

ployee of an air carrier to pay money to any person on account of any attempt or threat to hijack, damage, or destroy any aircraft operated by such air carrier, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 13675. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for the duty-free entry of mica films; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 13676. A bill to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to investigate the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and its subsidiaries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZION:

H.R. 13677. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ABZUG:

H.R. 13678. A bill to amend the national defense loan program to provide that the obligations of student borrowers to make payments on their loans shall be suspended while they are performing alternative service under the Military Selective Service Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BERGLAND (for himself, Mr. OBEX, Mr. LINK, Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ROUSH, Mr. THONE, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. FRASER, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. ROY, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. FOLEY):

H.R. 13679. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make advance payments to producers participating in wheat and feed grain programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 13680. A bill to amend title 5 of the United States Code with respect to the observance of Memorial Day and Veterans Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 13681. A bill to promote development and expansion of community schools throughout the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 13682. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to define and limit the exclusionary rule in Federal criminal proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 13683. A bill to amend the Flood Control Act of 1970; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. RED, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DOW, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. MAZZOLI):

H.R. 13684. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide emergency grants for operating subsidies to urban mass transportation systems on the

basis of passengers serviced; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 13685. A bill to amend chapter 7, title 24, United States Code, to provide that the cost of setting Government-issued grave markers, not to exceed \$100, be borne by the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 13686. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PURCELL (for himself and Mr. FRENZEL):

H.R. 13687. A bill to enable wheat producers, processors, and end-product manufacturers of wheat foods to work together to establish, finance, and administer a coordinated program of research, education, and promotion to maintain and expand markets for wheat and wheat products for use as human foods within the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 13688. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to require the Secretary of Labor to recognize the difference in hazards to employees between the heavy construction industry and the light residential construction industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 13689. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States, its territories, and possessions, to include privately owned property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.J. Res. 1094. Joint resolution to create a select joint committee to conduct an investigation and study into methods of significantly simplifying Federal income tax return forms; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ECKHARDT:

H.J. Res. 1095. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim April 1972 as "National Check Your Vehicle Emissions Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALIFIANAKIS:

H.J. Res. 1096. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating the period from March 12, 1972, through March 19, 1972, as "International Demolay Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. Res. 880. Resolution commending the Girl Scouts of the United States of America on its 60th birthday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H. Res. 881. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the full amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1972 for the Farmers

Home Administration's farm operating loan program and waste facility grant program authorized by the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, be released and made available by the administration to carry out the objectives of these programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GALIFIANAKIS:

H. Res. 882. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the full amount appropriated for fiscal year 1972 for the Farmers Home Administration's farm operating loan program and waste facility grant program authorized by the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, be released and made available by the administration to carry out the objectives of these programs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. Res. 883. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should suspend, in accordance with section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, economic and military assistance and certain sales to Thailand for its failure to take adequate steps to control the illegal traffic of opium through its borders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 884. Resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to the Soviet Union's violations of human rights and basic freedoms, in contravention of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Res. 885. Resolution providing expenses for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. KARTH, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. MOSS, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. MADSEN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. LINK, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. RYAN, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. VANIK, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ADDABBO, and Mr. KASTENMEIER):

H. Res. 886. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should suspend, in accordance with section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, economic and military assistance and certain sales to Thailand for its failure to take adequate steps to control the illegal traffic of opium through its borders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. SEIBERLING and Mr. SCHEUER):

H. Res. 887. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should suspend, in accordance with section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, economic and military assistance and certain sales to Thailand for its failure to take adequate steps to control the illegal traffic of opium through its borders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### RURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

### HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, 1972, the House of Representatives passed landmark legislation in the field of rural development, one of the most important pieces of legislation to pass

this chamber in the 92d Congress. I refer to the Rural Development Act of 1972.

This bill, H.R. 12931, which I cosponsored, will go far in reversing the recent trend for the rural population to move to the cities. I was happy to see this bill pass the House overwhelmingly by a voice vote. I would hope the Senate will act with equal dispatch in passing the Rural Development Act so that it can become public law this year. With 75 per-

cent of our population living on 2 percent of the land, the need for this legislation is obvious.

The first goal of the Rural Development Act is to slow down the need for rural residents to leave their homes because of poor living conditions. We cannot guarantee them a good income. That is not what this bill undertakes to do. But it does attempt to give those in rural areas better living conditions and to that extent make it practical to live in rural

areas. If we can do this—and I think we can—we must try to make it desirable and possible for the people to return to rural America.

How does this bill try to deal with this monumental task? It proposes to work through two existing agencies of the Department of Agriculture, the Farmers Home Administration and the Soil Conservation Service. The bill gives the FHA new areas of responsibility. It authorizes loans to rural residents, including farmers, to establish and operate small businesses in rural areas, to try to create jobs in those areas.

It authorizes loans to industry which will locate in rural areas, taking special care to prohibit industrial pirating from urban areas. These loans must be geared to improving the environmental climate of rural America by creating employment and otherwise improving life in rural areas.

Loans are also authorized for community services and facilities such as fire houses, equipment, ambulances, and rescue equipment. Civic centers can be built with these loans.

Recognizing that it is vital that every effort must be made to combat and prevent the pollution of the environment, the bill authorizes loans and grants for pollution abatement. In line with the new Federal standards for meat processing plants, financing is provided to help small meat packers remain in business by meeting Federal standards.

The bill increases the amount of money authorized for small community water and sewer programs. The House voted on the floor to raise this level from \$200 million to \$500 million.

The small watershed and the resource, conservation and development programs of the Soil Conservation Service are made more flexible by providing assistance in such areas as municipal and industrial water supply, water quality management, pollution abatement and control, and other areas such as fire protection and solid waste disposal.

This is really an excellent bill, which I feel sure, will enhance the quality of life in our rural areas and help make America in general a better place to live.

THOMAS GARRIQUE MASARYK

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, March 7 is the 122d anniversary of the birth of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk—statesman, scholar, journalist, and philosopher. Masaryk, recognized as the father of modern Czechoslovakia, epitomized the many virtues of his people. His accomplishments firmly establish him as one of the premier figures in the struggle for self-determination and personal freedom during the past 100 years.

Czechoslovakia, reborn after 300 years of rule by the Austrian monarchy at the close of World War I, is comprised of remarkable people who have continually

clung to high goals and firm moral purposes. More than any other individual, Masaryk—through his moral and political leadership—drew together these people and helped them form a state which symbolized democracy in Central Europe in the years following World War I.

Masaryk embodied great ideals. More important, he lived by the ideals he held. His entire life was a constant search for truth in whatever he undertook. His accomplishments constitute a long and impressive list. He was one of the finest journalists of his day. A respected and open-minded scholar, and professor at Charles University, Masaryk influenced those individuals who would lead Czechoslovakia in the hall of nations. As one of the leading philosophers of his day, Masaryk combined a moral and religious humanitarianism with an emphasis on the individual in society. As a statesman, Masaryk not only helped secure his country's independence, but at the age of 68, began a term of 17 years as President of Czechoslovakia.

Relying on his own beliefs and on the teachings of the great Czechs of the past, Masaryk emphasized the distinct nationalism of his people. While helping to create and nurture the revitalized Czech consciousness, Masaryk at the same time believed that democracy was the necessary continuation of the Czech traditions of Jan Hus and others. His influence on the leading national figures of the day made Masaryk the leading spokesman for Czechoslovakian national independence at the beginning of World War I. Joined by such distinguished nationalists as Eduard Benes and Milan Stefanik, Masaryk initiated an international campaign to acquaint the Allies and the people with the Czechoslovakian cause. By the conclusion of the war, Masaryk had become recognized as a great leader among statesmen.

His achievements as President of Czechoslovakia have immeasurable significance. The brilliance, sincerity, and inherent goodness of the man were not affected by the increased and burdensome responsibilities involved in creating and recreating a new nation state. Yet, throughout these times, he remained faithful to the ideals which had guided him throughout life.

We can learn much from this great hero of democracy. His words are a testimony to the essential idea to which we Americans must continually address ourselves:

Democracy is the only way to achieve political, economic and social justice and to realize man's love for man.

Moreover, he considered democracy the political form of the humane ideal. In other remarks, Masaryk challenges all freedom-loving men:

Democracy is not alone a form of state and of administration. It is a philosophy of life and an outlook upon the world.

The life of Thomas G. Masaryk, dedicated to the pursuit of truth, the nationalism of Czechoslovakia, and the democratic ideal, is an inspiration to all of us, a source of great pride for all Czechoslovakians, and a message of hope for mankind.

# NEWS BULLETIN OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD the weekly news bulletin of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. The bulletin is compiled and written by the staff of the ARBC communications committee.

The bulletin follows:

BICENTENNIAL BULLETIN, MARCH 6, 1972

A feasibility plan for a network of Bicentennial Parks will commence soon, so that the results may be presented to the full ARBC "for consideration at the earliest possible date," as directed by a resolution that was unanimously approved by the ARBC on February 21. As requested, ARBC Chairman David J. Mahoney presented the Bicentennial Parks concept and the resolution to the Governors and their representatives at the National Governor's Conference and the National Bicentennial Conference.

At the full Commission meeting on February 21, the battle against Sickle Cell Anemia received the official recognition of the ARBC as part of its national bicentennial program. In its resolution the ARBC also awarded use of the official symbol to the National Medical Association in the efforts to eradicate the eugenic disease which affects at least 10% of the Nation's black population. NMA President, Dr. Emerson C. Walden noted, "that by linking their goals with ours, both the NMA and the ARBC will reinforce in American minds that there does exist a real commitment in the interest of human lives and health which underlies the Bicentennial commemoration and reflects the relevance of that commemoration."

The Rhode Island Bicentennial Commission, under Chairman George F. McDonald, Jr., held a Bicentennial Planning town meeting at Rhode Island College on Saturday, February 26. Governor Frank Leicht and citizens from all parts of Rhode Island joined Chairman McDonald in furthering plans for the commemoration of the many Revolutionary War events in that state. One of the highlights of the meeting was the slide presentation by Michael Kreski of the Rhode Island School of Design, illustrating his innovative ideas for the Bicentennial.

Florida Lieutenant Governor Tom Adams has been appointed Chairman of the Florida ARBC by Governor Reubin Askew, to succeed Pat Dodson who remains a member of the Commission. Lt. Governor Adams serves as Florida's Secretary of Commerce, who is directly responsible for the state ARBC and all bicentennial activities.

Dr. Richard P. McCormick of the ARBC was the main speaker at a dinner for the 25 top winners of a Bicentennial model building contest sponsored by the Building Contractors Association of New Jersey on February 19. The assignment for the contest which was open to high school students was "Create by design and construct a model of the building that will be the New Jersey Pavilion in the 1976 Bicentennial Exposition." First place prize of \$500 went to William Sitler and Bruce Muller, sophomores at North Warren Regional High School. The winning models were displayed at the State Museum in Trenton, N.J.

"The Spirit of '76 Committee" of the American Legion met in Washington during the Legion's annual winter meeting and Director Jack I. LeVant was invited to brief the nine member group. John A. Jones,



Chairman of the "Spirit Committee" and Hollis Hull, Assistant Executive Director of the Legion both pledged their support to the Nation's 200th anniversary celebration. The one hour meeting was filled with the exchange of program ideas between the Legion and the ARBC. The "Spirit of '76 Committee" has been charged by the full membership of the American Legion to develop a national program of involvement for 2.7 million plus members, and its one million auxiliary. The Legion will conduct its 1975 National Convention in Philadelphia.

Arthur C. Kaufmann, Chairman of the Independence National Historical Park Advisory Commission, Philadelphia, has announced that the Liberty Bell will be moved for the bicentennial from Independence Hall into a new bell tower within Independence Park some two blocks away. The new structure is expected to be completed in 1974 to provide greater exposure for the crowds expected for the bicentennial and also to provide greater security for the national treasure.

Savannah, Georgia's elegant Customhouse, a Bay Street landmark since 1852, has been designated an Historic Customhouse and made part of the Bureau of Customs' contribution to the Bicentennial Era.

The Maryland Environmental Trust has begun a Bicentennial program to encourage the restoration of the Free State's rivers and streams to the condition in which they existed at the time of the American Revolution. In announcing "a living Bicentennial program," Trust Chairman George S. Wills said, "The important thing about this program as it relates to the Bicentennial is that stream-river restoration and conservation can be contemporary and important to today's environmental problems."

A five-man Bicentennial Coordinating Committee has been appointed by the Legislative Council of the Speech Communication Association to provide the Association leadership in planning and implementing a comprehensive bicentennial program in 1976. A wide range of potential activities is currently being considered by the committee, which will meet for the second time in Chicago this month.

*The Late Affair Has Almost Broken My Heart*, a book on the military aspects of the American Revolution in the Southern colonies will be published in the Spring of 1972 by Chatam Press. The book traces the careers of the 4 leading protagonists Lord Cornwallis and Col. Tarleton on the British side and Gen. Nathaniel Greene and Gen. Daniel Morgan on the American side.

## TAIWAN TRADE TO SURPASS THAT OF MAINLAND IN 1972

**HON. O. C. FISHER**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an interesting and revealing article which recently appeared in *Free China Weekly*. It follows:

### TAIWAN TRADE TO SURPASS THAT OF MAINLAND IN 1972

Wong Yi-ting, director of the Board of Foreign Trade, said Feb. 23 that the Republic of China's foreign trade will surpass that of the China mainland before the end of this year.

Speaking at a press conference at the Government Information Office, Wong said free China's two-way trade soared to US\$4.08 billion in 1971, up US\$1.03 billion over 1970. The

foreign trade of the mainland under the tyrannical rule of the Chinese Communists was about US\$4.7 billion last year.

Wong predicted that the Republic of China's foreign trade will continue to grow rapidly.

"Within two or three years," he said, "our country will become the No. 2 trade power in Asia, second only to Japan."

The United States, which bought US\$880 million worth of Taiwan products last year, remained the country's biggest trade partner. A favorable balance of US\$290 million was registered for the Republic of China.

Exports to the United States accounted for 41.1 per cent of the total exports, he said.

The foreign trade director said free China will have to sell more metals, machinery and electronic products to the U.S. from now on because of the import control on textiles by the U.S.

Other top trade partners of free China in 1971 were Japan, Hongkong and Germany.

Canada was listed fourth on the list, with imports from Taiwan of US\$113 million.

Wong said the Republic of China is doing whatever it can to narrow the trade gap with Japan, which soared to US\$500 million last year in favor of the island empire.

Meanwhile, the China Credit Service (CCS) predicted that free China's foreign trade will reach US\$5,400 million this year.

In its *ROC Trade Forecasts for 1972*, CCS said Chinese exports will amount to US\$2,870 million and imports to US\$2,530 million, resulting in a favorable trade balance of US\$340 million.

The CCS projection is substantially higher than the official prediction. Government leaders had predicted a growth rate of around 20 per cent for the current year.

Last year, free China's two way trade amounted to some US\$4,000 million with a surplus of US\$180 million.

## STANFORD UNIVERSITY AND THE PRESERVATION OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM

**HON. DONALD M. FRASER**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on January 5, 1972, the advisory board, Stanford University issued its decision in the matter of Prof. H. Bruce Franklin.

The decision of the board that Franklin should be immediately dismissed was subsequently accepted by the university's president, Richard W. Lyman, and the Stanford board of trustees.

As Dr. Lyman pointed out in his February 23 remarks before the San Jose Stanford Alumni Club, disciplinary cases against tenured faculty members are not numerous. This makes each case especially important and it is especially important that the university's position in the Franklin case be understood.

A colleague recently described Lyman as having the seldom seen combination of stamina, high intelligence, and great compassion. I understand that this description is not overdone. Lyman's San Jose remarks which follow testify to his understanding of what a university is and the challenges it faces.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS BY RICHARD W. LYMAN

What the Chairman has said in that very generous introduction may well be true, al-

though I often wonder where courage ends and foolhardiness begins.

The hardest thing that a University President has to do, I think, is to try to bridge the yawning canyons of noncommunication among the various groups that comprise or care about the University. In many ways he is in the best position to see how all the pieces fit together. He is in the best position to understand how differently the various groups perceive the University, its nature, purpose, and problems. Students, alumni, staff members, faculty, not to mention non-University but crucial elements like the various branches of government—these groups are all diverse within themselves, of course; it is difficult to think of a generalization about student attitudes that would hold true across the whole student body, for example. But among the groups there are also great differences. And at times I come close to despair in facing the task of helping them towards some mutual understanding.

I've perhaps been particularly conscious of this lately, when several issues have been raised about which the differences of opinion have been so great that attempts at explanation of one to another seem all but hopeless. The arguments over the Indian symbol; the protracted, often embittered, and soul-wracking controversy over military recruitment and the use of Stanford facilities by so-called "war-related" industries; and the diverse and often passionate reactions to the decision to dismiss Professor H. Bruce Franklin; in all of these there exist these huge differences in perception that leave one almost ready to doubt whether the parties at issue are in fact speaking the same language.

I don't propose to go into all of these, except insofar as you may wish to raise them in your questions—mainly because I want to get to the question period as quickly as possible. But I'd like to say a few words about the Franklin case, because it is so especially important that the University's position be understood, and my incoming mail tells me that all too often it is not.

On the one hand there are some all-but-hysterical outcries against our alleged trampling of both Constitutional rights and academic freedom—often these two are hopelessly confused, or simply assumed to be synonymous, by the writers. Here's a small sample:

"DEAR PRESIDENT LYMAN: It is with consternation that I notice in the January 6th edition of the *New York Times* that an associate professor of English at Stanford, H. Bruce Franklin, may be dismissed from the faculty because he has been forthright in the exercise of his personal political freedom.

"That this consideration is possible at Stanford is a symptom of deterioration in the conscientious fibre of the University. If Professor Franklin is dismissed, it will be proof of the extension of that deterioration and an irretraceable step in the direction of reducing Stanford to a second-class seat of learning.

"In expressing his convictions with vigor Professor Franklin has demonstrated the individuality which is the birthright of every American. This courage deserves promotion, not dismissal."

On the other hand, and far more numerous, there are the letters and cards from all over the country that say—well, let me quote from a couple of real ones, rather than paraphrasing:

"By all means fire Professor Franklin, an 'avowed Maoist.' Also fire all the 38 Academic Council members who made the recommendation that the charges against Franklin be dropped."

"May I commend you on your long overdue action in ousting these ungrateful radicals. I would strongly suggest that the teaching staff as well as the student body should be reviewed again, and anyone showing any

trace of being a radical be fired or sent home without any second thoughts."

Now you'll have noticed that the two kinds of message I've been describing and quoting have this in common: both rest on the assumption that Mr. Franklin was dismissed because he held radical beliefs, and expressed them. The critics say we're guilty of thought-control, and that our decisive action will set off a train of similar repressive moves throughout American higher education. And many who are congratulating us enthusiastically think the same thing—only they welcome the idea.

I don't think it can too often be reiterated that this view of the Franklin case misreads its meaning, and does so in a way that is seriously damaging, both to academic freedom and to on-campus discipline. The Advisory Board majority themselves put it about as clearly as it can be put:

"The real issue in these hearings is Professor Franklin's behavior on the offenses charged, not his political views. Diversity of political views is a great asset to the University. The charges here, however, are incitement to use of unlawful coercion and violence and increasing the danger of injury to others as means to achieving Professor Franklin's goals; it is that behavior, not his political views and their expression, which we judge unacceptable. Indeed, we note with approval that others holding and expounding extreme political views are today highly respected members of the Stanford faculty. Our decision silences neither political dissent nor criticism of the University. The only speech or behavior repressed by this Board's findings is that which clearly urges and incites others to unlawful coercion or violence, or to acts likely to increase the risk of injury to other persons. We believe such behavior should be restrained; insistence on such standards of faculty conduct will not chill open and the robust dissent on this or any other campus."

One visitor to the campus last month remarked upon the Advisory Board decision as "a great educational document." He meant to convey his admiration for the care with which he thought the Board has attempted to delineate the issues of faculty responsibility, had sought a proper balance between the rights of the institution and the rights of individuals within the institution, and had tried to break new ground—disciplinary cases against tenured faculty members are not exactly numerous in recent history—while at the same time avoiding the creation of dangerous precedents or excuses for the abuse of power by university administrators. I think that this visitor was right, and that in the longrun the Advisory Board's work will be generally seen as a landmark on the road to true freedom for universities.

How we use our freedom is, I suppose, the most important question we can be asked. The contemporary American university is a unique historical phenomenon. It does within one institution what in other countries generally requires several kinds of institutions. We offer a liberal arts education to liberate the minds of undergraduates; we train postgraduates for a variety of professions, some more esoteric than others; we also try, however imperfectly, to be good corporate citizens; Stanford is, after all, one of the biggest employers, biggest consumers, biggest landowners in Santa Clara County. (Yes, I know we're not entirely in Santa Clara County, but San Jose is, and most of Stanford is.)

That's a tall order. It's small wonder, in a time when society is at odds with itself over so many issues, that the University gets caught in the crossfire time after time. That is where the difficulties of communication come in. And that is where the question period ought logically to begin, for, to be

effective, communication must be a two-way street.

I thank you.

### MITSUBISHI WORLD AIR CENTER SALES, SERVICE PACT TOLD

**HON. GEORGE P. MILLER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Oakland International Airport is one of the most active on the Pacific Coast, not because of the flights in and out of the airport, but because it is the center for a number of supplemental carriers that are highly important to the defense and economy of this country.

The largest of these, and, as a matter of fact, the largest in the country, is World Airways with headquarters in the World Air Center at the Oakland International Airport.

The World Air Center is under the direction of Mr. Edward J. Daly, chairman of the board and its chief executive officer. Mr. Daly has built this company up since World War II and it now takes on a new complexion as being the sales and service center for Mitsubishi Aircraft International.

I make as a part of these remarks an article that appeared in the San Leandro Morning News on March 2, 1972:

MITSUBISHI WORLD AIR CENTER SALES, SERVICE  
PACT TOLD

Mitsubishi Aircraft International of San Angelo, Texas, and World Air Center, Inc., of Oakland, have announced the signing of World Air Center as Sales and Service Representative for the Mitsubishi MU-2 executive propjets. World will have sales and service responsibility in 11 Western states: California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Wyoming, Montana, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska and Hawaii.

The MU-2 executive prop-jets (three models—the MU-2F, G and J) are manufactured by Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd., in Japan, parent company of Mitsubishi Aircraft International. The basic fuselage, wing and tail sections are shipped to the U.S. where they are assembled, completely outfitted with interior and electronics, painted and made ready for sales in Mitsubishi Aircraft International's production facilities in San Angelo, Texas. American-made components represent more than 60 per cent of the plane's cost.

World Air Center, Inc., is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Oakland-based World Airways, Inc., the largest supplemental air carrier operating in the world today. Commenting to Makoto Kuroiwa, President of Mitsubishi Aircraft International, Edward J. Daly, Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of World, said, "We are delighted to be affiliated with Mitsubishi. Mitsubishi Heavy Industries is one of the largest manufacturers in the world. It is engaged in 46 major industries including aircraft and aerospace, ship building, construction, insurance, power generation, iron and steel, mining, petroleum, chemicals, transportation, textiles, pulp and paper, agriculture, and many others. Aircraft design and manufacture is a major segment of the Mitsubishi enterprises and the company has produced a fine business aircraft. I've watched this aircraft continue to gain the respect of corporate pilots throughout the U.S. As a high-speed execu-

tive prop-jet, the MU-2 has no peer in speed and performance in its category."

World Air Center's corporate Aviation Division located at Oakland's International Airport will handle sales and service for the MU-2. World is a complete total maintenance facility developed for full support of corporate aircraft ranging in size from light twins to large jet aircraft.

R. N. Dargle, Executive Vice President of World Air Center, and James S. Hayhoe, Director of Corporate Aviation, have stated that the Corporate Aircraft Division of World Air Center proposes to occupy the present World facilities upon completion of a new \$12 million maintenance complex at Oakland International Airport. The huge new 60-acre complex, located near World's present facility, is expected to be finished early next year. As originally projected—and subject to satisfactory negotiations—World would lease the facility from the Port of Oakland.

William D. Eikenberry, Mitsubishi's marketing chief, present for the signing of World, said, "Our expanding sales of the MU-2 requires an organization of World's capability and experience. We are extremely proud to have them represent us in the West. World Air Center will be a tremendous asset to our marketing efforts and in service and support to MU-2 owners."

### THE TRAGEDY OF VIETNAM: THE COST

**HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, in his typically incisive manner, David Brinkley, of NBC News, last week attempted to give the American public a brief, but tragically complete, accounting of the costs of our disastrous involvement in Indochina. Reams of statistics have been produced on the human monetary costs of this misguided, immoral war, but Mr. Brinkley's short commentary says it all. As we read his remarks and reflect upon the mindlessness of this war, we can only ask why the President continues it, and why Congress allows him to continue it, for another day:

COMMENTARY BY DAVID BRINKLEY

Yesterday, the Senate voted to raise the price of gold . . . to make official what had happened already—the devaluation of the dollar. Meaning that in relation to other currencies, the dollar is worth less.

To a great extent, it's one more side effect of the Viet Nam war. One of many. The others are familiar:

An inflation that already made the dollar worth less even before it was devalued.

The loss of about 50 thousand young Americans and the wounding of a quarter of a million more.

The killing of hundreds of thousands of Viet Nameese men, women and children . . . and the physical devastation of their country.

The waste of far more than 100 billion of the American taxpayers' money that could have been spent on something useful. Plus another 100 billion added to the Federal debt.

Serious damage to the morale and discipline of the American armed forces themselves, not to speak of young soldiers hooked on Viet Nameese heroin.

Severe disorders in the United States . . . riots and killing . . . anger and alienation of a



generation of young Americans . . . more hostility in a country already having too much.

A reduced public confidence in their political system.

Plus My Lai, draft evaders, profiteering and a great deal more.

All of it taken together make the Viet Nam war the biggest blunder in American history. The biggest.

We build monuments to our successes. As a reminder in the future, we might build a monument to this, a historic blunder.

They might also put a speakers' platform on it and require that any future political leader anxious to join other countries' warmongering make his speeches from this platform. To persuade anybody, a speech from that platform would have to be pretty good.

