said.

He also feels Duckworth made a significant contribution by pushing through the annexations of parts of Princess Anne and Norfolk counties, which gave the city some growing room before city-county mergers barred further annexations.

"And of course, the MacArthur Memorial will always be a memorial to him," said Martin.

Duckworth's advocacy of Norfolk expansion and his opposition to the mergers that created the cities of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake rubbed some of Norfolk's neighbors the wrong way.

But Sidney S. Kellam, long-time political power at Virginia Beach and a man who negotiated eyeball to eyeball with Duckworth, came through it with a healthy respect and admiration for the man.

"He was always forceful in his views and fair in his dealings—open and above-board," said Kellam, who has worked closely in harness with Duckworth during the past few years on the Tidewater Virginia Development Council (TVDC), the Hampton Roads Bridge and Tunnel Commission and other undertakings.

"I've disagreed with him many times, but it never made any difference in our friendship," Kellam said last night.

Duckworth was not a man to deal in the niceties of diplomacy and his blunt way of putting things often ruffled feelings.

But, as Kellam put it, "You always knew where he stood."

Paul Schweitzer, who served as school board chairman during the stormy Massive Resistance era, recalls that Duckworth "could bawl you out and get all over you for something, but the next minute he would be back with you, praising you for something you had done."

Duckworth appointed Schweitzer to the school board and Schweitzer later served on City Council as a member of the Duckworth team.

"His decisions sometimes didn't appeal to everybody," observed Schweitzer, but "Whatever he did or whatever he said was for the benefit of the city."

In the minds of most people, Duckworth probably is remembered best for the role he played in establishing the memorial to Gen. Douglas MacArthur in Norfolk. MacArthur

was Duckworth's hero, and as mayor he took the lead in advocating renovation of the old Norfolk City Hall as a final resting place for the general. He later became president and treasurer of the MacArthur Memorial Foundation.

But Lewis L. Layton, who also served on council with Duckworth, thinks of Duckworth in a larger context.

"I think he should be best remembered as the father of the foundation of modern Norfolk," he said. "Most of the changes—the facelift improvement of the city—were undertaken and carried forward during the time that he was mayor of the city. He had a tremendous ability to get people to work with him. During his time most of the urban renewal was carried out."

Duckworth was born June 20, 1899, in the little mountain town of Brevard, N.C. In 1920 he joined the Ford Motor Company and in 1931 became branch manager of the Charlotte, N.C., assembly plant—the youngest ever appointed to that position by the company up to that time.

He came to Norfolk in 1936 as manager of the assembly plant here. When the Navy took the plant over for wartime use in 1942, Duckworth became executive assistant to the War Production Board's regional director in Cleveland. Eight months later he became regional director.

In 1944 he bought out a Norfolk dealership and turned it into Cavalier Ford.

He was elected to City Council in 1950 on a coalition ticket and was made mayor that year.

One of his first moves was to expand the participation of business, industrial and civic leaders in the city's decision-making process. He increased the number of such individuals on non-paying commissions and committees from between 35 and 40 to between 150 and 200.

The Hampton Roads Bridge-Tunnel and the Chesapeake Bay Bridge-Tunnel also resulted in part from Duckworth's efforts. He was vice chairman of the Chesapeake Bay Bridge-Tunnel Commission and a member of the State Highway Commission at the time of his death.

Duckworth was one of a line of mayors who prided themselves on giving the city of Norfolk a clean government. When a newspaper article in 1958 showed that Duckworth's firm received a small amount of business from the city while he was serving as an unpaid member of the Committee Relating to the MacArthur Memorial and the Municipal Bond Commission, Duckworth promptly resigned the two positions with a terse note that referred to the article and observed, "They think there is some conflict of interest with my connections with the city government."

Duckworth's incredible energy always amazed those who knew him.

"I'm going too fast and I know it," said Duckworth in 1957.

"I have often wondered what kind of whipcord this man was made of," said retired banker John S. Alfriend, speaking at a luncheon following Duckworth's retirement. "He possesses to a high degree integrity, imagination, drive and force. He has no patience with inactivity and no inclination to move but one way—forward."

Age was beginning to slow Duckworth. He underwent major surgery in 1970 and his frequent walks were to ease a circulation problem in his legs.

"I told him several months ago, 'you'd better stop walking around in this neighborhood you're in,'" said Edward J. Brickhouse, a former member of Duckworth's City Council.

But Duckworth wasn't about to give up those walks.

"He was very ritualistic," recalls Jeanne Hazlewood, who worked with him as exhibit manager for TVDC.

"He took those walks the same time in the morning and the same time at night. You could set your clock by him. He liked to walk around the neighborhood at the crack of dawn and meet the ladies with their poodles—whoever happened to be up at that time of day."

Duckworth is survived by his wife, Gertrude Summers Duckworth; a daughter, Mrs. Philip S. Farrand of Norfolk; three sisters, Mrs. Pierre E. Bellotte of Norfolk, Mrs. Ewing Parsons of Roanoke and Mrs. Charles G. Rose Jr. of Fayetteville, N.C.; and two grandchildren.

His body will be taken from Twiford Funeral Chapel in Norfolk to St. Andrews Episcopal Church for funeral services at noon Monday. The Rev. Roger Snyder, the Rev. George D. Heath and Dr. Andrew Bird will officiate. Burial will be in Forest Lawn Cemetery. The family has requested that flowers be omitted. Among those expected to attend is Mrs. Douglas MacArthur, widow of the general Duckworth admired so much.

Former City Councilman Linwood F. Perkins summed up the virtually unanimous opinion of W. Fred Duckworth:

"No one had to second-guess him. He spoke his mind."

SAD NEIGHBORHOOD RECALLS FRIENDLY MAN (By Jack Dorsey)

NORFOLK.—The neighborhood where former Norfolk Mayor W. Fred Duckworth took his daily walk was saddened today over his death Friday night. Many couldn't believe it had happened.

Throughout the Riverpoint area between North Shore Road next to the Algonquin House where Duckworth lived and Little Creek Road at Major Avenue where he was found neighbors gathered in groups of twos and threes and talked of the tragedy this morning.

It seemed everyone knew the 72-year-old man from his daily walks up and down Major Avenue. Some told how they looked forward to his brief visits with them.

"He would always talk to you," said Charles Snell of the 7400 block of Major Avenue.

"Kids would come up and walk with him or he'd stop and pass a few moments."

"He asked me to walk with him a couple of times but he had such a fast gait that I told him I didn't think I could keep up," Snell said.

A father and his son out walking today on North Shore Road, both said they had seen Duckworth frequently.

"Usually he was alone but he would stop and talk on occasion," said Charles E. Starling of the 7400 block of North Shore Road.

Another neighbor, E. L. Bass, also of Major Avenue, termed the slaying "terrible" and said he only hoped the assailant was found.

"Duckworth was my boss in the early '40s when he was manager of the Ford Plant," Bass said. "He was a good man. It's just hard to believe that such a thing has happened."

Duckworth's daily walking was rarely interrupted except for the worst of weather, according to Snell and others who saw him.

Snell said the former mayor would dress for the weather and carried an umbrella for the rain or to ward off dogs.

Duckworth was found with an umbrella Friday night. Neighbors said he was also known to have carried a walking cane on occasion.

Most of the neighbors said that Duckworth walked at least once a day down Major Avenue to Little Creek Road and back. They said he would sometimes make the trip twice a day. But most agreed he always walked during the daylight hours.

"My wife was telling me just last week that we hadn't seen Mr. Duckworth during the day but that she had seen him walking

later at night," said Snell. "Maybe he had to work later recently."

Two other families, both of which live less than 50 yards from where Duckworth's body was found, also talked of the tragedy today.

Mrs. A. B. Schnell said she and her husband had just started looking at a 7:30 p.m. television show Friday and heard rapid shots from outside. She said she didn't think of them as gun shots and really paid no attention. It was several minutes later that police arrived, she said.

"He always had a cheerful word for you," said Schnell while sitting today in the warm greenhouse of a neighbor across the street, Mr. and Mrs. K. J. Jens.

"We saw him often as he would walk down this way. It was usually in the daytime though," Schnell said.

"It's a terrible thing," said Mrs. Jens. "We've never had anything like this happen in our neighborhood before."

Her husband said he was reading about 7:30 p.m. Friday when he heard the shots.

"It was just like someone taking a piece of paper and slapping it against a desk," Jens said.

Both couples said they frequently exchanged greetings with Duckworth.

A group of children riding their bicycles through the neighborhood today said they used to ride along on their bicycles with Duckworth as he walked along the street.

"He was really a nice man and he would always say 'hi' to us," said one of the youngsters.

W. FRED DUCKWORTH

The violence which last night took the life of W. Fred Duckworth on a quiet residential street near his home has in itself stunned and will deeply trouble this community.

It scarcely needs to be said that the maximum police effort is in order—and indeed this was quickly marshaled—to bring such measure of justice as is possible under the law and this vicious crime warrants. As well as to search out new safeguards against the kind of on-the-street risk which other law-abiding citizens are demonstrably running, too.

But adding greatly to the distress in this particular tragedy is the eminence of the victim, who had been one of Norfolk's most forceful mayors, and the caliber of civic performance so abruptly brought to an end. The whole Tidewater region has been immensely well served by Mr. Duckworth, and the record is overflowing with the evidence.

Aside from his long position of leadership in the business community, he played his most outstanding role as the head of the Norfolk City Council from 1950 to 1962. His was a take-charge manner of operation, and while this brought him criticism there was never any question as to his placing of the city's interests foremost, nor as to the effectiveness of his efforts.

He was the spearhead for a great deal of the dramatic transformation which Norfolk has experienced. Moreover, he was able to strike a hard-headed balance between what was possible—his approach was highly optimistic—and the fiscal and other limits under which a municipality has to operate.

After his retirement as mayor and councilman, that same pragmatic optimism was continued in various forms of service to the community. The chief focus of his concern became the Tidewater Virginia Development Council, a regional agency for attracting industry, but he was active in many other ways as well.

One of his deepest interests was the MacArthur Memorial Foundation, of which he was president—an outgrowth of the prime part he took in having General MacArthur agree to Norfolk as a final resting place and in establishing the Memorial as a national point of attention. He also contributed his

talents to the Virginia Highway Commission, of which he was a member; the Chesapeake Bay Bridge-Tunnel Commission (vice chairman); the United Communities Fund, and his church (First Presbyterian), in addition to filling such posts as a directorship at Virginia National Bank and the chairmanship of the Tidewater Small Business Investment Corporation.

In his conduct of serious affairs as well as in everyday conversation, Mr. Duckworth employed a drawing bluntness which could become quite crisp on occasion, and this, with some balancing good humor, made for a dynamic combination.

His candor cut through much of the fog that can afflict public activity, his fear of criticism was virtually nil and his do-something philosophy got many worthwhile things done. In the process he earned staunch friends and wide respect.

At his death now, especially under such shocking circumstances, a whole array of citizens left inevitably in his debt will share with Mr. Duckworth's family and close associates their grief and their loss.

[From the Virginian Pilot, Mar. 5, 1972]

HE LED NORFOLK WITH WORDS AND ACTION (By Jim Henderson)

NORFOLK.—W. Fred Duckworth arrived in City Hall with the blunt statement that "I don't know anything about politics—I'm just a businessman."

Then he proceeded with tireless energy to drive the city through its greatest period of development.

In the 12 years from 1950 to 1962, a record term for a Norfolk mayor, the city saw the expansion of redevelopment into downtown, the establishment of an industrial park, the construction of tunnels to Portsmouth and the Peninsula, the beginnings of a link to the Eastern Shore, strides in highway construction, the beginning of a library and a civic center, the conversion of the old courthouse building into a memorial and crypt for Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and the designation of Norfolk as an All-American City.

Each development bore some mark of the energetic North Carolina mountaineer-turned-industrialist who arrived in 1936, looked around, and glumly concluded that he didn't like what he saw, but stayed nonetheless to become the city's dominant personality during his years as mayor.

Duckworth epitomized the go-getter folk hero of the period of industrial growth between the two world wars—brusque, pragmatic, impatient with delay and red tape, intolerant of nonsense.

His penchant for direct action carried over into the conduct of municipal affairs.

"I've got his scars all over me and I cherish every one because he was a real man," recalled one City Council veteran of the Duckworth years.

Never given to mincing words, Duckworth openly dismissed the official history of Norfolk as a dull book and nettled traditionalists by calling the Confederate statue a pigeon roost. Miffed at what he considered a lackluster performance, he rebuked the city's legislative delegation in 1962, saying that "Norfolk hasn't gotten a thing" from that year's General Assembly.

Under Duckworth's strong leadership—often criticized as one-man rule—the council operated as a "team" on which a dissenting vote occasioned raised eyebrows.

The most notable dissent was that of now Mayor Roy B. Martin Jr., who refused to go along with the closing of the secondary schools in 1958 that hastened the end of Massive Resistance to integration.

Duckworth viewed the school closing as a swift solution to a nagging problem. "We did it to bring the matter to a head," he said later, "and I do feel it had some effect on getting it straightened out on the state level."

The school crisis "was one of the most difficult periods of the 12 years," he said. "We

tried to turn away and duck it. The council had no business being mixed up in it because we had absolutely no control over the situation."

One goal unrealized by Duckworth was consolidation of the south Hampton Roads area under a metropolitan government, with Norfolk as the "Manhattan" of a borough system—a plan that appealed to Duckworth.

High among achievements that pleased him was persuading Gen. MacArthur to choose Norfolk as his burial place and the residuary of the documents of his military career. Duckworth accomplished this in the usual manner—rather than engage in tedious negotiations he went directly to the general in New York, braced him face to face, and got his acceptance.

"A very tough-minded man," said a childhood acquaintance who has followed Duckworth since the early days in the mountain town of Brevard, N.C. "He was that way as a kid. He was shrewd and honest."

Duckworth was "looked on with a certain amount of awe" by his Brevard neighbors as "a shining example of how well a young country boy could do when he went to town." He had a year and a half at Davidson College behind him when he went to work at the Ford Motor Co. plant in Charlotte, N.C., in 1920.

Starting at the bottom, Duckworth worked up to become in 1931 the youngest—at 32—manager of the Ford plant. He left Charlotte to manage the Ford operation in Memphis in 1933, and moved on to Norfolk as manager in 1936 when the Tennessee operation was closed down.

An acquaintance from those days recalled that Duckworth was smitten with neither the people nor the place when he arrived in Norfolk. But the man who was to become synonymous with Norfolk—and the city's First Citizen in 1956—stayed on until the government took over the plant in World War II and he was swept up by the war effort.

In 1942 Duckworth went to Cleveland as deputy regional director of the War Production Board. He stayed until 1944, when he took over the Ford agency in Norfolk, now Cavalier Motor Co. He stayed on as Cavalier's president until 1957, when he became chairman of the board.

Duckworth didn't slacken his pace when he left City Hall. He stepped in as president and general manager of Tidewater Virginia Development Council, a regional industry-hunting organization he helped found. He also was a state highway commissioner and a member of the governing body of the Chesapeake Bay Bridge-Tunnel, and retained membership in an array of clubs and organizations.

Still the unreconstructed businessman when he left the mayors' office, Duckworth looked back at his reign with unpolitical candor.

"As a businessman I would say the 12 years were slow," he said. "We haven't accomplished things as rapidly as I would have liked."

A MAN RESPECTED, REMEMBERED

NORFOLK.—The city councilmen and civic leaders who knew W. Fred Duckworth repeatedly used the word "great" Saturday to describe the man.

Thomas F. Maxwell, who was city manager for six years under Duckworth, said, "He was a great person as well as a great mayor."

"He was extremely quick-minded and could understand a problem very quickly and was quick to make up his mind," Maxwell said. "His whole personality was one of getting the job done and in the right way."

Sam T. Barfield, commission of revenue, said, "I lost a great friend."

Barfield, a former councilman, had many a verbal duel with Duckworth in the early 1960s. But, Barfield said Saturday, "From those battles grew a mutual respect. For the last seven years we have been very close. The

man has contributed an awful lot to this city."

Barfield recalls that Duckworth was a champion of redevelopment. But he was also cautious about taking federal money.

He often said, "Let's check the strings before we take the money," Barfield related.

Lewis L. Layton, another former councilman who served with Duckworth, recalls "his extreme kindness."

The former mayor had a rough front which didn't always show what was behind it, Layton said, but, "He would help anyone on anything they asked him to."

Duckworth's chief contribution to Norfolk, Layton said, was his "steady push for progress. He never lost sight of the fact that Norfolk needed to grow."

Paul T. Schweitzer said, "One of the most educational four years of my life was serving on the City Council with Mr. Duckworth as mayor."

"I am simply stunned that such a thing could happen in our city. It would be bad enough to lose Mr. Duckworth under any circumstances. But, to be murdered in cold blood is simply unbelievable."

Schweitzer said Duckworth's chief contribution during his 12 years as mayor was "the leadership he brought to the city."

J. Pretlow Darden, who preceded Duckworth as mayor, said, "It's just a tragedy. He goes down as one of our great Norfolk citizens. He had the courage to support the things he thought was in the best interest of the city."

Former Gov. Mills E. Godwin Jr. called Duckworth a distinguished citizen with "strong opinions, great drive, and determination."

When Godwin was governor, he appointed Duckworth to the State Highway Commission and later to the Chesapeake Bay Bridge-Tunnel Commission.

Godwin said Saturday, "I had long been an admirer of h'm. I had watched the progress that he had brought about in Norfolk. I felt he was a dynamic individual with a sense of urgency about those things he was committed to."

Sidney S. Kellam, a longtime political power at Virginia Beach, fought with Duckworth in the early 1960s over annexation. But, later the men served together on the Tidewater Virginia Development Council and the Chesapeake Bay Bridge-Tunnel Commission.

Kellam said, "The community has lost one of its outstanding citizens. He was forthright, straightforward and determined."

Linwood F. Perkins Sr., a former councilman, said, "He made a statement and he stuck by it."

Perkins added, "He was a man with terrific drive. Norfolk is a better place because of Mr. Duckworth and his leadership in urban renewal."

Edward J. Brickhouse, who went on to the City Council when Duckworth went off, said, "I admired the man so much. He was outstanding. He was successful in everything he went into."

Mayor Roy B. Martin Jr., who succeeded Duckworth as mayor, said, "This is a great tragedy."

Martin was appointed to the council in 1953 by Duckworth and served with the former mayor nine years. Martin added, "Fred Duckworth's death is a loss to the entire city as well as to me personally."

REDESIGNATION OF VETERANS DAY AND MEMORIAL DAY

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, on January 23, 1972, a resolution to redesignate

November 11 as Veterans Day and May 30 as Memorial Day was passed by the Department of Connecticut, Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.

These commemorative days mark significant events. They are solemn occasions in the life of our Nation. For all of us, Veterans Day and Memorial Day are special occasions; for veterans, the meaning and memories associated with both are even more poignant. Therefore, we should give the most careful consideration to the views and wishes of the veterans organizations in designating these national holidays.

I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the resolution passed by the Department of Connecticut, Italian American War Veterans, at a January meeting:

RESOLUTION

Whereas: The thirtieth day of the month of May was designated as Decoration Day or Memorial Day shortly after the war between the States ended, and has been traditionally observed since and,

Whereas: The eleventh day of the eleventh month at 11 A.M. marked the event of the Armistice ending World War I, and shortly after World War II the eleventh day of the eleventh month was officially designated as Veterans Day and has been traditionally observed since and,

Whereas: The Congress of the United States by law has designated the last Monday in May as Memorial Day and the fourth Monday in October as Veterans Day, and,

Whereas: We believe that these changes of our traditionally observed holidays are against the wishes and beliefs of the great majority of the veterans and their families,

Now therefore be it resolved, The Department of Connecticut, Italian American War Veterans of the U.S. INC., does hereby request and petition the Governor and the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut and the President and the Congress of the United States of America to repeal the existing law and return to the traditional observance of May 30th as Memorial Day and November 11, as Veterans Day.

This resolution was duly acted upon and passed at our regular meeting of the Department of Connecticut, Italian American War Veterans of the U.S. Inc. on January 23, 1972.

FTC JURISDICTION AND POWERS TO PROTECT CONSUMERS BROADENED BY DECISION OF SUPREME COURT

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Supreme Court in a recent opinion broadened the jurisdiction and powers of the Federal Trade Commission in holding that the FTC authority is not limited to "the letter and spirit" of antitrust laws and statutes, but extends further to include general protection of consumers who have suffered injury from unfair and deceptive business practices.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter of consumer protection, I place in the RECORD herewith, excerpts from this case, Federal Trade Commission against the Sperry & Hutchinson Co.:

In reality the question is a double one: First, does (the law) empower the Commission to define and proscribe an unfair competitive practice, even though the practice does not infringe either the letter or the spirit of antitrust laws? Second, does (the law) empower the Commission to proscribe practices as unfair or deceptive in their effect upon consumers regardless of their nature or quality as competitive practices or their effect on competition? We think the statute, its legislative history and prior cases compel an affirmative answer to both questions.

Legislative and judicial authorities alike convince us that the Federal Trade Commission does not arrogate excessive power to itself if, in measuring a practice against the elusive, but congressionally mandated standard of fairness, it, like a court of equity, considers public values beyond simply those enshrined in the letter or encompassed in the spirit of the antitrust laws.

The Federal Trade Commission wanted and needed this broader authority and the action by the Supreme Court obviates the necessity of further consumer legislation and the creation of a Department of Consumer Affairs, as some have advocated. The Nashville Tennessean in a recent editorial on the court decision entitled "FTC Can Get To Work Now"—and I echo this admonition and sentiment.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter of consumer protection, I place the editorial in the RECORD herewith:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Mar. 3, 1972]

FTC CAN GET TO WORK NOW

The Supreme Court gave the Federal Trade Commission stronger powers to protect consumers by ruling that a regulatory agency's authority is not limited to moving against antitrust violations.

In a 7-0 decision written by Justice Byron R. White, the court said the FTC may go beyond the letter or even the spirit of antitrust laws and act against all kinds of immoral or unfair trade schemes.

This is good news to a consuming public which it seems is being victimized more openly all the time by shoddy products, poor workmanship and fast-buck schemes.

The White House Office of Consumer Affairs says it is being swamped by complaints from consumers who claim they have been gypped in one way or another and demand that they be given some protection by government.

Their complaints, the office says, range from discovery of metal pieces, hair, and other foreign matter in various kinds of canned foods to the conscienceless refusal of supposedly reputable manufacturers to make good on defective merchandise they have sold to the public.

The government would be helpless to protect the consumer from flagrant swindles if it could not proceed against offenders except under the antitrust laws, which apply generally to other areas of consumer gouging such as price fixing and the reduction of competition.

The FTC has been giving indication in recent months of wanting to do something worthwhile in consumer protection. The agency should now make the widest possible use of the new powers it has been given by the Supreme Court.

COMMUNICATIONS ISSUES I: THE FTC'S COUNTER-ADVERTISING PROPOSAL

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, after being mired for decades in a swamp of bureaucratic lethargy, the Federal Trade Commission suddenly came to life a few years ago as an energetic and effective consumer protection agency. And, under the chairmanship of Miles Kirkpatrick, the Commission has continued to expand in its record of success as an advocate of the rights of American consumers.

One of the most imaginative and potentially far-reaching of the FTC's recent actions was its counter-advertising proposal to the Federal Communications Commission. Briefly stated, this suggestion recommended that the FCC, under the Fairness Doctrine, require broadcasters to air responsible rebuttals to advertising claims which fall into one of four categories:

First, advertising asserting claims of product performance or characteristics that explicitly raise controversial issues of public importance; second, advertising claims which rest upon or rely upon scientific premises which are currently subject to controversy within the scientific community; third, advertising stressing board recurrent themes, which affect the purchase decision in a manner that implicitly raises controversial issues of current public importance; and fourth, advertising which is silent about the negative aspects of the advertised product.

In connection with this proposal, the FTC has urged that broadcasters sell counter-advertising time to those able to purchase it, and make free air time available to those citizens with something of significance to say who cannot afford the advertising rates. And, I would add, the Federal Trade Commission, has carefully limited its proposal, recognizing that the right to counter-advertising cannot be unrestricted. As the FTC pointed out, this is not an equal time proposal but simply an extension of the Fairness Doctrine to include controversial advertising claims, just as it now encompasses controversial political subjects and other issues.

The need for adoption of a proposal such as the FTC suggests should be clear to anyone who, from time to time, joins television advertisers' "captive audience." We are all familiar with the massive advertising campaign undertaken by the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey and its affiliates on our Nation's airwaves. This huge petroleum corporation is not content with lobbying Members of Congress and other officials in order to preserve its special tax status and to avert effective regulation of its environmentally harmful activities. It now purchases blocks of air time on such programs as the NBC Saturday Evening News to persuade the American public that its marine drilling activities are a boon, not a danger, to the environment.

If we believe the ads forced on the viewing public every few minutes for half an hour at a time, the fish in the Gulf of Mexico never had it so good until Standard Oil came along and started drilling. The ads, of course fail to mention the fish's opinion of the Chevron drilling operation explosions in the Gulf, the massive pollution which resulted, or the gross violations of Federal safety regulations which caused the oil spill.

Another type of ad, which presumably would be covered by the FTC's counter-advertising proposal, is that broadcast ceaselessly by the Bayer Aspirin manufacturer, the Sterling Drug Co. In obviously staged citizens' meetings the earnest Bayer Man convinces an extraordinarily attentive audience that Bayer is clearly superior to all other types of aspirin. The Bayer Man sells us the facts about aspirin and fields questions from worried housewives, who apparently have nothing better to do with their time than attend mass meetings on the subject of aspirin. If this type of advertising catches on, I suppose we shall soon be viewing public rallies at Madison Square Garden in support of "pucker power."

In any case, the Bayer Man engages in a quasi-scientific doubletalk about Bayer Aspirin merits. Misleading and insignificant distinctions are created, and, despite the protests of the American Medical Association, one of its studies on pain relievers is cited as a virtual endorsement of Bayer's superiority. In fact, the American people are not getting the facts on aspirin from the Bayer Man. He neglects to mention that the chemical components of, and manufacturing process for, aspirin are so tightly regulated by the Food and Drug Administration that all types of aspirin are virtually identical. The American public is also not informed that Bayer Aspirin costs approximately four times as much as the ordinary, but virtually, identical generic brand to be found in any supermarket. Bayer's multimillion dollar media campaign is a classic example of advertising creating a false demand for a product. The consumer needs some type of aspirin as a pain reliever; he is convinced by television ads that Bayer is somehow so superior that he should pay about 75 cents for it while an essentially identical product is available for only 19 cents; the 56 cent difference in price is attributable to financing an advertising campaign to create a false demand for Bayer, and the vicious circle remains unbroken.

These are only two examples where counter-advertising could aid the American consumer in receiving facts rather than commercial propaganda from his television set. Yet another, perhaps, is the media campaign being conducted by the Association of American Railroads, to promote "America's Railroads." In recent weeks, a spokesman for the railroads has been describing to the American public the allegedly unfair treatment of the Nation's railroads under Federal regulatory law and has urged enactment of the Surface Transportation Act which is now pending in the House Transportation Subcommittee. Although I and others on that subcommittee agreed to cosponsor this measure so that it

might receive consideration, I cannot condone the railroads' media blitz in its behalf. The railroads ads do not discuss the merits or demerits of this bill; the American people are being asked to take his word for it that enactment of the Surface Transportation Act is vital to the national welfare. This type of political advertising is as eroding of rational public discourse on public policies as 30-second campaign spots. I object very strongly to such attempts to bombard the American people with propaganda in the absence of any discussion of the bill's provisions, or its merits. If the counter-advertising proposal of the FTC were adopted the American viewing public might at least have the benefit of the views of such public groups as the National Association of Railroad Passengers on the questions of railroad regulation and subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, to paraphrase FCC Commissioner Nicholas Johnson, the counter-advertising proposal is one means whereby the American consumer can talk back to his television set. The proposal was discussed further, quite compellingly and in considerable detail by FTC Chairman Kirkpatrick in a speech on February 28. So that my colleagues may be aware of the Federal Trade Commission's rationale for this bold policy suggestion, I include the text of Mr. Kirkpatrick's speech at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF MILES W. KIRKPATRICK, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Over 100 years ago John Stuart Mill observed that "Not the violent conflict between parts of the truth but the quiet suppression of half of it, is the formidable evil; there is always hope when people listen to both sides: it is when they attend only to one that errors harden into prejudices, and truth itself ceases to have the effect of truth by being exaggerated into falsehood."

Mill's observation contains the essence of the Federal Trade Commission's recent counter-advertising Statement. It is to that Statement that I would like to address my remarks today.

The Statement was filed on January 6, 1972, in response to the Federal Communications Commission's notice of inquiry titled: In the Matter of the Handling of Public Issues Under the Fairness Doctrine and the Public Interest Standards of the Communications Act*, Part III: Access to the Broadcast Media as a Result of Carriage of Product Commercials. In its Statement, the Commission set out the four basic economic facts which undergird our endorsement of the concept which has become known as "counter-advertising." First, advertising plays a significant role in the maintenance of our free economy. Second, broadcast advertising—some \$3.6 billion a year represents a large quantum of economic power. Third, broadcast advertising—especially television advertising—is a uniquely effective method of getting across the advertiser's message. Fourth, television is a one-way street; despite broadcast advertising's enormous impact, no one but the advertiser gets to talk.

Having thus delineated the dimensions of the general economic situation, the Statement next discussed several limitations on the FTC's ability to deal effectively with all economic problems of broadcast advertising which may affect competition in consumer products. We cannot regulate it all because we lack the resources to do so. Even if we had unlimited resources, we should not reg-

ulate it all for the simple reason that not all of it—indeed relatively little of it—directly violates any laws enforced by the FTC.

Each advertiser is free to pick and choose among the many things he could say about his product to select the things he actually does say. Unless the advertiser by his selectiveness materially misleads the consumer, the Commission cannot second-guess the advertiser's emphasis. That leaves the consumer with an incomplete set of facts when he may wish to know more, or, indeed, needs to know more if he is to make a "rational" purchase decision.

In the heart of its Statement, the Commission said:

"The Commission believes that counter-advertising would be an appropriate means of overcoming some of the shortcomings of the FTC's tools, and a suitable approach to some of the failings of advertising which are now beyond the FTC's capacity. While counter-advertising is not the only conceivable technique, regulatory or otherwise, for ameliorating these problems, it may be the least intrusive, avoiding as it does the creation of additional governmental agencies or further direct inhibitions on what advertisers can say. Counter-advertising would be fully consistent with, and should effectively complement, the enforcement policies and regulatory approaches of the FTC, to foster an overall scheme of regulation and policy which would deal comprehensively with many important aspects of advertising, to insure with greater certainty that advertising serves the public interest.

"Any attempt to implement a general right of access to respond to product commercials must allow licensees a substantial degree of discretion in deciding which commercials warrant or require access for a response. Certainly, it is implicit in the foregoing discussion that not all product commercials raise the kinds of issues or involve the kinds of problems which make counter-ads an appropriate or useful regulatory device. It is equally clear, however, that the licensee's discretion should be exercised on the basis of general rules and guidelines which would *inter alia*, specify the general categories of commercials which require recognition of access rights.

"The FTC believes that certain identifiable kinds of advertising are particularly susceptible to, and particularly appropriate for, recognition and allowance of counter-advertising, because of characteristics that warrant some opportunity for challenge and debate. Such an opportunity has not been afforded sufficiently by means of broadcast news or other parts of programing, and it is unlikely that it will or can be so afforded by such means at any time in the future. Hence, it is believed that challenge and debate through counter-advertising would be in the public interest with respect to [certain] categories of advertising."

The first category we proposed is advertising asserting claims of product performance or characteristics that explicitly raise controversial issues of public importance. This category, which, since 1967, has been treated by the courts and the FCC as requiring fairness doctrine treatment in certain cases,* comprehends ads raising explicitly such controversial issues of public importance as pollution and auto safety.

The second category is advertising stressing broad recurrent themes, which affect the purchase decision in a manner that implicitly raises controversial issues of current public importance. Here we mentioned, for example, food ads which may be viewed by some as en-

* Television Station WCBS-TV, 8 F.C.C. 2d 381 (1967), *aff'd* *Banzhaf v. FCC*, 405 F.2d 1082, (D.C. Cir. 1968), *cert. denied* 396 U.S. 842 (1969). *Friends of the Earth v. FCC*, U.S. App. D.C. —, — F.2d — (No. 24, 566, August 16, 1971).

couraging poor nutrition habits. This category, too, has received at least implicit court approval.

A third category is advertising claims which rest upon or rely upon scientific premises which are currently subject to controversy within the scientific community. While the FTC is empowered to take formal action to eliminate deception resting on scientific claims, such action might create the unfortunate misimpression that the government has an official preference for one side of the controversy. Counter-advertising would avoid that government intrusion.

The fourth category is advertising which is silent about negative aspects of the advertised product. This category is self-explanatory.

That, then, is in summary our rather modest counter-advertising Statement. Today, I would like to add some perspective by discussing, and I hope, answering, some of the comments which have been made about counter-advertising. In effect, I will attempt to demonstrate the utility of counter-advertising by engaging in some myself.

I would like to take up first the charge that the FTC is shirking its regulatory responsibilities by passing the buck to the FCC, and that one of the reasons we prefer counter-advertising to our own regulation is because we feel ourselves unduly constrained by our procedures. Neither point is correct.

The FTC is empowered by law to put an end to unfair or deceptive advertising if it would be in the public interest to do so. We intend to continue to use this power to enforce the law as vigorously, rapidly, and effectively as we can. The purpose of counter-advertising is not to end false claims but to permit private groups and individuals in appropriate cases to dispute claims with which they disagree. Obviously, of course, there may be some situations in which a claim is susceptible of both FTC regulation and counter-advertising.

In a sense, that is the case now. Anyone can write a letter to the editor or print a leaflet or testify before a Congressional committee about advertising which he believes raises issues of explicit or implicit public controversy, rests on unresolved scientific premises, or fails to discuss negative aspects of a product. None of this activity is a substitute for FTC action in a proper case; rather, it complements FTC action. All that counter-advertising would do is permit one who wishes to comment on broadcast advertising to do so over the same airwaves which carried the ad in the first place.

The charge that we seek to abridge advertisers' procedural rights surprises me. Subjecting a respondent to a cease and desist order is of significant legal force; a cease and desist order carries serious penalties for violation and the FTC will continue to afford full procedural and substantive rights to all subject to its procedures. But to argue that no advertiser should be criticized, or commented upon, or discussed, or praised, for that matter, without due process of law, trivializes due process. Advertisers frequently comment on each other's products. That is called competition. Magazines and newspapers often praise or criticize ad campaigns. These are called editorials. But when we propose that the public be allowed to comment on TV about TV ads, we are charged with attempting to bypass our responsibilities. There may be some criticisms of substance of counter-advertising, but that certainly is not among them.

Let me emphasize, too, that we have not proposed an equal time doctrine. We did not suggest that each broadcast commercial should trigger a right to a free reply. We specifically and quite willingly, I might add, deferred to the FCC with respect to the mechanics and implementation of counter-advertising. We suggested that it might be

appropriate for the FCC to prohibit in some categories replies to particular ads, allowing only general replies to all advertising for broad product categories. We recognized the necessity of strictly limiting the frequency, number, and duration of reply ads.

We did recommend that the FCC require that anyone who was willing to pay for time be permitted to buy it, and we recommended that the FCC require licensees to provide some free time to those unable to pay for it.

It has been said that, if implemented, counter-advertising would drive advertisers off the air because they would not wish to run their messages in the same medium which permits attacks upon them. This, our critics say, would bankrupt broadcasters and ultimately deprive the public of free TV. If this were truly so, I suppose Ford would never advertise on the same network as Chevrolet. But, more seriously, I am deeply concerned by the notion that the majority of advertisers are able or willing to play the game only if the rules free them from any disagreement. In the first place, all advertising involves at least the implication that a competitor's product is less desirable than one's own. Some ads expressly criticize the much maligned "Brand X" or even name the competing product. I see no reason why counter-advertising should be any more deleterious to Product X than ads by the maker of Product Y. Why, in any event, should an advertiser have the right to monopolize the consumer's attention by trumpeting the virtues of his product when a consumer who learned of an aspect undesirable to him might not buy it if the attention monopoly were ended?

Then it is said that the presence of counter-ads will create a Tower of Babel, a multiplicity of ads so great that no one will be able to sort out anything. As I have already mentioned, the FTC did not propose that the FCC require limitless counter-ads. On the contrary, we explicitly recognized the desirability of limits as to frequency, duration and number. For example, we made the modest suggestion that it might be appropriate to cluster the free time in one prime five minute block per week. Nor did our proposal contemplate that all individuals or groups be granted access. Rather, we were concerned with increasing the points of view to be accommodated. Not all licensees will grant free time to all counter-advertisers.

It is enough that each licensee accommodate a few counter-advertisers.

But how, it is asked, will licensees, without risking the wrath of the FCC, sort out those who wish to counter-advertise and arrange them? How, I ask, do licensees select among the variety of public interest spots now available to them? Obviously, they exercise their best judgment, consistent with their obligation to further the public interest, convenience, and necessity. Since there has never been a license denial for failure to select wisely, I believe the broadcasters' continued best judgment will be quite adequate to the task of selecting counter-ads.

And, if the broadcasters select, how is the consumer to make any sense of the welter of ads and counter-ads? The answer depends on what a consumer is supposed to learn from counter-advertising. If a consumer is supposed to receive a flash of absolute revealed truth complete with breadth and depth of understanding, from an ad or a counter-ad, clearly inadequate. Just as an ad for a product tries to catch a consumer's interest, give him a piece of information, and induce him to consider the advantages of a product, so a counter-ad should catch his interest, give him a piece of information, and induce him to consider other aspects of a product. The key is the word "consider." No product ad is a dissertation with footnotes. It is a prod to thought, a spur to action. Neither must a counter-ad answer all the consumer's ques-

tions. If it encourages him to reflect, to think twice, to weigh for himself, to seek more information, a counter-ad will have done quite enough.

Without belaboring the point, I think those who would protect the consumer from too much information do him a real disservice. No consumer can know everything about all products any more than any voter can know everything about all issues. With respect to the electorate, Thomas Jefferson said:

"I know no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves, and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion." The analogy to counter-advertising is apt.

It has also been claimed that counter-advertising in broadcast advertising violates the First Amendment, because the First Amendment no more permits the government's requiring that material be broadcast than it permits the government's banning or censoring of broadcast material. Some broadcasters are saying that their right of free speech will be unconstitutionally burdened by requiring them to run counter-advertising. The trouble with this argument is that it ignores the question of whose First Amendment rights are at issue. As the Supreme Court held in *Red Lion*:

"It is the right of the viewers and listeners, not the right of the Broadcasters which is paramount. . . . It is the purpose of the First Amendment to preserve an uninhibited marketplace of ideas in which truth will ultimately prevail, rather than to countenance monopolization of that market, whether it be by the Government itself, or a private licensee. It is the right of the public to receive suitable access to social, political, esthetic, moral, and other ideas and experiences which is crucial here. That right may not constitutionally be abridged either by Congress or by the FCC."

But it is further argued that requiring access to television unfairly discriminates against broadcasters as compared to other media which carry advertising. This argument, of course, ignores the differences between television and other media.* A consumer who watches television must take evasive action which would do credit to Snoopy as the Red Baron if he is to avoid all television commercials and still watch TV. As a practical matter, most people will agree that the television viewer is a member of the advertiser's captive audience.

We trade regulation lawyers are not often dealers in the First Amendment, but the concepts behind the antitrust laws and the First Amendment do seem to converge at counter-advertising. If I were a potential monopolist—of ideas or of goods—I would revel in a system which lets me speak and sell at will but barred all those who would speak with ideas rather than with competing products. It is against just such monopolization that counter-advertising is aimed.

Another criticism is that no one will be able to regulate the counter-advertisements because their ads will be protected by the First Amendment. Thus, it is argued, advertisers who are held by the FTC to ever more rigorous standards of veracity will be subjected to attack which may be totally untruthful and totally unregulated. While this argument has surface appeal, I believe it is misplaced. I think *New York Times Co. v. Sullivan** is authority for the proposition that the First Amendment will not protect

**Red Lion Broadcasting Co. v. FCC*, 395 U.S. 367, 389 (1969).

***Television Station WCBS-TV, 8 F.C.C. 2d 381 (1967), aff'd Banzhaf v. FCC*, 405 F. 2d 1082 (D.C. Cir. 1968), cert. denied 396 U.S. 842 (1969).

those counter-advertisers whose falsehoods are delivered with "actual malice"—that is, when the counter-advertiser knows his statement is false or he acts with reckless disregard of whether his statement is false or not.

That leaves those who, through their innocent mistakes, deceive. In some instances such innocent misstatements would be constitutionally protected, although clearly this would not be the case for those counter ads that constitute purely commercial speech.*** I believe that we should risk the possibility of a few such distortions in order to achieve the balancing benefits that an effective counter-advertising mechanism would create for the American consumer. While our case for counter-advertising does not rest upon First Amendment considerations, it is perhaps noteworthy that chancing the possibility of some innocent distortion by counter-advertisers is fully consistent with the First Amendment's purposes.

I do not find at all persuasive the arguments leveled at our Statement. Perhaps what is even more striking is that every critic has in effect said "Yes, but..." Actually, our fundamental proposition, i.e., that broadened access rights for counter-ads may make sense as a matter of national economic regulatory policy, has gone virtually unchallenged. Instead, detractors have concentrated on alleged adverse side effects that would overwhelm the conceded good our proposal would accomplish.

For the reasons expressed in the original Statement, I continue to believe that Counter-Advertising would materially contribute to the goal of a healthy and informed marketplace. In short, I do not fear that our proposal would burn the barn to roast a pig. I am confident that whatever the niceties of unsettled or disputed questions of law that bear on our proposal, the FCC and the Courts will fashion procedures in accordance with the public interest.

I had thought our counter-advertising Statement a small contribution to the FCC's inquiry about the fairness doctrine, and I still think so. The ensuing outcry has surprised me. Perhaps now that you have heard me out you will agree that the proposal is a reasonable one and one that deserves consideration.

In closing, let me say that reasonable men may, I suppose, differ as to the merits of the Federal Trade Commission's proposal. I would hope, therefore, that the matter will be made the subject of rational discourse and reasoned examination. To quote from the remarks of a third learned gentleman of over one hundred years ago—"Men are never so likely to settle a question rightly as when they discuss it freely." Those are the words of Thomas Babington Macaulay, in 1830, a equally descriptive, I suggest, of the purposes of counter-advertising as of the kind of discussion that should surround the consideration of that proposal.

Thank you.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 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?"

***New York Times v. Sullivan, 376 U.S. 255, 265-6 (1963).

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

THE TAIWAN CONCESSIONS: A RED CHINESE VICTORY?

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Oakland Tribune has recently carried an editorial entitled "The Taiwan Concessions: A Red Chinese Victory?" that I want to share with my colleagues.

The publisher of the Oakland Tribune is the Honorable William Knowland, former U.S. Senator from California and former Republican leader of that body. Senator Knowland has always had a keen interest in the Orient. This is understandable, because we from California face the Orient and affairs on the shores of the Pacific are of common interest to us all.

It was my privilege to serve with Bill Knowland in the California Legislature and here in the Congress and I am sure that the question posed by this editorial is one that all of us are concerned with and would like to know its answer.

The editorial follows:

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, Feb. 29, 1972]

THE TAIWAN CONCESSIONS: A RED CHINESE VICTORY?

When President Nixon revealed last July he was going to Peking for a face-to-face summit with the leaders of Communist China, the question of Taiwan was generally acknowledged to be the starting point for any accord that might be reached.

At that time, we labeled the whole venture a "gamble where the odds are heavily against (the United States) from the start." Our concern for the integrity of this nation's solemn treaty obligation with the Taiwan government was shared by many diplomatic observers familiar with the powerful, conflicting forces churning about in the frothy geopolitical cauldron of Asia and the Far East.