#### NIXON REPORTS ON CHINA

### HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, there was a very interesting statement among the editorials in the Knoxville, Tenn., News-Sentinel of March 1 concerning the President's visit to China and the results of his meeting with Chou En-lai.

I would like to include the editorial at this point:

#### NIXON REPORTS ON CHINA

On his return from China, President Nixon denied he had made any secret deals there or given up any U.S. commitment to any other country, meaning Taiwan.

This assurance is welcome, because in the communique he issued with Premier Chou En-lai he clearly moved away from the Taiwan-based Nationalist regime, this country's ally.

It was unseemly for the United States to pledge to remove its forces from Taiwan—a matter that should first be discussed with the Nationalist—in a joint statement with the Chinese Communists.

Quite clearly, Chou demanded language that would undercut the Nationalists, and Nixon made the concession as his price for starting to improve relations with mainland China and its 800 million inhabitants. History will report whether he made the right choice.

That said, we cannot agree with charges coming from Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey on one side and the John Birch Society on the other that the President deviously sold out the Nationalists or invited the Communists to overrun Taiwan.

It is ironic to hear Humphrey talk about Nixon pulling the rug from under the Nationalists (who after all did lose their civil war) when he is a leader of a group of Democratic hopefuls who are competing to pull the rug from under South Vietnam, which has not yet lost its struggle.

In his airport-arrival statement, Nixon clarified his policy for the gradual removal of U.S. troops from Taiwan. He said "our ultimate objective is to withdraw our forces as a peaceful settlement is achieved."

It is difficult to quarrel with that goal. So long as there are token American forces on Taiwan and our defense treaty is in effect, an attack from the mainland is unthinkable. And once a peaceful settlement is reached, there will be no need for a U.S. military presence.

Most of the political talk about "abandoning" the Nationalists and leaving them "at the mercy of the Communists" strikes us as illogical and uninformed. If Peking were to decide on a military solution, these are among the problems it would face:

To cross the 100-mile-wide Formosa Strait, without having notable air or sea power. To land on an island held by a well-equipped army of 500,000 men. To embark on an amphibious military adventure in the East while one million hostile Russians are massed on the country's northern borders.

The people this country saw on its TV screens meeting with Nixon did not seem that crazy.

In all likelihood, the agreements between Peking and Taiwan will take many years, will be peaceably negotiated and, being made by the Chinese themselves, will make more sense than if we Americans try to do it for them.

#### RUSSIANS FLEE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, what the future holds for the District of Columbia if home rule is granted may be indicated by the recent announcement that the Soviets now numbering more than 400 people at the Russian Embassy in Washington have purchased "a vacation resort" 50 miles from Washington, D.C.

Included in the property purchased to assist the Russians in fleeing Washington are two three-story neo-Georgian mansions, one of which consists of 31 rooms.

I think that the story speaks for itself and ask that the related newsclipping follow.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 8, 1972]

#### RUSSIANS BUY RESORT SITE

(By Douglas Watson)

The Soviet government bought 45 acres and two neo-Georgian mansions on Maryland's Eastern Shore yesterday as a vacation resort for Russian diplomats here, ending years of searching for such a facility.

The Chesapeake Bay property, part of the 1,600-acre Pioneer Point Farms estate in Queen Anne's County, was purchased for slightly more than \$1 million from developer Charles G. Rist.

Embassy First Secretary Vladimir N. Orlov said the estate's three-story, 31-room Hartfield House will serve as the summer residence for the Russian ambassador. Noting that the mansion has a 3,000-bottle wine cellar, Orlov said, "I think we'll find a proper use for it."

He said the estate's other three-story mansion, Mostley Hall, will probably be used to house other embassy officials on summer and weekend vacations. A summer camp for the diplomats' children, which was held on rented property in Charles County last year, may also be moved to the estate.

Orlov noted the concern of some local residents and said, "I don't think these fears have any ground." He said the Russians intend to obey local laws despite their diplomatic immunity.

A State Department official said, however, that the land bought by the Soviets now has the same "inviolable" status as all embassy property, which is regarded as foreign soil.

He pointed out that American diplomats in the Soviet Union have a dacha (country house) on seven acres outside Moscow as a vacation retreat and that the American ambassador lives in a large Moscow mansion, Spaso House, while Dobrynin has been limited to an apartment at the Soviet embassy at 1115 16th St. NW.

The Russians had previously obtained State Department permission to buy the estate. The State Department spokesman said the American dacha is leased from the Soviet government, because, "You can't purchase any land in the Soviet Union."

The Russian diplomats and their families here, who total more than 400 people, are prohibited from traveling more than 25 miles from Washington without special State Department permission. Orlov said he hopes a general exception will be made for travel to the estate, which is about 50 miles from Washington, five miles west of Centreville, Md.

Rist, developer of the Charnita resort community near Gettysburg, Pa., bought the Pioneer Point Farms estate three years ago for more than \$2 million. He said yesterday his salesmen will start this weekend selling off the remaining 1,555 acres in lots of five acres or more to anyone who wants to buy.

The Soviet Embassy which expects to soon begin building a new embassy building on the site of the former Mt. Alto Hospital, had considered "several dozen" vacation places in Maryland and Virginia before yesterday's purchase, Orlov said.

#### TIMOTHY BURKE TREADWELL

### HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, Sunday morning, February 20, a great tragedy struck the family of First Selectman Timothy Burke Treadwell of Newtown, Conn., and the town of Newtown itself. Tim Treadwell died in a fire which destroyed the home where he resided with his wife and three young sons. Tim Treadwell was a young man of great promise and potential in public life and politics. He had served his town of Trumbull with great vigor and enthusiasm, and as it was stated in an editorial of the Newtown Bee:

The outpouring of fellow officials, townspeople and personal friends at the funeral service in Trinity Episcopal Church . . . gave evidence of the place of affection, esteem and admiration in which Tim was held, not only in Newton but in the neighboring towns which he also served through the Regional Council of Elected Officials, the Fairfield County First Selectman's Association, and the Connecticut Council of Mayors.

Mr. Speaker, I enclose editorials of eulogy which appeared in the Danbury, Conn., News-Times and the Newtown, Connecticut Bee.

The eulogies follow:

#### EDITORIAL INK DROPS

##### TIM TREADWELL

The untimely death of Tim Treadwell deprives a family of its father and a town of its elected leader. In both cases the loss is tragic.

The outpouring of fellow officials, townspeople and personal friends at the funeral service in Trinity Episcopal Church on Wednesday afternoon gave evidence of the place of affection, esteem and admiration in which Tim was held, not only in Newtown but in the neighboring towns which he also served through the Regional Council of Elected Officials, the Fairfield County First Selectmen's Association, and the Connecticut Council of Mayors.

Those who knew Tim well and watched him in the performance of his duties in office have long been impressed with his energy and stamina. Prompted by his love

for Newtown and his desire that its future be protected and insured, he made it a part of his administration to watch over the proceedings of all boards and meetings which might influence that future.

If Tim had a fault, it was his personal attention to matters which might safely have been delegated to others. And yet, within our memory, no First Selectman has worked as hard serving the town as did Tim from the day of his first appointment in April, 1968, to the day of his death last Sunday. Regardless of long hours or road blocks intentionally thrown in his way, we are sure he considered his job as a labor of love for his town.

Others will remember Tim for his enthusiasm of youth, his devotion to duty, his unbounded energy, his tendency to always look ahead, tackling projects which he believed would work for the future benefit of the town. He was thoughtful and kind by nature, and an obvious gentleman by training and habit.

Beyond all that, we will never forget the help he extended to us when this newspaper changed from letterpress to the offset method of printing in 1967. We thought our staff was prepared for the change, but unexpected problems were soon encountered.

Tim was then with the Varityper Division of Addressograph Multigraph Corporation and knew the offset process much better than we did. Seeing our trouble, he rolled up his sleeves without being asked and worked long hours with us until the problems were solved. It was the sort of service beyond the call of duty which seemed to afford as much satisfaction to him as it did relief to us.

Coupled with his sense of the need for future town and district planning, Tim has always shown much interest in young people.

It seems most appropriate, therefore, that a Timothy Treadwell Memorial Fund is being established for a future Youth Center in Newtown.

It is high tribute to Tim that his place in town will not be easily filled. His years in office deserve a capable successor. May we suggest, in townwide appreciation of Tim, that partisan politics be played in low key in the search for that man.

#### FIRE TRAGEDY IN NEWTOWN

The sympathy of many people throughout this area goes to Mrs. Timothy Treadwell and her three young sons in the tragic death of First Selectman Treadwell of Newtown in the Sunday fire which destroyed their home.

It is tragedy enough that a young father has been taken from his family, but the sense of tragedy is compounded by the loss to the town of Newtown of its chief executive and to the area as a whole of one of its most vigorous municipal leaders.

Mr. Treadwell represented a newer generation of first selectmen who recognize that the problems and challenges of today are not limited to the town which elects them.

Accordingly, he was active in the Regional Council of Elected Officials, serving as its treasurer, president of the Fairfield County First Selectmen's Association and a member of the Connecticut Conference of Mayors.

He was also not content with merely meeting the problems of the present or catching up with those of the past. He sought to anticipate problems of the future by good planning and effective early action so that his town and the area as a whole would be better places in which to work and live.

Fire tragedies occur so often in winter months, yet they usually seem remote to

most people. Mr. Treadwell's untimely passing is a reminder of how swiftly and savagely fire can strike, not only when unexpected but where unexpected.

His death leaves a void which will be most difficult to fill.

#### FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, JANUARY 1972

#### HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I include a release highlighting the January 1972 civilian personnel report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures:

#### FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, JANUARY 1972

Total civilian employment in the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Branches of the Federal Government in the month of January was 2,864,976 as compared with 2,865,902 in the preceding month of December. This was a net decrease of 926.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

#### EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Civilian employment in the Executive Branch in the month of January totaled 2,825,029. This was a net decrease of 1,494 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of December. Employment by months in fiscal 1972 follows:

Month	Full-time employees in permanent positions	Change from previous month	Temporary, part time etc.	Change from previous month	Total employment	Change from previous month	Month	Full-time employees in permanent positions	Change from previous month	Temporary, part time etc.	Change from previous month	Total employment	Change from previous month
July 1971.....	2,521,703	+1,391	381,448	+18,755	2,903,151	+20,146	November.....	2,528,233	-1,599	300,254	-2,982	2,828,487	-4,581
August.....	2,524,098	+2,395	366,062	-15,386	2,890,160	-12,991	December.....	2,525,858	-2,375	300,665	+411	2,826,523	-1,964
September.....	2,527,518	+3,420	317,021	-49,041	2,844,539	-45,621	January 1972..	2,552,297	+26,439	272,732	-27,933	2,825,029	-1,494
October.....	2,529,832	+2,314	303,236	-13,785	2,833,068	-11,471							

The major factor in the net increase of 26,439 in full-time permanent positions in the month of January 1972 was the reclassification to permanent status, under the terms of recent labor-management agreements, of approximately 30,000 Postal Service employees previously classified as temporaries.

Administration orders announced last August were directed at reductions in the category of full-time permanent employment, but little significant change has been apparent in this regard in the overall totals to date. However, it is noted that small reductions were reported in the months of November and December, and in January there would have been a reduction of about 4,000 if the Postal Service reclassification was excluded for comparative purposes. This would indicate that there may be some trend toward the projected June 1972 level of 2,531,500.

Changes in total employment in January

in Civilian Agencies of the Executive Branch as compared with civilian employment in Military Agencies were as follows:

	January	December	Change
Civilian agencies.....	1,698,671	1,696,691	+1,980
Military agencies.....	1,126,358	1,129,832	-3,474
Total, civilian employment..	2,825,029	2,826,523	-1,494

The civilian agencies of the Executive Branch reporting the largest decreases in January were Postal Service with 2,531 and Agriculture with 1,586. The largest increases during the month were reported by Treasury with 6,982 and Veterans Administration with 996. The changes in Agriculture and Treasury were largely seasonal.

In the Department of Defense the largest decrease in civilian employment was reported by Navy with 1,610.

Total Executive Branch employment in the United States in January was 2,639,512, a decrease of 181 as compared with December. Total employment outside the United States in January was 185,517, a decrease of 1,313 as compared with December.

#### LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHES

Employment in the Legislative Branch in January totaled 31,752, an increase of 536 as compared with the preceding month of December. Employment in the Judicial Branch in January totaled 8,195, an increase of 32 as compared with December.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a tabulation, excerpted from the joint committee report, on personnel employed full-time in permanent positions by executive branch agencies during January 1972, showing comparisons with June 1970, June 1971, and the budget estimates for June 1972:

#### FULL-TIME PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT

Major agencies	June 1970	June 1971	January 1972	Estimated June 1972 <sup>1</sup>	Major agencies	June 1970	June 1971	January 1972	Estimated June 1972 <sup>1</sup>
Agriculture.....	82,912	84,252	83,469	83,000	Interior.....	59,349	57,570	57,089	56,900
Commerce.....	25,427	28,435	27,738	28,500	Justice.....	38,013	42,662	42,727	45,100
Defense:					Labor.....	10,217	11,352	11,864	11,800
Civil functions.....	30,297	30,063	30,340	30,600	State.....	23,618	23,398	22,934	22,700
Military functions.....	1,129,642	1,062,741	1,061,323	1,011,000	Agency for International Development.....	14,486	13,477	12,826	12,400
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	102,297	104,283	106,319	102,000	Transportation.....	63,879	68,482	67,871	66,400
Housing and Urban Development.....	14,661	16,030	15,864	15,200	Treasury.....	86,020	90,135	94,186	98,500



Major agencies	June 1970	June 1971	January 1972	Estimated June 1972 <sup>1</sup>	Major agencies	June 1970	June 1971	January 1972	Estimated June 1972 <sup>1</sup>
Atomic Energy Commission.....	7,033	6,920	6,804	6,700	Tennessee Valley Authority.....	12,657	13,612	13,767	14,000
Civil Service Commission.....	5,214	5,324	5,183	5,600	U.S. Information Agency.....	9,989	9,773	9,598	9,400
Environmental Protection Agency.....		5,959	7,114	8,000	U.S. Postal Service.....	565,618	564,782	593,489	613,400
General Services Administration.....	36,400	38,076	36,148	39,400	Veterans Administration.....	148,497	158,635	161,250	162,700
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	31,223	29,478	28,332	27,500	All other agencies.....	29,807	31,333	32,342	34,300
Panama Canal.....	14,635	13,967	13,903	14,200	Contingencies.....				2,000
Selective Service System.....	6,665	5,569	5,809	6,200	Total <sup>2</sup> .....	2,552,571	2,520,312	2,552,297	2,531,500
Small Business Administration.....	4,015	4,004	4,008	4,000					

<sup>1</sup> Source: As projected in 1973 budget document; figures rounded to nearest hundred.

<sup>2</sup> Established as of Dec. 2, 1970, by transfer of functions and personnel from Interior, HEW, Agriculture, Federal Radiation Council and Atomic Energy Commission.

<sup>3</sup> Reflects reclassification to full-time permanent status of approximately 30,000 Postal Service employees previously classified as temporaries.

<sup>4</sup> Includes approximately 39,000 postal employees subject to reclassification under a labor-management agreement.

<sup>5</sup> January figure excludes 2,844 disadvantaged persons in Public Service Careers programs as compared with 2,778 in December 1971.

## HON. SILVIO O. CONTE CHOSEN "MAN OF THE YEAR" BY DUCKS UNLIMITED

### HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, in Newton, the Massachusetts Chapter of Ducks Unlimited presented our esteemed colleague, the Honorable SILVIO O. CONTE of Massachusetts, with their "Man of the Year" award.

Over 450 members and friends of Ducks Unlimited attended an annual banquet to pay tribute to our colleague's outstanding accomplishments in the field of conservation and environmental protection.

I would like to take a moment today to commend both the organization which gave the award and the man who was chosen to receive it.

The Massachusetts Chapter of Ducks Unlimited, under the leadership of State Chairman, Winthrop G. Dow, Jr., has done an outstanding job raising money for the establishment and maintenance of migratory waterfowl nesting areas and refuges. Nationwide, this nonprofit, non-political organization has raised \$25 million, setting aside \$18.5 million for wetland refuges in Canada. Presently, the organization controls 2 million acres of wetlands, including 9,000 miles of shoreline.

No one is better suited for the "Man of the Year" award than my friend and colleague, SILVIO O. CONTE. We have all watched him fight to protect migratory waterfowl and clean up the environment. Appointing him to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission was one of the best, and most appropriate, appointments this body has made.

In order that all my fellow Members of the House can appreciate the full significance of this award, I would like to insert into the RECORD the introductory remarks made at the Ducks Unlimited banquet by Mr. Charles G. Carothers III, Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife, and Parks, Department of the Interior.

The remarks follow:

This evening is certainly a double pleasure for me: I have the opportunity to enjoy the annual Boston reunion of Ducks Unlimited and the honor to introduce one of the outstanding conservationists in the House of

Representatives, Congressman Silvio O. Conte.

Before we present Congressman Conte with the Man of the Year award, I'd like to take a minute to refresh your memories of his many battles to preserve and protect our environment, particularly migratory waterfowl. He fought long, hard and successfully to overturn a Department of the Interior ruling which permitted the shooting of eagles from aircraft. He was instrumental in setting aside lands to preserve the condor from extinction. He helped to secure the passage of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and the bill which created the Redwoods National Park.

On the local front, Congressman Conte pried loose a \$40,000 appropriation to the University of Massachusetts for wildlife research and fought many battles to prevent the construction of the Dickey-Lincoln power project in Maine.

Moreover, he was one of the five original cosponsors of legislation to protect the Atlantic Salmon from present international fishing practices.

Nationwide conservation groups have long recognized that Sil Conte will go to bat on their behalf. In 1970, he was one of only 20 local, state and national elected officials to be endorsed for re-election by the prestigious League of Conservation Voters.

That same League of Conservation Voters has again recognized Sil's conservation accomplishments. Just this week the League cited Sil for his "outstanding" record on key environmental issues in the Congress.

He and 13 other House members scored 93 on a scale of 100 for 15 selected House votes in 1971 on environmental issues. The 93 score was the highest attained by any member of the 435-member House.

His 93 percent score compares with the average score in the House of 41 percent, and the average of all New England congressmen of 65 percent. Our "man of the year" was the only Massachusetts congressman to receive the highest rating, and one of only three in New England.

So you can see that Congressman Conte has been working for us in 1971, and throughout his 14 years in the House of Representatives.

I can vouch for this personally, because I've seen him in action on the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission. During his tenure on that Commission (since 1965), 18 new wildlife refuges have been created. The Commission has approved the acquisition of 225,218 acres of wetlands and nesting areas and the lease of an additional 10,000 acres. The Commission has overseen the expenditure of nearly 50 million dollars to preserve and protect migratory waterfowl and other species. Sil Conte has had a perfect attendance record at Migratory Bird Conservation Commission meetings—he hasn't missed a single one of the 27 meetings held since his appointment. That's an unusual and praiseworthy accomplishment in Washington.

So he's been fighting for us. Nowadays,

there's a general lack of information on the role of the sportsman in game management and wildlife preservation. Too few people know that the sportsmen have been the prime movers in the effort to preserve endangered species and clean up the environment. Ducks Unlimited is a prime example of such accomplishments. Sil Conte's work in the Congress is another example of a sportsman's personal commitment to wildlife protection and preservation.

Sil Conte is one of us. On the trip up, we swapped stories of hunting trips. The top prize had to go to the Congressman's three-day marathon journey when he spent two days in Stuttgart, Germany, then flew for a day's hunting outside of San Antonio. Afterwards, he arrived at 3 a.m. in the morning in Enid, Oklahoma, for a day's try at quail. Other men might have collapsed at this point, but Sil Conte made it home in time to travel out to the eastern shore of Maryland to close the goose season.

I've always believed that no one can appreciate natural beauty, and the need to protect it, like the sportsman. Nowhere will you find a better example of that theorem than Sil Conte. And nowhere could you have found a more fitting recipient of your Man of the Year Award than Congressman Silvio O. Conte.

## ADMINISTRATION CAN NO LONGER IGNORE THE NEEDS OF RURAL AMERICA

### HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, how long must our farmers suffer from lack of FHA operational loan funds?

As of today, 22 States are completely out of operational funds, and many others will be in the immediate future.

It is unconscionable that the additional \$75 million which the Congress wisely appropriated for FHA operational loans is being impounded by the Office of Management and Budget.

How long can OMB turn a deaf ear to the pleas of thousands of small farmers, the very lifeblood of our Nation, who rely on FHA operating loan funds for their economic survival.

I would like to urge my colleagues to join me in support of a measure I introduced today calling for the release of the \$75 million impounded funds. The administration must be forced to recognize that they can no longer ignore the needs of rural America—the very lifeline of our economy.

## AGENT DONALD DUCK: ENEMY OF THE PEOPLE

## HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an interesting article by Mr. James Goodsell on the propaganda techniques of the leftist regime in Chile which wishes to discredit the United States and our free enterprise system was carried on the perspective page of the Chicago Tribune of Wednesday, March 8.

Mr. Goodsell, a correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor, is knowledgeable of developments in South America, and I am pleased to insert his article in the RECORD.

The article follows:

AGENT DONALD DUCK: ENEMY OF THE PEOPLE  
(By James Nelson Goodsell)

SANTIAGO, CHILE.—Donald Duck and his fellow Walt Disney cartoon characters have come under sharp attack in a best-selling book published here which takes them to task for being agents of the capitalist system.

The book, "Para leer al Pato Donald" ["How to Read Donald Duck"] accuses the whole Disney organization of being "class enemies" of Chile's Marxist-oriented government. The book notes that a variety of Disney comic books are regularly issued here and that the Disneyland Club has become quite popular among Chilean children.

Within a few weeks after the book was issued in late December, it had become a much sought-after title in bookstores despite its relatively steep price of more than \$2 a copy at the official dollar-escudo exchange rate.

## COMPLEXITIES ARE HIDDEN

Its authors, Ariel Dorfman and Armand Mattelart, are leftist supporters of the Marxist-oriented government of Salvador Allende Gossens. Dorfman is a literary critic who works for the juvenile publishing division of Quimantu, the state publishing firm. Mattelart is a Belgian sociologist who heads Quimantu's mass communications division.

Quimantu has launched a variety of youth publications since it took over the facilities of Zig-Zag last year, one of Chile's most prestigious publishing firms. Many of these new publications compete with Disney comic books.

The authors of the new book attacking the Disney entourage maintain that "there are many complexities hidden behind the simplicity adopted by Donald Duck." They argue that in the Disney world, the characters are in the service of "neo-capitalism" and a consumer's society where man is only a cipher.

They claim that the Disney comic books are a threat to "the Chilean reality" because they advocate such "bourgeois" institutions as free enterprise. The Allende government is committed to taking Chile along the road to becoming a full-fledged socialist state.

## ATTACKS UNCLE SCROOGE

"As long as the smiling face of Donald Duck parades innocently thruout Chilean cities, as long as Donald Duck means power and collective representation," the authors comment, "then imperialism and the bourgeoisie can sleep peacefully."

In this connection, the Chilean study takes Donald's rich Uncle Scrooge McDuck to task for taking advantage of people to amass his fortune. Numerous cartoon samples of Disney comic strips are included in the Chilean book. There is one, for example, that shows Scrooge

McDuck swapping a cheap watch for "Genghis Khan's crown of gold and precious stones."

All this attack on Donald Duck and the menagerie of Disney characters, however, has had virtually no effect on the sales of Disney comic books. Indeed, bookstore dealers in Santiago say if anything, that the sales have increased.

## COMMENTS ON OUR JUNIOR COLLEGES

## HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the junior colleges of this country are the most rapidly growing sector of American higher education. They have exhibited great vigor and imagination in making educational opportunities more broadly available particularly to minority students, in providing vocational education as well as academic training, and in serving the communities in which they are located.

In response to requests from myself as well as other Members of both the House and Senate, Mr. Frank Mensel of the American Association of Junior Colleges has prepared some detailed comments on the House and Senate versions of S. 659, the Higher Education Bill. On the eve of the conference on this bill I would like to give my colleagues the benefit of Mr. Mensel's report. While I do not endorse all of its recommendations, I have found it to be extremely stimulating and helpful both with regard to this specific legislation and in setting out some of the problems faced by these dynamic institutions of higher education.

The report follows:

## REPORT FROM FRANK MENSEL

## STUDENT FINANCIAL AID

By landmark legislation enacted since World War II—the GI Bill, the National Defense Education Act, the Vocational Education Act, and the Higher Education Act, among others—the United States has moved steadily toward universalization of post-secondary education opportunity. S. 659 offers perhaps the boldest step yet in this direction, in seeking in the Senate version of the bill to extend the entitlement concept of the GI Bill to all the needy students who feel they qualify for studies beyond high school. Significantly this standard has the strong backing of the Nixon Administration.

The so-called Pell standard, or entitlement approach in the form of the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant, also has wide backing among the nation's two-year college leaders. Those who support it contend that it will work to the increased advantage of both low-income and middle-income students, which constitute the greater enrollments of the community colleges. It will, in their view, sharply increase both the college enrollment, persistence and completion rates among the low-income students, because it will provide immediate assistance to the vast numbers of such students who already are attempting to complete a community college education without the benefit of federal financial aid of any kind. Even though the community colleges typically draw heavily, and in many cases almost proportionately, from the lowest

income quadrant (see the testimony of A. A. Canfield, former state director of the community college system of Washington State, before the Pell Subcommittee in the Senate, July 21, 1970), the "automatic" grants as authorized by Chairman Pell would substantially enhance their chances of completing their course of study. Such grants would establish a largely uniform national standard, and would eliminate the grave inequities of the present system based on state allotments and regional panel approvals. Community colleges have been hampered in their support of sharply rising low-income enrollments, because their requests for aid have so often been pared by the state formula and regional review processes. Appendix A is a sample of correspondence which illustrates how hard some community colleges have been hit by these arbitrary cuts.