Now that the President's epic journey to the heartland of Chinese communism has ended, the worst fears of last summer seem fully confirmed, and the "gamble" appears only to have paid off in terms of a signal diplomatic victory for Premier Chou En-lai and his Marxist government in Peking.

By failing to confirm in the joint communiqué with Chou the U.S. commitment to protect Taiwan against external attack, the President even seems to have gone far beyond the previously announced Nixon doctrine abdicating the U.S. role of a global anti-Communist force. Remaining aloof and neutral in another's dispute is one thing; ignoring a promise to protect a friend is quite another.

The United States must acknowledge Chou's long-standing claim that Taiwan is part of China, and the promise of eventual withdrawal of all U.S. troops from the island seems to portend the day when an armed invasion will be launched by Communists secure in their knowledge that there will be no U.S. response.

Chou promises to "liberate" the 15 million Chinese on Taiwan, but as the reporters who accompanied Mr. Nixon related, there are already precious few liberties under the Chinese Communists. All mainland Chinese life is so closely controlled that true freedom and true liberty, even approximating the American meaning, are simply not known and not permitted.

But all this Mr. Nixon has known for many years. Is the President now prepared to sacrifice the Nationalist government and the Taiwan people to a life of Marxist slavery in order to find an accommodation with Chou En-lai?

There were no counter-concessions by Chou or by Red party Chairman Mao Tse-tung, and until these Red leaders show evidence beyond mere words of a true intention to work towards Asian peace, then the President's virtual disavowal of a solemn American treaty obligation seems both unprofitable and potentially dangerous.

Indeed, the people of Taiwan may be excused for reacting with the same uncomfortable nervousness as did the people of Czechoslovakia after Britain's Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain returned from Munich with the proud announcement of his "peace in our time" deal with Chancellor Adolph Hitler of Nazi Germany.

NIXON PROPOSES VISITS TO MOSCOW AND HAVANA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, while the public attention continues on the President's recent trip to Red China, little attention is being directed to his forthcoming visit to Moscow.

The repercussions from the China trip have not been fully analyzed as to its impact with our Latin and Central American friends and the situation is further aggravated by news leaks that one of the results of the Moscow trip could be a Nixon visit to Havana after the fall elections, of course, so as not to alienate the anti-Communist Cuban refugees in the United States—especially those who have become voting citizens.

I ask that related newscippings follow:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 4, 1972]

NIXON VISIT TO RUSSIA IS DISCUSSED

Secretary of State William Rogers and Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin discussed at length yesterday President Nixon's trip to the Soviet Union in May and agreed on further talks.

The two men began what amounted to a catalog of the possible agenda issues. U.S. officials said. Most of the issues were discussed in passing as problems that might be raised at or affect the Soviet-American summit.

State Department officials expressed private satisfaction that their boss would be heavily involved in the substantive preparations for the Moscow visit. This contrasts with the planning for the forthcoming Peking summit, which was handled almost exclusively by presidential adviser Henry A. Kissinger and his staff.

Rogers called Dobrynin in for what was described as a "tour of the horizon" upon the Soviet ambassador's return from Moscow. Dobrynin was in the Soviet Union for about

two months and reportedly held intensive talks on the Kremlin's American policy.

Among the subjects reviewed at yesterday's meeting were the strategic arms limitation talks, a European security conference and mutual balanced force reductions in Europe. The two men reportedly did not discuss China or Vietnam.

State Department spokesmen said that Rogers asked Dobrynin whether Moscow plans to receive former NATO Secretary-General Manlio Brosio, the designated allied negotiator on troop cuts. Dobrynin reportedly answered that he could not say. Brosio has been waiting for a Soviet invitation for months.

Rogers and Dobrynin are also said to have discussed such purely bilateral matters as American efforts to open a consulate in Leningrad. Washington has been holding up the opening of a Soviet consulate in San Francisco pending completion of arrangements in Leningrad.

Meanwhile, it was announced that the Soviet-American maritime talks held at the State Department since Jan. 25 are being adjourned to give both governments a chance to consider their progress.

Among the problems for the talks were the opening of Soviet and U.S. ports to each other's merchant shipping.

Washington is interested in getting port rights in Leningrad, Vladivostok and other harbors. The Soviets want to be able to load and unload cargoes in East Coast and Great Lakes ports.

Except for a major recent exception to load American grain on Soviet ships, the International Longshoremen's Association has refused to handle Soviet merchant shipping, which has been able to use only West Coast ports.

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 15, 1972]

RUSSIAN AT U.N. SEIZED AS A SPY AGAINST UNITED STATES

NEW YORK.—A 32-year-old Soviet citizen who works as a translator for the United Nations Secretariat was arrested last night on espionage charges outside a restaurant in Patchogue, N.Y., according to Robert Morse, attorney for the Eastern District of New York.

Morse said the suspect, Valeriy Ivanovich Markelov, who has worked for the U.N. since 1967, was arrested on charges of having classified information pertaining to the F14 fighter plane.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation said the case had been under investigation since the fall of 1970, when Markelov made the acquaintance of an engineer employed at the Grumman Aerospace Corp., in Bethpage, N.Y.

From the inception of the case, Grumman officials and the engineer directly involved cooperated fully with the FBI, a spokesman for the FBI said.

The FBI said Markelov gave the engineer a portable copying machine and a 35-mm camera with which to reproduce the classified material.

"Markelov had 11 separate meetings with the engineer at various restaurants in the New York area, and persistently requested confidential data concerning the new plane," the FBI said. According to the FBI spokesman, all of the meetings were observed by federal agents.

John F. Malone, the New York regional FBI director, said Markelov was arrested at 8:30 p.m. outside the Long Island restaurant after he had met with the engineer inside and received "classified" documents.

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) Morning Advocate, Mar. 3, 1972]

CASTRO MIGHT OKAY DIALOGUE WITH UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON.—Cuban Prime Minister Fidel Castro is telling intimates he is no longer

inflexibly opposed to resuming a more friendly relationship with the United States.

Diplomats attuned to Castro's thinking say there has been a decided change in his views since last September when he declared that Cuba has "no intention or desire of resuming relations with Yankee imperialism."

The first evidence of the emergence of a "New Castro" came in Chile last Nov. 25 when he declared that an era of U.S.-Cuban friendship might be possible after the Nixon administration leaves office.

In private conversations, Castro has made it known that the statement was no slip of the tongue. One diplomat, who asked not to be quoted by name, spent 45 minutes with Castro not long ago and said Castro's position toward a dialogue with the United States is unmistakably more flexible than it was just a few months ago.

Another Castro expert who has detected a change in the prime minister's attitude is Prof. James D. Theberge, director of Latin-American studies for the Center for Strategic and International Studies of Georgetown University.

Theberge said he has received information indicating that Castro is "astoundingly well-informed" about the position of a number of U.S. newspapers and editorial writers on U.S.-Cuban relations.

In an interview, Theberge said that Castro's concern over the viewpoint of U.S. opinion makers could be aimed at giving him a "feel of the possibilities of resuming a dialogue."

Theberge said Castro's apparent reappraisal of his headline anti-American stand stems primarily from a desire to free Cuba from what has become an almost total dependence on the Soviet Union.

In the economic sphere, Theberge said, the Kremlin is demanding more and more say on how Soviet economic resources are to be used in Cuba. He said Castro might find the Soviet presence more tolerable if Cuba showed some sign of economic progress. In Cuba, even sugar is rationed.

U.S. officials say Castro has given them no direct signal of a desire for resuming a dialogue and there is some question as to whether the Nixon administration would agree to talks prior to the November elections.

Nixon administration political strategists, recognizing the anti-Castro sentiment among Cuban refugees remains strong, say that a show of flexibility toward Castro before November could cost the Republicans thousands of votes.

"Nixon has said, however, that the Cuban issue could come up during his May summit consultations in Moscow."

According to Theberge, another of the reasons for Castro's apparent policy switch is that he is obsessed with the fear that the Moscow summit meeting could produce a U.S.-Soviet understanding at the expense of Cuba's security interests.

Before the summit, Castro was in a position to demand more from the U.S. and the Soviet Union. But now, he is in a position to demand more from the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

POLITICAL MORAL SEEN IN PEKING APPROACH

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Elliot Janeway is an internationally recognized economist whose column is carried regularly by the Chicago Tribune Press Service. The Chicago Tribune of Monday, March 6, comments in a most timely fashion on key questions stemming

from the new American contacts with Peking.

Mr. Janeway's column follows:

POLITICAL MORAL SEEN IN PEKING APPROACH

(By Elliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, March 5.—China is the big power with the least developed economy. Hers is the smallest role in the world economy. She plays it by keeping her foreign trade on a cash basis.

China's sensitivity to power relationships goes far to explain her preference for paying cash and letting the credit go. A recent experience of credit dependence is fresh in the minds of her wary leaders. It threatened to trap them, and they have shown their determination to avoid running the risk again.

Russia had sold airplanes and other equipment to China on credit before the family quarrel between Moscow and Peking erupted. When the Kremlin moved to exert a creditor's squeeze on China, the response from across the Great Wall was to pay Russia off and send her salesmen packing.

The political moral has not been lost on Russia's satellites in Eastern Europe. They would have more bargaining power with Moscow if they too had managed to pay Russia in cash and let the credit go.

MORAL WAS LOST

But the moral has been lost on America. Trade is one of the aims of the preliminary Presidential probe in Peking; and credit entanglements are to be one of the means. American exports will now be one of the measures of whether "the week that changed the world" changed it for better or for worse. China has the dollars to pay cash on the barrelhead for enough airplanes to put Seattle, Los Angeles, St. Louis, Wichita, Cincinnati, Hartford, and Fort Worth back on overtime. Moreover, she is loading up on more every day. For she has the very best paying business in America hitting the cash register for her.

No conjecture is needed to identify her profiteering from it; and it is one good business in America not within reach of the regulatory operations of President Nixon's Price Board. No less an authority on the present day China trade than Gen. Creighton W. Abrams has just identified it.

While the President was in Peking, Abrams singled out China as one of the Big Three Asiatic sources of the pernicious American blight known as the drug traffic; Peking's satellites in Laos and Cambodia are the other two.

CASH IS NOT PROBLEM

China is making as much money out of the American dope trade as she is making trouble for America with it. Therefore, cash is scarcely a limitation on her ability to buy the many staples of the American way of life she lacks.

Nevertheless, credit will be the official lubricant of the American trade flow about to be started up with China. Relying on it will put America in the position of literally using her own money to buy any sales she proposes to make with China.

Being banked by America will put China in the position of having the use of the goods she gets from America without having to pay for them until after they have paid for themselves. This means that the dollars pouring into her treasury from American drug trade will be hers to use elsewhere.

ASSESS THE CHANGE

China's flexibility in switching her negotiating stance vis-a-vis America from a cash to a credit basis needs to be assessed in terms of the main preoccupation of Communist strategy. This is not profit, but power. It is not economic, but political. It treats peacetime negotiation as an extension of

wartime combat, and trading as a way of fighting.

Considering China's willingness to let America bank her against the background of her fear of falling into Russia's clutches speaks for itself. Everyone knows that China has good reason to be afraid of Russia. Now everyone will know that China no longer sees any reason to be afraid of America. The economics of handout is the fellow-traveler of the politics of kowtow. The fear-conscious world of Asia will count it that way.

But freedom from fear of the other side meets only one of Communism's two conditions for making war by doing business. Positively weakening the other side is the other. Letting America pay for the privilege of making up for China's capital deficiencies will weaken America more than the most militant Marxist-Maoist bravado.

NEED DOLLAR INFLOWS

America's most pressing financial need is for new dollar inflows from overseas. Subsidizing still more exports that bring in no money is the surest guarantee that the present crisis of confidence will intensify.

The continuing spectacle of American subsidized exports flooding foreign markets without soaking up surplus dollars is bound to encourage still more destructive world wide speculation against present currency parities. The dollar is bound to be the principal victim.

More government borrowing threatens even worse damage to the dollar than more foreign giveaways. Peking's willingness to go along with Washington's offer to dig the United States Treasury into a deeper hole shows that China's government is more realistic about the sources of national strength than America is.

THE DECEPTION OF THE GREEK JUNTA'S "CONSTITUTION"

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the junta of Greek colonels that seized power in April 1967, was not composed of high-minded constitutional reformers. The coup was a power grab, raw, and crudely disguised.

Soon after they seized power, however, the colonels shed their military uniforms and began to play on the device of "a new constitution." This was to buy time, to serve their apologists, and generally to deceive American opinion.

The junta's 1968 constitution was written in secret by the junta's appointees, was never openly debated, and was voted upon under conditions of martial law. The people had a choice between no constitution at all—undisguised dictatorship—and a flawed document which offered a small hope of some future change at some unspecified date. Given this choice among evils, the people voted for the junta's constitution. But we should not be deceived regarding the genesis or the character of this constitution, despite the gleeful boasts of the junta and its apologists that ratification represented popular support.

The central aspect of the junta's constitution is that is designed to give the army permanent control of the nation. As for its provisions on individual rights, most continue to be suspended.

The following analysis of the 1968 constitution, prepared by Greek intellectuals, is worth reviewing as the Congress begins an examination of the United States-Greek home-porting arrangement:

THE JUNTA CONSTITUTION OF 1968

(The colonels have promulgated a Constitution known as the "Constitution of 1968." What follows is an analysis of this Constitution.)

On April 21, 1967, a conspiracy of colonels belonging to the Greek intelligence services seized power using a NATO contingency plan under the code name "Prometheus." Exactly one week after power seizure Mr. Rusk reassured American opinion that King Constantine "has called for an early return to parliamentary government. We are now awaiting," Rusk continued, "concrete evidence that the new Greek government will make every effort to re-establish democratic institutions which have been an integral part of Greek political life."

This 'return to democracy,' heralded and promised time and again by American statesmen, has never materialized. Instead, as is carefully documented by the Council of Europe, the Greek people have been subjected to an unabating reign of terror and intimidation which continues to this day. The junta and its sponsors, with an eye to world opinion, promulgated the Constitution of 1968 not for the purpose of espousing the democratic ideal, but, as it will be seen below, for the purpose of legalizing and perpetuating the junta and granting it a permanent status.

THE RIGGING OF A REFERENDUM

On September 29, 1968, the Greek junta held a referendum on its new constitution. Mr. van der Stoep, Rapporteur on the situation in Greece, made an extensive report to the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe. In January 1969, he made, inter alia, the following observations:

"28. The referendum was held under martial law. During my visit to Greece in April 1968, I received contradictory replies from different members of the Greek Government to the question whether martial law would be raised during the referendum campaign and at the time of the referendum itself. Mr. Pipinellis, Minister of Foreign Affairs, assured me that the referendum would be absolutely free and honest. In his personal opinion, he said, the state of siege should be raised for the referendum. The reality was different."

"31. During the whole 'discussion' on the Constitution, political leaders and political parties had no real opportunity to state frankly their views. Not a single meeting of political parties to discuss the draft Constitution could be held. Everything possible seems to have been done to isolate the political leaders from the people. Furthermore, some of them, and some of the leading political figures, were in prison, deported or under house arrest. Many others were under constant police supervision. Thus, there was no organized political opposition in the campaign."

"34. Before the referendum, the Greek people were for seventeen months subjected to an enormous one-sided official propaganda campaign by the government which monopolized all propaganda media since the coup d'etat and suppressed any opposition campaign. As I mentioned in my September report, I have received repeated reports concerning pressure which was exercised on village notables to use their influence to secure a safe majority in their village."

"45. On 3 November 1968, at the funeral of George Papandreu, which gave rise to the first important mass demonstration against the regime, the favourite slogan was 'OXI' (no), a delayed protest against the constitutional referendum. Ignoring martial law a

huge crowd of Greeks—300,000 according to certain press reports—shouted: 'We want freedom,' 'You are still the Prime Minister,' 'Down with Tyranny,' etc."

As expected, the results of the referendum: nearly 92% 'yes,' 8% 'no,' with 22.5% abstentions despite harsh penalties for failure to vote.

THE NATURE OF THE CONSTITUTION

The 1968 Constitution demonstrates its fundamental purpose:

(1) The Army is organized as a fourth, independent power which is not controlled by the elected representatives of the people, although it is integrated into the NATO command structure. The Army is *administratively autonomous*. Its decisions are binding on the Minister of Defense. It is further empowered to "protect the social order . . . against external and . . . internal enemies."

(2) As if that were not enough to defeat the will of the Greek people, a *Constitutional Court* is constituted with life tenure for its members to maintain control over the political life of the country. This Court decides irrevocably which citizens and parties may participate in the political process on the basis of their political beliefs. The Court is empowered to dissolve parties and to depose Deputies.

(3) The Constitution also forbids the elected Parliament to consider issues of *foreign or defense policy*, and imposes severe restrictions on *individual rights, freedom of the press, and labor activity*.

Thus, the Greek Army is licensed to operate as an *occupation force*. The parliament is reduced to *quiescent status* to provide political support for the Army, and the Greek people *reduced to political impotence*. A glance at the Constitution and how it operates:

THE ARMED FORCES: A FOURTH BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

The new Constitution establishes a fourth, district and inviolable constitutional power—namely, the armed forces of the nation. Article 131 provides the following:

"1. Promotions and retirements of the regular officers of the armed forces are effected by Royal Decree, issued on the recommendation of the Minister of National Defense, following a decision of the service councils constituted of highest ranking officers, as provided by law."

"2. If the Minister of National Defense disagrees with the decision of the council, he may within a mandatory time limit of fifteen days, after having taken notice of the decision, submit same to an appellate council of broader composition, by highest ranking officers."

"3. The assignments and transfers of the higher and highest rank officers of the armed forces are effected by service councils comprised of highest rank officers as provided by law."

"4. The decisions of the councils in accordance with the provisions of this article are binding for the Minister of National Defense and the administrative acts issued in execution thereof are not subject to review by the Council of State."

Thus, under the colonels' constitution the armed forces are formally, as well as in substance, beyond the reach of the civilian government. They constitute a self-governing body, whose objectives and basic structure are given by Article 129.

"1. The armed forces . . . have as their mission, to defend the National Independence, territorial integrity of the country and the existing political and social system against external or internal enemies."

"2. The administration of the armed forces shall be exercised by the Government through the Chief of the Armed Forces. He, as well as the Chiefs of the Army, Navy and Air Force are selected, from amongst those having the qualifications according to law,

by the Supreme Council for National Defense, constituted as provided by law."

To insure that they will indeed protect "the existing political and social system against . . . internal enemies," Article 130 provides the following:

"1. The members of the armed forces owe faith and allegiance to the Country, the national ideals and the national traditions and serve the Nation."

"2. The mission and the capacity of a military man is absolutely opposed to ideologies aiming at the overthrow or the undermining of the existing political or social regime or the corrupting of the national conscience of the Greeks, or associated with the principles and programs of parties outlawed."

Article 49 maintains the King as the symbolic head of the Armed Forces.

FURTHER SAFEGUARDS FOR PERMANENT ARMED FORCES DICTATORSHIP

The Council of the Nation

The Council of the Nation is a new institution patterned after the Crown Council of old. This supreme body shares with the titular Chief of State, the King, his substantive powers. The Council of the Nation consists of five members at most, one of whom is the chief of the armed forces. Thus the Army bureaucracy is raised to the top echelon of the state. Article 54 provides the following:

"2. The Council of the Nation shall be comprised by the Prime Minister, the Speaker of the Parliament, the leaders of the two most powerful parties in Parliament, as long as one of them is not also Prime Minister, the President of the Constitutional Court and the Chief of the Armed Forces."

The Council of the Nation has substantial powers in the formation and dissolution of governments. Article 43, section 1, provides that,

"The King shall dismiss the Government after hearing the opinion of the Council of the Nation."

Section 3 of the same Article states:

"In the event after general elections, no party wins the absolute majority in Parliament, the Parliament, after electing its Praesidium, shall propose a Prime Minister by the absolute majority of the totality of its members, and the King appoints him. If during this ballot no one obtains the absolute majority, the King shall then appoint the Prime Minister after first having obtained the opinion of the Council of the Nation."

And in section 4 of the same article, we read,

"4. In every other case except that provided in art. 93.3 the King shall appoint the Prime Minister after having obtained the opinion of the Council of the Nation."

Article 46 further provides that,

"The King may dissolve Parliament after having heard the opinion of the Council of the Nation."

THE CONSTITUTIONAL COURT: A POLITICAL POLICEMAN

An even more intriguing feature of the new constitution is the creation of the Constitutional Court. This new body assumes supreme supervisory powers over the political process as a whole. As provided in Article 98, its members are appointed for life by the current Council of Ministers—namely, the leadership of the military regime. Its members are selected from the highest court, the universities and from amongst public personalities in the political, social, economic, cultural and intellectual realms. In practical terms, of course, these categories must be understood in terms of the purges, exiles and defamation campaigns which Greece has experienced under the military regime.

The sweeping powers of the Constitutional Court are described in Article 106.

"1. The Constitutional Court decides on the meaning and the extent of the competences of the Chief of State, the Speaker

of the Parliament, and of the government, in accordance with the constitution, upon application of the Government, the Speaker of the Parliament or a Party recognized according to the Constitution and the rules of Parliament . . ."

"2. The Constitutional Court decides a) on appeals against legislative or administrative acts, on the preparation or carriage of elections, as well as on the validity of the election of deputies, whether they refer to electoral violations in carrying them out, or lack of qualifications . . . c) On every other case submitted to its jurisdiction by the present Constitution."

"3. The decisions of the Constitutional Court are irrevocable. They are published by order of its President in the Government Gazette, and from the time of their publication, the decisions are res judicata to all."

The dictatorial substance of the powers granted the Constitutional Court in sections 2.a) and 2.c) or Article 106 is spelled out in Article 58.

"1. Political parties shall be founded freely by Greek citizens having the right to vote. These parties through their activity shall express the will of the people and must contribute to the advancement of the national interest."

"2. The organization, the program and the activity of the parties must be governed by national and democratic principles. Their leaders and governing committee must be elected by representative conventions of their members. The charter of every party must be approved by the Constitutional Court which decides as to the conformity of its provisions in relation to the Constitution. No party shall have the right to participate in elections if its Charter has not had the aforementioned approval."