Community college sentiment supports the entitlement approach in the Senate bill. The rationale for this position runs strongly in the vein of the more detailed analysis supplied by the staff of the Washington office of the College Entrance Examination Board, contained in Appendix B, and used by permission of that office.

One aspect of the Pell approach, however, which concerns many community colleges is its tendency to penalize the colleges which charge very low tuitions or no tuition at all. It could tempt the community college systems which charge no tuition or very low tuition to increase their fees, despite the maintenance of effort stipulation. Since the general thrust of S. 659 is so clearly toward the universalization of post-secondary opportunity, the legislation should encourage more schools to reduce or eliminate tuition, at least in lower division programs.

An important step which S. 659 could take in this direction, and thus blunt the disturbing tendency just cited, is one that the community colleges have strongly urged in the past—elimination of the local matching funding in student financial aid programs, especially for the colleges which charge no tuition or very low tuition (e.g., \$100 or less per term).

The House and Senate versions both take another major stride toward broader opportunity, by providing much broader eligibility in the student financial aid programs for the half-time student. This will strengthen both the enrollment and persistence of the low-income students. Junior colleges universally commend the authors of both bills for this vital reform. Appendix C is an unofficial position paper from a staff member of the College Entrance Examination Board which summarizes current thinking about student financial aid programs and legislation as they impact on students and colleges.

Both bills also take important and commendable steps to help veterans who, as some analysts have observed, can at least presently do better financially on unemployment compensation than they can under present educational benefits. Both the House amendment providing a special work-study program for veterans and the Senate provision discounting VA benefits by 50% in their income eligibility for student financial aid have strong community college support. Community college leaders also have suggested that the student financial aid concept go even farther for veterans, and that they qualify uniformly for the Pell grants, with no burden upon them to prove need.

## INSTITUTIONAL GRANTS

The junior colleges were among the earliest advocates of annual direct federal grants based on enrollment or credits earned to help colleges operate. Our ranks are linked with the larger higher education community in firm support of the Green formula as adopted in the House bill.

Community college testimony and support



apparently were a factor in the development of this concept, which initially emerged as a major legislative proposal in the Green omnibus bill of the last Congress, H.R. 16098. Community college advisers were called by Chairman Edith Green into deliberations which helped develop the broader formula now embodied in the House bill.

The reasons the junior colleges have given broad support to this concept and formula are several:

1. It strengthens rather evenly the greater college and university community, both as a marketplace of opportunity and as a national training base so essential to the growing emphasis upon post-secondary preparation for technical and professional careers. A general shrinkage of this marketplace, as threatened by college closings, can only frustrate the national goal of universal opportunity. The Green formula offers both an immediate and long pull remedy against the financial crisis in higher education.

2. It also gives the college the broader, more flexible funding base they need to accelerate the reforms which so many colleges

recognized as needed long before the critics began clamoring for them.

3. And for the community colleges specifically, the Green formula offers a substantial "equalizer" in federal funding. Since historically the junior colleges have not shared fairly in many of the categorical federal programs for higher education, their leadership vigorously support the direct capitation grants as a way of bypassing the obstacles and biases of the grantsman and categorical processes.

It is argued by some that community colleges could realize greater federal funding potentially under the cost-of-education institutional support approach embodied in the Pell student aid reforms than under the Green formula. This postulation, however, is predicated upon the full, or nearly full, funding of the Pell student aid programs. The Green formula, on the other hand, rests on no such contingency and would be the source of immediate help, assuming it is funded in its own right.

Some data, although sparse in amount, exists which helps to show how institution-

al aid or cost-of-instruction funds would impact on two-year schools.

An AAJC compilation, using only Mrs. Green's formula for institutional aid of FTE times \$100 shows that for 1970, at full funding levels, two-year schools would receive \$167 million. The formulas add on \$100 for the first 200 students in each college. This would require \$36 million more, and another add-on for the next additional 100 students enrolled would require another \$18 million; or a total of \$221.5 million. A doubling of lower division grants to cover FTE's representing low-income enrollments would add for 1970, \$41.7 million; making a total of \$263.1 million for full funding. For 1971, the costs would jump to \$190 million, \$38 million, \$19 million, and \$47.5 million; or a total of \$294.3 million.

Table No. 1 shows state by state amounts required for full funding of Mrs. Green's formula. No information is available for the costs of funding the part of the House formula which is based on funds received by the colleges for EOG, work-study, loans, and veteran's benefits.

TABLE 1.—MRS. GREEN'S FORMULA APPLIED TO COMMUNITY/JUNIOR COLLEGES<sup>1</sup>

State	Number of schools	Full-time enrollment plus 1/2 part-time enrollment	\$100 times FTE	Add-on for 1st 200 students	Add-on for next 100 students	Total	State	Number of schools	Full-time enrollment plus 1/2 part-time enrollment	\$100 times FTE	Add-on for 1st 200 students	Add-on for next 100 students	Total
Alabama	22	18,135	1,813,500	1,320,000	400,000	3,535,500	Nebraska	9	5,511	551,100	270,000	180,000	1,001,100
Alaska	8	2,701	270,100	168,400	40,000	478,500	Nevada	1	202	20,200	30,000	400	50,600
Arkansas	8	4,203	420,300	240,000	160,000	820,300	New Hampshire	5	1,474	147,400	150,000	43,300	340,700
Arizona	12	24,627	2,462,700	360,000	240,000	3,062,700	New Jersey	22	22,808	2,280,700	589,000	343,600	3,213,300
California	96	460,481	46,048,100	2,839,800	1,825,500	50,713,400	New Mexico	9	4,220	422,000	360,000	140,000	922,000
Colorado	14	18,221	1,822,100	420,000	280,000	2,522,100	New York	59	138,264	13,826,400	1,752,200	1,070,000	16,648,600
Connecticut	21	18,152	1,815,200	574,000	367,800	2,857,000	North Carolina	62	41,756	4,175,601	843,200	901,800	6,920,600
Delaware	5	6,314	631,400	150,000	100,000	881,400	North Dakota	7	5,797	579,700	210,000	101,200	890,900
District of Columbia	4	2,436	243,600	120,000	60,000	423,600	Ohio	34	42,638	4,263,800	1,005,400	586,000	5,855,800
Florida	32	91,185	9,185,500	975,200	620,000	10,780,700	Oklahoma	16	10,198	1,019,800	480,000	280,000	1,779,800
Georgia	23	18,848	1,884,800	663,000	378,400	1,926,200	Oregon	15	36,664	3,666,400	450,000	260,000	4,376,400
Hawaii	7	8,674	867,400	210,000	107,400	1,194,800	Pennsylvania	47	58,435	5,843,500	1,385,000	787,000	8,015,500
Idaho	4	7,217	721,700	102,800	60,000	884,500	Rhode Island	3	6,239	623,900	90,000	60,000	773,900
Illinois	54	93,646	9,364,600	1,560,000	1,003,300	11,907,900	South Carolina	26	19,554	1,955,400	480,000	372,600	2,808,000
Indiana	4	6,070	607,000	116,300	40,400	773,700	South Dakota	2	325	32,500	45,800	4,700	83,300
Iowa	26	21,721	2,172,100	776,600	477,300	3,426,000	Tennessee	14	8,806	880,600	420,000	260,000	1,560,600
Kansas	24	16,015	1,601,500	720,000	374,100	2,695,600	Texas	54	83,804	8,380,400	1,590,000	947,700	10,918,100
Kentucky	22	10,759	1,075,900	660,000	393,400	2,129,300	Utah	5	6,629	662,900	150,000	100,000	912,900
Louisiana	7	5,638	563,800	210,000	134,100	907,900	Vermont	5	2,482	248,200	150,000	80,000	478,200
Maine	6	2,586	258,600	180,000	118,600	557,200	Virginia	25	27,592	2,759,200	750,000	427,600	2,936,800
Maryland	17	28,095	2,809,500	508,000	263,400	3,580,900	Washington	24	63,941	6,394,100	720,000	480,000	7,594,100
Massachusetts	33	38,116	3,811,600	990,000	620,000	5,421,600	West Virginia	7	3,581	358,100	197,000	71,200	526,300
Michigan	35	82,032	8,203,200	1,050,000	665,000	9,918,200	Wisconsin	28	27,565	2,756,500	823,200	443,600	3,023,300
Minnesota	22	17,751	1,775,100	634,800	367,500	2,777,400	Wyoming	7	5,174	517,400	210,000	140,000	867,400
Mississippi	25	21,765	2,176,500	768,000	424,700	3,369,200	1970 total	1,042	1,670,033	167,003,300	36,384,700	18,027,500	221,415,500
Missouri	22	24,943	2,494,300	660,000	365,500	3,519,800	1971 estimate	1,079	1,899,918	189,991,800	37,824,700	18,987,500	246,804,000
Montana	3	1,727	172,700	90,000	60,000	222,700							

<sup>1</sup> Data developed by AAJC.

<sup>2</sup> Using the Canfield projections, we can estimate that 25 percent of 2-year school enrollments

are from low-income families. This would add for 1970, \$41,700,000 to the cost of fully funding Mrs. Green's formula (total \$263,100,000) and for 1971, \$47,500,000 (total \$294,300,000).

Another compilation, by the U.S. Office of Education, Table No. 2, assumes funding at the \$100 million level. The two-year colleges, at that funding level, would receive \$16.5 million if the House formula were adopted, and \$32.6 million if the Senate formula were adopted and student aid provisions were previously fully funded. The costs of instruction grants in the Senate formula would require appropriations of \$540.8 million for the two-year schools at full funding. It must be emphasized that the state by state comparison in Table No. 2 is based on funding of only the \$100 million level for both the Senate and the House formulas.

MR. PELL'S FORMULA VERSUS HOUSE FORMULAS AT \$100m FUND LEVEL

State	Senate amount	House amount
Alabama	\$572,940	\$305,185
Alaska	3,413	4,474
Arizona	610,038	262,125
Arkansas	82,590	75,395
California	7,144,577	3,342,688
Colorado	438,754	200,927
Connecticut	496,219	225,151

State	Senate amount	House amount	State	Senate amount	House amount
Delaware	\$138,264	\$76,833	Oregon	\$610,499	\$245,111
District of Columbia	95,134	54,683	Pennsylvania (branch schools not included)	816,502	416,352
Florida	1,604,741	831,150	Rhode Island	79,564	24,184
Georgia	510,532	322,809	South Carolina	326,999	174,398
Hawaii	175,000	105,000	South Dakota	8,301	10,453
Idaho	141,381	83,495	Tennessee	275,644	199,579
Illinois	2,329,143	1,116,120	Texas	1,958,102	1,011,186
Indiana	75,082	45,606	Utah	189,602	92,176
Iowa	530,603	292,650	Vermont	50,177	33,268
Kansas	498,616	279,198	Virginia	567,111	248,130
Kentucky	43,076	110,902	Washington	1,320,966	520,898
Louisiana	65,452	26,290	West Virginia	54,937	39,686
Maine	2,121	2,295	Wisconsin	487,458	136,679
Maryland	677,560	323,612	Wyoming	149,977	287,798
Massachusetts	1,022,488	473,095			
Michigan	1,759,607	790,732	Total	32,648,670	16,468,704
Minnesota	539,938	297,508	With full funding	540,808,100	(*)
Mississippi	674,697	390,070			
Missouri	424,071	351,082			
Montana	48,701	35,221			
Nebraska	116,219	83,563			
Nevada	6,918	6,724			
New Hampshire	28,685	20,159			
New Jersey	838,159	418,976			
New Mexico	37,079	18,286			
New York	2,160,010	1,181,279			
North Carolina	1,077,740	501,183			
North Dakota	122,620	46,735			
Ohio	444,896	189,306			
Oklahoma	336,609	238,985			

<sup>1</sup> Approximate.

<sup>2</sup> Amount unknown.

Source: Data obtained from the U.S. Office of Education. Several experts have suggested that the results of this table are skewed in those States (i.e., Kentucky) where OE analysts failed to properly account for schools having large numbers of economically disadvantaged students which receive EOG, work-study, and NSL funds.

If the community colleges were to consider solely their own interest, they could only support the Senate's provision for cost-of-instruction grants which follow the federally aided students. But while the two-year colleges are acutely squeezed by financial pressures, the financial crisis in higher education reaches well beyond community colleges—touching such staggering issues as accountability, adjustment to rapidly changing market and social forces, and even survival itself. Though the community colleges are a growing bulwark for the resolution of such issues, they constitute only one element of a total solution. In the interest of both an early and total solution, and in support of the principle of direct grants, two-year colleges remain fast in support of the Green formula as a first measure in this direction.

#### TITLE X (COMMUNITY COLLEGES) AND CAREER EDUCATION

The Senate bill in Title X captures the main elements of the original Comprehensive Community College bill, authored by Chairman Harrison A. Williams Jr., and a staunchly supported by the junior college constituency from its inception three years ago.

The primary thrust of Title X is to give the States the planning incentives and help they need to put their higher education house in order, to strive for both comprehensiveness and convenience in the services their post-secondary system offers, to reduce program waste and duplication among different institutions in overlapping service areas, and to develop further as desired the comprehensive colleges (two-year and/or four year as proposed in the Carnegie Commission Reports) to deliver such services.

We know from these Carnegie Commission Reports and their supporting studies, as well as from the College Entrance Examination Board's Willingham Study, that the very availability of the comprehensive low-cost college largely serving commuter students—which in the overwhelming number of present instances is the two-year community college—has a profound impact toward the universalization of post-secondary options and opportunity. Such studies show that accessibility is still the first factor in whether young adults try college—and that such a college makes an immediate and substantial difference in the college-going rates of the young adult population.

This is clearly borne out in the college-going rates of the States that already have strong community college systems. The States which have such systems have, in effect, put the college opportunity in the form of comprehensive post-secondary services within both the cost and commuting reach of upwards of 90% of the population. Those States without such systems show much lower availability of the low-cost college opportunity, and at the same time, a lower rate of college attendance.

Title X is viewed here as a strong and essential complement to the section of the House bill which provides much broader support for career education and occupational studies on the post-secondary level. Community college leaders were consulted in the formulation of this program—Title XIV of the House bill—and it is gaining wide support in community college ranks. (AAJC's Commission on Legislation has not met recently enough to react formally as a body to Title XIV.)

The community college concept and mission is ideally suited as a systems base, or delivery system, for the broad-gauge programming called for in Title XIV of the House bill.

The community college stand on these aspects of the legislation has been succinctly stated by President Frank M. Chambers of Middlesex County Community College, in letters of Jan. 27, 1972 to Rep. Dom-

inick V. Daniels and other members of New Jersey's Congressional delegation:

"DEAR CONGRESSMAN DANIELS: I am most grateful for your informative letter of January 11, and for your open-mindedness towards our needs and toward Title 10 of S. 659.

"Certainly the equivalent Title in the House Bill which provides only for planning assistance to perfect State systems is a step in the right direction.

"It simply does not go far enough. To give substance to the new State plans we need, then, the development support that Title 10, S. 659 provides. We need it for two reasons: First, as you agree, because we bear the brunt of the opportunity explosion in higher education; and, second, because the Community Colleges have been short-changed in most of the existing federal categorical programs. With the exceptions of construction and equipment aid and developing institution support, we have fared like a stepchild in most higher education programs. This is partly explained by the fact that Community Colleges are so underrepresented in the professional staffing of U.S. O. E. The Community Colleges now enroll about 3,000,000 Americans—in numbers served, they are far and away the largest segment of the higher education community. About one-half of all freshmen now start their college work in the Community Colleges. We need in U.S. O. E., to champion and coordinate the programming for two-year colleges, the kind of new office or unit which Title 10 proposes.

"In my view, Title 10 is an ideal complement to the great new post-secondary career education title which the House Bill contains. Community colleges are in public education the main engine of the post-secondary career education developing in our nation today, and to achieve the fuller promise of the career education programming, which this Title of the House Bill provides, you need the community college systems which Title 10 would support; in other words, one Title is systems development, the other is programs development and they mesh, ideally, toward the same great objective. Thus, I vigorously support both provisions.

"We, in the Community Colleges, look ahead to the Conference Bill meshing the best features of both Bills as the greatest landmark ever achieved in legislation for higher education. We appreciate the great contributions of the House Bill and, particularly, your own profound leadership in the whole effort. . . . Our movement is making remarkable strides, thanks in large measure to the growing recognition Congress has been giving the Community Colleges. . . .

"Sincerely,

"PRESIDENT CHAMBERS."

Features of Title X which are regarded by AAJC's Commission on Legislation as essential to the final legislation are, in addition to the state planning incentives already embodied in both the House and Senate bills:

1. Sliding-scale short-term development and expansion support, meant to help ensure that the new colleges will be built in target areas where they are needed most, e.g., the inner city.
2. Sliding-scale leasing assistance for temporary facilities.
3. A high-level unit in the Office of Education to monitor and coordinate federal assistance to community colleges.
4. Stipulation and deadline requiring States to bring the several state plans, including this proposed plan, in the various federal programs for vocational and higher education, into harmony with each other.

The community colleges have long since tired of hollow assurances from the bureaucracy that community colleges would soon receive stronger staffing and broader support specifically addressed to their tremendous growth and needs within the framework of

existing programs and staff deployment. However, with the exception of the several junior college specialists serving to such profound advantage in USOE's Division of College Support, the community college leadership in the various other existing federal services and programs amounts essentially to tokenism.

More than any other element of education, the community colleges already are the delivery system for the post-secondary career education in progress in the States. Such programming, in fact, constitutes a massive element of the community colleges, which are rapidly emerging as the backbone of the post-secondary manpower development effort—the most glaring weakness of which at this point is the lack of federal support.

Career education is hardly someone's new brainchild—it is a huge reality in the community colleges. Its impact is sketched in some detail on p. 4 of our June 22, 1971, letter to Senator Pell (Appendix D), which covers information he requested when S. 659 was still in his Sub-Committee markup.

#### STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

Community colleges have registered strong approval of the Senate's modifications of Title III and the support for Strengthening Developing Institutions, but also for the House's larger authorization. Another jump in the administration's budget request for this program shows again what a versatile and effective response Title III has been to pressures on higher education for new services and diverse institutions. The greater number of new colleges opening in the 1970's as in the last decade, will be community colleges serving new target areas, with substantial non-traditional, non-white enrollments. Unless the omnibus bill sharply increases the community college set-aside (which neither bill yet does), then discretionary authority over the spending should be extended, as the senate bill proposes, to allow a still more flexible and changing response to the rapidly changing college complexes. At least three eligible community colleges badly need direct help under this program for every one now helped—and that number will rise sharply as a great many of the community colleges built in the last several years becomes eligible under the five-year limitation that presently precludes their participation. Community colleges have long urged that the five-year limitation be eliminated entirely.

#### FACILITIES

The community colleges want to maintain the separate line-item support for facilities now in effect under Section 103 and the recent education appropriations acts which have carried Section 103 as a separate line. They also prefer the concept of a flexible set-aside, as embodied in the Senate bill.

Lumping Sections 103 and 104 support into either a single authorization and/or a single funding line would only leave the fast-growing community colleges at the mercy of the state facilities commissions which are still, in most cases, dominated if not controlled by the traditional institutions. This would be contrary to the congress' policy action in the last three years, which has responded to growth pressures on the community college by giving them the lion's share of the construction grants.

For the next decade, the greater expansion pressures are likely to continue to fall at the community colleges' doors. The recent studies which show community college construction needs for this decade as roughly \$6 billion, and those of the traditional institutions as two or three times greater than that, are not a realistic estimate of the community college expansion. This is true because such studies cannot effectively gauge the space needs of proposed community colleges which at this point are only on the drawing boards.



The Carnegie Commission Reports forecast the construction of some 230-250 such colleges in this decade. AAJC forecasts run still higher.

Senator Cranston emphasized this same point to the Senate Appropriations' Committee in its recent hearings on national priorities, when he noted: "I have mentioned the community colleges. They are the fastest growing segment of education, particularly in the enrollment of disadvantaged and non-traditional students. For the budget to again recommend zero funding for community college construction is to propose the crippling of both higher and vocational education, since the two-year colleges are taking such a tremendous share of the growth load in both areas. The whole current authorization of \$936 million annually could be spent to great national benefit on community colleges. It would, in fact, hardly dent the backlog of their urgent facility needs. Almost every estimate made of community college growth in the last two decades has fallen for (sic) short of their actual growth, and I think this applies again in the current estimates of their facility needs because such estimates cannot begin to recognize the true space needs of the many community colleges which are at present only on the drawing board."

#### POST-SECONDARY FOUNDATION

The community colleges and AAJC's Commission on Legislation have given wide and persistent support to the proposal of a National Foundation for Post-Secondary Education, or Higher Education. Hopefully, the Foundation, as well as the Institute, would lead education as a national priority still closer to cabinet status.

The provision for the Foundation should specify in more detail who would constitute the board, thus to ensure equal representation for community colleges, vocational education, and the business colleges. If the board were dominated by university and traditional college interests, the same interests might well monopolize the grants. The Senate's preference for calling it the Foundation for Post-Secondary Education is regarded as a wise emphasis.

Likewise, the professional staff for the Foundation should be drawn proportionately from the several major segments of post-secondary education.

#### LIBRARIES AND INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

Community colleges have been added to the nation's higher education community at an average of nearly one per week for the last five years. It is estimated that 230 to 300 more two-year colleges should be planned and constructed by 1980 to meet the needs of the steadily mounting enrollments who desire post-secondary education at economical rates with near-by and open door access. The present colleges and ones yet to be built are and will be in pressing need of library facilities, library materials, and other learning media. The Senate's provision of an increased annual authorization of \$130 million is entirely appropriate to these pressing needs.

The community college view coincides with that of the American Library Association, carried here as Appendix E by permission of ALA, and it stresses support of the Senate's Section 112 permitting the Commissioner of Education to waive the maintenance of effort requirement on grants for acquisition of library resources and also clarifying, through conforming language, that basic grants are entitlements.

#### COMMUNITY SERVICES

The Senate's changes in this program are clearly preferred over the House's simple extension of it. This is a program which in operation has consistently resisted the participation of the community colleges. More than 90% of the funding has gone to four-year colleges and universities, when in fact the community colleges are ideally suited for implementing this program.

By earmarking \$5 million for grants to colleges in the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas, to meet urban problems keyed to national priorities, the Senate provides a new dimension and flexibility that will help give the program new direction, encourage wider community college participation, and redress the imbalances of the past.

#### EDUCATIONAL PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT

Higher education has been vigorously pursuing self-reform and innovation on many fronts, particularly in the community college segment. The development and retraining of college administrators and teachers, as fostered by the Education Professions Development Act, has contributed enormously to this effort. Yet public reaction prods the colleges toward a still faster revamping of directions and services. This period of accelerated change will require still greater support for staff and faculty development. These trends and demands easily justify the Senate bill's authorization of \$600 million.

The House version of the bill provides for fellowships for nursing schools. Adoption of this provision should aid community and junior colleges in meeting the nation's critical need of providing qualified allied health professions personnel.

#### STATE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

The community college position also strongly supports the Senate's authorization of \$50 million for state scholarship incentives. Various states already have scholarship programs, which augment the federal student financial aid programs, and serve students whose needs are ignored in the federal programs, particularly as they apply in community colleges. All states will be encouraged by this provision to develop such programs.

#### A BRIGHT IDEA

### HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine sent me a most refreshing idea recently and I would like to call this to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives. Mrs. Bruce A. Booher, of Corryton, Tenn., suggests that we have a "slow day" each month, a day when speed limits of 30 miles an hour are imposed on our roads and everybody slows down.

I think this is an excellent suggestion and perhaps some of our towns could proclaim such a day. I urge my colleagues to give some thought to this idea, and I thank Mrs. Booher for her letter which follows:

FEBRUARY 15, 1972.

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN.

DEAR SIR: Please read one foolish letter, it won't do any good but neither will it do any harm and it's such a beautiful thought. I was just sitting here thinking what a wonderful thing it would be if there could be one day a month called "The slow day." This would be a day when no one could drive over thirty miles an hour on certain streets and roads. This would give our old folks a day to go out and do the things they need to do and it would not hurt the rest to slow down either. I have these friends who are over seventy, never had an accident but they love to go and nearly every Wednesday they go up to Union County to see their son, each time I see them leave I pray they will make a safe trip. I know you are interested in our young people because you have written me about my son who is in the Navy. I appreciate this as I do love my son but, this

is his first service to his country in any way. I feel he will appreciate his country more in the future for having served it and when he gets back safely. He's not my first son to go and won't be the last, my husband and three other sons served before him and I have one more. However the old folks have served their country too and for a much longer time. They paid the taxes that built these roads so wouldn't it be great to have one day that they could use them and really enjoy doing it?

Thank you very kindly for letting me sound off.

Sincerely,

Mrs. BRUCE A. BOOHER.

### APPEARANCE OF SENATOR ERVIN BEFORE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

### HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Northern Virginia Daily of March 3 contains an excellent editorial on the forthcoming appearance of the senior Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN) before the Supreme Court of the United States.

This is not the first time that Senator ERVIN has argued before the Nation's highest Court since he began his service as a U.S. Senator. His deep knowledge of constitutional matters commands respect both in the Senate and in the Nation.

The issue now before the Court, concerning which Senator ERVIN plans to present arguments, involves military surveillance of civilians. This is a basic civil rights issue, one in which Senator ERVIN long has taken a firm stand on the side of guaranteeing individual liberty and dignity.

The Northern Virginia Daily is published at Strasburg, Va. The editor and general manager is Mr. James J. Crawford.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Ervin and the High Court," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

#### ERVIN AND THE HIGH COURT

If all goes as Sen. Sam J. Ervin Jr. expects, we are going to be witnesses to a rare spectacle sometime this spring—the sight of a United States senator arguing a case before the Supreme Court. The venerable North Carolina Democrat, long known as one of the most ardent congressional defenders of constitutional liberties, plans to take up the cudgels against military surveillance of civilians.

A case involving this issue is now before the Supreme Court. It arose when a number of individuals and groups sought an injunction against the Army and Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird to halt military snooping into their affairs. The U.S. District Court in Washington threw out the case, but subsequently the Circuit Court of Appeals reversed this decision and ruled that the defendants were entitled to a hearing. Then the government appealed to the Supreme Court, which is expected to decide the issue before its adjournment in June.