"4. The general functioning of the parties, as more specifically provided by law, shall be subject to the continuous supervision of the Constitutional Court, which shall have the right to dissolve any party whatsoever whenever it ascertains serious violations of the Constitution or the laws."

"5. Political parties whose aims or activities are manifestly or covertly opposed to the fundamental principles of the form of government or tend to overthrow the existing social system or endanger the territorial integrity of the Country or its public security, shall be outlawed and dissolved by the decision of the Constitutional Court, as provided by law."

"6. The deputies of the party being dissolved shall be declared deposed of their office, and the seats held by them in Parliament, shall remain vacant until the termination of the parliamentary period."

Thus the parliamentary process becomes a mockery of democratic institutions. But there are more safeguards. Under Article 61, section 2, no one can be proclaimed a candidate, or be elected Deputy if:

"f) he has been irrevocably convicted for active participation in a party, organization, association or union whose aim is the preparation and application of ideas tending to overthrow the existing political or social system or the detachment of part of the territory, for life."

Furthermore, in Article 56, section 2, we find:

"Those irrevocably convicted to a penalty whatsoever for acts or activities directed against the existing political or social system shall be denied the right to vote."

In sum, the Constitutional Court becomes a political policeman—an organ of ideological control over the parliamentary process which guards the enormous powers of the military establishment against the voice of the people.

This does not, however, complete the analysis. Far and beyond these provisions, the Constitution of 1968 establishes other

"constitutional guarantees" that democracy shall not rear its head again in Greece.

THE EMASCULATION OF PARLIAMENT

Under the conditions detailed above, the Parliament assumes a Quisling status, and its functions are not worthy of specific mention. There are exceptions, however, which illustrate beyond doubt how the constitution functions. These exceptions deal with matters which are put beyond the competence of the elected representatives of the people.

Article 77, section 3, provides that:

"The establishment of (Parliamentary) Investigation Committees on matters pertaining to foreign policy or to the defense of the country is not permitted."

Again, Article 23 states:

"2. Emergency Law No. 465 of the year 1968 'on amendment and completion of some provisions of Law 1880/1951 on ship taxation' enlarging the protection of Greek merchant marine beyond the one afforded by act 13 of legislative decree 2687/1953 'Concerning investment and protection of foreign capital' cannot be amended. Subsequent law to be issued only once and for all may amend it only to confer additional protection."

"3. Emergency Law 89 of the year 1967 'Concerning establishment in Greece of Foreign commercial and industrial companies' and Emergency Law 378 of the year 1968 supplementing the above, cannot be amended. Subsequent law to be issued only once and for all, may amend them only to confer additional protection."

Thus in matters of foreign affairs, national defense and foreign investment, the Parliament (the people) is excluded. The junta's enactments on foreign investment, which have turned Greece into "open territory" to foreign business interests, are made a permanent feature of the legislative structure.

THE NONRIGHTS OF THE CITIZEN

Under the 1968 Constitution, individual rights are strictly limited. Article 9 provides that:

"1. Every person has the right to the free development of his personality provided he does not infringe on the rights of others and does not violate the constitutional order and the moral code."

Article 14 establishes a peculiar concept of freedom of the press.

"4. Seizure of printed matter, either before or after publication is prohibited. By exception, seizure after circulation is permitted by order of the public prosecutor: (a) because of insult to the Christian and any other known religion; (b) because of insult to the person of the King, the Crown Prince, their wives and children; (c) because of a publication which (1) discloses information on the organization, composition, armament and deployment of the armed forces, or on the fortifications of the country, (2) is patently rebellious, or aims at overthrowing the regime, or the existing social system or is directed against the territorial integrity of the Country or creates defeatism, or constitutes an instigation or attempt to commit a crime of high treason, (3) intends to protect or diffuse for political explanation, views of outlawed parties or organizations, and (d) because of indecent publications manifestly offending public decency in cases provided by law."

"6. Press offenses are deemed offenses whose author is taken in the act, and are brought to trial without preliminary examination, as provided by law. Violations of this provision by the competent public prosecutor constitutes a serious disciplinary offense."

Thus printed matter is put under the direct and forceful control of the judicial branch of government which interprets and applies sweeping restrictions. Since the radio and television are also under the direct administrative control of the government, all mass communications media are in substance at the disposal of the new establishment.

March 7, 1972

The rights of association and strike are limited by the provisions of Article 19.

"2. Every union of persons, the purpose or activity of which, are directed against the territorial integrity of the Country, or the principles of the regime or the social order or the security of the State or the political or civil liberties of the citizen shall be prohibited. It is dissolved by Court decree.

"4. The right of association of civil servants may be subject to certain restrictions by law. The same restrictions on the right of association may be imposed on employees of Local government bodies, or other legal entities of public law, public enterprises, and public utilities."

"5. Resort to strike for the purpose of achieving political or other ends unrelated to material or moral interests of the workers shall be prohibited."

"6. Strike of any form by civil service personnel of any kind, personnel of local government bodies or of other legal entities of public law, shall be prohibited. The participation of such personnel in a strike is considered itself as a submission of resignation."

Article 15 abolishes the secrecy of private communications. It states that:

"The secrecy of letters and of all other means of correspondence is inviolable. A law defines the guarantees under which the judicial authority is not bound by secrecy, for reasons of national security and public order or for the revelation of heinous crime."

EMERGENCY POWERS

The 1968 Constitution contains one final feature which can be employed if all other constitutional safeguards and protections against democracy fall. These are the sweeping provisions of Article 25, which state that:

"1. In case of war, mobilization due to external dangers or serious disturbance or patent threat to the public order and the security of the Country from internal dangers, the King on the recommendation of the Council of Ministers may suspend by Royal Decree throughout the Country or in part thereof the operation of articles 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 111, and 112 of the Constitution or some of them, and put into effect the then applicable law on 'State of Siege' and to establish extraordinary tribunals. This Law may not be modified while in operation."

THE NATION BELONGS TO THE ARMY

Thus the Constitution of 1968 provides the colonels' junta with all the legal paraphernalia necessary to legitimize their indefinite stay in power. The Chief of the Armed Forces administers an internal security force which is bound to the preservation of a totalitarian ideology. The bureaucrats of the Constitutional Court have sweeping powers over parties, party platforms and qualifications of candidates for Parliament. The press is gagged. Individual rights are reduced to a dead letter. The right to vote becomes a privilege granted or not depending on the citizen's political views and political record.

The 1968 Constitution sanctions the continuation of martial law by other means. It is designed to forge a permanent link between the military regime of Greece and the global strategists, as well as with the economic interests which they expedite. It might well be called "Crowned Neo-Colonial Militarism."

SUPPORT GROWS FOR HOMEBOUND TUTORING PROGRAM FOR HOMEBOUND YOUNGSTERS

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, last October, with 77 cosponsors, I introduced

H.R. 11131, a measure that would create a supportive tutoring system for homebound, handicapped youngsters through the employment of college students. The bill was developed with the active cooperation of 47 States and is designed to benefit the estimated 1 million youngsters in our Nation who for short or long periods of time are prevented from attending classes in our public school system.

Interest in the measure has been growing and colleges also, who would participate in the development of local programs of tutoring in cooperation with special education departments, are becoming increasingly aware of and interested in the measure. I am very pleased and proud, therefore, that another 23 Members of the House have decided to join me in reintroducing this bill. This brings the number of cosponsors up to 100, representing 31 States.

For the convenience of my colleagues, I am inserting in the RECORD a list of the new cosponsors. For their perusal, also, I am including here some of the comments I have been receiving from colleges throughout the Nation:

LIST OF NEW COSPONSORS

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Bill Alexander.
William A. Barrett.
Mario Biaggi.
Edward P. Boland.
Hugh L. Carey.
Dominick V. Daniels.
John Dellenback.
Ronald V. Dellums.
John G. Dow.
Henry B. Gonzalez.
Julia Butler Hansen.
Margaret M. Heckler.
Floyd V. Hicks.
Walter B. Jones.
Joseph M. McDade.
Parren J. Mitchell.
F. Bradford Morse.
John M. Murphy.
James G. O'Hara.
Bertram L. Podell.
Ogden R. Reid.
Frank J. Thompson, Jr.
Charles A. Vanik.

REACTIONS TO H.R. 11132 FROM INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

ARIZONA

Northern Arizona University—"I reviewed the bill and shared it with a few of my colleagues. Those of us who read it agreed that this piece of pending legislation is viable and merits support."

CONNECTICUT

The University of Connecticut—"You and the co-sponsors are to be commended for the proposed legislation to aid homebound handicapped youngsters."

FLORIDA

University of South Florida—"I have discussed the provisions of the Bill with several of my university colleagues and others in our local public school system and have found all to be in favor of its intent and objectives. I am convinced . . . that this approach contributes much to both the student and tutor."

GEORGIA

Georgia State University—"The proposed tutorial program would be beneficial for both teachers in training and homebound students."

HAWAII

Honolulu District—"We will be looking forward to the passage of your bill to aid

the homebound, handicapped youngsters since it will have a great impact on the education of handicapped youngsters throughout the nation."

IDAHO

Idaho State University—"I think that your concept is an excellent one and should bear excellent results. Certainly homebound children need and deserve educational opportunities equal to that of their ambulatory peers."

Moscow School District—"The district is most interested in your efforts to provide services to handicapped students who are homebound and unable to attend regular school."

The district is most anxious to assist legislation seeking to provide services to the homebound, and would like to be kept informed of the Bill's progress and development."

INDIANA

Indiana University—"I read with interest H.R. 11131 . . . I can see how this financial aid might benefit both the homebound child needing assistance and the college student needing financial aid."

ILLINOIS

Southern Illinois University—"In general, I feel that the provisions you are requesting will further extend services to handicapped children. Your proposed plan would permit tutorial services to be provided for all homebound handicapped children included under the Education of the Handicapped Act."

KENTUCKY

University of Kentucky—"The enabling legislation . . . appears to provide for a more ready entry of handicapped populations into professions serving handicapped children. Further, it would appear to provide an element of very essential service for a nationally neglected population."

MASSACHUSETTS

Northeastern University—"Please accept my congratulations on a thoughtful and extremely important bill."

MINNESOTA

Moorhead State College—"I give my wholehearted endorsement to this measure. Our department would be most anxious to participate in such a program."

MISSOURI

University of Missouri—"Dr. Leon Johnson . . . who is in charge of our program for training teachers of the handicapped . . . shares my enthusiasm for your proposed bill. The procedure that you proposed would dovetail quite closely with the program we presently operate."

MISSISSIPPI

University of Southern Mississippi—"I do not find any particular fault with the intent of the proposed H.R. 11131. The Homebound have been neglected in our attempt to help children with special needs."

NEW MEXICO

New Mexico State University—"We offer our full support to H.R. 11131 concerning homebound children . . . If we can be of any assistance in gaining support for this worthy bill, please call on us."

NEW YORK

State University of New York at Albany—"In my estimation, the lack of effectiveness of current programs for homebound students is directly related to the small amount of time that is devoted by professional teachers to the homebound student. . . . Tutorial work . . . would probably considerably improve the academic as well as the possible personal effectiveness of the homebound pupil."

NORTH CAROLINA

University of North Carolina—"Please let me express my support for H.R. 11131, the bill to aid homebound, handicapped young-

sters through the establishment of a tutoring program."

East Carolina University—"I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on the sponsorship of a meaningful legislation as H.R. 11131. It is my belief that this is a most significant piece of legislation and will be of great service to both handicapped children and college students."

OHIO

College of Communication—"I am struck particularly by aspects of your bill that might favor a veteran, the vocationally handicapped or other categories. Right now I have two students applying for admission to my program. One of them is totally deaf and the other is totally blind. There is serious doubt whether we can carry them through four years of college to meet state certification requirements; but they very well might qualify for a rich and rewarding professional career in specialized programs possible under your bill."

Ohio State University—"I am very interested and in support of the bill you are sponsoring (H.R. 11131) to aid home-bound, handicapped youngsters through the establishment of a tutoring program."

OKLAHOMA

Central State College—"Enclosed is a copy of the program goals for our university students who teach homebound classes on the ward. I shall involve as much interest as possible for your proposed legislation."

PENNSYLVANIA

University of Pittsburgh—"The basic idea of utilizing college students as tutors and instructional aides under the direction of qualified teachers is a constructive concept that has many immediately apparent advantages. As a Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation we would strongly support the utilization of college students in the education of exceptional children."

Slippery Rock State College—"This bill is in accord with modern educational thinking in that it will be a great stride towards providing equal educational opportunity for all children."

SOUTH DAKOTA

Augustana College—"I have read your proposal (H.R. 1131) rather carefully.

"I feel that this is an excellent idea and should be supported."

TEXAS

University of Texas at Austin—"In my experience with this type of handicapped child and youth, it has been distressing to me to learn that over the past fifteen years these youngsters are being more and more excluded from appropriate educational programs."

"You and your colleagues certainly are to be congratulated on this legislation and I certainly know that many agencies . . . will be most interested and supportive."

TENNESSEE

Memphis State University—"I have read with considerable interest H.R. 11131 introduced by you on October 6, 1971. I assure you of the support of this institution and the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation. I would further like to state my reasons for my enthusiasm for such a far-reaching program." (detailed comments.)

VIRGINIA

Norfolk State College—"Your bill is certainly timely and would be a significant step toward the provision of quality instruction for homebound, handicapped children."

College of William and Mary—"This is to inform you that the Division of Special Education at the College of William and Mary endorses your bill, H.R. 11131. The proposed bill will, if enacted, provide a vital service to a number of children in public schools."

WASHINGTON

Washington State University—"I will be most anxious to hear of the disposition of

the bill and will be watching the Digest for reports of action."

Eastern Washington State College—"I would like to say that we are fully in support of this bill and hope you are able to successfully enact it into law. If I can be of further assistance, feel free to contact me."

NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE WILLIAM A. BARRETT, HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak for all of the members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and particularly for those of us who serve on the Subcommittee on Housing, in noting with great pleasure and appreciation the citation awarded last night to our colleague, Congressman WILLIAM A. BARRETT, of Pennsylvania, by the National Housing Conference.

Congressman BARRETT has served on the Subcommittee on Housing since its formation in 1955, and has been its chairman since 1965, following the retirement from Congress of our first chairman, the Honorable Albert Rains of Alabama. These two gentlemen have been chiefly responsible in the House for initiating, guiding or shaping the legislation of the past 18 years which has brought about vast changes and improvements in the housing conditions of the American people.

As former Congressman Rains said last night as the main speaker at the 41st annual banquet of the National Housing Conference at which awards were made to Congressman BARRETT and to Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, of Louisiana, we tend to become so bogged down in the mechanics of housing bills and the details of programs that we sometimes fail to see and appreciate the impact of this legislation on the lives of our citizens.

He spoke of flying over the United States and seeing vast housing developments, nursing homes, acres upon acres of college dormitories, the residential areas of medical centers, public housing, housing for the elderly, facilities for the group practice of medicine and related health disciplines, redeveloped cities and new towns, and then you begin to understand what the legislation on which we have worked so hard really means to this country.

TWO DAYS' WORK PER DAY

"BILL" BARRETT, in the nearly 8 years in which he has been chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, has been a deeply dedicated, indefatigable hard worker who has demonstrated unbelievable patience in conducting hours and days and weeks of hearings into all aspects of housing legislation. He is always willing to give of his own time to listen to the ideas and suggestions and criticisms of public officials, builders, lenders, suppliers, and experts in all fields related to housing, just as he patiently and endlessly listens to vast numbers of people in his own congressional district of Philadelphia who bring to him each night a myriad of problems which he attempts to resolve.

delphia who bring to him each night a myriad of problems which he attempts to resolve.

Congressman BARRETT usually puts in 2 full days of work every day—first in Washington and then in Philadelphia. Despite this incredible schedule of work, he brings to his assignment as chairman of the Housing Subcommittee a quiet, attentive, genial, unhurried, and friendly attitude which wins the cooperation of the Members and also of the interest groups with which we discuss housing policy. It is a formula for getting things accomplished, and in his case it works remarkably well. His innate courtesy and friendliness are matched by his compassion for those who need the help of the housing legislation we enact in order to achieve the national goal of a decent home in a suitable environment.

RESOLUTION BY NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE

Truly loved by his colleagues in the Congress, Congressman BARRETT last night received from one of the most prestigious of the public interest segments of the housing movement, the National Housing Conference, a plaque containing the following resolution adopted by the membership of the NHC at this year's annual meeting and presented to Mr. BARRETT by Nathaniel S. Keith, NHC president:

IN TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM A. BARRETT

The National Housing Conference honors Congressman William A. Barrett for his 26 years of vigorous and able representation of the first congressional district of Pennsylvania and Philadelphia in the House of Representatives, and for his foresight and leadership in providing effective housing and community development legislation.

As one of the original members of the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Congressman Barrett has provided leadership and initiative in all the legislation the Housing Subcommittee has handled in its history.

As Chairman of the Housing Subcommittee since 1965, Congressman Barrett has demonstrated the high qualities of leadership so necessary in the field of housing and community development legislation. Major legislation enacted under this chairmanship includes the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, the Model Cities Housing Act of 1966, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, urban mass transportation legislation, and most recently the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970.

In honoring Congressman Barrett for his distinguished career, we look forward to his continuing leadership in the years ahead.

By Resolution of the Membership of the National Housing Conference, Washington, D. C., March 5, 1972.

SPECIAL DRUG ACTION OFFICE
PROPOSED

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, it appears certain a Special Drug Action Office bill will become law sometime this March if the House and Senate can reach agreement on the differences in the two versions. However, regardless of the final

form of this important legislation, the public and the business community remain the most important factors in any alleviation of the drug abuse problem. Public and business support of drug abuse prevention legislation improves the effectiveness of what Congress passes into law.

In this regard, the McDonnell Douglas Corp., could well serve as the model of corporate responsibility with its program aimed at helping its employees and the St. Louis community resolve alcohol and drug abuse problems. McDonnell Douglas' commitment to rehabilitation is evidence of the concern this firm has for its employees.

The St. Louis region is fortunate to have the kind of business community it does for the St. Louis offices of Western Electric and General Motors have begun similar drug abuse prevention programs.

I would call to the attention of my colleagues a news story describing the McDonnell Douglas effort; it was written by John M. McGuire and appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, February 21, 1972.

At this point I insert the news item in the RECORD:

CORPORATE PROGRAM ON DRUG ABUSE

When a McDonnell Douglas Corp. employee is frequently absent on Monday morning or the day after payday, it does not go unnoticed.

And if another McDonnell worker appears listless or even irascible, this too is officially recognized.

Even changes in the way an employee dresses might come under the scrutiny of some corporate executive.

These behavioral differences may even be jotted down by a supervisor or senior executive. However, all this is not part of a personnel spy system, some sort of Big Brother activity that results in punitive measures.

It is what the giant aerospace corporation calls its employee assistance program, a corporate-wide aid for the employee who may be suffering from alcoholism, the effects of drug misuse or behavior disorders which result in absenteeism and deteriorating job efficiency.

Basically, the program is intended to identify the problem at the earliest possible stage, get the employee to recognize he has a problem and then help him by recommending agencies where he can seek assistance.

When the program was first implemented more than a year ago, Donald W. Douglas, corporate vice president-administration, said that the main objective of the plan was "to retain valued employees." Of course, the profitability aspects of a productive workforce also were considered, a McDonnell spokesman said.

In its early stages, the assistance program was geared primarily to the problem of excessive drinking. Later, the words drinking and alcoholism were deleted from the program, as the scope was broadened to include drug-related troubles and emotional disturbances.

Despite the corporation's commitment to the rehabilitation plan, Douglas, in an administrative bulletin, indicated that the firm's patience was not unlimited. "If he (the troubled employee) does not honestly attempt to modify his conduct, it would become grounds for termination."

The guiding force behind McDonnell's assistance program is Robert C. Krone, corporate vice president-personnel.

Krone has long been active with the Greater St. Louis Council on Alcoholism ("My friends inveigled me to take the posi-

tion") and the St. Louis Foundation for Alcoholism and Related Dependencies.

When Krone speaks his fervor comes through, as he talks in a low key but intense fashion.

He feels strongly that the success of any legislative efforts to increase rehabilitation centers for the treatment of alcoholism and drugs will depend ultimately on industry.

"After all," he says, "industry maintains machines. Why not maintain people? 'We're sadly lacking in treatment facilities.'"

On the average, noted Krone, a typical industry or large business will have about six per cent of its work force affected by excessive drinking. At McDonnell, the assistance program has become so widely accepted that 31 per cent of those treated were self-referrals.

Krone says he wants to expand the concept. He has been urging other firms to initiate similar programs. So far, the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., with facilities here and in Crystal City, Mo., the United States Postal Service and Western Electric Co. have started programs.

Moreover, McDonnell officials have made presentations to top echelon management and union officials at such places as Cupples Co. Manufacturers, and Lever Brothers, where assistance programs are being considered.

Other companies that have expressed an interest in starting a McDonnell-type aid program include ACF Industries, Inc., Brown Group Inc., Chrysler Corp., Ford Motor Co., Granite City Steel Co. and Missouri Pacific Railroad.

"The head of Kennecott Copper Corp. (of which Peabody Coal Co. of St. Louis is a subsidiary) has said that if industry does not become involved in this problem, within 10 years there will not be a society for industry to work in," said Krone.

A major problem, he added, is our continuing movement toward a pill-oriented society. About 19,000,000 persons take sleeping pills every night. And of course, "the 'under 30' tendency toward the dry chemicals (drugs), that are illegal, is well known."

Another large employer in the St. Louis area, General Motors Corp., has an extensive national program for assisting troubled workers. It is similar to what McDonnell Douglas is doing.

Clifford Merriott, a Detroit-based corporation officer involved in the program, said the assistance plan involves corporate-wide screening of employees, with the same agency referral when alcoholism or drug misuse is detected. Employees with problems are given a medical leave.

Merriott said that so far GM has experienced a success ratio of 65 to 66 per cent. "This indicates that it's pretty well worth it in the salvation of trained employees."

Krone is also attempting to get labor involved in dealing with the problem. He had high praise for the United Automobile Workers and its president, Leonard Woodcock, for that union's involvement in a national rehabilitation effort.