Ervin's involvement as a lawyer in the case began only when he was engaged as counsel by several church-related groups that are intervening. In a sense, therefore, he does not stand at the heart of the matter.

In another sense, the fact that Senator Ervin is personally taking a hand in the case serves to underscore its importance. That has been evident all along: military surveillance of civilians engaged in the exercise of their First Amendment rights poses a fundamental question of American civil liberty. The point is given new emphasis by this esteemed senator's decision to go beyond his role as chairman of the Senate Constitutional Rights subcommittee, which already has held hearings on the subject.

#### HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

#### HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable discussion being heard relative to the highway trust fund.

Some people say it contains excessive funds that should be diverted for other uses.

For those who are concerned about this question, I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with your permission, testimony presented before the House Public Works Committee by Wendell Huber, highway engineer of Otter Tail County in behalf of the Minnesota Good Roads committee.

The article follows:

#### TESTIMONY BEFORE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee. My name is Wendell P. Huber, Otter Tail County Engineer, Fergus Falls, Minnesota and currently President of Minnesota Good Roads, Inc. Minnesota Good Roads, Inc. is the one organization whose only purpose is promoting better highway transportation systems in the State of Minnesota. (See attached list.) It is in this second capacity that I stand before you today. There is a great deal currently being written and indeed much discussion in some circles to the effect that excessive money is available for highway construction. As proof of this statement, the balance in the highway trust funds is cited. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Federal Highway Trust Fund reflects Federal cutbacks, holdbacks or just plain not releasing full apportionments to the states and in no way reflects the needs for roads and highways back home.

The Minnesota Department of Highways today finds their system in a poor state of repair due in part, to the concentration of funding on the Interstate System these past 16 years. Needs studies show that as a bare minimum, the State of Minnesota should be spending 100 million dollars annually on their 12,000 mile Trunk Highway System to provide even the basic safety and mobility required—Today they are spending only half of that and after this current biennium when the state highway bond funds are depleted, this figure will drop to a third or less.

The same plight exists in our counties and municipalities throughout the state. I tell you here today that in Minnesota we have thousands of miles of roads that are not surfaced yet—We have hundreds of miles of roads that are not even graveled yet—We have people in rural Minnesota that for as much as six weeks every year, cannot get to their normal medical facilities or the local

seat of government to conduct necessary business. Surfaced roads would go a long way towards taking care of these people and their basic transportation needs.

I say that before people start preaching excess highway funds, let them look across rural America and see where we really stand presently as far as serving our people.

In our handout today, is a map of Minnesota showing our substandard highways and bridges on the state system and I say the counties and municipalities are no better off.

Release the Federal Administration created trust fund balances and we'll try to put them to vital use serving the people of our state.

You'll notice I said, try to put them to use because unfortunately the flow of Federal highway funds is not the whole problem, as vital as it may be.

The highway, road and street programs across this nation are today buried in procedures and red tape. The TOPICS program that our urban counties are trying so desperately to move ahead with are fraught with procedures—the Federal wage determinations on a county by county basis serve only to delay projects from letting at the 11th hour. Area or regional wage rates would much better serve the purpose than our present county by county method.

In June of 1971, before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, on Investigations and Oversight, it was testified to that where we used to have five procedures prior to preparing plans, specifications and estimates and four afterward, we now have eighteen procedures that must be accomplished prior to PS&E and still four after—and more boxes are being added to the preliminary flow chart every day.

In our rural counties, we have people living on the land that cannot get to where they want to go during long periods every year without driving as much as 50 to 75 miles out of their way if at all to find a road that is passable, much less to freeway standards.

Somewhere along the way, the cart has gotten before the horse and if our aim is to provide reasonable transportation to rural America, then we must re-evaluate present-day policies. To me, it is incomprehensible to require the same lengthy procedures and agency clearances to get the farmer out of the mud that is required to construct a modern multi-lane urban freeway.

Some counties in Minnesota have recently passed resolutions to the effect that they cannot afford to use federal funds in their road projects because the federal funds are literally eaten up by red tape procedures before one spadeful of dirt is turned.

If the purpose of red tape has been to bring the road program to a standstill in this Country, the goal has been very nearly accomplished as I stand before you today.

In Summary: First of all, we want to impress upon you the need for preserving the dedication of the Highway Trust Fund. Our argument on this is that there is not enough money available even now, to make the highway improvements which the people want and need. I'm referring not only to our State Trunk Highways, but also to County Roads and Municipal Streets. And where we're really in a bind is on the problem of bridge replacement . . . a particularly pressing problem in our State. Secondly, we hope that some means can be found to prevent the repeated interruptions of the Federal Highway Trust Fund, the holdbacks and the cutbacks. When such holdbacks occur, our five-year programs are out the window and there is a great deal of bad feeling from people who have been promised a certain road improvement, then suddenly find they are not going to get it on schedule.

Last, but certainly not least, those of us who are connected with the actual building of roads are deeply concerned about the

great amount of red tape involved, even on very small projects where it costs us almost as much in manpower to get Federal Aid as the amount we eventually receive. We think there are some reasonable solutions to this problem.

I wish to thank this Committee for allowing me time today to testify on a matter of grave concern and vital importance to the people back home. Thank you again.

#### PETER BIERSTECKER: VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

#### HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars sponsor a national "Voice of Democracy" speech contest for young people each year. This year's first place winner for the State of Wisconsin is Peter Bierstecker of Combined Locks, Wis.

Peter's speech concentrates on the responsibilities we all have as a result of the freedoms which we enjoy in our country. I feel that his thoughts are particularly relevant to our country today. It is with great pleasure that I include his fine speech in the RECORD:

#### SPEECH OF PETER BIERSTECKER

I'm an American who believes that my heritage is the greatest gift I have ever received. An American who knows that this gift is a product of effort and, at times, even death. An American high schooler who is constantly discovering new advantages of being born free, and who, at the same time, is growing to realize that because I have been given freedom, I have also been given responsibility.

What have I learned about my responsibility to freedom? Every day living has pointed out to me that responsibility goes hand-in-hand with freedom. For instance:

I remember when I was six years old and sadly discovered that Santa Claus was, in reality, my parents. Next year my "Want List" was smaller, because I knew my parents had to pay for the presents. Today I am free to ask my government for assistance, but I have a responsibility to ask only for necessities, because I know there is no Santa Claus and the taxpayers will have to "foot the bill."

All my life I have lived in a comfortable house, but I learned that every time I cut the grass or shoveled the snow, this house became more and more "my home." I guess it's because you only truly possess something after you have earned it. Some day I hope to have a home of my own, and maybe, by respecting the property and personal rights of others now I can earn this right.

My home has been more than comfortable—it's been democratic. I have always been able to "tell my side of the story." This privilege has made me aware that, along with freedom of speech, comes a duty to listen to others and their opinions, to know what I'm talking about, and to study and examine issues carefully before expressing my opinions.

This past year, I learned to drive a car, and gained a greater knowledge of the unity of freedom and responsibility. I keep the car clean and replace the gas I've used, but this is only a minor part of the responsibility I owe my parents for the use of their car. Because I have been given the right to drive, I have a duty to operate their car as they would—with care and concern for every other person on the road. This same prin-



ciple can be applied to my use of American freedoms: because I have the right to worship as I please, it is my duty to respect the religious beliefs of others; because I have the right to trial by jury, I should remember that a person is innocent until proven guilty, and I should not pass judgment; and when I have the right to vote, it will be my responsibility to use my vote intelligently.

Yes, I am an American teenager who realizes what he has been given—the right to eat, sleep, work, speak, pray and live as I desire. My responsibility to these freedoms is clear. My role is to help preserve, protect, and defend these rights so that all future Americans can be born free, just as I was.

## TAXES: A POLITICAL ISSUE

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor of February 7, 1972, carried a fine editorial on tax policy which I would like to share with my colleagues. Therefore, I include the text of the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

#### TAXES: A POLITICAL ISSUE

As the horde of candidates for the Democratic presidential nomination stampedes across the political arena in search of issues that President Nixon may not already have preempted, the question of taxes appears to have growing appeal.

Up until recently, it looked as though Mr. Nixon had even that one sewed up, in the form of a value-added tax (VAT). But for a variety of reasons, discussed below, Mr. Nixon spoke quite vaguely about VAT in his State of the Union message, and he stressed the tentativeness of a VAT plan he submitted Saturday to an advisory commission for study.

Meanwhile, all the problems which give rise to calls for tax reform remain very much in the public mind. Democratic hopefuls, naturally, wish to keep them there. Which is why two contenders, Senators Edmund Muskie and George McGovern, both chose this past week to come out specifically against the VAT and to put forth alternative possibilities of their own.

Senator Muskie narrowed his focus onto the housing problems of elderly Americans. He proposes to add a \$1 billion item to the federal budget to guarantee every over-65 American a decent home. At the same time, his plan would offer incentives to the states to reform their crushing property tax structure. To qualify for federal help, the states would have to publish data comparing the assessed value of every parcel of property with estimated market value, thus exposing any instances of preferential tax treatment.

Senator McGovern's plan addresses itself to the cost of running public schools and the relationship of that cost to the property tax. Under his proposal, the federal government would pay at least one-third of all costs of public elementary and secondary school education. This federal budget item could mount to \$24 billion by 1976. Based on the number of schoolchildren, plus allowance for special conditions, the states would automatically receive 75 percent of the earmarked funds.

Other Democratic contenders may be expected to throw their own position papers into the hopper of political debate. Before the public is buried under a mountain of conflicting and piecemeal tax proposals, this might be a good time to take another look at the value-added tax which is generating the current campaign tax debate.

#### SEARCH FOR A TAX CURE-ALL

The value-added tax exists as a major fixture in European tax structures. All member countries of the European Economic Community already have it, or will have it this year. In 1970 France, Germany, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands collected between 24 and 40 percent of their revenues from it. Denmark, Norway, and Sweden depend almost as heavily on the VAT.

But it has been tried only once in the United States. Michigan adopted it in 1953 and dropped it 13 years later in favor of a corporate income tax. It began to get serious national attention only a couple of years ago as the Nixon administration cast about for means of financing its revenue-sharing proposal to help cities and states out of their ever-worsening financial plight. Another appealing factor was the VAT's potential for helping exports, since it can be rebated under rules of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, while direct taxes cannot.

Like Senators Muskie and McGovern, the Nixon administration also sees VAT as a means of persuading states to reform their property tax laws and take some of the burden off home-owners. And with deficits mounting to \$80 billion over his four-year term in office, Mr. Nixon is also understandably anxious to offset this political liability with an increased revenue take.

The revenue-gathering power of the VAT is impressive. For each 1 percent imposed, it will yield an estimated \$5 billion. Mr. Nixon's tentative plan offers a roughly 3 percent tax rate, which would yield about \$13 billion after rebates to the lower and middle income public.

The assumption here, of course, is first that the United States needs more tax revenues; and second, that the VAT is the best means of getting them. These assumptions are certainly arguable. Some will fault the first on grounds that the government should cut back on costs.

Opposition to the second assumption, that the VAT is the best new available tax source for financing government at all levels, comes from many directions. But most challenging of these are those fiscal watchdogs who insist that the United States needs a thorough structural reform in the name of equity. It is to this school of thought that we address the third part of this discussion.

#### TAX FAIRNESS, THE REAL QUESTION

A recent analysis of the gap between rich and poor in the United States, done by Joseph Pechman of the Brookings Institution, concluded that the lowest fifth of American families gets only 3.2 percent of the national income, while the top fifth gets 45.8 percent. The shocker in these figures was that the gap is apparently much bigger than economists had believed, and that it has possibly grown wider since 1966.

One of the reasons for this is germane to this discussion of taxes and tax reform: federal graduated individual and corporate income taxes have been deliberately trimmed back in the last five years, to the advantage of the well-to-do.

While the personal income tax is theoretically based on a sliding scale from 20 to 70 percent, with the rich paying relatively more than the poor, Mr. Pechman's study finds the tax base riddled with special provisions. As a result, few high-income persons pay the theoretical rate.

The cost of this system of exemptions to the federal government is enormously high. A Treasury Department study of the total cost of selective tax reductions to individuals and corporations (which the Treasury innocuously calls "tax aids") showed that these "aids" cost the federal government \$36.5 billion in 1968 and \$44 billion in 1969.

The more recent Brookings Institution study on erosion of the personal income tax dug deeper than the earlier Treasury version. In it Mr. Pechman included some items not

normally considered income, but which are just that for the individual concerned. By his reckoning, if the federal government were to eliminate all such "tax aids," the government could raise an additional \$77 billion a year under current tax rates.

It is against such reckonings that adoption of Mr. Nixon's value-added tax, or any alternative which any Democratic presidential candidate might come up with, must be considered.

Cynics will argue, with reason, that meaningful tax reform—meaning closing of loopholes, perhaps including even tax-free municipal bonds, capital gains write-offs, and oil depletion allowances—is at any time an exercise in futility from a practical political standpoint, and most especially so in an election year.

Perhaps so. But the fact that it subornably recurs as an issue tells us that systematized tax privileges stick in the public conscience like a bone in the throat. The name of this game is economic justice. And no politician on the 1972 campaign scene understands that game more clearly than George Wallace, that fisher of votes from the deepening pools of blue-collar discontent.

Mr. Nixon has attempted to deal with the tax fairness issue by offering a system of rebates to the lower-earning public in his VAT proposal. This would relieve the tendency of the new tax to penalize the poor to the advantage of the rich and would thus improve its chances of passage. But this would not redress the basic regressiveness of the total tax structure. Until the entire system is geared to making every citizen pay his fair share of taxes, without exception or privilege, debate over tax mechanics will not win either the sympathy or the votes of the American people.

## LEGISLATION CALLING FOR THE FCC TO INVESTIGATE THE A.T. & T.

### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, residents of the greater New York City area, as well as citizens throughout this Nation have been outraged by the rising costs of telephone service accompanied by deteriorating service by their local telephone companies. All of us recognize the vital role that telephone service plays in our Nation's system of instant communications, for without the telephone, most business and government operations would grind to a halt. To maintain high quality service at the lowest cost, the Federal Communications Commission has been mandated by law to carry out investigations of the price and rate setting policies of American Telephone & Telegraph Co., the parent corporation for nearly all telephone service in the country. Such a study, Mr. Speaker, has never been completed by the FCC. With growing requests by local telephone affiliates for rate increases, it is incumbent upon the FCC to conduct a detailed study of A.T. & T.'s rate structuring, profit and expenses in order to provide the data necessary to facilitate informed judgments and decisions on these requests. Therefore, I am introducing legislation today calling for a full and complete investigation of the A.T. & T. rate structure and I call upon my colleagues in the House to join me in urging that this legislation be enacted as soon as possible.

# **TURKISH GOVERNMENT BANS OPIUM GROWING**

**HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the Turkish Government deserves commendation for its no-nonsense prohibition on opium growing.

During the past decade, many Americans have felt resentment toward the Turks. We felt they were profiting from the export of a product which was responsible for half our urban crime and which turned life into a living hell for hundreds of thousands of young Americans. It was a standard sick joke that the Turks could not stop opium production because 50,000 families depended on it for their livelihood. From 1958 through 1970, the Turkish Government reduced the number of provinces in which opium growing was permitted from 42 down to seven, and then down to four in 1971. Despite this, opium production increased year by year until it exceeded 150 tons annually.

Recognizing the effect of this production upon the American people, the Turkish Government has now taken drastic action. It has absolutely banned the planting of opium from 1972 onward. At the same time, it has given its farmers fair compensation: During 1971, the Government Office of Soil Products bought up all the opium the farmers could produce. From now on, each of these farmers will receive an annual government payment equal to the value of his 1971 crop, minus the value of any other crop he grows on the same land. Thus, opium growing can be abandoned without financial hardship.

Of course, some farmers may try to reap a windfall by accepting the government payments and at the same time planting opium for illegal sale. But I am hopeful that the Turkish police will do the necessary enforcing.

The American people owe the Turkish people a vote of thanks.

The press release from the Turkish Embassy follows:

## **TURKISH RADIO BROADCAST ON BAN OPIUM CULTIVATION**

Dear listeners, for many years opium poppy cultivation and opium have been a subject of international relations.

"Opium smoking" and "Opium addiction", which have become more and more widespread in some countries, have become an important health problem for governments. Especially in recent years, the use of opium, heroin and other narcotics has reached such dimensions in the United States, as to cause a national danger for American youth and the country itself.

As everyone knows, the Republic of Turkey is a country which cultivates the opium poppy from which opium is derived. Whereas opium was grown in 17 provinces in 1933, 29 provinces grew opium in 1940, 35 provinces in 1945, 38 provinces in 1948, 39 provinces in 1952, 40 provinces in 1955, 41 provinces in 1956 and 42 provinces in 1958.

In 1961 at a conference in New York, all international agreements in connection with narcotics were combined. A new agreement was signed, called "the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotics", the Republic of Turkey

participated in this convention. The characteristics of this convention are: in countries where the opium poppy is cultivated, opium poppy planting will not be free but will be subject to official licensing. This has been called licensing of opium poppy cultivation. In this way an attempt was made to control the production of narcotics at its source.

Narcotics are used in the manufacture of medicines and in other beneficial ways. In fact, it is with this intention that the cultivation of opium poppy is permitted. But addition to heroin, an opium derivative, and similar drugs are harmful to health. The fact that this threatens a whole generation has caused nations to jointly undertake preventive measures. The 1961 agreement is a step in this direction.

Although addiction to narcotics has not become extensive in Turkey as yet, the Turkish Government, for humanitarian reasons and because of international interdependence in this matter, signed and approved the 1961 agreement.

The 1961 opium agreement not only controls opium planting through licensing, but also commits signatory nations to fight against opium smuggling. A serious and effective fight was to be made against smuggling, and if that were not successful then the planting of opium should be entirely banned. This is the most important commitment of the 1961 agreement.

Thus Turkey began to decrease the number of provinces in which opium planting was permitted. The number of provinces decreased to 35 in 1961, to 25 in 1962 and to 16 in 1964. It increased to 19 provinces in 1965 and to 21 provinces in 1966; but as of 1967 it decreased again to 18, to 11 in 1968, to 9 in 1969, to 7 in 1970 and to 4 provinces in 1971.

The Turkish Grand National Assembly, through passage of law No. 812, approved the agreement which became effective for Turkey as of June 22, 1967. The licensing law, necessitated by this agreement was accepted by the Turkish Grand National Assembly in 1971.

NATO's Committee on Challenges of Modern Society, the United Nations Economic Council's Commission on Narcotics, UNESCO and the Interparliamentary Union are interested in this matter. A fund was established at the United Nations to fight against narcotics.

Our country also became a party to the agreement signed in Vienna against synthetically produced narcotics and psychotropic substances.

As we pointed out earlier, Turkey from the outset has in all sincerity and seriousness begun to put into effect the International agreements which she has signed and approved. First she reduced the number of opium planting provinces year by year, then she established an organization to fight against smuggling.

Because of the press, the public in the United States of America believes that most of the heroin and narcotics, the use of which is spreading in that country, is smuggled in from Turkey; this belief is so widespread that the feelings of great appreciation for Turkey, generated in that country during the Korean War, have now turned, although extremely unjustifiably so, into feelings of near-hatred in virtually every American family. The American government, seeing this, offered aid to Turkey for a more effective application of the 1961 agreement and for prevention of smuggling. In 1968, a \$3 million agricultural products development and control agreement was signed, allocating one and a half million dollars to the Ministry of Agriculture and an equal amount to the General Command of Gendarmerie.

One factor which drew attention as the number of opium planting provinces in our country decreased, was this; although the number of provinces decreased, production did not decrease.

The amount of opium sold to the Office of Soil Products, which holds a monopoly on opium, was 119 tons in 1967, 125 tons in 1968, 128 tons in 1969, 63 tons in 1970 and 149 tons in 1971. It is evident that these figures do not compare with the number of decreased provinces.

In addition it is claimed that a large amount of opium is being smuggled out of Turkey. A point drawing special attention is that the Office of Soil Products, which could buy only 63 tons in 1970, bought 149 tons in 1971. Although the number of opium planting provinces was down to nine in 1969 and to seven in 1970, from the latter crop, 90 more tons of opium could be purchased. The reason for this was that the governments of July 1971 announced by radio day after day, again and again, that the planting of opium would be totally banned in 1972; that an indemnity would be paid to growers in the last 7 provinces; that the rate of calculation for indemnity would be based on the quantity of opium delivered through the Office of Soil Products in 1971. Thus sales of smuggled opium in comparison to 1970, decreased. At the same time, it was discovered that at least 90 tons of opium had been smuggled in 1970. Smugglers could not do much business in 1971.

Following March 12, the following was said in connection with opium in the program of the first Erim Government:

"Our government, which believes that opium smuggling has become a disaster for all the world's youth and above all else damages humane feelings, is seriously determined to deal with this problem. A better means of livelihood will be demonstrated for opium growers and they will be supported."

Previously, when the area of opium poppy cultivation was reduced from 47 provinces to 7, no compensation was paid to the farmer deprived of his crop. He planted other crops and more or less made a profit. Today the government has found the means of compensating the loss of growers in the three provinces where cultivation was banned in 1971, and the last four provinces where cultivation will be banned in 1972.

Two types of aid will be provided to the growers in these last seven provinces; compensation will be paid for giving up opium poppy cultivation; long range studies will be prepared and investments made for new crops, or for income in some other way.

The first Erim Government, with a decree dated June 30, 1971, banned all opium poppy cultivation in Turkey as of 1972. At the same time, it was announced by radio and other means of mass communication reaching the growers, that growers who turned in their crop of opium to the Office of Soil Products in 1971 would receive indemnity for their opium crop loss in coming years. The indemnity would approximately equal the amount received for his 1971 crop, after income from production in his field, or some other crop such as wheat, for example, is deducted. Thus growers in the seven provinces will suffer no losses in the coming years from being deprived of opium poppy cultivation.

Meanwhile, the Government is having studies made in order to decide which crops can best replace the opium poppy in these seven provinces where the opium poppy was previously grown.

An agreement has been reached with the government of the USA on this subject. American experts who have come and will return to Turkey in February, will make trips to this area, probably making the province of Afyon their center. They will continue their studies, and at the end establish in a report, together with our experts, what should be done in this area. After this investment projects will be prepared. The aim is the development of areas in these seven provinces as pilot areas for the modernization of Turkey's agriculture and agricultural industry. Starting from here, modernization of agriculture



throughout Turkey will continue with great speed.

As it will be understood from explanations thus far, the reason for the banning of opium poppy cultivation in Turkey is the fact that smuggling could not be combatted through any other means. As smuggling could not be prevented there was no other alternative but to fulfill our commitment in the International Agreement of 1961. That is why opium poppy cultivation has been entirely banned throughout Turkey. But in order not to deprive the grower of his legal and lawful income because of this decision, short- and long-term measures have been taken and are being taken. Efforts are even being made to provide a better income than before.

A better level of income for less effort will be provided to the opium grower. So the grower has no reason to complain of the banning of cultivation. Yet from time to time, here and there, one hears fine sounding phrases which are not based on facts about opium and the poppy. Sometimes they go to such extremes on this subject as to point out photographs of the fields where the opium poppy was cultivated in 1971, captioning them as "barren fields where no poppy cultivation could be made."

As for the opium smugglers, it is a fact that they are suffering losses in the millions from 1971 as a result of the latest banning decision of the government. It is no great problem for them to sacrifice a few million Turkish Liras in order to have this decision revoked. On the subject of opium, therefore, one should carefully distinguish between the efforts of smugglers and the benefits to growers. If one misses a point, he can be tricked by the smugglers. Smugglers have met with losses and will continue to lose. But the opium planter will definitely secure a better income. In addition, the use of Turkey's name as a poisoner, dragging youth to disaster, and the source of American and world public opinion against Turkey, will be eliminated.

President Nixon's announcement over radio, television and in the press on June 30, with his Secretary of State on one side and the Turkish Ambassador on the other, praising Turkey's decision to ban, was sufficient to turn public opinion of 200 million Americans in favor of Turkey. In addition, Governments of several States have officially thanked Turkey and the Turkish Government for this humanitarian decision.

#### AMERICAN INDUSTRY AND THE POLLUTION PROBLEM

#### HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, on December 7, 1971, I was pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues a speech by Mr. Carl A. Gerstacker, chairman of the board, the Dow Chemical Co., discussing the challenge of the pollution problem and the opportunity and the initiative which this problem places before industry.

As we all know, industry has borne the brunt of the blame for the existence of many of our pollution problems. The various industries have been accused of a lack of sensitivity to both the people and the environment. I think that this is a vast overstatement of the reality. The truth of the matter is that we, as individuals, have made demands on industry and technology in a way which over-

looked the vacuum which existed in our knowledge about the effects of many new products.

While this does not mean that industry is relieved of its share of the burden for our present difficulties, I think it does indicate that, in the proper context, industry can and will shoulder its responsibility for the resolution of the problems which we now face.

Along these lines, another address of Mr. Gerstacker has come to my attention which I believe is worthy of the attention of my colleagues. Hopefully the people in industry who are responsible to the leaders of our Nation's corporations will give some attention to the message contained in his latest speech.

In addressing the Detroit Economic Club, Mr. Gerstacker had the attention of some of the giants of American business. His message was a simple one: American business and industry must grasp the opportunity laid before them by the pollution problem, take the initiative in its resolution.

The Dow Chemical Co., whose corporate headquarters are in my congressional district, has made great strides in this direction. And not without the profit motive. As Mr. Gerstacker notes, the profit motive is central to good corporate business. To eliminate the problem of waste by developing new uses for manufacturing byproducts not only eliminates a pollution problem, but increases productivity and profits. Businesses must look at this kind of opportunity and the Dow Chemical Co., has initiated a broad, companywide, mechanism to meet these challenges.

I believe that this type of corporate, and other achievements in the pollution control area noted in the speech, responsibility and initiative deserve recognition and I offer Mr. Gerstacker's remarks for my colleagues' consideration.