"I'm ashamed to say," he added, "that so far the major union in our plant (the International Association of Machinists) has not participated in the program to any real extent."

At McDonnell Douglas it is emphasized, from Krone on down, that supervisors are not to diagnose the employee's problem, but merely monitor job performance and attendance. There is also an immediate check by persons administering the program into the relationship between the supervisor and the underling.

Occasionally, Krone admits, there will be a case where an aberrant behavior report turns out to be nothing more than deep seated animosity between boss and worker. In these situations, no consultation takes

place and frequently there is a personnel re-assignment.

Under its program, McDonnell uses an employee assistance co-ordinator to oversee the operation of the plan and conduct counseling sessions.

In addition, McDonnell will see to it that guidance and counseling are made available to members of the employee's family, since the firm recognizes that behavioral problems of a family member could affect on-the-job performance.

P. Don Sparks, who helps administer the assistance program for the corporation, outlined the differences between the effects of alcoholism and drug misuse.

The body tolerance to alcohol is greater "and more sinister," he said, whereas drug addiction and the reaction to it is more immediate.

Both Sparks and Krone talked about dress and appearance as an indicator of possible personal troubles. With the alcoholic executive, Krone explained, it is not uncommon for the man to dress fastidiously, even overdress, in an effort to hide his drinking problem.

Sparks told of helping a 14-year-old daughter of a McDonnell executive who had become a second-stage alcoholic.

He is concerned that more and more young people are turning to the excessive use of alcohol instead of drugs because they feel it is less harmful.

Krone says it has been McDonnell's experience that problem drinking spans all levels on the corporation's organizational chart.

He cited one case of a young executive, considered one of the corporation's "real comers," who fell victim to alcoholism but was saved through the program.

He is now one of its most ardent volunteers, said Krone.

THE RESTRUCTURING OF THE UNDP

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, Rudolph A. Peterson, newly installed Administrator of the United Nations Development Fund, will now oversee the implementation of reforms which were begun under his predecessor, Paul G. Hoffman. These changes, it is hoped, will help make the UNDP a more effective instrument for delivering development assistance. I insert in the RECORD an article on the coming changes, published in the Pre-Investment News of the UNDP.

The article follows:

REFORMS FOR UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT FUND

The first 19 country programmes, outlining assistance to be given by the UNDP under its new concept of development co-operation, go before a newly-enlarged UNDP Governing Council, meeting for its Thirtieth Session from 12 to 28 January in New York. The governing body of the UNDP also will take up a budget that calls for an estimated \$288 million to be spent on economic and social development projects throughout the world this year.

At this session the Council will welcome a new Administrator, Rudolph A. Peterson, United States, who succeeds Paul G. Hoffman. Council President for the session is H. E. Kastoft of Denmark.

The innovation of country programmes is a major step towards fulfilling the 1970 Governing Council Consensus to restructure UNDP to effectively deliver increasing development assistance.

In the past, the UNDP Administrator has submitted individual projects to the Governing Council for approval at semi-annual sessions. The number and type of projects was based on requests by developing countries and on the amount of voluntary contributions each year to UNDP.

Under the new system, governments of developing countries are informed of the amount of UNDP financing that they can expect annually over a three-to-five year period. Through 1976, the Programme anticipates contributions of nearly \$2,000 million. Each developing country is informed about the level of resources—known as Indicative Planning Figures (IPF)—that it can expect from UNDP for the planning period. For example, Colombia, one of the first nations to prepare a country programme, has an IPF of \$20 million for the 1972-76 period.

Governments determine their priority needs for technical, preinvestment, institution-building, training and other projects that normally do not call for heavy direct capital investment. With the aid of the UNDP Resident Representatives, the governments then prepare a country programme that indicates the timetable for the projects.

ADVANTAGES

Among many advantages expected from the new system is more rapid arrival of experts and equipment, a fundamental problem that plagues most international and bilateral development assistance programmers.

A second major advantage will be the co-ordination by developing countries of all pre-investment assistance, whether from bilateral or multilateral sources, on the basis of development plans.

A third advantage cited by experts who have helped put the new concept into operation is the impetus given to economic and social development planning, and co-ordination of government ministries.

Finally, the programming process provides for annual reviews of priorities and progress, so that any needed adjustments can be made.

PAYING TWO-THIRDS PLUS

The Governing Council also will consider 108 new large-scale country and inter-country projects and additional assistance for 12 on-going projects in countries that have not so far submitted country programmes.

The new projects will cost an estimated \$309 million. Developing countries receiving UNDP assistance for these projects will be paying over two-thirds of the cost, and UNDP is to provide an estimated \$100 million.

Most of the UNDP contribution will finance internationally recruited experts for development projects. Equipment purchases are expected to amount to over \$19 million, and over \$10 million in sub-contracts will be awarded. The balance will go mainly for training abroad and fellowships.

MAIN EMPHASIS

In most regions the main emphasis of the new projects is on education and training.

In Asia and the Far East, the Administrator states in summarizing his recommendations, a number of projects are closely linked to investment and production. One of these is a tin and tungsten exploration and development project in Burma. In Mongolia, the new programme will help set up an experimental and demonstration plant for use of scrap leather. Another Asian project will provide technical support to East Asian governments in off-shore prospecting.

In Africa, projects include additional support for forestry training and demonstration in the People's Republic of the Congo, which earns almost 60 per cent of its foreign exchange through its forestry projects. An

intensive programme will be launched in Ethiopia to eradicate the cattle-destroying rinderpest—a project linked to a regional effort being carried out by the Scientific, Technical and Research Commission of the Organization of African Unity.

In the Middle East, the UNDP will undertake its first project in the newly-independent nation of Bahrain in a bid to help the Government strengthen its agricultural services. In Greece, UNDP will help establish five centres for higher education—a field for which the Government has budgeted \$33 million and secured a \$13.9 million loan from the World Bank.

NEW TECHNOLOGIES

In three of the Europe, Mediterranean and Middle East nations, new techniques in information management are the focal points of UNDP assistance. These projects are taking place in Israel, Morocco and Tunisia.

In Latin America, two-thirds of the new projects are aimed at education and in-service training. The transfer and adaptation of new technologies, however, underlie a number of other new ventures. These include a Brazilian proposal to develop agricultural production through the use of nuclear technology and an Argentine project to set up a centre for the use of computers in health programmes.

TRANS-NATIONAL PROJECTS

The Administrator also has an additional 45 regional and 15 inter-regional projects expected to cost more than \$6 million this year. Examples of these projects include a typhoon programme and a venture to improve fertility and water control for high-yield cereals in Asia; assistance in leprosy control in Africa; a centre for educational planning and administration for Arab states, and assistance to a Latin American centre for the study of the conservation and restoration of cultural property.

Inter-regional projects encompass such fields as airport fire control; eradication of the desert locust; training in computer science, and disease prevention.

During the council session there will be concurrent meetings of a budgetary and finance committee which was established last year.

GOVERNING COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP EXPANDS

The UN General Assembly has increased the membership of the UNDP Governing Council from 37 to 48.

The enlarged Council will have 27 members from the developing countries including 11 from Africa, 9 from Asia (including Yugoslavia) 7 from Latin America. Twenty-one will be elected from developed countries—17 from Western Europe and industrialized nations of other regions and 4 from Eastern European countries.

As in the past, members of the enlarged Council will be elected for a three-year term from among the Members of the UN, specialized agencies and the IAEA.

In a resolution adopted last month, the General Assembly stated that the enlargement of the Council was necessary in view of the strengthened and expanded UNDP programme, and in view of the growth in UN membership since the establishment of the UNDP.

The members of the Governing Council which have been elected by the Economic and Social Council for terms varying from 1 to 3 years are:

TERM OF OFFICE EXPIRES ON

31 DECEMBER 1972

Austria, Cameroon, Cuba, Denmark, Guatemala, India, Iran, Italy, Ivory Coast, Japan, Mexico, Morocco, Philippines, USSR, United Kingdom, United States.

1973

Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Central African Rep., France, Indonesia, Kuwait,

Libyan Arab Rep., Norway, Pakistan, Romania, Sweden, Uganda, Zaire, Zambia.

1974

Bulgaria, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Fed. Rep. of Germany, Finland, Iraq, Lebanon, Netherlands, Nigeria, Poland, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yugoslavia.

POST 366 OF THE AMERICAN LEGION CELEBRATES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 4, I had the honor to be a guest speaker at the 50th anniversary ceremonies of the Cpl. John Loudenslager Post 366 of the American Legion.

The Loudenslager Post, at 7976-78 Oxford Avenue, Philadelphia, is in the Fourth District of Pennsylvania, which I represent. It has a long and distinguished record of service to veterans and the community, and I was proud to be asked to take part in the golden anniversary celebration.

The post is almost as old as the American Legion itself and its history is something the Legion and all veterans can point to with pride.

A local newspaper, the Breeze, recently printed the story of the Loudenslager Post as its lead article. At this time I enter that history into the RECORD:

LOUDENSLAGER POST TO MARK GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY ON SATURDAY

(By Helen Blaker)

The term "blast off" was unknown in 1922 when Corp. John Loudenslager Post No. 366 of the American Legion was organized, but one can easily imagine it fitting the occasion.

The "launching" of this premier service organization of the Fox Chase-Rockledge area took place in old Wilson Hall (destroyed by fire in 1922) in the Northeast Shrine Club with many prominent citizens present and music furnished by the Fox Chase Band.

The fledgling Post was named to honor Corp. John Loudenslager who was killed in action at Chateau Thierry in July 1918 at the age of 17. He was the only bona fide Fox Chase boy to be killed in action in World War I. The original wooden cross from his grave in France is now enshrined in a memorial at the Post Home in Fox Chase.

C. Wilson Fry, or "Wid" as he was known to his friends, was the prime mover in organizing the new Post and was elected its first Commander. Under his capable leadership and that of 49 Commanders to follow him, (no one has served more than one term) the Post has mushroomed from 70 men to a 900-member organization with a broad history of accomplishments and activities.

To mark 50 busy years of patriotic dedication to "God and Country" the Legion has planned a gala celebration on Saturday evening, at the Northeast Shrine Club, and has invited numerous officials of the national organization to aid in commemorating the auspicious event.

The famed Loudenslager Glee Club will also perform at the dinner festivities.

The local post has come a long way from its modest beginnings, starting out meeting at the Rockledge school hall for \$1.00 a year and janitorial fees. The men set out ambitiously to raise funds for their own Post Home and ran motion picture benefits, a se-

ries of boxing bouts at the Shrine Club and carnivals.

In 1925 they purchased the property at 8308-10 Pine rd. and got busy with renovations and maintenance.

With hard work they managed to pay it off by 1938, despite the fact that they were in the midst of the country's worst depression.

By this time, however, the Post Home also housed a remarkable array of satellite organizations. In 1940 the list of such units and memberships included the Post with 216 members; Auxiliary—68; Boy Scout Troop—41; Girl Scout Troop—20; Sea Scouts—20; Honor Society—55; Son's Band—38; Girls Color Guard—10; Glee Club—40; Junior Orchestra—18; Junior Baseball Team—15; and Scout Bugle and Drum Corps—28.

In addition, Public Speaking, Music and tap dancing classes were also held at the Post Hall, the main meeting room being 15 ft. wide by 28 ft. long.

Time marched on and in 1943 the group purchased the former Fox Chase Bank & Trust building, the current Post Home at 7976-78 Oxford av., and proceeded with extensive alterations to suit their needs. The mortgage was paid off in only three years.

The latest improvements have been the installation of air-conditioning and wall-to-wall carpeting.

Mrs. William S. Wilkinson, mother of John Loudenslager, presented the Post with its first Post Flag. She was a loyal friend and affectionately known as "Mother Wilkinson" to all the men of the Post until her death in 1961.

The first national colors were presented by Mr. E. Frain of the Home Defense League.

Since then the process has been reversed with the Legion making countless donations of American flags to boy and girl scouts, cubs and brownies, churches, schools and sundry organizations including one to the Radar Base in Thule, Greenland.

The first Memorial Day service conducted by the Post was held at the Lawndale Theater (now the Abbey Playhouse) and attended by more than 500 people. Since then they have conducted a parade through the community with services at Lawnview Cemetery.

Many still recall the imposing figure of the late Gen. John Gentner, a past commander, astride his horse organizing the Memorial Day parade for many years.

The Post also decorates the grave of each veteran in Lawnview, Trinity Oxford, and St. Mary's Cemeteries each year with flags and flowers.

Half the nearly 500 geraniums are bought by the Post and half donated by the children of our local schools. At one time they also covered Monette Cemetery, but this is now handled by the Jewish War Veterans.

There is a special Corp. Loudenslager stained glass window at the Memorial Church of the Holy Nativity, Rockledge, where the family attended. Along side this is a plaque bearing the names of the local men who served from the parish in World War I. Each Memorial Day the Post sends a wreath to the church in their memory.

In 1927 Post #366 assumed sponsorship of Scout Troop 206, which met in the building weekly, and at times the men feared their boys would tear down the building with their exuberance. However, they were permitted to actually demolish the old barn at the rear of the property, and were on their way to digging a new basement and foundation when the project was shelved for more ambitious plans, reports Historian and Past Commander, E. Paul Kunst.

He is also Commander of the Fifth District.

The minutes of 1932 reveal "Comrade Barney Peppelman (of Rockledge) was appointed a committee of one to clean out the barn." An interesting discussion must have prompted this entry as "Barney" as he was

known to his buddies, was not famous for his reticence.

In fact, Past Commander William Scholtenberger recalls, "Barney arrived at the meeting late one night and by way of apologizing for the delay commented, 'Sorry I'm late, fellas. We had an unexpected visitor—My wife had a baby'; nevertheless, he found time to get to the meeting anyway."

Rockledge, Clarence Saltiel, remembers, "The troop had a Drum and Bugle Corps until the late 50's. When the weather was bad they practiced indoors at the old Post Home. If you think modern rock bands are loud, try a 32-piece drum and bugle corps in a 15 x 28 room with an 8-ft. ceiling!"

"The highlight of their numerous activities was participating in the 1937 National Convention parade in New York City. With their completely new uniforms and equipment they were proud to be the only Scout Troop in the 16 hour parade!"

Another highly successful program has been the Junior baseball team, organized by George Watts in 1927, one of its few Life Members. They often won the district and city championship and in 1956 and 1957 they won the state championship, the only Philadelphia team to accomplish this feat!

Since 1960 their manager has been Benny Culp, former Phillies catcher. Several Loudenslager players have gone on to big league contracts, the most notable being Roy Campanella, who played for the team in the 30's, and is a member of the Baseball Hall of Fame.

Years back there was a Girls Color Guard which marched with the 40-piece band. Ethel Hibbs, now Mrs. Clarence Saltiel, and Betty Rankin, now Mrs. Fred Fite, are two former active members of this group who still live in the community.

The Women's Auxiliary added a new dimension to the Loudenslager Legion family and no small part of the Post's success was due to help received from the ladies.

They have been particularly active in the fields of welfare and rehabilitation in various hospitals. For their own area they put on a saucy floor show each year which everyone looks forward to with eager anticipation.

The Junior Auxiliary for girls under 18 takes care of activities for the distaff set. Unlike the "Sons of the Legion" their participation has been continuous since they started many years ago.

The Glee Club was organized in 1933 by the late Carl Brendlinger. The first director of the all male group was William T. Davies, who also directed the choir at Holy Nativity Church and the Glee Club rehearsed there for several years.

Harry W. MacMillan, Jr., was the first accompanist and now the only remaining original member. He served as director since 1933.

Their first concert was in the Trinity Oxford Community House back in 1934, and since then the club has sung at Woodrow Wilson Junior high and Northeast high school and at countless special performances in hospitals, churches, Convention Hall, the Academy of Music Stage Door and radio and T.V. programs, as well as Memorial Day services at Lawnview in the chapel.

The present Post Home is designated as an official fall-out shelter and in case of attack, is probably the safest place in town, especially the old bank vault area downstairs, which is now the Post Canteen. This basement area was once the scene of a minor catastrophe when a delivery man pumped 2,000 gallons of fuel oil down the wrong pipe and it wound up four inches deep over the entire floor!

The late Harry Winklespecht, who was custodian at the time, discovered the mess and some say his exclamations still echo throughout the building!

A prime concern of the Legion is the care and rehabilitation of their sick and disabled comrades, veterans of all wars, and mindful of this responsibility always have an Active Service Officer available to assist veterans and their families, now in the capable hands of P. C. Bernie Lawler. They hold parties for and visit disabled vets in hospitals and the ladies take them useful gifts.

Throughout the community the Legionnaires have recognized people for their outstanding contributions by presenting them with a Distinguished Service Award. Among those so honored have been Father Burke, Pastor of St. Cecilia's in 1938; Charles M. Dudley, principal of Woodrow Wilson Jr. high in 1951, and the late Rev. Herbert Jones of Holy Nativity in 1969.

Present Post Commander, Carl Unrath, is optimistic about the Post's future, saying, "We now have well over 125 Viet-time members who take an active part in Legion affairs and I see no reason to expect a decline in the American Legion in the foreseeable future, even if as we all fervently hope, there are no future wars to provide new veterans. That bridge can and will be crossed when it is reached."

"In the meantime the goal of Post No. 366 is to continue to expand its policy of service to God, Country and Community, particularly in the areas of youth development and veteran rehabilitation."

THE AMNESTY ISSUE

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the question of whether to grant amnesty to draft evaders and resisters has received increasing attention in the media and especially in the other body. We have observed a parade of witnesses present strong and emotional arguments on both sides of this question before the Kennedy subcommittee, and this has left some of us in a rather ambivalent state on the issue. At the extreme poles we have heard opposition to amnesty either because it carries with it the stigma of guilt or because it deals too leniently with those who have refused to serve their country. In between these poles, it seems to me, there have been the more reasoned and rational voices which have recognized that some form of amnesty will eventually be necessary as part of an overall attempt at national reconciliation once the war is over.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, the Sunday Star of March 5 carried an excellent editorial entitled, "Amnesty: An Idea Whose Time Will Be Later." The editorial points out that while the time is not yet ripe to grant amnesty, it is not too soon to begin fashioning the best possible solution which avoids the extremes of leniency and recrimination—a solution aimed at a "maximum of justice" and "within a general framework of reconciliation for all." At this point in the Record, Mr. Speaker, I include the full text of that editorial and commend it to the reading of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

AMNESTY: AN IDEA WHOSE TIME WILL BE LATER

Tens of thousands of young men (no one knows the exact number) evaded the Vietnam war illegally and are now on the run or living in Canada, Sweden or elsewhere abroad. Should they be given amnesty? If so, should it apply only to draft-resisters, or also to deserters, and should this amnesty be tied to certain conditions of atonement? Or should these young men continue to be prosecuted, which means that most would remain in exile?

As borne out by the varied testimony before Senator Kennedy's Judiciary subcommittee last week, these are questions that touch the raw emotions generated by the war itself. The emotions run the full spectrum, from a fervent ennobling of the draft dodger as above the law and the party sinned against, to the furious portrayal of the exiles as self-indulgent cowards to be written off by their country indefinitely.

The major questions must be faced. If, as we believe, the time is not now ripe to grant amnesty to those who chose not to serve their country, it is nevertheless time to begin fashioning the best possible, over-all solution. It should be a solution that avoids the excesses of both leniency and recrimination, seeking instead a maximum of justice.

The war is indeed winding down. But it is not over. We still have men in Vietnam, and some are fighting, and a few are dying, adding to the 55,000 Americans who already have died in the conflict. Other Americans languish in North Vietnamese prison camps. To the champions of immediate, universal amnesty, all this is irrelevant. It is not. To welcome home now the draft-dodgers and deserters, as if what they did was guileless or incidental, would be a monumental affront to those who have performed their duty, and continue to perform it. And so the point can be made that whatever amnesty plan is devised should be tied to a date, perhaps next year, when the war—or America's participation in it—can reasonably be expected to be ended.

There is ample precedent for amnesty in this country. George Washington pardoned participants in the Whiskey Rebellion, Abraham Lincoln pardoned Union deserters on condition they finish their enlistments, and after the Civil War, Andrew Johnson granted amnesty to soldiers of the Confederate Army. More recently, 16 months after VJ Day, President Truman established an amnesty board that eventually pardoned some 1,500 men of the 15,000 who had refused to fight in World War II. That ratio of numbers is not particularly instructive for the current situation. Yet the idea of an amnesty board is a good one, for it would permit review of individual cases and circumstances, both among the draft resisters and the deserters.

Distinguishing between those two big classes of deliberate non-combatants presents a specific difficulty in an already complex issue. Legislation introduced by Senator Robert Taft, Jr. of Ohio, a moderate-to-conservative Republican, and Representative Edward I. Koch, a New York democrat, spells out amnesty conditions for draft evaders but conspicuously excludes the deserters. This same dual approach has been endorsed by that firm anti-militarist, Senator McGovern. Is it right?

Historically, desertion has been viewed as an extremely serious offense. That is as it should be. Yet, in the context of the last several years, what is the guilt difference between the young, perhaps uneducated soldier who began to question the war only after he was inducted, and the more sophisticated offspring of the middle-to-upper class who began his own evasive tactics before his draft call was imminent? To consider amnesty only

for the draft-dodger could be read as a form of elitism. At the same time, to excuse desertion as but the reflex action of the uninformed is dangerous and patronizing.

The truth is: Some of the more educated draft evaders were truly motivated by anti-war ideal; some were skulking opportunists, or they fooled themselves, or were fooled by Doctor Spock and other aging surrogates of the impressionable and impatient young. Some of the less educated deserters were late bloomers in the anti-war movement; others were schemers who may well have accepted duty in Germany but who bugged out when ordered to Vietnam; still others went over the hill for no other reason than to escape discipline for hitting an officer or robbing the cash box. All of which is to say that each group includes a great diversity of individuals. Each group includes the leaders and the led, those who were influencers of, and those who were influenced by the gathering anti-war movement, those who plotted their way meticulously and those who acted on impulse to gain asylum from duty and danger. The argument builds then, for the kind of tribunal that can judge individual cases on their merits.

Another imperative of any reconciliation plan is that the amnesty be conditional. This is, in a sense, a contradiction of terms, because the word "amnesty" derives from the Greek word for "forgetfulness." Yet the concept should be clear enough, and it is central to the legislation proposed by Taft and Koch. They believe amnesty should be coupled with the requirement of two (Koch) or three (Taft) years of service in the peacetime military or in civilian activities such as the Peace Corps or hospital work. When that service is completed, amnesty then would take effect. It is a defensible concept. The number of years of service, of course, must still be settled. It could be made standard for the typical evader-in-exile, with flexibility provided for some of the individual cases to be judged by review boards. And there is good reason why this arrangement should be accompanied by clemency for draft evaders who went to jail rather than abroad.

The middle course of conditional amnesty will be opposed by those at both poles of the argument. Yet it is noteworthy that the American public, though still sharply divided, favors the conditional amnesty route over a more liberal approach or no amnesty at all. According to a Newsweek poll taken by the Gallup organization in January, 7 percent of Americans favor outright, unconditional amnesty for draft-dodgers. A majority, 63 percent, favors the Taft-Koch approach requiring alternate service, while 22 percent oppose amnesty of any sort.

The problem with the unconditional-amnesty argument is its basic assumption that the draft-dodgers did nothing wrong and therefore have no debt to pay. "Premature morality," it is called. The assumption is facile and untenable. The law was there to be obeyed. If the consequences of obedience—that is, service in Vietnam—was abhorrent to some, the route of disobedience and resistance was open. It had been pioneered before, notably in the field of civil rights. Yet it is the low form of civil disobedience that leads the resister to break the law and then cry for amnesty. It is the high form that recognizes the law can be broken but the penalty must be paid. And in this case, the nation will demand that the draft resisters and deserters pay a penalty, mild in form though it may be.

The problem with the rigid anti-amnesty argument is that it is totally open-ended. It presumes a kind of permanent banishment, together with long jail terms for those who filter back. And this, in the years ahead, will appear increasingly out of line with reality and the American way.

Time surely will make a difference. Neither the Taft bill nor anything like it appears to have a chance of passing in this election year. By next year, assuming our pullout from Vietnam is virtually complete, the climate of opinion may well have reached the point where an amnesty plan may be both feasible and justifiable. This war, after all, has been America's most divisive. Those who prosecuted it, as well as those who ran away, made their share of mistakes and indulged in a degree of self-deception. As the idea grows of putting the war behind us, so will the idea of conditional amnesty within a general framework of reconciliation for all.

TRIBUTE TO BARBARA GORICH

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, most of us have known individuals who have unselfishly devoted their time and their energy to the service of their community and their fellow man.

However, few of us have had the honor of knowing an individual who has had such a dramatic and widespread effect on improving the quality of life in their community as Mrs. Barbara Gorich of San Pedro, Calif.

For over 28 years, Barbara has been identified with every aspect of community affairs in the San Pedro area. To each program she has brought concern and understanding; but, above all, she has brought a philosophy which has permeated her every deed: A philosophy of justice and dignity to every human being.

In a very real sense, the progress of the community of San Pedro is a history of the contributions of Mrs. Gorich.

The list of posts which she has held, organizations which she has served, projects which she has aided, and ideas which she has fostered, is omnibus.

As a community leader, Barbara's activities speak for themselves.

For three terms, Barbara Gorich served as president of the San Pedro Coordinating Council—an organization that she has served in various capacities for 28 years. She served as a director of mental health, chairwoman of the local United Services Organization, director of Women for Good Government, a member of the Compensatory Education Advisory Council of Los Angeles City Schools, and chairwoman of the City of Hope Drive.

In addition to providing leadership, Mrs. Gorich has actively participated in numerous worthy programs, a partial list of which includes the Homer Toberman Settlement House, United Crusade, Free Clinic, Retarded Children, Salvation Army, Boys Club, March of Dimes, Cancer and Heart Drives, YWCA, and the YMCA.

Barbara is a member of the Harbor Human Relations Council, Woman's B'nai B'rith, Beth El Sisterhood, San Pedro Jewish Sisterhood, and the Chamber of Commerce.

Both the mayor of Los Angeles and the former Governor utilized Mrs. Gorich's talents by selecting her as the 15th area chairman of the Community Advisory Council on Youth, as community chairman of the Adult for Youth Program, and as a member of the Governor's Advisory Commission on Youth.

As evidence of her concern for the youth of the harbor area, Barbara has undertaken projects which would help and guide young people toward a more active involvement in community projects. Through her guidance, the San Pedro Coordinating Council sponsored Camp Archie Shields at Portuguese Bend. This project, which has been enjoyed by 25,000 youngsters, has taken care of yearly Christmas parties for children from needy families. In addition, the camp operates a youth employment service.

To give the community a new look of beauty and cleanliness, Mrs. Gorich helped the chamber of commerce in recruiting over 500 young people and adults to participate in Operation Clean Sweep.

Barbara has worked in cooperation with the harbor division of the police department to give the youth of the area a better appreciation of the law and its enforcement.

She has consistently encouraged and aided the Wilmington-San Pedro Youth Opportunity Center, the Teen Posts and the Headstart programs. In fact, she is credited with saving a Teen Post from being evicted from its building by personally interceding with the owners of the building and appealing in the Teen Post's behalf. Barbara also has assisted the various programs connected with the EYOA—Adult Neighborhood Participation Project—and parks and recreation activities.

She has encouraged the training for youth jobs at the U.S. Public Health Service Clinic in San Pedro.

In order to help minority students with English, Barbara Gorich started yet another program: adopt a little brother or sister, whereby high school students tutor the children who need help and encouragement.

Barbara has worked to eradicate the drug menace in the harbor area. She was cochairman of the Kiwanis Club's Drug Alert project, and she has participated in youth forum sessions on drug abuse.

Mrs. Gorich actively participated in the proposal for the San Pedro Courthouse, the Beacon Street urban renewal project, the San Pedro Fisherman's Fiesta, Los Angeles birthday festivities, and many more community efforts.

Barbara's efforts have not gone unnoticed. She was honored with a testimonial dinner by the San Pedro Chamber of Commerce. Appointed ambassador-at-large by the mayor, she spoke before the San Antonio, Tex., City Council where she was appointed "Alcalde de la Ciudad de la Villita" by San Antonio Mayor McAllister.

Mr. Speaker, to list all of her contributions would take hours, and those of us who know her dedication cannot ade-

quately express our gratitude for her years of service.

In addition, those of us from the harbor area know that first of all, she is a wife to her understanding husband, Rudy.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Barbara Gorich is a tremendous asset to our country and to our community. If ever our Government begins to recognize individuals as "national treasures," I will place Mrs. Gorich's name in nomination for that honor, for, indeed, she deserves that recognition.

AMERICANS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL ACTION PRAISE HILLIS' VOTING RECORD

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the voting ratings given Members of Congress by the well-known Americans for Constitutional Action are recognized as reliable indicators of a Congressman's dedication to fiscal soundness, economic stability, a strong national defense posture and the general principles of constitutional government.

My good friend and colleague, Congressman ELWOOD "BUD" HILLIS of the Fifth Indiana District, is only in his first term in the House of Representatives, but ACA has already cited him as a "good addition" to the Congress. It is a pleasure to insert ACA's commendatory letter to BUD HILLIS into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

AMERICANS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL ACTION,

Washington, D.C., March 3, 1972.

Hon. ELWOOD HILLIS, M.C.
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HILLIS: Americans for Constitutional Action wishes to congratulate you on your voting record for the First Session of the 92nd Congress. Our ACA rating, just recently published for 1971, shows you have a fine conservative voting record, of which residents in Indiana's Fifth District can be proud.

As you may know, our recent ACA voting study revealed a sharply increased conservative trend by House Republicans in 1971, thanks to Congressmen like yourself. Whereas House Republicans in 1969 had an overall ACA rating of 60 percent, and a 69 percent rating in 1970, last year that figure rose to a pleasing 76.6 percent.

In its current analysis, ACA selected voting records from 24 major roll call votes in the Senate and 29 major votes in the House on issues including school busing, strong national defense posture, welfare, appeasement of Communism, increased spending by the Federal bureaucracy, food stamps to strikers, etc.

Your votes on these important issues proved you to be a good addition to the conservative voting block of the House in the 92nd Congress. We hope you will keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. McMANUS,

President.

MONEY FOR THE PEACE CORPS: MONEY FOR PEACE

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, last month, a House-Senate conference committee settled on an appropriation for the Peace Corps. It was disappointingly low, several million dollars less than the \$77.2 million which had been authorized by the Senate and which we had fought for unsuccessfully in the House. As a result of the compromise appropriation, the Peace Corps will have to make rather substantial cuts in its programs for the last 4 months of this fiscal year. That is a tragedy because the Peace Corps has been very effective. It has been a symbol of what the people of this country can do to help the people of less fortunate countries.

I would hope that Congress will help restore some of those programs by voting for the full authorization when the next Peace Corps budget comes up for consideration. It is a small price to pay for the cause of world peace and understanding. I would like to insert in the RECORD copies of the letter I sent to the President before the conference committee's decision and a copy of the reply from the White House. My colleagues may find them of interest.

The letters follow:

FEBRUARY 2, 1972.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am deeply concerned about the drastic cut imposed by the House in the Peace Corps appropriation for fiscal year 1972.

This is not the time to cut the Peace Corps. The number of volunteers applying and requests for volunteers by participating countries is rising for the first time in five years. Almost unique among Federal government agencies, the Peace Corps has actually cut its administrative expenses.

From a peak of over 15,000 volunteers and trainees in 1966, the Peace Corps enrollments declined to 10,600 in 1969 and have further declined to 7,900 at the present time. Thus, the strength of the Corps has been cut almost in half in the past five years. These cuts were justified by a steady decline in the number of volunteers and requests for volunteers. But this trend has now reversed itself. There is no longer any justification for continuing to reduce Peace Corps appropriations. Requests are up 50 percent over last year. The number of applications has risen by 50 percent in the last two years. The \$68 million would entail cutting the Peace Corps in half once again. Such a move at this time could only be interpreted as an intent to abolish the program altogether.

Nor should the Peace Corps be phased-out because of administrative inefficiency. The Corps cut its administrative costs \$3 million since last year. It has cut administrative personnel by 29 percent.

At a time when the world is speculating about the growth of a new American isolationism, this nation must confirm its concern for the welfare of other nations.

The financial struggle of the Peace Corps is only another indication of how this coun-

try has misplaced its priorities. The Peace Corps needs about \$80 million to operate effectively. \$80 million is the cost of 66 Mark 48 Navy torpedoes. \$80 million is the cost of three F-15 fighter planes, and \$80 million is the amount of money this country spent every other day last year to fight the war in Southeast Asia.

There is quite a difference in the emphasis—between peace and war.

I urge you to make clear your commitment to a fully-funded Peace Corps, and to specifically stress to the Senate and the House-Senate Conference Committee that it is your strong wish that the appropriation be restored to \$77 million.

Sincerely,

ABNER J. MIKVA,
U.S. Congressman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., February 4, 1972.

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MIKVA: This will acknowledge and thank you for your letter of February 4 to the President urging support for full funding of the Peace Corps.

The President supports the budget request he made a year ago for the entire foreign assistance program for fiscal year 1972. As you know, that bill contained \$82.2 million for the Peace Corps. Other items included \$762 million in supporting assistance, \$703 million in military assistance and \$1.4 billion in development and humanitarian assistance. It has been unfortunate that Congress failed to recognize the benefits of all elements of the foreign assistance program.

You may be assured that your letter will be brought to the President's attention and also shared with the appropriate members of the staff.

With cordial regards,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TIMMONS,
Assistant to the President.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST ABORTION

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, it seems obvious to me that we have an obligation to uphold the constitutional principle of the right to life and yet abortion proponents continue to advocate that we ignore the laws which proclaim and protect the rights of the unborn child.

Mary Kay Williams shares my concern for the unborn child, and she has written a series of six articles on abortion for the North Carolina News Service. The pieces explore the various ramifications of abortion, including such critical issues as the relationship of abortion with personal conscience, the law, maternal health, population control, unwanted children, and women's liberation.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the first of the articles, "Abortion and Women's Lib," into the RECORD, with the remaining five to be submitted on succeeding days.

The article follows:

I. ABORTION AND WOMEN'S LIB
(By Mary Kay Williams)

What passes for thoughtful arguments in favor of abortion is often a series of slogans,

cliches, and misrepresented facts. You've heard them all before . . .

"A woman should have the right over her own body". . . "An unplanned child will be an unwanted child". . . "An unwanted child will be a battered child". . . "Life is tough enough without being born handicapped". . . "It's a private matter between a patient and her doctor". . . "Abortion may be wrong, but I don't want to impose my morality on anybody else."

The slogans for abortion proceed like a comfortable litany. One can get used to them. Nice people start saying them. Gradually they become so respectable that they go unchallenged. And this is their danger. In this service, we'll be exploring some of these cliches and slogans against other data. First we consider what some extreme types in women's lib have to say about abortion.

They begin by maintaining that a woman should have the right over her own body. When the question is raised whether this right clashes with the right to be born, their response is usually that this is a private matter—that the fetus (the unborn child) is only a part of the mother's body like her appendix or her tonsils.

This is the point to challenge—this collision of rights between the fetus to continue life and the mother to control over her body. The basic question: is the fetus just a part of the mother's body, no different from her tonsils? Rhetoric may say one thing. But what do doctors and lawyers say? And what do pregnant women think?

The essential humanity of the unborn child has been established and recognized by all the modern sciences of embryology, fetology, genetics, biology, and perinatology (the study of life from conception until after birth). They affirm that:

1. Fetal tissue is unique. There never was nor ever will be again another piece of tissue identical to it. It is very closely related to all the other tissue in a person's body.

2. Fetal tissue is different from the parent organism. Ask any biologist. He will tell you that the chromosomes and genes of the fetus are fixed at conception, and are different from that of the parents. And so while a mother's tonsils are hers and hers alone, the fetus is not a part of her body in the same way.

3. The fetus has an independent life. This is a dramatic discovery. It was reached by the new and exciting science of fetology—the study of life in the womb. What it means is that the mother is a passive carrier, but the fetus is largely in charge of the pregnancy. This is why obstetricians treat the fetus as a second patient, different from the mother. And by doing so, they support the conclusions of world-famous Dr. H. M. I. Liley who pioneered in studying the fetus of the mother's womb. After decades of research, Liley concluded that the fetus "is neither an acquiescent vegetable nor a witless tadpole as some have conceived him to be in the past, but rather a tiny human being independent as though he was lying in a crib with a blanket wrapped around him instead of his mother."

The medical evidence is indisputable. Scientific advancements have made the fetus more protectable than ever before. One cannot continue to say that the fetus is no different from the tonsils, or that the mother should have a death-control over that fetus. A woman can have control over the rest of her body, but the fetus is not just another part of her body.

There are pro-abortion lawyers who argue that life begins at birth or at viability (i.e., the ability to survive outside the womb). Using the above-mentioned medical data, the distinguished law firm of Shea and Gardner addressed this argument in a brief to the U.S. Supreme Court.

"Life begins at conception and for practical medical purposes can be scientifically

verified within 14 days. Within three weeks, at a point much before 'quickening' can be felt by the mother, the fetus manifests a working heart, a nerve system, and a brain different from and independent of the mother in whose womb he resides; the unborn fetus is now a living human being. It is universally agreed that life has begun by the time the mother realizes she is pregnant and asks her doctor to perform an abortion."

If one needs further evidence of fetal recognition, look to law. Law has traditionally upheld the rights of the fetus:

1. The fetus can inherit by will and by intestacy.

2. The fetus can be the beneficiary of a trust.

3. The fetus can sue for injury. For example, if the fetus is harmed when the mother is hit by a car or an assailant, that fetus can sue to recover damages.

4. The fetus is protected by the criminal statutes on parental neglect.

5. The fetus can be preferred to the religious liberties of the parents. For example, some religious sects do not allow blood transfusions, and the hospital must comply. But if the life of the fetus depends on a blood transfusion, the court can order the hospital to override the mother's objection in favor of the greater concern—the life of the unborn child.

Feminists say that most women believe in abortion. Yet it is widely known that black women and women of other minorities are highly suspicious of abortion and birth control programs. They often regard them as a not-so-subtle form of genocide. To many blacks, ghetto abortion clinics and zero population growth sound too much like "zero black babies!"

This is why family planning was condemned by a recent conference convened by the official black health institutions in America, and black members of the U.S. House of Representatives. The conference polled a unanimous vote to urge better maternal and child health care—a position pro-life groups would readily agree with.

Probably the most substantial data on how the over-all American population views abortions is the recent analysis by Dr. Judith Blake, chairman of the department of demography at the University of California.

While personally favoring abortion, Dr. Blake had to conclude from her research that some 80 percent of the population disapproves the legalization of easy abortion. Also contrary to the radical feminist line, Dr. Blake found that women under 30, as well as college-educated women, have negative attitudes toward abortion.

Most surprising of all, the Blake research pinpointed the strongest promoter of easy abortion to be the white, upper-class, liberal, educated non-Catholic male. In the light of this discovery, it may well be that the women's movement is playing into the hands of a group they oftentimes denounce as chauvinists—fighting for a cause which might not be their own.

THE 53D ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 29, 1972

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to pay tribute to the members of the American Legion who have carried on the fine tradition of helping to care for America's war veterans.

The active programs of the American Legion and other veteran's organizations have played a key role in assisting the U.S. Congress in formulating beneficial Federal programs to aid the deserving men and women who have served this Nation in the uniforms of the American soldier, often at great risk to their lives.

Equally as important, Mr. Speaker, the American Legion has steadfastly led this Nation's people in maintaining patriotism and love of country. It is this firmness of conviction by American Legion veterans and other such dedicated groups of veterans that helps support America and keep our Nation strong.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to have this opportunity to state my faith in our soldiers and honor the veterans of the American Legion. I salute their efforts.

MARK V. TINIAKOS—OUTSTANDING JOURNALIST

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of my colleagues to the accomplishments of Mark V. Tiniakos who is assistant editor of one of the outstanding ethnic newspapers in my city of Chicago—the Greek Press.

A few months ago Mark Tiniakos was honored by issuance of a proclamation by Gov. Richard B. Ogilvie of Illinois in recognition of his outstanding contributions to the Greek people in Chicago and Illinois.

Mark Tiniakos has served as assistant editor of the Greek Press for many years and has regularly contributed feature articles to the Hellenic Free Press; the Greek Star Newspapers, edited in Chicago; the National Tribune, edited in Detroit; the Hellenic Review, channel 26—WCIU-TV; and "The Hellenic Hour," WOPA-FM radio.

In addition to completing more than 10 years in the newspaper, television, and radio media, Mark has been a pioneer in support of the Pan-Hellenic Student Association, acting as president and one of its founders. The Pan-Hellenic Student Association of Chicago and Illinois is an organization of Greek-American students from colleges throughout Illinois who in recent years migrated to our State from Greece for the purpose of extending their education and for becoming specialists in their respective fields or professions. Included in the activities of this association are public lectures, civic meetings, classical dramatic stage presentations, student counseling, and employment assistance. His undertakings in this area gained for him the respect and admiration of his fellow citizens, and especially, the staff of the Consulate General of Greece and international, national, and local political and civic leaders.

Mr. Tiniakos has also given distinguished service as an officer of the Greek Independence Day parade committee. In 1970, he served as publicity chairman

and in 1971 he served as assistant executive secretary and treasurer. This committee is responsible for sponsoring an impressive parade in Chicago, marking the anniversary of Greek Independence Day. It is a civic and patriotic event which is eagerly awaited by the residents of the Chicagoland area.

The Greek-American community of Chicago is proud to include Mark V. Tiniakos as one of its members who has steadfastly and conscientiously, with undiminished vigor and industry, made a niche for himself in the hearts of his fellow men. I extend my warmest congratulations to him on his contributions to the Greek-American community in Chicago and my best wishes for continuing success as he serves his fellow citizens in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I would like to include the proclamation issued in honor of Mark V. Tiniakos on October 29, 1971, by Governor Ogilvie. The proclamation follows:

STATE OF ILLINOIS—PROCLAMATION

There are many gaps which develop when members of one culture join another. Many times new modes of behavior and new means of communication must be developed just to understand and be understood within another country's society.

Those who enter a new culture must absorb a tremendous amount of new living knowledge and at the same time maintain their individuality. In meeting this task of both assimilation and maintenance of cultural individuality, mass communications plays a vital role.

Mr. Mark Tiniakos has, through painstaking and dedicated efforts in the journalistic field, worked to bridge and fill the societal gaps in the Greek-American community in Chicago.

He has contributed to the Greek Press newspaper, the Greek Star, the National Tribune, the Hellenic Review, Channel 26 and the Hellenic Hour.

He has also been a pioneer in support of the Pan-Hellenic Student Association acting as president and one of the founders.

Therefore, I, Richard B. Ogilvie, governor of the State of Illinois, proclaim the week of October 31, as Greek-American Week in tribute to this individual's efforts for the recognition of the Greek people in Chicago and Illinois.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Illinois to be affixed.

Done at the Capitol, in the City of Springfield, this 29th day of October, in the Year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and seventy-one, and of the State of Illinois the one hundred and fifty-third.

RICHARD B. OGILVIE.

A TRIBUTE TO MR. SIM DELAPP

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, as we move closer to 1976, the 200th anniversary of America's independence, we will be paying tribute more and more frequently to the heroes of our past: Men and women who played leading roles in the birth of a nation, or in helping her grow to maturity, or in leading her as she as-

sumed the awesome responsibilities of a global power.

Particular attention will doubtless be paid to those responsible for making democracy thrive in this country, those who made real the dream of government "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

The names of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and others come readily to mind in thinking of these giants of democracy, but there are other names, perhaps not so familiar, whose contribution to popular sovereignty, the foundation for democracy, has been great and lasting.

One such name is Sim DeLapp, the guiding light and inspirational force for the Republican Party in North Carolina for much of this century.

Like other States of the South, North Carolina was for many years in the grip of one-party domination, a travesty of democracy that restricts the right of the people to choose the policies of government they will follow and limiting the exercise of popular sovereignty.