The remarks follow:

#### PROFITS AND POLLUTION

(By C. A. Gerstacker)

When it was proposed that I speak here today, the suggestion was made that all I had to do was tell you how to make money out of solving every one of your pollution problems. I hope none of you came literally expecting me to do that, because if I could I'd be the richest, most expensive management consultant in the world today. I will give you some of my thoughts on how I think we ought to go about our anti-pollution efforts, but you'll have to take it from there.

In checking out the records I find that I last addressed this distinguished organization in October, 1966, and that as chairman of the National Export Expansion Council I urged you at that time to work on developing your exports to help the nation solve its balance of payments problem. I know this is a powerful group, because apparently my message eventually got to the right people. Only five years later we finally did something about the balance of payments problem (although the problem is not solved and is worse than ever), and we are working a lot harder on encouraging exports today than we were in 1966.

Thank you for heeding my dire predictions on international problems.

I know it won't take the members of the Economic Club of Detroit as long to get to work on the nation's pollution problems.

We have now been working on these problems, of course, for a very long time. Like our economic problems, they are tough,

baffling, frustrating problems, not easy to dramatize, difficult to galvanize public opinion behind, and frustrating in their solutions—but basic to our national progress.

My message today is very simple; it is that solving pollution problems is good business as well as good citizenship. It can be profitable. So let's get at it, with energy and enthusiasm, now.

Does that shock you? Some of my business friends and competitors are questioning my sanity, or they are claiming that I'm merely trying to attract attention. But it is true that we at Dow Chemical believe that eliminating pollution can be profitable.

Why do we stress profits? Because they are the lifeblood of the American free enterprise system. They are the spur that makes it move and work. They separate the worthwhile from the needless, success from failure. They are the discipline that makes business run more productively than government.

I could harangue Dow managers, Dow scientists, superintendents and workmen all day long about our being good citizens and about conducting themselves properly, and maybe they would listen and do something—but only maybe. If I talk profits, on the other hand, they really vibrate, and they want to do something about it, enthusiastically, now. They know profits affect their jobs, their pay, and their future.

Pollution usually affects not us, but someone else, downwind or downstream, so we need more than an ordinary motivation to do something about it. We need the profit motive which drives us all—and that is why Dow is stressing that solving pollution is good business as well as good citizenship.

One of the major lessons of the recent past is the ubiquity of our environmental problems. We have learned, the hard way I suppose, that pollution pays no attention to boundaries, either municipal, state or national.

We have learned that what we put in the river at Detroit directly affects Lake Erie, Toledo, Cleveland, and points beyond. We have learned that what a Canadian company puts in the St. Clair River may affect the fish in Lake St. Clair and the recreational facilities of an entire region's sportsmen; what happens in Canada affects Michigan.

I am chairman of the U.S. Task Force on the Environment of the Advisory Council on Japan-U.S. Economic Relations. It may seem strange to you that a businessman from a chemical company in Midland, Michigan, would be more than casually concerned about pollution levels and laws in Japan. Let me explain.

As the world's lesser-developed nations strive to raise their standards of living, and as the non-industrial nations work to become industrialized, we are reaching a level of industrialization, and consequently of pollution danger, that now threatens all of us on the space ship Earth.

Some of the more pessimistic of the environmental experts insist that it is already too late, that unless we make incredibly difficult changes within the next few short years we will have soiled our earthy home beyond repair. I do not agree with the doomsday school of ecology. I believe we need good, sound international standards and controls, and we need them promptly—standards for environmental performance and controls on the strains that we are placing upon our environment.

On the one hand, we are attempting to eliminate hunger and poverty and pestilence from the earth, with increasing, but not universal, success; and on the other hand, while we are providing a higher material standard for these millions of people, this means using up more of our natural resources and, inescapably, putting more pressure on our environment to produce what humans need. Do the needs of humans come

first? I believe most of us would agree that they do.

There are many aspects of the problem that we have barely touched. If, for example, we pass laws in this country dealing with automobile emissions and make some kinds of after-burner compulsory, or if we make air bags mandatory, shouldn't we then provide the technology to make them available to other automobile manufacturers, around the world, who market their products in this country?

If Japanese laws required some safety device on automobiles driven in Japan, wouldn't we expect them to tell us how to make it?

We need international understanding on these matters rather promptly, before we get into needless, endless, and endlessly difficult international bickering on this kind of subject.

Further, if we in the U.S. develop special knowledge about environmental contaminants, shouldn't this knowledge be common knowledge, available to all nations—assuming it is knowledge that has a bearing on human health?

American science has turned its attention to these problems, and indeed, much of the focus of the world's scientific world is now turned to the problems of the environment; and we can expect an increasing flow of environmental knowledge as time goes on. We do need international devices to encourage and facilitate the proper flow of this information across national boundaries and language lines.

This is important to us as businessmen because the costs of environmental clean-up enter into our overall costs and into our ability to be competitive not only with our domestic rivals in the United States but on a global level as well. If for example, U.S. business pays the cost of pollution solving, but the Japanese government pays the cost in Japan, we U.S. business people will have another cost disadvantage.

If we do not reach agreement on these matters, we may soon have another barrier to international trade, and a significant one.

I believe the United States should take the lead in establishing standards of excellence and equity in environmental matters and in developing international agreements on such standards.

As you may know, the United Nations is holding the first large-scale international meeting on this subject in Stockholm this June; and hopefully this will be a big first step to such accords, which to date have consisted mostly of tentative bilateral exchanges of ideas and proposals, as is the case between the Japanese and ourselves.

While international understanding is important and should get our priority attention on a governmental level, I believe we should also be working on the problem at the company level, especially those of us employed by international companies.

One of the reasons international agreements are important is that otherwise we are going to see the rise of havens where pollution is tolerated in the interest of jobs—and we are already getting indications that some of the underdeveloped nations, eager for industrialization, will invite industry to come to them regardless of pollution problems. We must avoid the setting up of pollution havens by international agreements before they get started.

We in industry don't have to wait for strong national pollution control programs or international agreements, of course. We can decide it's in our own self interest to build and operate clean plants everywhere in the world. To be competitive and to avoid later, costly clean-up of old plants we should be installing our best waste prevention technology now.

Another step we can take in this regard is to lay down global guidelines for our own

companies in the pollution control area. We at Dow Chemical are currently fashioning the guidelines that we expect Dow Chemical plants around the world to observe.

We are looking at all the aspects of pollution, from air pollution and odor problems to noise and water problems, and a wide range of potential pollutants running from antimony to zinc, and we are attempting to set goals for Dow plants that will make them not only good citizens—we have always tried to be that—but environmentally sound operators, protectors both of the environment and of the public health.

It will be the goal of each Dow location, in the 23 states and 20 foreign countries where we operate, to meet or better our guidelines or the government's standards, whichever are tougher.

We believe we are the first company to take such a step, so I'd like briefly to explain how we see these global pollution control guidelines working. I should mention that more than 30 per cent of our gross plant is outside the United States.

In each of our major plant operations we have established an Ecology Council, and these Councils are assigned responsibility for overseeing the implementation of our environmental guidelines in cooperation with a corporate Ecology Council at our headquarters in Midland. The corporate Council includes top officers of the company, and regionally the Councils include the presidents or general managers of geographic regions.

On the basis of the overall guidelines, local plants can develop specific plans for meeting environmental needs, including such matters as these:

Pollution control is a line responsibility and is one of the factors considered in the performance of line managers—in other words, in whether he gets a salary increase.

Every Dow employee is responsible for environmental protection in the same way he or she is responsible for safety, quality, equal opportunity, and productivity.

Our basic attack is one of reducing wastes and conserving our raw materials. We therefore engineer waste prevention or reduction into the plants we build, and no capital is authorized for plant construction unless the plans include the prevention of waste problems.

At each site we have programs to contain accidental losses and emergency plans to deal with the major losses that might result from a natural disaster or some other unanticipated event.

We will conduct periodic baseline studies to determine the natural, or baseline, levels, of various environmental constituents, and we'll check to see if changes have occurred, and we'll continually try to identify the constituents of our effluents and emissions and evaluate their impact upon the environment.

At each Dow location, regardless of size, at least one competent person will be assigned to coordinate environmental matters.

We'll continue to cooperate with government agencies in developing and enforcing effective and realistic environmental standards.

We will not consider landfill for waste disposal, unless it is safe and truly the most effective method. Likewise, deep well disposal is out as a long-term solution, and so is ocean dumping of chemical wastes. The only exception would be where we are returning like to like, as for example returning salt water to the ocean, or spent brine to a brinewell.

In some parts of the world environmental laws are conspicuous by their absence; but we are telling our managers, no matter where they are located, that they must meet the Dow guidelines regardless of lack of local standards or laxity of enforcement.

Let me return to one of these guidelines, because it is the key to the message I have been preaching to my business friends: "Our basic attack is one of reducing wastes and conserving our raw materials." I have been

saying that spending a lot of money on a waste disposal facility should be the last thing a good businessman does—and I mean a businessman who really has the public's well-being at heart. If we are going at it the right way we should first look at all the yield losses in our manufacturing operations, and analyze and evaluate them. What we should then do is to convert these yield losses into salable product, if we can. And our goal should be to eliminate such losses entirely. We paid money for those raw materials; let's not waste them. If we avoid wasting them we not only conserve our materials and have more product to sell but we don't have the expense of disposing of them as wastes.

In our business, we are going at it this way, and we believe that we can save enough money so that we can at least break even, or get the job done—on balance—at no net cost. Our goal is to make a profit on it—and we have made good profits on our capital spent for pollution control so far.

Perhaps I should cite a few examples for you cynics who are still doubtful.

At Dow's Midland (Michigan) plant, we are installing 28 cooling towers, at a cost of \$7.2 million, to reuse our cooling water. Better operating efficiency and lower water costs will give us a 10 per cent return on this investment. That's not great, but it's not bad, either.

The Dow Corning Corporation, at Hemlock, Michigan, invested \$2.7 million to recover chlorine and hydrogen previously lost to the atmosphere in making silicon metal. The savings in operating costs are \$900,000 per year—not a bad return.

Hercules spent \$750,000 to reduce the solids discharged into the Mississippi and is now saving \$250,000 yearly in material and water costs as a result.

Dow's Midland Division has saved \$6 million in materials that were previously lost to the sewers, in the last three years alone.

Seven pollution control projects, when installed in our fourteen latex plants around the world, at a capital cost of about \$2 million, are expected to cut operating costs by almost \$2 million per year.

Through a project to save chlorinated solvents now being vented, Dow's Freeport, Texas, plant expects to save \$100,000 per year with a capital investment of only \$125,000.

The profit motive should apply to consumers and the public as well. You all have heard about the phosphate problem in lakes and streams and are familiar with the efforts to reduce the amount of phosphates in detergents. Taking phosphates out of detergents is the expensive—to the consumer—way of solving this pollution problem. The housewife will have safer and better detergents at a lower cost if the phosphates are removed at the sewage treatment plant. Detergents only contribute about half of the phosphates; the balance comes from human and animal wastes. Dow Chemical has a process that will remove up to 90 per cent of the phosphates—not just the detergent half—in the sewage plant, at a cost of about \$2 per person per year. We have proven this process in sewage plants in more than 40 cities, including a recent government-sponsored major demonstration in Grand Rapids. The capital cost is very low—in Grand Rapids it was less than \$1 per person.

And now, let me offer my hearty congratulations to the great city of Detroit.

I am pleased to report that we have just signed a one-year contract with the city to make use of the same technology. Detroit will use waste pickle liquor in its treatment, followed by the application of Dow flocculating agents to remove the phosphates. We have been working with the city of Detroit since 1968 in developing and testing this phosphate removal system.

Why don't you people in other cities urge your own local governments to follow Detroit's example and use this efficient way to



remove phosphates and save the taxpayer's money and the housewife's money?

I have one further point I'd like to discuss, and that is product stewardship. As you know, the government has been increasing our accountability for our products by leaps and bounds in recent years. You in the automobile business have seen your responsibility for your product extended to areas that you were never accountable for before, mainly in the safety area, and this extension of responsibility is happening in all of industry.

Industry is being asked to assume complete stewardship over the products it makes, ranging all the way from the mining of the raw materials through to the end of the product's life, including the packaging material. And in the case of products like the automobile, this includes disposal of the battered, worn-out junk heaps sometimes left on streets or vacant lots to rust and decay.

Industry must put on the mantle of product stewardship itself, before it is forced upon us by public opinion, by the consumer organizations, and by the government.

At Dow we are attempting to take on this role as completely and as swiftly as we can. We call it product stewardship, and the Federal government is calling it "advanced analysis", but it is the same thing. If you don't mind my again citing examples from my own company, let me give you an illustration or two of the kind of activity this represents:

In Los Angeles we arranged to have polyethylene milk bottles collected and re-extruded into irrigation pipe; this produces a useful product from a waste disposal problem.

Because of our long experience in dealing with hazardous chemicals we at Dow know a great deal about employee exposure to chemicals and other work hazards and about preventing injury from these hazards. We are now making this technology available to others who may not have the size nor the experience to work out safe operations involving such hazards. We call this our *Environmental Health Services*.

We also have a great deal of know-how in the area of industrial analytical chemistry. If you need to know the level of mercury in a food product, or the residue of a chemical on a harvest of fruit, or you can't determine what chemical is showing up in your effluent, we know how to find out, and we also offer this service, and we call it our *Interpretive Analytical Services*.

We are also increasingly concerned with the general or specific impact of various products on the environment—sometimes this is the impact of new products, sometimes the impact of products we sell in some new use, sometimes it is the impact of an old product in a use that no one ever got around to analyzing. We have assembled a corps of experts that we call our *Environmental Testing Advisory Board*, and it is their job to tell us what the environmental impact is or will be.

It is critical to our business and to solving the ecological problems of our day to consider these matters at all stages in the development of new products. It is critical that environmental tests be conducted in relation to the proposed end uses of a new product.

In the political and emotional climate of today new products are going to face increased marketing restrictions if they have not been proven environmentally, so we are being just as careful as possible not to allow any new problem out of our research laboratories and to find the answers to some old problems along the way, as well.

The day is gone when a chemical manufacturer could dismiss responsibility for his product when it left the plant fence. The day is gone when any manufacturer could

ship it and forget it. The day of full product stewardship is here.

It is time for us to accept that, and live by it.

I have covered the subject of pollution with a fairly broad brush. In the process, I have tried to point out those aspects of the problem that have most significance to us as businessmen today.

In conclusion, however, let me say this: I do believe with a passion in the profit motive, and I really believe that if we hitch the profit motive to some of our problems, we will get them solved. Pollution control will continue on forever if we see it simply as a drag on earnings, as a necessary nuisance, classified as overhead. If we see the opportunity in pollution and exploit that opportunity to the hilt, then we will help our earnings, and we will solve our pollution problems, and we will solve the nation's pollution problems. But we need that profit incentive.

Doing something simply because it's good citizenship is not enough. It doesn't really motivate. So I urge you to harness the profit motive to your pollution problems. Try it. I think you'll like it.

DOW CHEMICAL U.S.A.,

Washington, D.C., February 28, 1972.

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG,  
Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR AL: Enclosed is a copy of the speech which Carl Gerstacker presented to the Economic Club of Detroit on February 22, 1972. You had indicated a desire to receive a copy of this and, hence, we are forwarding a copy to you.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES T. MARCK, Manager.

## SBA HELPS STIMULATE OUR ECONOMY

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Administration has been doing more than its share to help stimulate our economy, and under the fine leadership of its Administrator, Thomas S. Kleppe, the results have been most satisfying.

Mr. Kleppe recently spoke in Albuquerque, N. Mex., in my congressional district, and I would like to insert for the RECORD some of his remarks made at that time:

[From the Albuquerque Journal, Feb. 24, 1972]

### SBA CHIEF SAYS AGENCY HELPS INCREASED ECONOMY

No other federal program can add the multipliers to the nation's economy that the Small Business Administration can, and its record as a catalyzer in job creation and economic development will prove it.

This was the message brought to Albuquerque recently by the nation's Small Business Administrator, Thomas S. Kleppe.

"Our real purpose can be expressed in a single word: 'Jobs,'" said Kleppe, and all our resources and attention are going toward the making of more jobs.

Projections by the New Mexico Governor's Comprehensive Manpower Commission indicate that 125,000 jobs will be required by 1977 to bring the state's employment up to the national average, Kleppe said adding:

"The SBA wants to do its part. Obviously

we can't do the job alone, but we have the resources and the expertise to help New Mexico reach that goal."

During the last fiscal year, in New Mexico, the SBA increased its loan activity 174 per cent dollarwise, from \$6.5 million to \$17.8 million, Kleppe reported.

And the SBA's local development corporation program, with a combined investment of more than \$1.6 million in federal and private capital, has helped create or save more than 500 jobs in New Mexico, Kleppe said, adding:

"We believe that it is important for each community to set up job goals, to publicize those goals and then institute community planning to reach them."

The SBA does not go out and promote itself and its services to minority enterprises, Kleppe said. Last year 19 per cent of all loans went to the minorities, but the agency addressed itself both to minorities and majorities. Assistance to minorities in New Mexico runs a little higher than the national average.

The cumulative loss rate, nationally, on SBA loans is 4 per cent, but the "trouble" rate runs about 10 per cent, Kleppe said. In New Mexico the "trouble" rate is running about 15 per cent, but it's on its way down.

It was pointed out to Kleppe that one New Mexico loan, which originated in Denver, and another which originated in Washington—perhaps the two most publicized in the state—went "sour."

"You're talking about something very close to my heart—something very close to the President's heart," Kleppe said. "That is decentralization of government. We need government near the people, where the action is, and that's what we're doing. We're delegating our authority to the regional offices, and they're delegating it to the district offices like the one in Albuquerque."

Kleppe, a former North Dakota congressman, said he had reduced the staff of the central SBA in Washington from 897 to 777, sending 120 "out into the field where they're needed."

Fred S. Neumann of Dallas, regional SBA director, who accompanied Kleppe on his visit to Albuquerque, said the outlook for revitalization of Sandia Indian Industries, Inc., an SBA-supported enterprise in Albuquerque, is looking better.

"There are a lot of things to be worked out, but the U.S. Postal Service has granted an extension," said Neumann. "Pat Rutherford (head of the Dallas-based management and development firm, Land-Air, Inc.) has a good track record, and if anyone can salvage the operation, Pat will do it. He's putting a lot on the line."

Kleppe was here to address a noonday meeting of bankers and leaders of other segments of the New Mexico financial community.

"The cooperation of the banking community with SBA has been very good—excellent," said Kleppe, "but we have a wide area in which we can work. Of the 30,000 banks in the United States, only about a third are signed up to cooperate with the Small Business Administration."

## BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA—BUILDING MANPOWER FROM BOY-POWER

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I recently received an inspiring progress report about a tremendous force for good in our

country, the Boy Scouts of America. This fine organization can boast of many outstanding accomplishments in 1971, and I want to take this opportunity to share them with my colleagues in Congress.

In 1976, just 4 years from now, our Nation will celebrate its 200th birthday. This significant year also represents a target date for the Boy Scouts of America. By then, it expects to reach its goal of involving in its programs a representative one-third of all boys of Scouting age.

To date, the success of Scouting is phenomenal. Some 4½ million boys from third grade through high school are currently involved in its activities. This represents one in every four American boys between the ages of 8 and 16. In 25,000 cities and towns across America, Scouting is a potent force.

In my own State of Tennessee, approximately 117,000 youths and adult volunteer leaders are involved in the Boy Scout program, with total membership expected to increase by 19,000 this year.

The Boy Scouts of America is the first and largest youth organization chartered by Congress. This huge private organization stands willing and ready to help in every State in our Nation. It offers an organized, contemporary, and universal program to help tackle such problems as drug abuse, pollution, juvenile delinquency, and unemployment.

The year 1971 was a year of which the Scouts can well be proud. Project SOAR—Save Our American Resources—culminating in Scouting's Keep America Beautiful Day June 5, turned out 19,255 Tennessee Scouts and 3,736 adult volunteers. In a single day, these Scouts gathered 442 tons of litter, spruced up 1,298 acres of Tennessee parklands, and cleaned up 1,307 miles of Tennessee roadways and rivers. Nationwide, over 1 million Boy Scouts cleaned up 558,000 tons of litter. So successful was the project the executive board has renewed it for another year.

Operation Reach, the Boy Scouts' nationwide fight against drug abuse, was successfully tested in pilot projects last year. I understand these will be extended into Tennessee and other States in 1972.

My own State of Tennessee, with its abundant natural resources and scenic beauty, has contributed to opportunities for Scouts in our area. Its six Scout councils maintain nine camps, covering more than 3,500 acres. More than 12,500 Tennessee Boy Scouts and Explorers enjoyed use of their facilities last year.

In addition, 570 disadvantaged boys attending from our inner cities had their first chance to learn about nature and outdoor living. Scouts from all parts of the country enjoy 25 camping facilities and 10 historic or wilderness trails in Tennessee approved for the Boy Scouts of America National Campways tour program.

Tennesseans are leaders in the Scouting movement. Cited in my report for their participation on a national and regional basis were Dr. Chambless Rand Johnston and E. B. Stahlman, Jr., Nashville; Herbert G. Stone, Kingsport; Paul Borda, Memphis; and Louis J. Williams, Chattanooga.

We can make no better investment for the future of our cities than Scouting. This program has given many young men and adults their first glimpse of life outside the ghetto and has offered them a sense of community spirit and pride. There are now more than 50,000 Boy Scouts sponsored by housing authorities in housing projects. In these areas, the constructive Scouting programs have drastically lowered vandalism and juvenile crime. By encouraging job training and information, Scouting is helping to reduce hard-core unemployment in our inner cities. More than 2,000 urban teens are members of law enforcement Explorer posts, helping to build new respect for law and order in former high crime areas.

I salute the Boy Scouts of America in Tennessee and throughout the Nation for their past achievements and wish them well as they pursue future goals. The Boy Scouts are living proof America's manpower does indeed begin with boypower.

## POST-VIETNAM ARMY

### HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, to hear some describe it, one would think that the post-Vietnam Army is on the verge of collapse as a result of morale, race, drug, and discipline problems. That such is not the case is well known to me and my colleagues who have visited Army posts in recent months. Seeing firsthand what is happening dispels quickly false impressions created by misleading news accounts.

Such was the case with Mr. John A. Crown, a journalist, who visited Fort Benning, Ga., recently and writes how his conception of the Army was changed from one of skepticism to that of being highly impressed. As he says in his article published in the National Observer:

The most striking aspect was the unexpected *esprit de corps* from private to commanding general. At the risk of being ostracized by the Marines, I submit that it compares favorably with that elite force.

I have visited Fort Benning and was similarly impressed, but I have visited several other Army posts including Fort Carson, Fort Ord, Fort Bragg, and Fort Dix and can report that Fort Benning is not an isolated case. The leadership throughout the Army has responded to the many challenges of this turbulent period with foresight, wisdom, and a keen insight into the makeup of today's youth. While we by no means are certain of the success of efforts to obtain an all-volunteer Army by the summer of 1973, I am confident that, however the necessary manpower is obtained, our Army will be a well led, disciplined and effective fighting force in which this Nation can take great pride.

Mr. Crown's article follows:

[From the National Observer,  
Mar. 4, 1972]

## HOW THE ARMY CHANGED THE MARINE VET'S MIND

(By John A. Crown)

As a Marine Corps veteran, I am a firm believer in volunteering for military duty. But I associate volunteering with elite forces, not with so ponderous an organization as the U.S. Army.

So I have been skeptical of the Army's program to dispense with the draft and, by July 1, 1973, depend upon volunteers for all its manpower. My skepticism has been set forth at length on the editorial pages of the Atlanta Journal, my full-time employer.

Partly because of these published views, the Army invited me to visit Fort Benning, "the home of the infantry," which is some 100 miles southwest of Atlanta. The idea was to get a firsthand exclusive view of how the modern volunteer army is taking shape. Army parlance for it is an acronym: VOLAR.

## AN ARMY SCENARIO

I knew the Army wanted me to see the most favorable parts of the VOLAR program to convince me that it's working. So, predictably, I didn't hear many gripes or doubts voiced by enlisted men, though I found some reservations expressed by noncommissioned officers. Clearly, though, the over-all attitude I found at Fort Benning was one of enthusiasm for the program, especially among the officers running it.

Though I had arrived there as a declared doubter about VOLAR and skeptical that I would get a full view of its minuses as well as its pluses, I came away impressed. Maybe I was "had," but I concluded that if the remainder of the Army could meet the pace set by the 197th Infantry Brigade, VOLAR might work.

The most striking aspect was the unexpected *esprit de corps* from private to commanding general. At the risk of being ostracized by the Marines, I submit that it compares favorably with that elite force.

In November 1970, Fort Benning, Carson, and Ord were selected as sites for pilot runs of Project VOLAR. Fort Bragg was added a bit later, and subsequently 12 additional posts or locations were included. VOLAR is scheduled to end by July 1 and the desirable aspects applied Army-wide as money permits.

Each of the first four Army posts in Volar was allowed to concoct its own plan for handling soldiers so that they would be induced to re-enlist.

## COZY TWO-MAN ROOMS

The Fort Benning plan encompasses 136 items aimed at attracting and retaining volunteers. Examples include elimination of "hurry up and wait," ensuring that off-duty soldiers are not awakened for morning clean-up, giving a half holiday on payday for handling personal affairs.

To any veteran, the most obvious changes are in the barracks and the mess halls.

Within the Volar barracks of D Company, 1st Battalion, 29th Infantry, the rows of bunks so familiar in my day have given way to two-man rooms, each with a door. Within each room are two bunks, which can be arranged to personal taste. In addition, the Army provides two wall lockers, a desk, chairs, curtains, and a rug. The two occupants can select the room color from a variety of water-base paints and paint the walls to suit themselves.

With no squad bays and no reveille, I inquired how the soldiers get up in the morning. "The squad leaders take care of that," was the laconic reply, which I interpreted to mean that there is still some old with the new.

Within each room the decorations seemed to be up to the individual. I saw on the walls such diverse items as American flags, center-



folds and other illustrations from Playboy, antidrug posters, and engineer maps of Fort Benning complete with training schedules.

In the barracks' day rooms are the highly publicized beer-vending machines. "They get sick before they get drunk, so beer is no problem," was one captain's comment.