Mr. DeLapp is largely responsible for changing all that in North Carolina. For years, it has been said, the Republican Party in our State could hold its convention in a telephone booth. But today, we have strong candidates challenging each other for the right to run as Republican nominee for U.S. Senate, Governor of North Carolina, and U.S. Representative, in addition to many State and local offices.

The two-party system is at last a reality in North Carolina, and the Republican Party and the people of North Carolina owe a large debt to Sim DeLapp for making it so.

One of those most indebted to him stands before you today. I first met Mr. DeLapp in Chicago many years ago, when I was pitching for the St. Louis Cardinals and he was attending a Republican National Convention. Little did I know then that he would be the man most responsible for my being here today as the Representative of some of America's finest people, the constituents of the Fifth District of North Carolina.

Mr. Bill Maynard, a talented staff writer for the Thomasville, N.C., Times, recently wrote a profile article on Mr. DeLapp, in which he describes many of the challenges, the setbacks, and the successes that have been a part of Mr. DeLapp's remarkable political life.

The story of this deeply patriotic and totally dedicated man will, I believe, make for interesting and inspirational reading for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I commend it to their attention, and insert it in the RECORD at this time for their consideration:

SIM DELAPP—A "POLITICIAN'S POLITICIAN"—HE MADE THE GRAND OLD PARTY IN DAVIDSON COUNTY

(By Bill Maynard)

LEXINGTON.—Sim DeLapp can remember the days when he had to beg Republican friends to sacrifice themselves on the political altar against Democrat opponents. He even had to pay their filing fees before they would run for office.

In those lean years, beginning with the Great Depression and lasting until about the time Eisenhower came on the scene, the

Davidson County GOP was doing well just to fill the ballot with a slate of candidates.

Republicans like DeLapp struggled just to keep the party in existence. Since then times have changed.

The Republicans are in power now in Davidson County, holding all five county commissioner seats, both State House seats, and the U.S. congressional seats.

More than anyone else, Sim DeLapp is the man who has made the county GOP what it is today. Mr. Republican, Davidson County, he's the classic example of the dedicated behind-the-scenes politician.

"He has seen the party come from its infancy to its position of influence today," says Thomasvillian Joe Berrier, one of five county commissioners who are deeply indebted to DeLapp.

"If there hadn't been someone of his calibre, the county probably would have become a one-party county long ago, and stayed that way.

"Though he says he has retired from politics," Berrier continued, "no one really believes it, not even Sim. He is still tremendously respected and influential."

DeLapp says he is retired, at least in comparison to what he used to do, but he also admits that "people laugh at me when I say that."

The Lexington lawyer has been to five national conventions as a delegate and to one as a state campaign chairman (for Eisenhower in 1952).

From 1942 until 1950 he was state chairman for the GOP. From 1950 until 1964 he served as general counsel of the state party.

For years he was the Davidson County GOP.

DeLapp received his law degree from Duke University in 1921 and started his Lexington law practice the next year. But he was in politics long before then, even before he could vote.

"It all started in 1906 when I was eight and my father ran for sheriff. He won by 104 votes," recalls DeLapp. "I was sick one night and woke up to a crowd outside the house singing in celebration of my father's election victory."

"For about a month thereafter I heard talk of things like throwing out ballot boxes to beat him, that being a Democratic county."

As a boy, then as a young man, and finally as an adult, DeLapp has been deeply involved in every election since 1906—until the last campaign, when DeLapp says he only gave a few speeches.

"I give a few talks," he says, "but I don't assume the responsibility of running a campaign any more. The last time I lined up a ticket was in 1966."

As a teenager he hung around headquarters during campaigns, handing out buttons and literature to people who came by. He went with his father to political rallies and grew up on politics.

In 1922, fresh out of law school, he was offered the county chairmanship.

"The party leaders had a meeting that year after the elections. We had been badly beaten," DeLapp remembers. "They said the county would never go Republican again because all of the new people moving into the county were Democrats. So they turned the problem over to Sim."

"I was young and told myself things wouldn't be like that if I had anything to do with it. Beginning in 1922 I sort of took charge and ran every campaign from then until 1956."

DeLapp's law office became GOP campaign headquarters from June to November of every election year.

"I'd be out of my office from June to November doing party work," he recalls. "Almost every night there was a precinct meeting of some sort. The only way to keep the party alive was to keep stirring."

"I just made a bare living. I let my grocery bill get behind for months, but somehow I made it. My grocer was good to me."

DeLapp recalls that those were the days "when I was working my fool head off and we weren't getting anywhere."

The Great Depression just about finished off the party, and DeLapp. He had to pay most of the filing fees out of his own pocket, or from what he could raise.

"That was the hardest time of all," says DeLapp. "It was awfully hard to get anybody to run for anything. They always thought they'd lose—and they did. But we always made it a close fight."

Not only was politics expensive to DeLapp, it was very unpopular and sometimes dangerous.

"Politics in the Thirties was terribly bitter," he recalls. "You had to have guts to work for the minority party." He was temporarily very unpopular in those lean years, working in a Democratic county, but it passed. He adds that the challenges he faced during those years gave him a confidence in himself that later made his law practice the success that it became.

One particular incident in 1938 he recalls as one of the two hottest hornets' nests of his long career.

"I was the only Republican on the county elections board," he reminisces. "We had been beaten pretty bad. I sat there and challenged every ballot I thought the Democrats had forged, and every time I spoke up the whole courthouse crowd hissed and booed."

"That was the hottest thing we've ever had."

"I thought, 'Boy, my name is mud now. They'll really take me for a ride.'"

"Everyone was angry at me since I had some ballots thrown out. A couple of lawyers came up from Wadesboro and were beaten up. A few Democrats had been drinking one night and they said they'd get me. A friend got his pistol and sat on my front porch all night just in case there was any trouble."

"That's how bitter it got. But everyone eventually made up. One man who tried to have me taken off of the elections board later became a close friend."

That year was perhaps the low point of the GOP in Davidson County.

Slowly DeLapp's long years of labor began to reap political dividends. In recognition of his dedicated party work, he was named state GOP chairman in 1942.

Another four years later DeLapp's county organization finally won power, for the first time since pre-Depression days.

DeLapp's Republicans held power off and on in Davidson County until 1958, and then in 1966 they returned after an eight-year dry spell.

The last year in which DeLapp took a really active role in the party's campaign was 1966.

"In late January of '66 I broke my hip and was layed up at home in a wheelchair. I was still busy from January until late March lining up the ticket."

Davidson County Sheriff Fred C. Sink and U.S. Rep. Wilmer Mizell, are two of the men DeLapp persuaded (or picked) to run that year.

The Republicans swept every public office in the county, down to justice of the peace.

A year earlier DeLapp walked into the second of the two hot "hornets' nests" of his career—at a meeting of the Southern Synod Evangelical and Reformed Church in Lexington.

DeLapp was invited to address the synod, which was openly supporting the civil rights movement. He suggested that someone else give the address, since he felt he didn't agree enough with the church leaders.

He finally agreed to speak—one conservative Republican to a group of reformist churchmen.

He didn't let the audience intimidate him. He said exactly what was on his mind.

He attacked what he termed were the permissive attitudes the liberals were spreading, the lawlessness of demonstrators in the streets, the unwillingness of able-bodied people to do honest work for an honest living, the inflated federal welfare rolls that were corrupting the nation with free handouts.

While DeLapp spoke, church leaders walked out.

Later he recalled that he had never seen so much hate in people's eyes as he did at that meeting. He was accused of everything evil under the sun—except dishonesty and bearing malice.

DeLapp believes firmly in the tenets of conservative Republicanism, because he believes they are best for the country.

"His politics is a result of a great concern for the country," says county commissioner Joe Berrier. "He has been a tremendous scrapper for what he believes in, but he has never held malice toward anyone. Even though one may disagree with him, no one has lost respect for his integrity and honesty."

Though his philosophy may sometimes be called old-fashioned today, it is nevertheless honest; and his motives are honorable.

And that's more than can be said about most politicians today.

He has turned down many a chance to gain political favors, because his philosophy would not let him.

If there are injustices being done in the nation, and DeLapp readily admits that there are many, the old political pro feels the only sensible way to right them is through political action.

WHAT'S GOOD FOR THE PEOPLE IS GOOD FOR THE GOVERNMENT

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the Internal Revenue Service has stated that Federal, State, and local governments have been exempted from most of the price controls of the economic stabilization program.

However, wages and prices for the people who pay these governmental costs, fees, taxes, and levies are pretty much frozen within restrictive guidelines.

Our people are concerned. How can they pay higher utility rates, higher tuition costs, higher permits and licenses when their own income is frozen?

This dilemma is well expounded in an editorial written by Richard G. LeMasurier in the February 24 issue of the Paynesville Press. I insert that editorial into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

WHAT'S GOOD FOR THE PEOPLE IS GOOD FOR THE GOVERNMENT

(By Richard G. LeMasurier)

An alarming news release from the Internal Revenue Service last week stated federal, state and local governments have been exempted from most of the price controls of the Economic Stabilization Program (Phase II). When a government can impose serious wage and price restrictions on its people, and then exempt themselves from these restrictions, the threat of total governmental control looms dangerously close overhead.

George O. Lethert, Internal Revenue Service District Director for Minnesota, said the new price control regulations published in the Federal Register on January 27, 1972,

March 7, 1972

allow federal, state and local governments to adjust prices on any work, service, publication, facility, license, or other similar items of value performed, furnished or issued by the governmental unit. Plus, tuitions and other charges for schools, college or universities owned and operated by a state or local government have also been exempted under this Price Commission ruling, as have charges for water and sewage disposal services.

Since such a large percentage of a person's income is spent on taxes, tuitions, license fees and other governmental charges it is disastrous to let these increase at will, while a business or individual's income must remain stable. What happens is that the percentage of income spent on governmental charges will increase out of proportion to the fixed income.

In a study by State Auditor Rolland Hatfield on the property tax structure a few years ago, it was reported that 12.2 per cent of the income of a Minnesota family of four with an adjusted gross income of \$3,500 was spent for state income, property and sales taxes. A percentage that drops to 6.8 per cent for the same sized family earning \$50,000.

When tuitions, licensing fees, assessments and all the other governmental charges are figured in that 12.2 per cent figure looks closer to 15 per cent.

A family with an income around \$10,000 paying, for example, 10 per cent of their income for government services may suddenly, without warning, find themselves paying 15 or 20 per cent for those same services while the income stays at \$10,000.

It is obvious runaway inflation on government charges cannot be withstood by families who can't get raises, or business that can't raise prices.

The end effect will be more unemployment and more on the welfare rolls. Employment depends on industry; and industry locates where the business climate is favorable. If the United States governments State, Local and Federal insist on grabbing all they can get in taxes and other charges, but dictating a freeze on personal profits, American industries are going to slowly dwindle away.

Inflated government costs are as harmful as increased labor demands in pricing American industry out of business. Already, many Minnesota firms are moving to other states because of our state's anti-business climate, and when no states are favorable for business, these industries will move right out of the country.

A fair economic stabilization program, one that will work, is a program where costs for individuals or business are froze along with wages and prices; such a freeze would include taxes, fees and all government charges.

It is unnerving to watch the government do exactly as it wishes with total disregard of the financial welfare of its people. Once a government has control of its people financially the people's ability to influence their own destiny is diminished, because nothing speaks quite so loudly in this country as money.

While "total government control" might be a bit too "1984-ish," it cannot be denied the governmental exemption to the wage/price freeze carries serious political implications for the future of this country.

OPINION POLL

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert my March 1972 opinion poll of the 23d Congressional District, Ohio, in the RECORD.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., March 1972.

DEAR FRIENDS: Through the years your response to the Minshall Opinion Poll has helped make my voice in Washington genuinely representative of the 23rd Congressional District. Combined with first-hand information gained in committee hearings and House debate, the consensus obtained from these polls is most important in helping me to reach legislative decisions. Further, on matters of Administration policy-making, I always call the results of the questionnaires to the attention of the White House and the President's Cabinet.

As in the past, a copy of the poll is being sent to every home in the District. If you wish additional copies, please call my Cleveland office, 2951 New Federal Building, telephone 522-4382.

Returns run into the tens of thousands so you can understand why it is not possible for me to answer each one individually. All will be carefully tabulated and results made known in a future "Washington Report" newsletter.

No envelope is needed for the attached self-mailer. Simply cut along the dotted line, fold with return address outside, stamp, and mail. Please do not staple or tape together as this slows the tabulating process. Should you have any specific question or problem requiring my assistance, I would appreciate your sending it separately from the poll in order to avoid delay in giving your request top-priority action.

Thank you for giving me the very valuable benefit of your views through this questionnaire, and please do not hesitate to call on me whenever I can be of service to you.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,

Member of Congress.

MINSHALL OPINION POLL

1. Do you feel the President's trip to China was worthwhile? Yes. No. Undecided.
2. Total yearly costs of the United Nations run more than \$1 billion of which we pay about 36%. Should we reduce our contribution? Yes. No. Undecided.
3. Do you agree with the way President Nixon is ending U.S. ground combat involvement in Vietnam? Yes. No. Undecided.
4. Would you grant amnesty to the men who left our country to avoid the draft if they agree to 3 years of some sort of federal service? Yes. No. Undecided.
5. A Blue Ribbon Defense Panel reports the Soviet Union is achieving military superiority over the U.S. Should we maintain arms parity with Russia? Yes. No. Undecided.
6. Do you favor continuing the present wage-price control program? Yes. No. Undecided.
7. Would you support a "value added tax" (3% national sales tax) if it lowers your local property taxes? Yes. No. Undecided.
8. Are you willing to pay higher taxes for completely nationalized health care for all? Yes. No. Undecided.
9. Should the minimum hourly wage be raised from \$1.60 to \$2.00? Yes. No. Undecided.
10. Do you support my constitutional amendment to guarantee local control of schools and school busing? Yes. No. Undecided.
11. Are you in favor of federally-subsidized public housing in your neighborhood for low-income and welfare families? Yes. No. Undecided.
12. Now that 18-year-olds can vote, should they also be subject to adult civil and criminal laws? Yes. No. Undecided.
13. Should the Constitution be amended to guarantee equal rights for women? Yes. No. Undecided.
14. If the 1972 presidential election were held today, who would be your choice for President? Answer:

15. What is the most important issue facing the Nation today? Answer:

Your Age: _____ Occupation: _____ City and Ward: _____

COMMUNIST CHINA AND NARCOTICS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when there is a euphoric feeling that peace may be at hand with the Communist Chinese, a feeling not borne out by the fact that the Peking Government continues to sponsor subversion and terror throughout Asia, one important question remains unanswered and, to a large measure, unasked.

That question is this: How involved is Communist China in the flow of narcotics in Southeast Asia and elsewhere in the world?

The Communists deny any involvement, and our Government agrees with the official Peking denials. There does, however, seem to be more to the story than this.

Recently, a former British official in the Far East, A. H. Stanton Candlin, reported that:

When President Nixon goes to see Chou En-Lai, he is seeing the biggest drug pusher in the world.

Mr. Candlin makes a compelling case, and while up to date evidence is lacking, the denials of any Communist Chinese involvement in narcotics seem less than credible.

We do know, for example, that the Chinese Communists have a record of past involvement in this area. In 1950, after they established control of the mainland, Henry Anslinger, U.S. Narcotics Chief, placed an American complaint before the United Nations to the effect that the Communist Chinese were smuggling narcotics into Japan.

In a recent column discussing this subject, Allan C. Brownfeld reports that:

His (Anslinger's) evidence was overwhelming and proved that during the early 1950s China was heavily engaged in the illicit drug trade. Mr. Anslinger testified in 1955 before the Senate Judiciary Committee. He declared that Red China "had singled out the United States as a primary target for its illicit traffic in opium and heroin."

Mr. Brownfeld reports that during a recent visit to the Far East:

American officials in Hong Kong and elsewhere in that area declared without a doubt that "Communist China is not responsible for narcotics." They were, however, the only ones to say this. Americans outside of the government, and officials of other governments expressed the view that Communist China was deeply involved. They pointed out that answers received from American officials were "political" answers, meant not to damage the President's efforts at "reconciliation" with the Communist Chinese.

At a time when thousands of young Americans, particularly servicemen in Vietnam, are becoming addicted to heroin and other dangerous drugs, it is incumbent upon our Government, if it is sincere in its desire to stem the tide of such drugs, to investigate the possible

involvement of Communist China in their production and distribution.

Mr. Brownfeld raises a number of important questions. I wish to share his column, which appeared in Roll Call of February 24, 1972, with my colleagues, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

COMMUNIST CHINA AND NARCOTICS

(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

As President Nixon meets in Peking with Communist Chinese leaders there is one subject which does not appear to be on the agenda, but which many concerned observers, both in this country and abroad, would like to see discussed. That subject is the question of Communist China's involvement in the world-wide traffic in narcotics and dangerous drugs.

Speaking to a small group of legislative aides on Capitol Hill, A. H. Stanton Candlin, a British narcotics expert who has spent many years in the Far East, declared this month that "When President Nixon goes to see Chou En-Lai he is seeing the biggest drug pusher in the world, with 80,000 acres under cultivation."

This idea is neither new nor novel. According to Mohammed Hassanein Helikal, editor of Cairo's semi-official Al Ahram newspaper and a confidant of the late Egyptian President Nasser, Premier Chou En-Lai told Nasser in 1965 that Communist China planted opium in Vietnam, hoping to demoralize U.S. troops there with drugs.

Even a brief review of the facts with regard to narcotics addiction now afflicting American servicemen in Vietnam leaves open the question of where the massive amounts of heroin, not to mention marijuana and other drugs, are coming from.

This writer recently discussed that question while in the Far East. American officials in Hong Kong and elsewhere in that area declared without a doubt that "Communist China is not responsible for narcotics." They were, however, the only ones to say this. Americans outside of the government, and officials of other governments expressed the view that Communist China was deeply involved. They pointed out that the answers received from American officials were "political" answers, meant not to damage the President's efforts at "reconciliation" with the Communist Chinese.

U.S. spokesmen, up to the highest level, have consistently asserted that 80% of the heroin brought into the United States is manufactured from Turkish opium. Originally, the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs calculated this figure not just for Turkish opium, but for Middle Eastern and especially Iranian opium. Iran remained a major opium producer and purveyor long after 1955, when it prohibited the planting of poppy. Cultivation was again authorized in 1969.

Turkish authorities have been restricting poppy cultivation from 21 to 9 provinces, with most of the planting restricted to four. As of June, 1971, all cultivation was prohibited. Production itself was curtailed long before 1971. During this same period, heroin consumption in the U.S. and elsewhere went up dramatically. With a dynamic growth of consumption in the U.S. and elsewhere, and a concurrent reduction in the output of Turkish opium, the contribution of Turkey to the American heroin market cannot possibly have remained static at the 80% level.

There is some undisputed history with regard to the past involvement of the Communist Chinese in opium and heroin production. In the course of the long march from southern China to the Yenan caves in Shensi, some 400,000 Communists were forced into a mountainous region which lacked agricultural and other income-producing resources.

The Communists turned to the cultivation of opium as the most expeditious means of survival and of financing the "protracted struggle."

They began to market their product by 1938-39, and they were helped in their efforts by the Japanese who rescinded the prohibition on opium smoking that had been imposed by the Chinese Nationalist Government. The Japanese were anxious to stimulate opium consumption among the Chinese and the Communists were eager to trade opium for metals, including gold, and they reportedly also used opium as a bank reserve.

According to Mr. Stanton Candlin, the Chinese Communists are now using a policy of "psycho-chemical warfare," first used by the Japanese on the Chinese themselves in the 1920s and 1930s. The Japanese established brothels and spread morphine. It was done by intelligence services of the army and the Chinese method being used today "can be traced to the Japanese. They saw it done to themselves and they are improving on it." Much of this material is set forth in the volume, "Traffic In Narcotics" by Henry Anslinger, former U.S. Narcotics Chief.

In 1950, after the Chinese Communists established control of the Mainland, Mao forbade opium smoking in China and a few opium growers were executed with great publicity. Yet shortly thereafter, Commissioner Anslinger placed an American complaint before the United Nations to the effect that the Communist Chinese were smuggling narcotics into Japan. His evidence was overwhelming and proved that during the early 1950s China was heavily engaged in the illicit drug trade. Mr. Anslinger testified in 1955 before the Senate Judiciary Committee. He declared that Red China "had singled out the United States as a primary target for its illicit traffic in opium and heroin."

In a speech of September 21, 1961, Rep. Francis E. Walter (D-Pa.) referred to Communist Chinese "dope warfare" against American and United Nations troops during the Korean War. He added that many of the narcotics were peddled "at bargain prices by young women pushers near all military installations in Korea." He stressed that the products were of high quality and reported that during 1952 the Japanese police arrested over 2,000 pushers near American installations. He stated that opiate were coming into Hong Kong, Burma, and Thailand from the North, and he quoted the U.N. Commission on Narcotics Drugs as the source of this information. During the Korean War, U.S. troops found an opium processing plant in Pyongyang which was producing prepared opium and morphine.

Heroin addiction among American troops in Vietnam steadily rose toward epidemic proportion beginning in December, 1969. It has also been stated that a heavy heroin influx followed shortly after the Cambodian invasion in the spring of 1970. This influx was estimated from service deaths resulting from drug overdoses by Assistant District Attorney John Steinberg of Philadelphia who investigated the Vietnam drug scene in the fall of 1970 as a special consultant to the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency. Shortly after the Cambodian operation "large quantities of heroin began arriving in Vietnam . . . uniform packaging and refining indicated a single highly organized source."

Reviewing the available information, Professor Stefan T. Possony, Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution of Stanford University, stated that "I am satisfied that while much detail remains hidden and statistical accuracy is not attainable, the overall story has emerged rather clearly. The various sources have—on the whole—been mutually confirmatory. The sources do reveal a cleavage of opinion on the role of Maoist China, but I believe this difference can be resolved. I

also want to record that denials of Chinese Communist involvement which I have seen were in the nature of flat assertions and were never accompanied by analysis."

Professor Possony notes that "In terms of production, the Chinese Communists have the capacity of replacing suppliers like Turkey who may go out of business. They are also able to satisfy a larger market and/or growing market demands." It is high time that this question was discussed openly.

OMAHA'S "GLASPHALT" EXPERIMENT

HON. JOHN Y. MCCOLLISTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. MCCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, in this era of national concern for the quality of the environment, I should like to call attention to a resourceful, imaginative, and eminently productive environmental program undertaken by the citizens of Omaha in my home State. I believe that this continuing program, now well into its second year, is without equal—not only with respect to its effectiveness and scope but also in terms of community involvement. It stands out as a shining example for other communities facing similar environmental problems.

One of its unique aspects is the recycling of used glass bottles and jars collected by the community into an experimental new road-paving material known as "glasphalt." This method of recycling was decided upon after it had been determined that the cost of shipping the waste glass to bottle-manufacturing plants outside the State would negate the economic benefits. The nearest glass container manufacturing plants are located in Oklahoma and Illinois.

The driving force behind this program is a woman who has contributed immeasurably to the cause of environmental improvement in Nebraska, and I would like to acknowledge her achievements publicly at this time. She is Mrs. Les Anderson, chairman of the Governor's Council To Keep Nebraska Beautiful and chairman of its sister organization, Keep Omaha Beautiful, Inc.

In late 1971, Mrs. Anderson received a special award from Keep America Beautiful, the national antilitter organization, in recognition of the leadership and inspiration she provided in organizing the Omaha environmental program and in keeping it moving in the face of obstacles and difficulties that would have daunted a less courageous soul. And Midlands—the Sunday magazine of the Omaha World-Herald—designated Mrs. Anderson its "Woman of the Year."

Her first success—the repaving of an Omaha street with glasphalt made from jars and bottles collected by Omaha residents—received nationwide publicity. The event itself, and the painstaking efforts that preceded it, have been admirably recounted in an article in the November 1971 issue of American City magazine, and I would like to request permission to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time. The article follows:

GLASPHALT PAVES DOWNTOWN CITY BLOCK

How does a community recycle its discarded bottles when it has no glass-container plant within reach to accept the bottles for reprocessing?

Citizen groups in Omaha, Nebr., found a way. They organized their own glass recycling project. They first collected bottles and arranged to have them processed into "glasphalt," a blacktop paving material that contains crushed glass for aggregate. Omaha officials cooperated by paving a downtown city block with recycled glass.

THE BEGINNING

The Omaha project evolved within the much broader framework of a statewide environmental program.

In the winter of 1970-71, Mrs. Les Anderson, chairman of the Governor's Council to Keep Nebraska Beautiful, began to map plans for a three-pronged "Nebraska Environmental Action Month" which was to include litter clean-up drives, tree-planting activities and the collection of waste glass and paper for recycling. But the nearest glass container plants where the salvaged bottles could be recycled were in Illinois and Oklahoma, nearly 400 miles away.

However, Mrs. Anderson had heard about glasphalt. And she knew that several industrial concerns, a real estate developer and the University of Missouri (Rolla) had sponsored glasphalt paving projects on a test basis. First off, she interviewed glass container industry experts to familiarize herself with the technology and economies of glasphalt. On the basis of this knowledge, the city of Omaha seemed like a good place to start. Next she talked to Omaha's City Engineer Marvin Staven. He assured her of the city's complete cooperation, if she could deliver the glass.

GETTING OTHERS TO HELP

Working through Keep Omaha Beautiful and other civic-minded groups, Mrs. Anderson was convinced that she could round up the 60 or more tons of old bottles required to pave a city block, if a network of collection centers could be set up where people could bring the glass. To get the ball rolling, she developed local publicity pointing out that Omaha was going to get a glasphalt street and urging residents to start saving bottles for it. The promotion manager of a local supermarket chain, offered to make space available in eight store parking lots for bottle collection sites.

A refuse hauling contractor, whose firm uses large bins to collect garbage at Omaha business establishments and industrial plants agreed to place bins with capacities of four to eight tons on the eight supermarket parking lots designated as collection centers.

To crush the glass Mrs. Anderson's group located a stone crushing plant. The manager agreed to crush any bottles the drive might produce.

The bottle collection drive—and a simultaneous paper drive—were set for the first week in April. The collection was timed to coincide with the high school spring recess, so there would be plenty of student volunteers available to help. Boys and girls from eight school ecology clubs manned the bins at the eight collection centers, and the bottles began to pour in. In addition to being inundated with bottles, the collection sites were also deluged with a flood of paper bags and cartons in which the bottles had been delivered. These were taken to paper collection centers staffed by the Salvation Army.

SUCCESS

The week-long bottle drive yielded 30 tons of glass, or about enough to make glasphalt for a half a city block. Mrs. Anderson, deciding that more was needed, organized a second bottle roundup in May. By early June enough bottles had been collected (about 65 tons) to pave an entire block.

In August the blacktop made from crushed bottles salvaged from litter and solid waste was laid along an entire block in the central city.

City Engineer Marvin Staven expects to extend the glasphalting of Omaha's streets to one project per year. He anticipates using approximately 100 tons of glass in each project. This, he estimates, will produce about 500 tons of glasphaltic concrete. He plans to purchase a hammermill-type crushing unit to process the glass.

As the article in the American City indicated, Omaha's 1971 glasphalt paving project was just the beginning of Mrs. Anderson's environmental crusade.

Since that time, under her inspired leadership, citizens of Omaha have collected 100 additional tons of glass and huge amounts of scrap metal and paper. The city has agreed to purchase the glass from "Keep Omaha Beautiful" for \$4 a ton for recycling into glasphalt. Meanwhile \$2,000 worth of crushing equipment has been purchased to process the reclaimed jars and bottles into cullet suitable for use in glasphalt.

The glass has been stored outdoors in a fenced-in area at an outlying landfill site. But plans are now well advanced for a permanent, fully-equipped collection center to be located within the city.

This will be a one-stop waste reclamation center, where Omahans can deposit wastepaper and used metal cans as well as empty jars and bottles. The city has offered the use of land and a small but adequate structure. It is anticipated that proceeds from the sale of the crushed glass to the city and from the sale of salvaged paper and metal to commercial outlets will more than pay all operational costs in addition to compensating "Keep Omaha Beautiful" for the modest start-up costs.

Meanwhile I am happy to report that Governor Exon has again designated the period from April 15 to May 15 "Nebraska Environmental Action Month." This will give added impetus to the far-reaching environmental action programs now underway not only in Omaha but throughout Nebraska.

JUDGE MICHAEL ZIMMER**HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a long and colorful career of public service was brought to a close last week when the Honorable Michael E. Zimmer stepped down as a member of the city court in my home city of Buffalo, N.Y.

I have known Judge Zimmer for nearly three decades as a close personal friend, as a dedicated public servant, and as a respected member of the city court.

Judge Zimmer was known for his harsh voice but no one questioned his fairness as a member of the judiciary. Behind that harsh voice was a man with a big heart. He was tough, but he still had compassion.

Above all, Judge Zimmer loved his country. He was impatient with those who failed to show due respect for their

country and its flag. He came up the hard way, worked his way through school and college and is ever grateful for the opportunities he has had as an American.

I am arranging to give Judge Zimmer a flag which has been flown over the U.S. Capitol especially for him. I can think of no more appropriate gift for this outstanding citizen of whom my city is so proud.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I include an article and an editorial:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, March 1, 1972]

JUDGE ZIMMER, A TOUGH FIGHTER, IS RETIRING AFTER LONG COURT CAREER OF TOUGH DECISIONS

(By Tom O'Grady)

After three dozen years as a civic leader, fighting politician, stern and colorful city court judge, it isn't likely that Michael E. Zimmer will fade into obscurity.

Judge Zimmer is quitting his court job today, ten months earlier than he'd have to, but he still shows himself to be in vigorous good health, keenly interested in law and a close follower of events.

He has had a career that began here—some people called him a "carpetbagger"—in 1923 when he arrived in Buffalo from his native Pennsylvania with a high school education, one year of junior college, a strong back, big fists—and ambitions.

Young Zimmer, one of 13 children from a coal-mining family, had worked his way through St. John Kanty Prep School, Erie, Pa., and financed his law school the same way.

Getting his degree, he plunged into civic endeavors, particularly on the East Side, where he became a member of 18 organizations.

He fought his first political battle and had to take on the Bar Association of Erie County during it in 1935 when he became an independent candidate for a Democratic nomination for City Court Judge.

FIRST BID FOR JUDGESHIP

Then 33, he beat an organization-endorsed candidate, Thuman W. Stoner, in the primary, becoming the first candidate from the Polish East Side to gain a major party nomination for the judiciary.

The would-be judge put on a fierce campaign, first trying to rally women by "getting the mothers and grandmothers out of the kitchen" to register and vote.

In 1937, during the Depression, there was a much-sought opening on the City Court bench due to the death of Judge George P. Burd.

Most of the judges then, headed by the late Chief Judge George W. Woltz, were Republicans, but several Democrats had gained the office, which then paid \$6525 a year with an extra \$350 for chief.

There was a wide split within the Democratic Party with two big factions.

A four-hour meeting was held in the Porter Ave. residence of Mayor George J. Zimmerman on Sunday, June 13, 1937. It was attended by a large group of East Side figures.

They urged a Zimmer appointment. There were an estimated 200,000 Polish-Americans in Buffalo then, and Mr. Zimmer was living at 984 Fillmore Ave, with his wife, the former Victoria Siudzinski, and one child.

APPOINTED TO COURT

Mayor Zimmermann appointed Judge Zimmer the next day.

In the November elections, running for the unexpired four-year term, Judge Zimmer lost to the Republican candidate, Charles T. Yeager, who later became surrogate and recently died.

In 1938, Judge Zimmer was given an appointment by Mayor Thomas L. Holling as executive secretary of the City Planning

Board. Two years later, after another appointment to City Court following the death of Judge Peter Maul, Judge Zimmer went on that year to win election to an unexpired seven-year term.

Judge Zimmer is of medium height, stocky build and has a ruddy complexion, which heightens and flushes with the intensity of interest he displays.

His courtroom manner appears to show an underlying toughness but for persons who have observed him closely his toughness hasn't meant harshness but an even-handed attempt to know fully any matter before him.

A tendency to brush aside legal technicalities and take over questioning of witnesses often drew strong objections by lawyers that sometimes escalated into heated sessions that left the walls resounding.

Judge Zimmer became known for some pet phrases, such as asking a lawyer what he was "bellyaching" about. Later he became addicted to use of the expression "ball of wax" to explain what he was trying to do over objections.

"SAME BALL OF WAX"

"It is the same ball of wax," he would say in a somewhat pleading manner. Another expression he had for a long time was "humbug."

"It is humbug," he would sing out when he thought the legal arguments were becoming specious. "Don't give me that, Counselor. It is humbug!"

He always told persons taking the stand, singing it out: "Put your hand on the Holy Book." His name for the Erie County Penitentiary was "the workhouse."

Judge Zimmer favored the old state law providing for up to six months in the penitentiary, now reduced to a maximum of 15 days, for persons convicted of public intoxication.

Once he made a decision that a defendant had lost control of his drinking, he would sentence him.

"Six months in the workhouse," he would declare. "You need to dry out. It will save your life."

He never sentenced anybody without a complete background check, and favored probation and fines. For those who violated probation or became a menace to the community he didn't hesitate to impose penitentiary sentences up to the maximum and sometimes commented he wished he could give more.

FEARLESS, BLUNT-SPEAKING

Influence meant nothing to him, only determining the facts and making a proper judgment. He feared nobody and often was blunt-speaking, making statements from the bench that often astounded persons in the courtroom.

"And now," he loudly declared once after three accused burglars were brought before him, "let's see what these crumb bums are in for."

He lambasted a politician in open court one day for walking in and attempting to whisper something to him, declaring: "Nobody is going to put me behind the eight ball. He will be thrown in jail."

Not that Judge Zimmer didn't try to help people, but he wanted everything out into the open. He was meticulous in his record keeping, taking full sets of notes of his own and making complete docket entries in a fine handwriting.

In 1947 Judge Zimmer had another stiff election challenge but won a good victory, this time for his first full 10-year term. Two years later he tried for chief city judge, losing to John W. Ryan Jr.

FAMILY COURT BID FAILS

In 1957 there was another exhausting election campaign to go through, but he won a second 10-year term. Two years later he tried for the old Children's Court, had another

clash when the Erie County Bar Association failed to endorse him, and lost to Judge Raymond R. Niemer.

Democratic County Chairman Peter J. Crotty and Judge Zimmer attacked the Bar Association and the committee involved as being motivated by Republican political leanings in its ratings.

In 1967, his term again up, Judge Zimmer didn't have to campaign. The Bar Association gave him its highest rating of well qualified and he had the endorsement and nominations of all parties, Democrat Republican, Conservative and Liberal, for a third 10-year term.

Although some lawyers tried to duck Judge Zimmer, who was the delight of courtroom spectators, most often the litigants—be they complainant or defendant in criminal cases or plaintiff and respondent in civil cases—would walk out of his courtroom satisfied over having been given a day in court, regardless of the outcome.

He would plant himself in the high-backed swivel chair, take on everything that was on the calendar, give everybody a chance to have his say and clean it up.

His most earnest effort was to clarify and bring the matters to a final conclusion and he would stay until midnight if necessary.

[Editorial from Buffalo Evening News, March 2, 1972]

JUDGE ZIMMER RETIRES

City Court will be a little less colorful with the retirement this week of Judge Michael Zimmer, a stern and outspoken man who served ably on the bench for more than 30 years. He overcame imposing odds, political and otherwise, to win and hold his judicial position. Despite some unorthodox courtroom habits, he usually left litigants with a feeling that he had decided their case in a spirit of common-sense fairness. Those qualities served him and the community well, and we join others in wishing him a healthy, happy retirement.

ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion recently about the growing sense of mistrust that the people have for their elected officials. Corruption at every level of government seems, at times, commonplace. Congress has spent many hours talking about the problem and proposing solutions for it. Some of the possible solutions are embodied in the latest campaign spending legislation. It is a start, but we still have a long way to go in restoring the confidence of the people in their government.

Ultimately, the people themselves decide what kind of Government they want—a government they can believe in and trust or a Government they view with suspicion and doubt. The people have the final decision because they determine which men and women will represent them in the State legislatures, in the city councils, and the Congress. That determination is made at the ballot box.

My distinguished colleague from Illinois, Congressman ABNER J. MIKVA, recently wrote an article about ethics in government. It appeared in Hyde Park Voices, a community newspaper in Chi-

cago, and I insert the text of the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

POLITICAL ETHICS

People have started to take a new and unusual interest in government and politics lately . . . and not simply because 1972 happens to be a Presidential election year. Given the cause, it cannot be considered a healthy interest. Hardly a week goes by without another instance of scandal or corruption or dishonesty in public office . . . and Illinois has done so well at it that the state has gained national distinction in the area. First, there was the Secretary of State. His salary was never more than 30 thousand dollars a year but, when he died, he left a tidy estate of two million dollars . . . part of it stacked in a shoebox. A few months later, a Chicago alderman vanished . . . along with 100 thousand dollars in federal funds. Most recently, the Cook County States Attorney was indicted . . . so was a prominent federal judge, charged with bribery and tax evasion while he was Governor. While all of this was going on, there were disclosures about a number of public officials who owned race track stock—stock that returned a rather remarkable profit. 1971 was a banner year for political scandal.

Each instance of dishonesty cannot be considered separately. There is a cumulative effect, and an attitude develops . . . as it is developing in this country now . . . that equates public office with scandal, public officials with deceit, public trust with contempt. It puts politics in the gutter. Public service is an honorable profession though, and it does not belong there. For every committeeman or legislator or alderman who takes a bribe, there are a thousand other honest officials. They do their best . . . in a modest, unspectacular and scrupulous way . . . and that is the highest form of public service. Corruption in government is particularly corrosive. The thousand honest public officials are somehow tainted by the one dishonest official. So long as most men and women in government are honest, corruption is twice as vicious.

Paul Powell is not really important . . . just as each instance of dishonesty in itself is not really important. So, people should not be terribly troubled by the legacy of Paul Powell, but they might well be alarmed by the legacy of the system . . . the legacy of public indifference . . . that endorsed, elected and encouraged him . . . year after year after year. And, they might well be alarmed by the legacy of the system that picked the successor to Paul Powell . . . a man whose family had an interest in the racetrack business he was supposed to regulate.

No political system ever will be able to rid itself completely of political corruption. That does not mean we should not try and, in Illinois at least, we are not even close. We must try because so much more is at stake than just the money that is lost through corruption. (If corruption in government hangs in the balance, taxes still would not go down.) A way of government hangs in the balance. The agenda of unfinished business in this country is awesome, and we will never be able to end the war . . . or properly educate our children . . . or fight the drug problem . . . unless the people have faith and confidence in the men and women they elect to govern them.

George Bernard Shaw once said that democracy is the only device that insures that people will be no better governed than they deserve. If there is scandal in government . . . if there is corruption . . . it is the people's fault. They have the power and the responsibility to vote politicians out of office if they are not honest . . . but only rarely do the people exercise it. Paul Powell was elected Secretary of State twice and, before that, he was elected time and again to

the state legislature. Many of the people who voted for him knew about his influence peddling . . . knew about his way of doing business . . . knew about his rather comfortable relationships with some race tracks and trucking firms. They kept sending him back to the state capitol in Springfield because he was a nice guy or because he was strong on some social issues. Given Paul Powell's sense of propriety and honesty, the state could have done without his vote on increasing aid to the elderly.

Most public officials . . . from alderman to President . . . are no wiser, no stronger, than the people they represent. They have the same tendencies and the same weaknesses. Indeed, that may be why some people find it awkward to rail against dishonesty in government when they try to pay off a city official for a favorable zoning ruling . . . when they cheat on their income tax . . . or when they clip a 5-dollar-bill to their drivers license in case they are stopped for speeding. It is hypocritical . . . to say the least. However, there is a double standard that ought to be imposed on public officials. When the people elect someone to office, they are entitled to expect him to be—not just above criminal behavior—but above suspicion. To warrant the public's trust, an official must meet stricter standards than private citizens expect of each other.

Until that millenium when all men are honest, there must be legislation that helps the voters determine whether or not a public official has met those standards. To begin with, there must be complete disclosure of financial holdings and income. Disclosure is the essence of any reform simply because it would be impossible to eliminate every single conflict of interest. After all, having children in public schools and voting on an education appropriation constitutes a "conflict of interest" in the strictest sense of the phrase. However, with complete disclosure, the people would know where a public official has interests, and then they can determine whether the interests conflict with his public responsibility.

There should be a board established at each level of government—a board made up of private citizens and public officials—to help determine what constitutes a conflict of interest and to decide whether the holdings

should be liquidated or put in a blind trust. Finally, this country must have campaign reform. If there is corruption at this point in the political process . . . if a candidate has to sell his soul to get the money for his campaign . . . a law requiring complete disclosure would be meaningless.

There are some encouraging signs. Although Congress did not pass the most comprehensive campaign spending reform legislation . . . because of the veto threatened by the President . . . it did approve a Democratic proposal to make political contributions of up to 50 dollars deductible on an individual's income tax. (A person has the option of taking a tax credit of up to 25-dollars.) Public financing of political campaigns is still a long way off . . . but we have made a beginning. There is also a stirring in Illinois. That much scandal has to generate demand for reform, and perhaps the legislature is finally beginning to respond to public pressure.

Good ethics legislation will help but, in the final analysis, the people decide what kind of standards and principles their public officials must have. It is not too much to ask that our public officials distinguish between private gain and public trust. If they cannot make the distinction, they do not merit the office.

EASTERN ACTS TO PROTECT NONSMOKERS

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Eastern Airlines, one of the largest air carriers in the world, has joined in the campaign to provide separate seating for smokers and nonsmokers on public transportation. In compliance with the intent of H.R. 4776, the Nonsmokers Relief Act I introduced early last year, Eastern has sent me the following telegram:

We know of your interest in separating smokers from nonsmokers on airplanes. You

will be pleased to hear that Eastern Airlines as a result of consumer comments will soon start setting aside seats on our aircraft in a special area for smokers. We are already providing this service on a few of our flights and we expect the procedure to go into system-wide operation this coming April 10. (Signed) Russell L. Ray Jr., vice president of consumer affairs.

Eastern joins an ever-growing number of transportation companies who are voluntarily complying with the intent of the Nonsmokers Relief Act. The mail that has flooded into my office in support of this bill proves conclusively that the overwhelming majority of Americans feel as I do—that on one should be forced to inhale dangerous tobacco fumes.

Since the Nonsmokers Relief Act was introduced, American Airlines, United Airlines, and Trans World Airlines—and now Eastern Airlines—have agreed to provide separate seating for smokers and nonsmokers.

Groups as varied as the Railroad Passengers Association and the American Medical Association House of Delegates also have supported this measure. The Interstate Commerce Commission has ruled that separate seating must be provided aboard buses.

The U.S. Surgeon General in a recent report said the health of a nonsmoker could be adversely affected if he is forced to inhale tobacco fumes from others, particularly in a confined area. H.R. 4776 would protect the rights and health of millions of nonsmokers—without placing a burden on those who choose to smoke.

Every American should have the right to breathe unpolluted air; he should not be forced to inhale the noxious fumes from others. While many carriers are now providing separate seating, others are not. The Congress should act promptly on the Nonsmokers Relief Act to protect the rights and health of all Americans.

SENATE—Wednesday, March 8, 1972

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON III, a Senator from the State of Illinois.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-living God, as we bow in this midday moment of prayer, we commit ourselves anew to Thy divine sovereignty, to Thy revealed word and to the guidance of Thy spirit. Remove from us all that obstructs our understanding of Thy will or impedes our doing it. While we cherish the rich heritage of the past make us willing to discard what is outworn and to welcome the truth which is new in promises of a better world. We plead not for security but for loyalty. What we pray for those who labor here, we pray for those everywhere in the service of this Nation.

Breathe through the things that are

seen the peace of the unseen and the eternal. We pray in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1972.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON III, a Senator from the State of Illinois, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. STEVENSON thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 6, 1972, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 960) to designate the Sycamore Canyon Wilderness, Coconino, Kaibab, and Prescott National Forests, State of Arizona.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

- S. 247. An act for the relief of Albert G. Feller and Flora Feller; and
- S. 888. An act for the relief of David J. Crumb.