#### THE "PEPSI GENERATION"?

It should be understood that two-man rooms and beer-vending machines aren't available now for recruits in any Army basic-training units. They were briefly, in a Volar experiment at Fort Ord, but were eliminated after about two months.

The Army said it was easier to maintain order and discipline among recruits housed in open barracks. As for the beer, says an Army spokesman in Washington: "The vendors aren't making much money. The recruits, as members of the Pepsi generation, seemed to prefer soft drinks."

In the Fort Benning Volar unit which is not a basic-training outfit, men no longer mass for movement into mess halls equipped with long tables and backless benches. The meal hours are posted, and each soldier supposedly comes in at his convenience, signs the book to signify he's eaten, and goes down an inviting-looking cafeteria line. He then goes to a four-man table, sits in a chair, and has his meal.

"I like it," was the straightforward comment from a volunteer from Tuscaloosa, Ala. "The food's good, and I get enough, but I still go to the snack bar."

#### PHYSICAL-TRAINING FUN

Army cooks still do the cooking, but the old bugaboo—kitchen police—is a thing of the past. It is performed by hired civilians.

It was a cold, wet, and raw day in February when I watched the 18- and 19-year-old volunteers of the 2nd Battalion, 10th Field Artillery, undergo physical-training tests. Manifest was the spirit of humor on the part of both noncommissioned instructors and the men. There was a sense of competitiveness too, as each soldier sought to excel.

Ask any of the men in Volar why they volunteered, and you get a wide variety of reasons and guesses. Most frequently cited are the unit-of-choice plan and proximity to home. Along with this is the elimination of former restrictions on how far a man can travel on a week end.

Pvt. Arlis Woodall of Sanford, Fla., says he signed up to "stabilize myself for 16 months." He likes the Volar approach because it lets him go home on week ends to "rest up," and "it gives me a chance to be myself."

Volar "seems to be working fine for me," says Pvt. Russell Johnson of Darlington, S.C. "It's doing its thing and should do it in the future." And Pvt. Lindbergh Williams of Atlanta remarks: "I contrast Volar with the scientist and his experiment. We're the guinea pigs. It's up to us and our leaders to make Volar work."

First Sgt. Jerry A. Holloman says Volar is working, at least at company level, but that it "does nothing more than what good units in the Army have been doing for years." He says of the volunteers: "There's not much change from 22 years ago. There may be a few discipline problems, but like most young Americans, they need someone to motivate and teach them."

From Staff Sgt. John J. Fones comes a similar reaction: "Some aspects of Volar are working really fine. Discipline, however, is in need of work." He says the volunteers "look about 50-50 to me. Some look good and the other half needs work, but there is a higher educational level, and that makes things easier."

#### PUTTING A GOOD FACE ON IT ALL

Fones believes that "the future for an all-volunteer Army is not that bright, but there are some things, like the five-day work week, which are good. The lower-rated enlisted

man, though, is getting as much as we are, the noncommissioned officers, and there is nothing for them to work for."

Sgt. Frank E. Toles says the volunteers have "a pretty good attitude and know what's going on. They should have a good attitude since they're volunteers in the first place."

An optimistic attitude prevailed among all the soldiers I talked to in a field-firing exercise by the 1st Battalion, 29th Infantry. Each man said he was attracted by the benefits of the new Army, and some looked ahead to the veterans' benefits. There seemed to be a feeling that they were making a contribution and doing something "meaningful" as volunteer soldiers.

"What we are aiming for is elimination of menial nonsoldier duties, and to put in their place meaningful training," says Lt. Col. Henry Doctor, Jr., chief of Fort Benning's Volar Project and former deputy commander of the 197th Infantry Brigade, the Volar unit there.

"We believe that ego involvement is vital. We believe that pride is instrumental, and that a soldier's conviction that he is making a contribution is essential to success. We want to attract the good people and keep them in."

Just last week, Maj. Gen. Albert H. Smith, the Army's recruiting boss, complained that the Army isn't yet meeting its enlistment quotas for combat branches despite recent pay raises that doubled a recruit's pay to \$288 a month.

The shortage could be eased, the general said, if the Army were permitted to begin paying an authorized \$3,000 bonus for enlistment in combat units. Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird is resisting Army pressure to begin the bonuses until the full effect of the pay raise on enlistments is clear.

Nevertheless, testimony before the House Armed Services Committee by Pentagon manpower chief Roger Kelley showed that enlistments for the combat branches rose sharply in 1971 to 26,874, far more than the 3,106 in 1970. He said this was one of the "further signs of progress toward an all-volunteer force."

When the 197th Infantry Brigade was designated a Volar unit in December 1970, its initial mission was to recruit its own volunteers. An all-volunteer brigade by June 1973 was the goal. But recruiting has been so aggressively pursued that this has been moved up a year.

"We are going to become an all-volunteer brigade by the summer of 1972," says Col. Edwin L. Kennedy, the soft-spoken Mississippian who commands the unit.

"Not only did the brigade lead the way for the entire army in the unit-of-choice recruiting program in 1971," he adds, "but at the same time it continually improved in every aspect of mission accomplishment."

Unit-of-choice is the first step in VOLAR. A volunteer can choose his basic-training site, which is an innovation. More important, he can choose the unit to which he will be assigned after basic training. He is guaranteed a minimum of 16 months with that unit.

"I chose the 197th because I can get home every week end," says a volunteer from Atlanta. "I chose Fort Ord, Calif., for basic training because I'd never been to California."

But he admits he was somewhat disappointed with Fort Ord. He had expected a Hollywood-type climate rather than that experienced in northern California.

#### THE 197TH "BELONGS"

The 197th has Alabama, Georgia, Florida, and South Carolina as its assigned recruiting area—although anyone anywhere can choose it. Recruiters from the 197th working with the Army Recruiting Command, crisscross the four-state area looking for volunteers who will measure up. Their message is that the 197th "belongs" to those four states.

"We're filled all our combat-arms slots with volunteers, and now we're well into all the administrative assignments," Colonel Kennedy remarked.

"We're concentrating on the AWOL rate, and it is low. We're concentrating on racial harmony, and we've had no incidents. We're concentrating on narcotics, and there is a lot of self-policing—we get tips. Basically, it's a matter of individual responsibility. We give 'em a job to do and they do it."

"Despite the popular view, they don't lie around the barracks smoking marijuana, and asking people 'Why?' all the time," Colonel Kennedy said.

The 197th Infantry Brigade is not the entire Army. It is a long way from here to an all-volunteer Army. It is even longer to a sustained all-volunteer Army, once the novelty and initial enthusiasm fade.

But a first step is essential, and the 197th seems to be off to a good pace.

#### EFFECTS OF NUCLEAR POWER

#### HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, rising public concern about the effects of nuclear power has been reflected by increased attention in the Nation's press. As of the first of the year the AEC noted 22 nuclear reactors were operable, 54 being built and 52 projected with reactors already ordered. This rush to blanket the Northeast with nuclear power plants has been called "one of the most dangerous and misguided steps ever taken by man," by an eminent biologist, Mr. LaMont C. Cole of Cornell University.

Now an outstanding physicist whose experience dates from the World War II's Manhattan project has sounded a warning that unfortunately was not widely picked up by the press. An acknowledged authority on nuclear weaponry and the problem of radioactive fallout from weapons testing, Dr. Lapp is equally at home in the field of civilian nuclear power reactors.

In a number of articles in the New York Times and the New Republic, Dr. Lapp has examined the question of the safety and siting of the huge reactors that are nearing completion, like the world's largest to date at Indian Point, Westchester County, N.Y. He does not like what he sees. He has specifically warned that reactors proposed for Newbold Island in the Delaware River, 5 miles from Trenton and 11 miles from Philadelphia, should not be licensed because by 1980, there will be about 750,000 living in the 10-mile high risk zone around the reactor. Scientists at Harvard and MIT are repeating these warnings at special Rule Making Hearings on the Adequacy of the AEC Interim Guidelines for Emergency Core Cooling Systems. They contend the reactors are too powerful. There is little possibility of protective systems which would be called into play in the event of a pipe break to quench the core before a meltdown and the consequent breaching of the containment. What would follow this sequence of events would cause tens or hundreds

of thousands of deaths for miles downwind and require the evacuation of hundreds of thousands of miles and cost billions, it is held. Would anyone be able to calculate the genetic damage to future generations which Dr. Edward Teller in 1970 termed infinite?

Dr. Lapp is a respected advocate of nuclear energy. His views are sought by members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and members of the Atomic Energy Commission. When he speaks out of deep personal concern as he did on the first day of the ECCS hearings, we should listen to his recommendations.

I commend to my colleagues his remarks:

**NUCLEAR POWER SAFETY AND EMERGENCY CORE COOLING**

(By Ralph E. Lapp)

My name is Ralph E. Lapp. A Statement of Qualification was filed with this Board on Jan. 7, 1972.

I appreciate this opportunity to appear as a participant in discussing an issue of serious concern to the future growth of nuclear-electric power in this country. My studies in the fossil fuel sector of our energy economy convince me that new power sources are essential to the nation's well-being and that uranium-based power represents the only available option for the United States in the near decades. Thus I appear before this Board as an advocate of nuclear energy. However, I am deeply concerned that the present light water generation of nuclear power reactors may not employ an adequate margin of safety to create public confidence in them.

As of Jan. 1, 1972 a total of 23 nuclear generating units, rated at 10 million kilowatts of electrical power, are in operation. Industry has accumulated about 100 reactor-years of experience with power reactors. It might be thought that this record, laudable as it is, should instill confidence in the safety of this new power source. However, this experience has been primarily with reactors of modest power; Shippingport (90Mw), Yankee (175Mw) and Dresden-1 (200Mw) for which emergency core cooling is less of a challenge than in the 500-800 Mw class, for which about a fifth of the experience applies. Of course, there is no experience with the 1,000 Mw units, then we have about 18 reactor-years of record, i.e. 18 years of operation of all reactors normalized to a 1,000 Mw level.

The fact that there has been no major thermal emergency (ECC accident or LOCA, loss-of-coolant, accident) in the past is of little statistical significance. An accident probability of 0.01 per reactor per year or one chance that a reactor will exhibit an ECC accident in one year's operation is not acceptable as a public risk. This would mean a 25 percent chance of accident over the 25 year life of the power unit. Life time operation of four such units would obviously be hazardous in the extreme. Deployment of large numbers of reactors requires that the individual reactor risk must be extremely small since the total risk is summed.

The dramatic increase in power levels imposed upon reactor design a concomitant rise in power density and this, in turn, posed an emergency core cooling problem which, apparently, presented itself to the AEC's Regulatory Staff with the Consolidated Edison application for a construction permit (Indian Point 2 application of Dec. 1965, awarded Oct. 14, 1966 for an 873 Mew PWR.)

It was on Oct. 12, 1966 that the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguard (ACRS) stressed the need for emergency core cooling systems of high reliability and for investiga-

tion of the thermal behavior of uncovered cores.

On Oct. 27, 1966 the Director of Regulation appointed a task force "to conduct a review of power reactor emergency core cooling systems and core protection." A year later the Ergen task force filed its final report "Emergency Core Cooling" containing 12 conclusions. The Ergen report defines a large number of technical unknowns in the ECC field and makes many recommendations. The report could scarcely be regarded as a confidence-builder for the nuclear industry. It is significant that ACRS (letter of Feb. 26, 1968) found itself in "substantial agreement" with some conclusions of the Ergen report. It is even more significant that thereafter, in letters dated March 20 and Nov. 12, 1969, ACRS reemphasized its recommendations on additional safeguards and research on ECCS. This repeated emphasis, including reiteration on June 22, 1971 in testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, supports my view that safety research in the ECC sector is lagging behind time goals consonant with the safe deployment of large power reactors.

This safety gap which has opened up between the accomplishments of AEC-industry research and development and the reality of the AEC's Regulatory approval of nuclear-electric stations appears to me as most significant and for this reason I would like to direct my testimony to it.

As a specific example, I call attention to the long time delays which have been occasioned in the LOFT, loss-of-fluid test facility at the National Reactor Testing Station (NRTS). I wish to emphasize this particular facility since LOFT essentially to reactor safety is described by the AEC as follows:

"LOFT is the only integral test in the world planned to carry out a major loss-of-coolant accident experiment which integrates all of the accident initiation, response, and consequence phenomena into a single test with engineered safety systems in operation. Additionally, it can be noted that:

(1) LOFT is the focal point which provides a fundamental sense of direction to water reactor safety investigations,

(2) as a live reactor in an accident made it makes investigators face reality, and

(3) it provides a central vehicle to build and hold a competent technical staff in a vital national program."

(Source: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy hearings, FY 70, Pt. 2, p. 957.)

The conceptual design of LOFT was completed in 1963 and Kaiser Engineers was the firm selected as architect engineer for the facility. AEC testimony in 1964 stated: "This experiment is scheduled for test operation in late 1966." (JCAE Authorization FY 65, p. 764.) Testimony last year (JCAE Au. FY 72, Pt. 2, p. 855) stated that LOFT was 60 percent complete in its construction and that initial operation was scheduled for late 1973.

Thus it appears that LOFT is seven years behind schedule and that high temperature operations will be delayed until 1975. Given the present timetable for deployment of nuclear stations, the LOFT experiments take on the character of a *post facto* safety program.

LOFT is not an isolated example of slippage in time-framing of the reactor safety research program. If we look at the AEC's WASH-1146 "Water Reactor Safety Program Plan" (Feb. 1970) we find a tabulation of 50 individual programs in reactor safety, 15 of which are classified as *Class A Priority* defined (p. I-14): "A. This is applied to very urgent, key problem areas, the solution of which would clearly have great impact, either directly or indirectly, on a major critical aspect of reactor safety." (Emphasis as in original document.)

In addition, 20 of the programs are stipulated as *Class B Priority* meaning, "This is applied to problem areas which are demonstrably of high interest due to their potential effect on reactor safety." Many of these

programs relate to the ECC issue, yet the document shows them extending over a 4 to 5 year time span, beginning in fiscal year 1970.

It is difficult for me to reconcile the fact that much AEC safety research is in the future tense, whereas power reactors are in operation. It seems to me that this situation places the AEC's Regulatory Staff in an awkward position when it is called upon to approve new plant construction and operation. The position will be very much more awkward when utilities come in with reactor designs employing higher power densities. Aerojet Nuclear Corporation (pg. II-22) Au Hrg FY71 Pt. 1 p. 133) stated:

"While the resolution of the ECCS issue is believed acceptable for most present reactors at listed powers and power densities, the Committee is not now prepared to advise on the acceptability of ECC systems for higher power density cores. Experimental work is required to provide a basis for evaluation of operating and accident behavior at higher power densities. The ACRS also notes that more experimental work is required to establish the degree of safety and conservatism in current ECC systems."

I note that the Dec. 28, 1971 statement of Aerojet Nuclear Corporation (pg. II-22) states:

"The development of analytical models used to analyze and predict the events of loss-of-coolant accidents in water-cooled reactor systems should be complemented with experimental tests which provide data to evaluate and verify the solutions of the analytical models. Without such experimental tests and resultant data, meaningful confidence limits cannot be established for the analytical models."

When, over a year ago, LOFT semiscale tests indicated a deviation of experiment from the predictions of calculational codes, the Regulatory arm of the AEC established a task force to review the data and in June 1971 Interim Criteria for ECCS were stipulated. In a number of public statements (New Republic, Jan. 23, 1971) I proposed application of limits to reactor power levels and conservative siting policy to reduce the population at risk to the radioactive consequence of a thermal catastrophe. The AEC Regulatory Staff (p. 1-32 of its January 27, 1972 testimony) rejected such proposals in favor of the evaluation model approach. But how good is such a model when it lacks experimental verification?

LOFT experiments later in this decade will test the predictive capabilities of analytical models but complete verification may not be attained since LOFT is a 55 Mw reactor and application of the results involves a scale-up of more than a factor of 60. Furthermore, a limited series of LOFT experiments can test only certain ECCS efficacies. Indeed, a full-scale test with an operating power reactor would provide only a single set of results applicable only to the specific accident mode and core history of the reactor. There will always remain unresolved aspects of verification and for this reason the AEC will have to exercise conservatism in its regulatory role. This is tantamount to saying that reactors can not be made absolutely safe and that there will always be some element of risk for people living in the vicinity of a power reactor.

The siting of nuclear-electric stations adjacent to large populations imposes extraordinary responsibilities on the regulatory agency which must license these plants. A nuclear power plant constitutes a unique metropolitan hazard both in nature and in potential magnitude. I can think of only one parallel of comparable risk, namely, siting a large population in a valley directly below a high dam. In such a case there is direct, line-of-vision perception of the threat and graphic comprehension of the consequences of a dam failure. It is, of course, a low probability event. Given no earth disturbance,



such as a seismic shock, people could put confidence in the engineering record of the dam builders, but rare events, such as earthquakes, can have high consequences and this is precisely the statistical situation posed by siting nuclear plants near metropolitan populations.

However, the layman is not apt to have line-of-sight perception of the nuclear risk. If he objects to the siting of a nuclear plant in his vicinity, he is at a disadvantage in intervening to oppose the nuclear action. In order to match wits with the nuclear utility, the intervenor needs time, money and availability of competent technical authority. I would estimate that perhaps \$500,000 is the sum needed to fund an adequate intervention. Very often an intervenor finds it almost impossible to obtain the services of qualified persons to serve as experts. Too often, the intervenor has felt that he was in contest with not only the utility and the nuclear vendors, but also with the Atomic Energy Commission. If local intervention is to serve as a check on deployment of unsafe reactors or on unsafe siting, then intervenors must have access to some independent authority with which to challenge the organized technical resources of the utility.

As an example of the problem of democratic application of checks and balances in a nuclear issue, I cite the 163 page statement submitted here today by the AEC Regulatory Staff. On page 2 of the Foreword states:

"As the testimony indicates, the technical data available today have been combined with complementary conservative assumptions and procedures in the evaluation models. Together, these give reasonable assurance that a design meeting the criteria will provide adequate protection to the health and safety of the public."

But if we were to turn back the clock to the days before the Semiscale tests 845-851, and assume that the Regulatory Staff had then been required to prepare a statement like the 163 page testimony submitted today, would it not have been quite different in its character? Would "reasonable assurance" as now posited have been as conservative as today's? We are not given a definition of what the Regulatory Staff means by "reasonable". In any event the health and safety of a large population is being decided by a small population of experts who put their trust in evaluation models whose predictive capabilities are subject to future verification. It is significant that neither the statement of Aerojet Nuclear Company nor the testimony of Milton Shaw defines the time scale for LOFT. The long delays in bringing the LOFT reactor into operation constitute a serious deficiency in the AEC's reactor safety research program and point to a need for examination of the mechanisms by which the AEC Regulatory Staff coordinates its research needs with the AEC's Division of Reactor Development and Technology. It would be pertinent to know how the Regulatory arm of the AEC has expressed its concern over the long delays in the LOFT and other safety programs.

In his testimony (p. 3) Mr. Shaw states: "The background and pertinent information pertaining to our safety R&D program and its relationship to other ongoing R&D programs and to the U.S. civilian power program have been presented in many official AEC publications and covered in depth in annual testimony before the Congress (references 4-7, 10, 11)."

I submit that the AEC's safety program is deficient in publication of up-to-date and critical evaluations. I admit that this deficiency is being corrected and the situation is improving. But I have taken the time to recheck the literature references cited by Mr. Shaw and I find that the AEC's safety program has been inadequately dealt with

in Congressional hearings. In some years the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy glossed over the issue with no critical examination of the program. The most recent literature cited by Mr. Shaw (AEC Licensing Procedure and Related Legislation, Hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, 4 Parts, 2090 pages) is almost exclusively devoted to regulatory matters with only little attention given to reactor safety. One would have thought that the Idaho Semiscale Experiments would have been treated in detail by the Joint Committee. Instead, the issue was dealt with by calling Mr. Shaw from the audience during a hearing to testify briefly on the problem. The Joint Committee concerned itself with studying means of expediting the licensing procedures. There exists an urgent need for the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to hold public hearings on the vital issue of reactor safety.

I do not wish to appear to be unduly critical of the Atomic Energy Commission, but the nature and magnitude of potential nuclear risks demand a public accountability which imposes unusual responsibilities upon the AEC. Our democracy must invent mechanisms for dealing with technological risk so that checks and balances are applied to the decision making of the AEC. The emergency core cooling issue involves such complex technology, as illustrated by the technical details of the 163 page AEC Regulatory Staff testimony, that I doubt if we have arrayed here today adequate talent to challenge the testimony. I note that a total of ten Regulatory Staff personnel sponsor the testimony. We have almost a full score of AEC or AEC contractor personnel of high technical qualification to back up the AEC's presentations before this Board.

Summarizing my position—I believe that the Atomic Energy Commission has allowed reactor safety research to lag so that its Regulatory Staff is called upon to judge reactor applications without an adequate experimental base which verifies the evaluation models and checks out the calculational codes of the safety statements submitted by the utilities. Furthermore, it is my opinion that new mechanisms are required to provide independent checks and balances for the protection of the public health and safety in areas where high power reactors are sited.

It appears to me that part of the explanation for the faltering AEC safety program in ECOS may be ascribed to the undefined role of the nuclear industry in this area. There was apparently a belief within the Atomic Energy Commission that it had fulfilled its promotional aspects of reactor development during the late 1960's and that it was up to industry to assume responsibility for the safety of the reactors which were being marketed. In this connection the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (JCAE Au. Hrg. FY71 Pt 1 p. 115) commented:

"We are unable to determine what factors determine industry vs. AEC funding of reactor safety research programs, other than in those cases where the AEC discontinues support. Then the decisions is clearly up to industry."

It is my own impression that interest within the AEC shifted from safety research on water reactors to programs oriented toward the power-breeder and that this also accounts, in part, for deficiencies in the present water reactor safety program.

The proprietary nature of certain reactor safety information developed by nuclear vendors may be tantamount to a classification of data which denies intervenors access to information vital to their efforts. I believe that this point will be amplified by attorneys who are participating in this hearing.

In conclusion, I wish to summarize some suggestions and recommendations which may

be constructive in increasing public confidence in nuclear power safety:

1. Require the Atomic Energy Commission to submit an annual report on progress in nuclear reactor safety programs. I would suggest that this report include the separate comments of the Regulatory Staff and of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards.

2. Amend the Atomic Energy Act to require biennial public hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for the purpose of investigating the current status and adequacy of the AEC-nuclear industry safety programs.

3. Direct the Atomic Energy Commission to issue specific criteria for the siting of power reactors, defining the allowable population at risk as a function of distance from the reactor site. (The absence of specific criteria has allowed escalation of the population at risk to a point where the Newbold Island facility would, if approved, "see" 0.75 million people within a radius of 10 miles.)

4. Encourage the nuclear industry to redesign reactor cores to effect a reduction in power densities so as to ease the burden on the ECC system in the event of a coolant accident.

5. Require power derating of the 1,000 Mwe class reactors of the pressurized water type which are sited so as to have more than 10,000 persons at risk within a radius of 10 miles from the reactor.

6. Direct the Atomic Energy Commission to initiate a program to develop core restraint systems (i.e. "core-catchers") as part of a defense-in-depth safety system to insure the public safety and protect the environment. (I would add that such a safeguard becomes essential for offshore reactors since a meltdown could result in extensive marine contamination.)

#### AN INTERVIEW WITH A RED CHINESE REFUGEE

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, despite the seeming wish of so many Americans from the highest echelons of our Government down to the man in the street, to deceive themselves about the reality of life in Communist China, there continues a steady stream of refugees from behind the Bamboo Curtain who relate firsthand knowledge of the almost total lack of real freedom present for the average Chinese.

Hong Kong remains the chief destination of mainlanders seeking to escape the rigors of Mao Tse-tung's so-called paradise. Recently one of these mainlanders, 27-year-old Yu Kuo-hun, was interviewed on Taiwan which he had finally reached, by Mike Thompson, at the time, director of regional and State activities for the Young Americans for Freedom.

The interview appears in the March, 1972 issue of YAF's monthly publication, New Guard.

It is my hope that my colleagues will profit by reading this evidence of the continuing subjugation of the Chinese people on the mainland of Asia by their Communist masters. The interview follows:

## AN INTERVIEW WITH A RED CHINESE REFUGEE

(By Mike Thompson)

## CHRISTMAS IN CHINA

Last fall Mike Thompson, then YAF's Director of Regional and State Activities and currently Administrative Assistant to a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, travelled to Southeast Asia to report on the South Vietnamese elections. On his way home, Thompson stopped in Nationalist China, where he interviewed Yu Kuo-hun, a 27-year-old Chinese who fled the mainland in March 1971. Yu escaped into Hong Kong, and had been in Nationalist China for only three days when Thompson interviewed him.

THOMPSON. I understand that you have just come from the mainland—that you have just fled Communist China.

YU KUO-HUN. Yes.

THOMPSON. What made you leave mainland China?

YU KUO-HUN. The main reason for me to escape is that I can no longer endure the Communist tyranny and I can't have a living on the mainland—that is the mode of power that drove me to escape to freedom.

THOMPSON. Could you give me an idea of what life is like today on mainland China?

YU KUO-HUN. Oh, yes. I would like to start with my own life. Since my parents left me at home, only my grandmother and I were left behind. My grandmother was a very old woman so we could find no way to make a living. We lived a very hard life. At that time we experienced the cultural revolution—we really had nothing/almost nothing to eat and little to clothe ourselves. My grandmother died of starvation. So I was alone. I traveled around looking for petty jobs. I could get 9 feet of cloth for my travels every year and 2 pails of rice for food every day. How far you travel—you have to apply for a travel permit. But it is even very hard to get a short distance travel permit. The job situation is rather bad on the mainland. So this is not only my case—but the case of almost everyone.

THOMPSON. Are there any freedoms allowed to the people on mainland China?

YU KUO-HUN. On the mainland the people do not have freedom—we don't have freedom to travel—we don't have the freedom not to travel; we don't have the freedom to speak—we also do not have the freedom not to speak; we don't have the freedom to read—we also do not have the freedom not to read. What I say means that if they ask you to do something—to go somewhere, you have to; but, if you want to go of your own accord you are not allowed to do so unless you obtain a permit. As I said before it is rather difficult to get a permit. For speech it is the same thing. Nobody can whisper to one another—nobody can talk in the sly among one another. If you whisper you may be suspected of something harming to the Communists. So, people are not allowed to talk or whisper. However, if you don't talk—if they ask you to talk and you do not talk you are also to be punished. When you are asked to say something—you must say something. You are not allowed to read other kinds of books unless you are forced or compelled to read something for Mao. Mao's quotations—we must read Mao's quotations in the morning as well as the evening. If you don't read aloud you are suspected of concealing hatred against Mao. On the mainland, in fact, we don't have any kinds of freedom.

## NO FREEDOM TO WORSHIP

THOMPSON. Is there any freedom to worship on mainland China?

YU KUO-HUN. There is certainly no freedom of worship on the mainland. All the monasteries, temples and churches were destroyed. It became more serious during the cultural revolution [but] even before that no religion was allowed to stay on the main-

land. So all the Bibles and scripts of religion were buried. One of my uncles was a Catholic priest. Since the Communists know that he is a priest he was forced to go with them for a parade. He was asked to put on a foolish cap and wear the priest robe. Then he was paraded around the city showing the people that this was the end of the priest. Besides this there are also other punishments; both physical and mental.

THOMPSON. You lived on mainland China during the Red Guard movement. Could you give us an idea of what life was like at that time and what it's been like since?

YU KUO-HUN. The cultural revolution started out of the [power struggle], because the faction in power fought against the militants. This started a revolution. This means that when they started to fight each other as a result the Red Guard was started. The Red Guard was divided into several sections and they fought among themselves. They had formed groups for this man or that man's faction and feuded with one another. As a result many people died of such fighting. But the situation became even worse when the Red Guard started to plunder the warehouses and tried to beat and run the officials like magistrates, governors and villages heads. They tried to beat them and take them out of the popular lead as other individuals and their properties were snatched away. Everything was in great disorder. These people's peasant property was taken away. So the situation was in great chaos. Not until the Red Guard movement was reduced in intensification did the fighting among them reduce a lot; but, after the movement all those who had made trouble were given a similar punishment as the magistrates were before them. So when everything had piped down the magistrates sought their revenge . . . When they found out who had done harm to them they took retaliatory action. These people were either put in jail or punished by other means—such as they were sent to the frontier for hard labor. As for the students who were very active in the movement—after the movement the students were sent to labor farms for hard labor and they are not allowed to go to the schools—so, they had to suspend their studies. They have to work as slave animals. This is the way the Communists handled the Red Guard movement and also the aftermath.

## RED GUARDS UNCONTROLLED

THOMPSON. Who controlled the Red Guard movement? Were any of your friends in it? What was their attitude towards you?

YU KUO-HUN. As a matter of fact the Red Guard movement wanted to oust Mao Tse Tung—as I mentioned—before the power struggle they wanted to eliminate him. So, they started the movement. Initially nobody controlled the Red Guard. The Red Guards controlled themselves. Later on the situation became very confused. It seemed that nobody could control anybody. Many of my friends were in the Red Guard movement—some of whom received punishment later on for their part in the movement.

THOMPSON. What happens to people on the mainland who question the writings of Mao Tse Tung or are you allowed to question the writings of Mao Tse Tung?

YU KUO-HUN. Nobody dares openly to criticize Mao Tse Tung. A person—a farmer for example—would be sent to the frontier at hard labor. If soldiers or Communist officials happen to criticize Mao they will receive even more severe punishment. On the mainland people are told that Mao Tse Tung is the savior of mankind—without him the world will be plunged into complete chaos. Nobody can or dares to criticize Mao.

THOMPSON. Does the present regime on the mainland headed by Mao Tse Tung represent the people of China?

YU KUO-HUN. Mao's regime cannot represent the will of the Chinese people but out-

wardly it seems that Mao controls the mainland because the people are innocent people and unarmed—they cannot start a rebellion and fight against Mao openly because if they do they will be suppressed very easily—annihilated very easily. So they know that they could do nothing against him. If you show any sign of anti-Mao or anti-Communist feelings you will be in danger of being put to death or imprisoned. So the people hate Mao but cannot fight against him. Thus, I say Mao cannot represent the people because the people's will does not go with him.

THOMPSON. Would the people in Communist China support an effort to replace the present regime with a government which would allow more freedom for the people?

YU KUO-HUN. Of course the Chinese people wish for a government that can give them more freedoms. A desire for freedom is human by instinct. So the Chinese people wish to replace the Mao regime with another regime, which can give more freedom to the people.

## LIFE MISERABLE

THOMPSON. If I have calculated correctly I believe you were about 5 years old when Mao Tse Tung came to power on the mainland. That means that you have been able to live during the entire period and are able to compare what life is like now to what it was 24 years ago. In our country, there are those who say that life in Communist China has improved significantly. Would you comment on that?

YU KUO-HUN. When I was young I felt rather miserable because I did not have enough food or decent clothes to wear. So I decided to go out—looking for petty jobs. I thought outside life might be better; but, in fact, it is the same as my native home. I traveled for several years and I usually had about 1½ pails of rice [pail is a small amount used as minimum wages]. This was ½ pail per meal of rice. I found that on the outside better places could offer only 3 pails a day. This barely satisfied you for a meal. So I found the situation as bad as my home town. I traveled almost every corner of Kwangtu Province. The livelihood there was the same as my home town. I was also told that people said that life in Taiwan or Hong Kong was better. But when I arrived in freedom I found it was just like heaven. I never imagined that it would be like this in the free world. When I arrived here—walking under the trees and going to the shops to buy anything I wanted I found that people can talk with one another freely—any form of talking they like. Life on the mainland and life in the free world constitute a striking contrast.

THOMPSON. Then you left mainland China through Hong Kong?

YU KUO-HUN. Yes.

THOMPSON. How long ago were you on the mainland?

YU KUO-HUN. I escaped to Hong Kong in March of this year.

THOMPSON. Do you have any friends—or did you have any friends on mainland China who have fallen victim to the regime of Mao Tse Tung and for what reasons did these people fall victims?

YU KUO-HUN. I had several friends who had fallen victim to the Mao regime. One in particular was the son of a farmer. During the Red Guard movement he was very active—he fought against the faction in power. When the movement was subdued the faction came to power again. My friend was arrested and tortured badly. Later on he was put in jail—I have no knowledge of what has happened to him. There were many friends like that.

THOMPSON. So there are many people you personally know who are in jail on mainland China?

YU KUO-HUN. I have one uncle who worshipped God who is still in jail. Because of his religion he was a good, gentle man who



never did anything bad to people—he always helped the people. But now he is dead.

THOMPSON. Do you have a hope to return to mainland China someday in any type of capacity whether before or after mainland China is free?

YU KUO-HUN. So long as the Mao regime is in existence I do not want to go back because I don't want to suffer more in the future.

#### MILITARY SUPPORT FOR REVOLT

THOMPSON. If there were an effort to free the mainland would some in the military support such an effort, or would the military support Mao?

YU KUO-HUN. It is a sure thing that once popular China starts a counter-attack that some military forces on the mainland will stand up against Mao and in favor of us. Even now there are many, many uprisings taking place on the mainland. Take Quang Che—even now there are many inner forces strongly opposed to the Communists. Once there is any sign of an attack the Communist forces will automatically stand by us against the Communists.

THOMPSON. Do these guerrilla forces have support among the people?

YU KUO-HUN. Of course the people will stand by these guerrillas—in other words the people will stand by our national troops because they need them and they know that once they go back to the guerrillas the people will be liberated. So they will join in the fight with the guerrillas wholeheartedly.

THOMPSON. So, different from Communist guerrillas, for instance, in Vietnam, who have to forcibly tax the people in order to get their food and supplies, the people on mainland China are willingly supporting the guerrilla movement against Mao Tse-tung?

YU KUO-HUN. The Chinese people at large will support a victory of the guerrilla forces unconditionally. Also, if these people can be furnished with worth-while equipment they will join the guerrillas.

THOMPSON. You mentioned earlier the fact that there were uprisings against Mao Tse Tung—does this mean that the control that Mao Tse Tung has from Peking is not necessarily throughout the country so that farther away from Peking, for instance, the control is less and less?

YU KUO-HUN. Yes.

THOMPSON. Now that you are in a free country what do you plan to do?

YU KUO-HUN. Become either a worker or businessman.

THOMPSON. What is the feeling of the people on mainland China toward Chiang Kai-Shek?

YU KUO-HUN. The people on the mainland worship CKS very much because before the war and the fall of the mainland CKS managed very well and was the leader of the people.

THOMPSON. Even someone like you who was quite young when the Communists came to power on the mainland?

YU KUO-HUN. The old people always tell us secretly. So in comparison we feel that CKS is much better than Mao.

THOMPSON. So the only way that today's generation on mainland China can learn about the past is in secret discussions with the older people just as in all the other Communist nations?

YU KUO-HUN. Yes, the past life is told secretly by the old people.

THOMPSON. Could you give us a definition of what freedom means to you now that you've experienced it for about six months?

YU KUO-HUN. I had no knowledge of freedom; had no experience of freedom in the past; but, now I have come to a place where I can think freely, breathe fresh air—do not have to do anything I don't want to—I feel at peace. There is no worry—just happiness. This kind of feeling I never felt before.

THOMPSON. Tell him finally that there are

millions of people in the United States who hope someday that all the people on mainland China can feel the same way.

#### AMNESTY

### HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the question of the thousands of Americans who, for reasons of conscience, refused to participate in our military activities during our involvement in Indochina is a difficult and trying one.

Louis Lusky, who is a professor of law at my alma mater, Columbia Law School, has been very active in this area and had an excellent article in last Sunday's National Observer which I am inserting in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I think that there are two basic principles which should guide us in our effort to exonerate and reconcile war resisters: first, relief should be afforded not only to those who declined to enter the military, but also to those who became aware of the wrongness of our involvement subsequent to entry into the Armed Forces; second, our approach should not, and must not be a punitive one.

The article follows:

[From the National Observer, Mar. 11, 1972]

#### AMNESTY FOR WHOM, AND HOW MUCH?

"Why should we forgive these traitors and cowards, pardon their crimes, welcome them back from Canada and Sweden?"

The question is asked whenever amnesty for war resisters is debated. There are myriad variations on this same theme; sometimes the bluntness is softened, sometimes the rightness or wrongness of the war is acknowledged to be relevant, sometimes distinctions are recognized between those who have fled and those who have submitted to punishment. But the core of the question is constant. It always starts with "Why" and it always is premised on the following assumptions:

(1) That those who have broken the law to show their opposition to the war in Southeast Asia are "traitors" (meaning "disloyal" rather than actually guilty of treason as defined by Article III, Section 3 of the U.S. Constitution).

(2) That those who have broken or evaded the law in order to avoid service in the war are also cowards.

(3) That the society can well do without these people if they choose to leave or stay away, and can well relegate them to the status of fugitives, convicts, or ex-convicts if they elect to return or remain.

(4) That the only real problem is how to be fair to these law violators (and their families)—the remaining 200,000,000 or so of us having nothing to worry about except the general ethical responsibility to let the punishment fit the crime.

(5) That the "we" (Why should we forgive) does not include the law violators, but include only the great law-abiding majority who have made the laws and have at least acquiesced in the war.

Believing that each of these assumptions is fallacious, I shall try to show that the dominant concern for amnesty is a concern for the welfare of society as a whole, and that prepossession with the problem of fairness to the violators involves a sad distraction from the main point. Secondly, I shall mention

a few undisputed facts that, in my opinion, cast serious doubt on the accuracy of the first three of the five listed assumptions—facts that suggest that amnesty may be called for even if we disregard the needs of the larger society and seek nothing but fairness to the law violators. In addition, I shall very briefly describe the legal tools that are available to do whatever the American people ultimately say they want done—as they may say at the polls this November.

First, let us examine the root question, the starting point for appraisal of any proposal for public action: Whose ox is being gored? The fourth and fifth of our five propositions both say, in different ways, that fairness to the lawbreakers is our only concern. I submit that, though by no means unimportant, it should not be even our primary concern. I say that our primary concern is to thrust this long and divisive war into history as completely and rapidly as we can, to let time get on with its healing, to cleanse our society of a continuing legal fallout whose half life is measurable in decades, and—without denying ourselves the honor of mourning the dead, supporting the crippled, and comforting the bereaved—to turn our minds and hearts to the future.

#### LESSONS CAN BE LEARNED

Dirty and frightful as the war experience has been, lessons can be learned from it that may help us deal with future challenges in a manner more humane, more effective, and less expensive: The war has demonstrated that a society such as ours, in which the people have the ultimate power of decision (however long the exercise of that power may be delayed), will tear itself apart if led into a war whose necessity cannot be made clear to all or nearly all of the people. The war has also done much to liberate us from the fiction, so carefully nurtured by Sen. Joseph McCarthy and his latter-day disciples, that communism is a unitary, monolithic phenomenon comparable to a killing disease—leprosy, say, or tuberculosis—which we are honor bound to fight wherever we find it, and which we can effectively handle with the same sovereign remedies wherever and whenever it shows itself. The war has done a great deal to dispel the dogma that our nation (militarily encumbered, as it is, by its dependence on consent and its humanitarian ideals) can lick anyone we elect to fight, and the still more dangerous dogma that a "white" nation can lick a "nonwhite" nation in any fair and equal combat. The war has also reminded us, as we have not been reminded since the Great Depression, that our liberties are fragile—lovely flowers that flourish and blossom only in the sunlight of common consent—and that our society can remain open only if the policies of our Government command the support, or at least the acquiescence, of nearly everybody (not just a 51 per cent majority).

All these lessons, and others too, will serve us well when we grapple with the problems of today and tomorrow, if only we can allow ourselves to learn. But our ability to understand and profit from the dearly bought experience is, and will remain, gravely impaired so long as the legal debris of the Southeast Asia war remains to distract us, so long as our eyes are blinded by the ashes of dead issues.

What is this legal debris? Let us suppose that tomorrow morning the fighting ends and all war prisoners are sent home. (For years we have been told that the war's end is imminent; and it is a good bet that it will in fact end, or practically end, no later than a few weeks before the November election.) What, then, will our situation be? At that time we shall have terminated the war in its international aspect only. On the domestic side these quite substantial vestiges will remain—and, barring amnesty, will remain for years and decades to come:

(1) Tens of thousands of objectors to the war have broken the criminal law and, if not already prosecuted, are subject to prosecution. Numerically, the largest groups are draft refusers (or evaders) and participants in illegal demonstrations. The great majority have engaged in no act that has involved or threatened injury to any person, or substantial damage to (or theft of) any property; but some few have committed assault, arson, burglary, and perhaps worse.

(2) Some of these people have exiled themselves in Canada, Sweden, and other foreign countries. Others, who have not fled, either (a) have been convicted and have completed their sentences, or (b) are presently being prosecuted, or (c) are subject to prosecution.

(3) This last group—those who are subject to prosecution but have not yet been arrested or indicted—is by far the largest. The war's end may lead most prosecutors to ignore them in favor of more dangerous offenders. Even so, however, each of them (and probably his spouse and close associates) will know that prosecution may ensue—at any time before the applicable statute of limitations has run (and some of them run a long time)—if anything is said, published, or done that awakes the prosecutor's unfavorable attention. The violator will in effect be a probationer, and as such he will have reason to keep his mouth shut on controversial issues. His one venture in political expression—opposition to the war by illegal means—may prove to be his last.

(4) Almost without exception, these violators believe—perhaps rightly, perhaps not—that they have served rather than harmed the United States by revealing, through their law-breaking or self-exile, the depth of their own conviction that the war has been wrong, helping to speed the general realization (which all agree has now come) that the war must be ended. Millions of others share that belief, and will continue to proclaim the injustice of continued punishment, prosecution, or *de facto* probation. To that extent—and it is a large extent—the divisive effect of the war will be prolonged.

(5) The rankle will not die away as soon as prosecutions are ended and sentences served. The stigma of criminal status—the status of the ex-convict—will still rest on those who have suffered it. The status carries with it various political and civil disabilities, heavier in some states than in others: disability to vote, to hold public office, to obtain public employment; ineligibility for admission to the professions such as law, medicine, and teaching, or for admission to other licensed callings such as taxi driving and liquor retailing; and so on.

(6) The law violators are numerous enough, and are sufficiently dispersed geographically, to spread these effects throughout the land. The problem is thus a national one, and—arising as it does from a national war, involving as it does our national political health—it can only be dealt with effectively and uniformly through Federal action.

These are the conditions that will face us when the war is over. But should we postpone until then our consideration of the problem? I do recognize the accuracy of President Nixon's prediction that amnesty—though it will surely come, as he says, just as it has come (in one form or another, and not always under the name of amnesty) after every divisive rebellion or foreign war—will be delayed until our prisoners are back home and American servicemen (except perhaps for volunteers) no longer fight in Southeast Asia. It does not follow, however, that we ought to wait until then to lay the political groundwork. It is not too soon to initiate public debate on the scope and timing of the amnesty—the amnesty that history and the President say is inevitable, and which the President, on Jan. 2, declared he would be "very liberal" in granting when the time

comes. There are enough months left before the November election for public opinion to crystallize, for candidates to be queried on their amnesty views, and thus for the people's will to be expressed at the polls.

Nor is it too soon to lay the legal groundwork. It is true, as President Nixon has reminded us, that clemency for Federal offenses is an executive function. Article II, Section 2 of the Constitution gives pardoning power to the President. But Congress also has a part to play.

At a minimum, Congress can and should shoulder part of the political responsibility—for amnesty, particularly if relatively quick and broad, will require political courage of a high order; this long war has been divisive—by a concurrent resolution affirming congressional approval and support of whatever amnesty it thinks the public interest demands. That is the least that Congress can do, or at any rate it is the least that I think Congress should do.

There is explicit, though not indisputable, authority that says Congress itself has the power to grant amnesty. The Supreme Court has so declared on more than one occasion, though always in cases that involved other issues and did not squarely present the question of congressional amnesty power. An amnesty statute would constitute an assumption of full political responsibility by Congress. It would also constitute the most authoritative expression of the will of the American people, a consideration the importance of which will be explained in a moment.

To avoid any lingering Constitutional doubt (and to avoid the wrangling of Constitutional experts that delayed enactment of the 1964 Civil Rights Act), the effectiveness of the statute might be made conditional upon affirmative Presidential action. That is to say, the bill might stipulate that it would become law only if the President signed it, or approved it by later public proclamation—not if he simply failed to sign it (which ordinarily allows a bill to become law) or vetoed it (unless it were then enacted over his veto and he or his successor later approved it by proclamation). Politically, such a limitation is of small importance in view of the unlikelihood that the bill would pass at all without support from the White House.

It may be said that such a concurrent resolution or statute would be premature at the present time because the war is still being fought. Perhaps this is so, although the objection might be at least partially obviated by a provision delaying the effective date until the President proclaimed that hostilities had ended or been reduced to such a level as to justify the effectuation of amnesty.

But let us assume that specific amnesty action is deemed to be premature for the time being. There is still grist for the congressional mill. It is certainly not too soon to provide the President with all the authority he needs for full and effective amnesty, even though he may not exercise it for a while. Congress has followed this course before. For example, the President was vested with authority to fix prices, wages, and rents long before he saw fit to exercise it. When the time did come, he was in a position to act without delay for congressional action.

#### PRESIDENTIAL POWER LIMITED

True it is that the President already has plenary power to grant clemency to Federal offenders, both military and civilian. True it is that such clemency can take the form of full pardon (with erasure of guilt—as is done in cases of mistaken identity), or remission or reduction of punishment. True it is that reasonable conditions—perhaps an oath of allegiance, as after the Civil War; perhaps alternative public service, as proposed by Senator Taft and others—can be

attached. There are, however, certain things that the President probably lacks power to do without congressional authorization. He probably lacks power to restore the citizenship of those who have relinquished it in protest against the war; it is Congress that possesses the naturalization power. And he surely lacks power to grant clemency to the many violators of state law, a category that includes most of the illegal demonstrators.

As a matter of fact, some Constitutional lawyers may well say that this latter group cannot be granted clemency even by Congress and the President acting in concert. They may say that the power resides only in the respective state governors. My own opinion is otherwise. I believe that Congress has an untapped but available Constitutional resource in the "privileges or immunities clause" of the Fourteenth Amendment. As I have written before:

"Section 1, after providing that all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to its jurisdiction are its citizens, goes on to provide: 'No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States.' The clause has been little used, largely because of a restrictive—and, I believe, erroneous—interpretation by the Supreme Court in 1873 in the Slaughterhouse Cases. But the original purpose of the clause is precisely applicable here. The purpose was to enable Congress, by defining the privileges and immunities of Federal citizenship, to afford protection against hostile state action. The newly freed slaves were, of course, the main subjects of concern, but the clause is not limited to them.

"If Congress believes that our national interest requires the early restoration of domestic harmony and that such harmony will be promoted by amnesty for antiwar demonstrators and others, then Congress has the power to grant them amnesty. What it takes is a declaration by statute that it is a 'privilege and immunity' of United States citizens to gain annulment of convictions and other legal disadvantages suffered by reason of specified acts of opposition to the war. If Congress so provided, the amnesty could be conditioned upon Presidential activation, and it could be made subject to such conditions (for example, an oath of allegiance) as Congress might impose or empower the President to impose."

#### A JUDGMENT ON THE WAR

It remains to consider how broad the amnesty should be. That depends ultimately upon whether our concern extends to the condition of our whole society, or whether we interest ourselves only in fairness to the violators; and that question is intimately linked with the judgment that the American people make upon the rightness or wrongness of the war itself. If the war is found to have been the basic mistake from which all else flowed, those who opposed it sooner and more vigorously than the rest of us are to be regarded as having performed a service through their illegal acts. They may well have sped the general realization of the war's true character; at any rate, that was their purpose and their hope. This realization has gradually come into focus as we have read the Pentagon Papers, as we have learned the shabby factual basis of the recently repealed 1964 Gulf of Tonkin Resolution (which, in the absence of a formal congressional declaration, is generally taken to mark the beginning of the war). If the violators have served the United States by their submission to punishment or self-exile—acts which, it may be said, have connoted courage much more often than cowardice—amnesty should be broad, quick, and unconditional.

A strong case can be made for the proposition that Americans did pass adverse judgment on the war no less than four years ago. In my opinion the 1968 Presidential election,



in which both major candidates won nomination on an end-the-war program—and in which President Lyndon B. Johnson (who indeed had won the 1964 election on a no-war platform) declined to run for the stated reason that he feared his candidacy would hamper his peacemaking efforts—was a clear condemnation of the war. If it was, most Americans have said that the war has been a bad one at least since 1968, if not since its beginning.

This November the people will have another opportunity to express themselves, if the issue is adequately framed in the Presidential and congressional races. Should the people reaffirm what I think they said in 1968, it logically follows that every American should be relieved of every legal disadvantage he would not have suffered if the war had never begun (or, at the least, any such disadvantage that he incurred after the 1968 election). That implies not only remission of criminal penalties but erasure of criminal status, for every offender whose crime would not have been committed but for the war.

It is desirable that amnesty be granted openly and officially if premised on the wrongness of the war—not bit by bit in the form of quiet military discharges given to deserters, or case-by-case leniency accorded by clemency commissions or parole boards. The candid admission of error is beneficial not only to the individual soul, as the churchmen tell us, but also to the body politic. The French profited from their painful recognition of the wrong done to Captain Dreyfus. The Germans profited from their even more painful recognition of the wickedness of Hitler and his Nazis. We Americans, if we truly believe that the war in Southeast Asia has been a bad mistake, would benefit—both in self-esteem and in our relations with the rest of the world—by making express and official acknowledgment of the error, and doing it sooner rather than later.

Full amnesty might not, however, be thought appropriate in all cases. It would not be illogical, though administratively difficult, to limit clemency to those whose offenses were motivated wholly or partly by conscientious opposition to the war. (To be sure, such a limitation would discriminate in favor of the articulate young men who are capable of explaining their feelings in religious-philosophical lingo; and relatively few of them come from Appalachia or Harlem). Neither would it be illogical (though, again, administratively difficult) to deny full clemency to those whose offenses have been "violent"—not an easy term to define; does it include sit-ins? the scrambling of draft board records?—and who, by such acts of arson and assault, have revealed themselves as menaces to their neighbors. Even with these limitations, however, most acts of criminal opposition to the war would be pardoned.

If, on the other hand, it turns out that most Americans can agree only that the war should be put behind us, amnesty will be narrower. There may be liberation of prisoners, but no erasure of the stigma of conviction or restoration of political and civil rights. There may be amnesty for Federal offenders (most of whom are draft refusers) but not for state law violators (most of whom have been prosecuted for some form of violence or near-violence, though the great majority have done no more than block the transport of draftees or engage in other illegal demonstrations).

#### DANGERS IN UNJUST ACTION

In appraising the desirability of limitations upon amnesty, however, one sober fact must not be ignored. Attica stands as a reminder of the difficulty and human waste involved in punishment of people who believe themselves to have been unjustly convicted, and the primitive crudity of the methods our

penologists have thus far devised for dealing with them.

And in deciding whether clemency is due to such offenders as the Berrigans, we should ask ourselves this question: Had John Brown's body not lain a-mouldering in the grave when the Civil War ended—if, instead, he had been serving a prison term—would he have been accorded less generosity than Jefferson Davis and Robert E. Lee?

Only a crystal ball could tell us how the amnesty problem will eventually be resolved. Much may depend on *how* the war ends. Should it cease at a defined moment—perhaps with the aid of the United Nations, whose competence in this regard has suddenly increased with the admission of mainland China; perhaps as a result of President Nixon's trip to Peking; perhaps as a result of a congressional act of punctuation—amnesty is likely to be quicker. Should the war trail off as gradually as it began, amnesty may be slow in coming.

But come it will. And it is now time for every American to examine his own thoughts and opinions; to make them known to all who will listen; to call upon candidates for statements of position; and to carry his convictions with him into the voting booth on Nov. 7.

### THE PRESIDENT AND EDUCATION

#### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, throughout the United States property taxes are placing a crushing burden on many homeowners. One of the reasons for this burden is that we are relying to an undue degree on property taxes as the basic method for financing our elementary and secondary schools.

Recently, courts in four States have ruled that this undue reliance on property taxes is a violation of the U.S. Constitution.

I believe that the time has come for the Federal Government and the States to assume a greater share of the cost of financing elementary and secondary education, and to relieve the local property taxpayer from this crushing burden.

On March 17, 1971, I introduced a bill, the National Partnership in Education Act, which would have the Federal Government assume one-third of the cost of elementary and secondary education in this country. The National Education Association and other interested parties, including the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Sidney Marland, have endorsed this concept.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House a recent editorial broadcast on station WGN in Chicago which speaks responsibly on the burning issue of property tax reform. This editorial is in keeping with the finest traditions of broadcasting.

I would urge the Members of the House to read this editorial to gain a better perspective on the emerging currents in school finances.

The editorial follows:

#### THE PRESIDENT AND EDUCATION

As President Nixon reported on the State of the Union, he said he was not going to

offer Congress a mass of politically-appealing proposals which would have small chance of passage, especially in the highly-charged political atmosphere of a Presidential election year. Instead, the President called on Congress to resist political pressures, giving statesman-like attention to still pending domestic programs he has placed before it.

There was, however, one new program of significance, not spelled out in detail, but certainly demanding attention before Congress quits Washington for the hustings. The program, to be outlined in a special message, calls for a greater federal role in funding elementary and high school education. The courts in four states, as the President pointed out, have found that reliance on varied local property taxes makes public education less than equal, based on the money available for schools from district to district.

"Soaring school costs and soaring property tax rates," the President said, "now threaten both our communities and our schools." We agree with the President and await the specifics of his plan to aid education.

In the meantime, if Congress really wants to begin serious consideration of the problem, it has at least one bill before it. Offered by Chicago Congressman Roman Pucinski, it calls for the federal government to provide one-third of the cost of public primary and secondary education. This bill could provide a vehicle for starting the debate, and the sooner the better.

### IN PRAISE OF AN EDITORIAL

#### HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, on Monday night, February 28, 1972, President Richard M. Nixon returned from the most important trip any President of the United States has ever undertaken.

His motives for going, his apparent change of thought on China, what he accomplished and the impact of the journey, have all been—and probably will continue to be—discussed and questioned; questioned at all levels of governments and by private citizens across the country and around the world.

A recent editorial in the Quincy Patriot Ledger deals with the enmities that existed and, of course in varying degrees, still exist between this country and the People's Republic. It traces some of the policies this country has had toward China in the past quarter century. The editorial gives us an insight into what China is today in terms of population and fiscal matters. It looks at the President's visit and concludes that we should all hope that the journey was a beginning of better relations—and more importantly, greater understanding—between the two nations.

Mr. Speaker, this thoughtful editorial from the Patriot Ledger from the hometown of John Quincy Adams, is, I feel, worthwhile reading for my colleagues in the Congress.

The editorial follows:

#### OFF TO CHINA

"Our enmities are not immutable, and we must be prepared realistically to recognize them and deal with their cause."

This sentence from President Nixon's for-

eign policy report this year serves as well as any to illustrate the theme behind the President's journey to China on which he departs tomorrow.

It is an historic visit which will symbolically put behind the two nations nearly a quarter-century of militant estrangement. But one should not expect dramatic new breakthroughs in American-Chinese relations resulting from this visit.

For much of the postwar period, the United States has pursued a policy of encircling the Communist-held mainland to prevent feared Chinese expansion. Militant talk of fostering worldwide wars of national liberation by Peking, the absorption of Tibet and then the Chinese intervention in the Korean War prompted such concerns.

"The Soviet and Chinese Communists know that their combined power can dominate the Eurasian continent. If the other nations of Europe and Asia stand alone, they will be unable to resist the iron embrace of international communism," Secretary of State John Foster Dulles declared in 1955.

At the time, of course, China and Russia were allies in what looked like a massive "Communist monolith" with the means and intent of rolling over unprotected nations. By the end of the decade, however, nationalist concerns in Moscow and Peking had produced cracks in the monolith, and early in the 1960s, there was a dramatic split. If enmities are not immutable, neither are alliances.

During the 1960s, there developed a kind of parallel interest in the United States and Russia in containing China—for example, during the Sino-Indian border clash and later in 1965, when both Russia and the United States sent warnings to Peking not to intervene in the India-Pakistan war. American intervention in Indochina seemed to serve Russian purposes by blocking potential Chinese expansion to the south, as the combined Soviet-American interest in the Indian subcontinent guarded that area.

The upheavals of the Cultural Revolution in 1966 further sapped Chinese strength and fragmented centralized political control. In short, within a decade, the perceptions and realities of Chinese power and Chinese intentions have dramatically changed. The China we are now dealing with is politically divided, economically weak, militarily inferior, predominantly concerned about Russia, and seemingly prepared to end its long self-imposed isolation from the world.

It is a land of slightly more total area than the United States, but less than half the territory of the Soviet Union, containing about four times as many people as the United States. Its population is half-literate, mostly unskilled, and poor—a gross national product about half that of the current American budget and with a per capita national income of \$145, compared to Russia's \$2,000, and America's \$5,000. China has accomplished a great deal under Mao Tze-tung by itself, at great human cost, and is proud of those achievements.

What can we expect of the Nixon visit? Probably very little in terms of major agreements.

As another token of good will, the President has just extended to China the same trading terms as those with the Soviet Union, which are less favorable than the more liberal trading opportunities given Poland, Romania and Yugoslavia. But there is not a great deal we can trade with China.

There may be a live-and-let-live statement, a recital of discussions of differences, perhaps a willingness to have exchanges of travelers, and so on. But one cannot expect anything really major. And in actuality, many of our differences with China involve third parties and general regional interests—we have no national territorial disputes with China, no arguments over fishing rights or oil or similar resources.

But we do differ in outlook. To Chinese, American intentions in Asia probably do not look benign. Here is this far-off country, the United States, talking of its peaceful intentions and protecting the "free world," yet sending its warships from thousands of miles away steaming up and down Chinese seas for two decades, marching perilously close to Chinese borders during the Korean War, putting half-a-million soldiers into Southeast Asia in recent years and building the world's mightiest nuclear arsenal while speaking timorously of the Chinese "nuclear threat."

To the Chinese, who historically have not had especially happy relations with Westerners, U.S. concern about the Chinese dragon gulping down neighboring Asia in the face of such massive American military display must seem curious and directed by other motives.

The Chinese are likely to be polite, correct and cautious to their wealthy American visitor with his train of technicians, advisers and elaborate technological gear. They may not even take swiftly to the idea of extensive economic relations with the United States (except for aid without strings), given the past of economic exploitation by Westerners, and certainly not to talk of arms control, given the great imbalance in modern weaponry.

The President himself has noted: "My visit to Peking in February will certainly not bring a quick resolution of the deep differences which divide us from the Peoples Republic of China. But it will be a beginning, and it will signal the end of a sterile and barren interlude in the relationship between two great peoples. Finally, it will represent a necessary and giant step toward the creation of a stable structure of world peace."

Let us hope that this journey does represent a beginning toward more fruitful relations, at least toward greater understanding of each other's intentions.

#### REDUCING SMOKE FROM JET ENGINES

#### HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, in these days of lagging timetables and target date slippages, it is heartening to find any project running ahead of schedule—and doubly so when that project involves environmental protection.

That is why I was gratified to learn this week that the American Airlines Maintenance and Engineering Center in Tulsa is 3 months ahead of schedule in its \$1.75 million program to reduce smoke from the jet engines that power its Boeing 727 Astrojets.

This jet-smoke reduction was committed to by the airline industry 2 years ago and is scheduled for completion by the end of this year.

I am proud of my constituents who are responsible for these pace-setting efforts of American Airlines in Tulsa. I also salute American for its continuing concern and leadership in the field of environmental protection, as outlined by Orlan A. Soli, its Tulsa-based vice president for maintenance and engineering, in a progress report which I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

TULSA, OKLA., Feb. 29.—American Airlines is three months ahead of schedule in its \$1.75

million program to reduce smoke from the jet engines that power its Boeing 727 Astrojets.

Orlan A. Soli, vice president-maintenance and engineering, said that more than 75 per cent of the airline's 358 JT8D engines have been converted to a new configuration that is virtually smoke-free.

American is one of 31 airlines that are spending some \$30 million to convert 3000 jet engines in accordance with an agreement developed by airlines, the Department of Transportation and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The agreement calls for conversion of the engines by the end of this year.

The modification involves changes in the combustion system (or "burner cans") inside each engine. The changes prevent formation of the carbon particulates which are the source of the "black smoke" visible from the exhaust of the JT8D engines.

"Already most of our 98 standard and stretch model 727 aircraft are equipped with the modified engines," Soli said. He noted that the airline's new DC-10 and Boeing 747 aircraft are powered by new engines which emit little if any visible smoke.

American has long been concerned with engine smoke and noise, Mr. Soli said. In the early 1960's it was the first airline to equip its four-engine fleet with "cleaner" fanjet combustors for the JT8D engine offering its findings to the rest of the industry. And in the case of the DC-10 American wrote environmental specifications into the contracts for the plane and the engine.

#### "VOCABULARY GROWTH" BY RUTH FRAGER

#### HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House of Representatives are rarely at a loss for words, but if a silent moment should ever arise, there now exists a nonpartisan remedy available to politicians of any persuasion, and in fact to any citizen. This remedy, an excellent and entertaining new book entitled, "Three Dimensions of Vocabulary Growth," is coauthored by a good friend of mine, Mrs. Ruth Frager of Shelton, Conn.

Mrs. Frager developed the idea for her book while serving as chairman of the English Department at Housatonic Community College in Bridgeport, Conn. She and her coauthor, Lewis M. Paternoster, decided to translate one of their frequent discussions of vocabulary building into a readable and interesting method of increasing everyday word power.

The result is a textbook which makes the usually arduous chore of learning new vocabulary fun but effective. For the information of my colleagues, I include an excellent article by W. C. Rockwell on both Mrs. Frager and "Three Dimensions of Vocabulary Growth" which appeared in the February 3 edition of the Suburban News.

The article follows:

RUTH FRAGER COAUTHORS A NEW COLLEGE TEXTBOOK  
(By W. C. Rockwell)

At a loss for words? You know the frustration of groping vainly in the cloudy recesses



of your memory; the aimless snapping of your fingers; the closed eyes grimace accompanied by an annoyed shake of the head. The word escapes you doesn't it?

It's not an unusual situation. In fact, it is so common among the millions who can converse in English at all, that two professors of Housatonic Community College in Bridgeport decided to do something about it.

The result is a new textbook that is as diverting and entertaining as any of the popular word games like cross word puzzles, scrabble, jumbles and the latest derivatives of these.

The book is called "Three Dimensions of Vocabulary Growth" and if you are a devotee of the Readers' Digest department called "Increase Your Word Power" you are going to want to know more about this intriguing paperback which is, in many respects, a product of Shelton.

Mrs. Ruth L. Frager, wife of Shelton's former mayor, Charles Frager, co-authored the book with Lewis M. Paternoster of Bridgeport and much of the actual work was done in Mrs. Frager's home studio at 43 Cold Spring Circle.

Both authors are assistant professors of English at the Housatonic Community College where Mrs. Frager is chairman of the English Department. They spent a little more than three years at the task which was started about five years ago. The two years hiatus (See Lesson 12, page 52 of the book. It means a gap where something is missing and comes from the past participle of the Latin "haire" meaning "to yawn") anyway the two years gap between compiling and writing the book was the period in which the two authors were in search of a publisher.

#### HOW IT HAPPENED

The idea for the book developed, as those things generally do, from frequent conversations and discussions with other professors concerning some of the problems of teaching English, especially to students whose reading abilities were somewhat less than sharp.

They decided that if a textbook book could be devised which would make vocabulary building a more lively and interesting aspect of learning perhaps it would be a decided benefit to those students who found it difficult to sharpen their reading and grasp of ideas.

"Well," said Paternoster, "why just talk about it. Let's do it. Let's compile such a book and put it to use."

So they did. Part of the time they worked in Mrs. Frager's basement studio, part of the time in her office at the college. Paternoster had had some similar experience in compiling textbooks when he worked with Dr. Don Parker of Science Research Associates where he co-edited two college preparatory Reading Laboratories.

#### ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Paternoster was reading coordinator with the Stratford school system for 13 years, taught in adult education for seven years and was a part time lecturer at Housatonic College until his full time appointment there in 1969. He received both his BS in English and his MS in secondary education with emphasis in reading from the University of Bridgeport. He is a member of the International Reading Assn., the Connecticut Association for Reading Research and a member of the Northeastern area two-year College Reading Assn. He resides with his wife and two daughters in Stratford.

Mrs. Frager, well known in Shelton where she has made her home for the past 10 years, was married to former Mayor Charles Frager in 1964. Five years later she, herself, went into active politics when she became a Democratic candidate for alderman from the Second Ward.

She was formerly married to the late William W. McCracken, an artist and is the mother of three daughters, Mrs. Emily Nelson of Manchester; Peggy McCracken, a staff member at Houghton-Mifflin, publishers in Boston; and Mrs. Susan Anders, of Charleston, W. Va. There are two grandchildren, Christopher and Heather Nelson of Manchester.

Mrs. Frager received the BA in English with special honors from Smith College and her Master's from Wesleyan University. She has a fellowship at Yale University in American studies and her poetry has been published in National Anthology High School Teachers and other publications.

She was raised in Stratford and returned there after graduation from college to teach in the public school system in which she was named department chairman for Stratford and Bunnell High schools in 1957. She resigned the position in 1966 when she joined the Housatonic family.

She took active part in the planning and creation of the college as a member of the Regional Advisory Council on which she served as secretary. She resigned the position when she was appointed to the faculty and during the Spring of 1970 she served as Dean of faculty in the absence of Dean Ekstrom.

#### ABOUT THE BOOK

Mrs. Frager has taught at the University of Bridgeport, College of Education, on a part time basis over a six year period and was the first woman member of the Bridgeport Engineering Institute.

The textbook, already in use at Housatonic Community College, presents three methods for learning new words, the basic technique of the three methods being to learn some additional fact about a word when learning the word itself and its definition.

The first dimension, according to the preface of the book, is based on "an interesting history behind" the word. "Words with stories behind them," say the authors, "remain fresh and vivid in the memory and become a permanent part of one's working vocabulary."

Etymology constitutes the second dimension, in the authors' opinion. "Etymologies are especially valuable as mnemonic devices they are often evoked by the word itself," says the preface.

The third dimension has to do with words which "fall naturally into categories or groups of words with related meanings," according to the preface. "When a new word is learned it can be placed in such a category and distinguished from other words related to the same general idea. The new word then becomes a ready and precise vocabulary tool that can be used with effectiveness and confidence."

Probably no professor of English would condone this suggestion but the average "word buff" can find much of interest merely by delving into the book at random, on a desultory (see page 16) basis, so to speak.

But then, even the authors say "words are more eloquent than anything that could be said about them. To understand that fact is to be well on the way to vocabulary growth."

(Reader's Digest, note: My next rating on your "It Pays to Increase Your Word Power" will be in the (20 to 19 correct' bracket.)

#### GIRL SCOUTS HONORED

### HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, this week Congress is paying tribute to one of the

Nation's most respected organizations—the Girl Scouts of the United States of America. March 6 marked their 60th anniversary, and it provided us with an opportunity to reflect upon the high ideals and accomplishments that have made scouting a worldwide bond of friendship.

The Girl Scouts have succeeded in accomplishing true peace and understanding between their international membership. Their efforts to unite the young people of the world have succeeded where our similar efforts among world leaders have fallen short of the mark. A record like that of the Scouts deserves our true appreciation and encouragement.

And, so, I join my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to add my sincere congratulations to a long list of supporters of the Girl Scout movement.

#### DIPLOMATS FACE A RISING TIDE OF VIOLENCE

### HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker a recent excellent article in the Christian Science Monitor focuses on an increasingly serious problem: the rising tide of violence directed against diplomats. The article points out that the "list of crimes committed against foreign diplomats and their property around the world is growing at an alarming rate. It runs the gamut from kidnapping and assassination to annoying verbal taunts and ink splashing."

Mr. Speaker, I am sponsor of a bill H.R. 10502, which is directed at this problem. This important new legislation would provide for optional Federal jurisdiction in this area, which is, after all, one of Federal responsibility. The legislation would fill an inexcusable void in our current legislative scheme. I am hopeful that the Judiciary Committee, which is holding hearings on the legislation on March 16, will find itself able promptly to report the bill favorably, and that the full House will likewise give prompt and favorable attention to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD the article "Diplomats Face a Rising Tide of Violence," Christian Science Monitor, February 29, 1972, second section, page 7:

#### DIPLOMATS FACE A RISING TIDE OF VIOLENCE (By Lucia Mouat)

WASHINGTON.—Sniper fire into a room where four children are sleeping in the Soviet mission to the United Nations . . . firebombing of the British Embassy in Dublin and repeated bomb threats against the British Embassy in the United States . . . assault and robbery of an employee of the Embassy of New Zealand in Washington.

Whether motivated by politics or simple economics, the list of crimes committed against foreign diplomats and their property around the world is growing at an alarming rate. It runs the gamut from kidnapping and assassination to annoying verbal taunts and ink-splashing.

Diplomacy, as a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations put it during a debate on the subject last November, is no longer, if it ever was, a "career of calmness and tranquillity." Increasingly, he noted, it is a "calling of danger."

In dedicating a small park next to the State Department that same month to the memory of foreign-service officers who lost their lives while stationed overseas, Secretary of State William P. Rogers in effect underlined the point where he observed that natural disasters and disease as causes of death had given way in more recent years to sniper fire, bombings, and the like.

In the United States alone, some 127 incidents involving foreign officials and property were reported during the past year. Forty-one of these involved attacks on Soviet missions and personnel—ripe targets for those protesting Moscow's treatment of Soviet Jewry. Bomb threats and similar kinds of harassment without follow-up action are not included in either figure.

#### "PRICE OF FREE SOCIETY"

In a practical sense, there is only so much that the United States can do. Though concerned and embarrassed by such incidents, U.S. officials argue they are in part the price of a free society.

Other nations—particularly the Soviet Union—are not so easily convinced. Soviet diplomats, pointing to what they see as effective and official crackdowns on such groups as Washington antiwar protesters and the Black Panthers, insist that where there is a will, there is a way. They say Washington could do far more than it does to curb the militant activities of such groups as the Jewish Defense League.

Soviet officials further argue, with considerably more success, that penalties for attacks on foreign diplomats and property tend to be light. They have asserted that few if any are in jail as a result of the many attacks against Russians in the United States, in the last year or so, and U.S. officials have to admit that the record tends to confirm the charge.

In fact, the blame, if that word can be used, lies more in the legal process of delays, appeals, and free-on-bail provisions aimed at ensuring a fair trial than in the actual penalties. Many of the incidents which do occur are purposefully just a shade within the law.

For its part, the United States has stepped up its preventative efforts in recent years. Two years ago President Nixon expanded the White House police force to form a special executive-protection service contingent which now numbers 800 men and steadily patrols Washington's embassy row. And secret-service agents now protect visiting dignitaries.

#### LEGAL FRONT CONSIDERED

Washington is also in the midst of a fresh effort to tighten up protection on the legal front.

Under present law, the mugging of a diplomat is treated much the same as the mugging of anyone else and is generally subject to local rather than federal jurisdiction. Legislation sent to Congress by the Departments of State and Justice and now pending in subcommittee would bring the United States a step nearer many other nations where national criminal law prevails by extending federal jurisdiction to crimes involving foreign and U.S. officials.

Included in the broad definition of crime under the new legislation would be kidnapping (even if no interstate transportation is involved), property damage, and the relatively hazy area of harassment. Drawing upon an existing New York statute, the new legislation defines it to include trailing an official in a public place after having been told not to do so, indulgence in abusive

language, and, among other things, communicating with such foreign officials anonymously by letter or telephone.

Those "selling" the legislation stress its logic. They say that since foreign and domestic policy can be affected by such acts, they should come under federal jurisdiction. Currently, federal officials can only urge, without any guarantees, that local authorities cooperate in any enforcement measures they suggest.

#### MISSING DIMENSION

Proponents of the new legislation say it would also add a certain dimension of order to federal law which has been missing. They point to the fact that 30 percent of this country's public officials, for instance, now are covered by federal criminal statutes. But, they add, while the list now includes a postman, it excludes such people as Secretary of State Rogers and a prosecuting attorney for the Department of Justice.

Backers of the new legislation expect several changes to result from it. Speedier prosecution of cases, for example. Case loads are often extremely heavy in local courts. Also, in the case of the Soviet attacks, there have been charges that New York City courts have been subject to strong Jewish pressure to be lenient on those charged with crimes. In more than one case, there has been a hung jury.

The Soviets have frequently pointed to Rabbi Meir Kahane, head of the Jewish Defense League, as an example of a man who has been arrested several times but who is free enough to keep on making threats and becoming involved in several incidents.

#### PRIMARY RELIANCE CITED

In July Rabbi Kahane was given a five-year suspended sentence and fined \$5,000 after pleading guilty to a charge of conspiracy to manufacture explosives. He was free to go to Israel for three months shortly afterward to confer with friends there.

Hopes are that the new legislation may also enable federal authorities, who have less-limited resources generally than local authorities, to move in fast and extensively on investigation of a case. Primary reliance then as now, however, would be on local police as in the case of New York City to do the day-to-day protective work.

The job is extremely costly. New York police, who have maintained an especially heavy patrol on the Soviet mission to the UN since the sniper incident last fall, spend about \$2.5 million a year to protect foreign missions. Protection of the new Peking delegation accounts for about one-fifth of the total.

Also in the hopper as a change in tradition in handling attacks on foreign diplomats is a move to broaden extradition powers. Normally this has been confined to return of a fugitive who committed a crime on home soil. Recently an extraterritorial aspect has been developing within the law. This aims at return of the fugitive although the offense was committed in another country as long as a U.S. official was involved in the attack.

Most of the current treaty efforts in this area seek to lock up the loophole allowed for political offenses by tightening the definition, and to ensure that the fugitive who has committed a crime against a foreign official, find no safe haven in any country.

#### SENATE NOD AWAITED

A treaty with members of the Organization of American States, signed by President Nixon last February and now awaiting Senate approval, would exempt just such attacks on diplomats from the category of political offenses allowed under most extradition agreements. The fugitive would no longer have an easy "out."

An even tougher, and certainly broader, legal convention on the subject is expected to come before the International Law Com-

mission meeting next summer for discussion. This would offer similar assurance, if concluded, that there is no safe haven for those committing acts of terrorism—whether against diplomats or anyone else.

Both treaties are seen as supplements to existing domestic legislation and extradition treaties. One of the major problems, of course, is catching the fugitive in the first place. In parts of Latin America it is practically impossible. Once caught, the fugitive would usually be dealt with under existing domestic law. However, if he should seek refuge in a neighboring country on grounds he had committed only a political offense, the new treaties might help secure his extradition and prosecution.

For its part, the United States has recently reviewed its own security measures abroad, usually in cooperation with local authorities in each place. Marine guards posted at each embassy, largely to protect it from incidents inside the premises, are considered a deterrent.

#### INCIDENTS PROTESTED

"When there are chronic problems, it's usually where local authorities don't have the resources or the capability of catching dissidents," says one State Department lawyer.

The United States vigorously protests incidents abroad, however, if it has reason to believe that they are government stimulated or that the government failed to take proper preventative action in the light of a known threat. When cars of the U.S. diplomats and journalists in the Soviet Union, for instance, were damaged after dissidents in this country set fire to Soviet cars, the connection appeared all too obvious to authorities here.

Foreign officials tend to feel that once they have complained about such incidents to the State Department here, they have done all, if not more, than is required. There is an understandable reluctance to appear in court as a complaining witness in the case and to undergo cross-examination. This adds to the U.S. burden in trying to resolve such incidents smoothly.

Politically motivated attacks ride with the tide of events and presumably will continue to a degree so long as instigators think there is something to be gained by them. The diplomatic community feels it has had quite enough and that its effect has been minimal.

When Sir Geoffrey Jackson, former British ambassador to Uruguay, was released after being held eight months by Tupamaro guerrillas, he was careful to stress his continuing affection for the Uruguayan people. But he was emotionally relentless on one point; "This business of ambassador-snatching is counterproductive and self-defeating. . . . It has got to end."

#### ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

#### HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1972, there was debate on the House floor regarding the extension of the Economic Opportunity Act. During this debate, Congressman QUINN, of Minnesota, placed a table in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with statistical information on the number of Headstart children being served in my State. The percentage figures regarding Alaska are wrong and misleading. I wish to correct the RECORD by inserting a letter I received from the executive director of the



Rural Alaska Community Action Program, Inc.:

RURAL ALASKA COMMUNITY  
ACTION PROGRAM, INC.,  
Anchorage, Alaska, March 3, 1972.

Hon. NICK BEGICH,  
Congressman from Alaska, House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEGICH: Frank Peterson has sent me a copy of the Congressional Record from the U.S. House of Representatives for February 16, 1972 in which the debate on the extension of the Economic Opportunity Act took place. During that debate, a table was presented by Congressman Quile which purported to show the number of eligible children for Head Start in the state and the number served. This chart appears on page 1063.

The chart would seem to indicate that 99% of the eligible children in Alaska are served. It simply is not true and I don't know what figures are used, but they are very misleading. As you are well aware, our Head Start programs operate in only 38 villages throughout the state. There are over 200 villages in the state and most of these villages contain a number of children who are eligible for the program. Our estimate, based on current population figures, show that there are at least 4,785 children in rural Alaska who are not served by the program. Our estimates would show that at least 3/4 of these children were eligible for Head Start.

I thought it was important to bring these figures to your attention as it is my understanding that already in Washington, D.C. there is a great hesitancy to fund programs in Alaska because of the Land Claims Settlement and the oil lease sale. Of course, we here in Alaska realize that neither of these situations are going to immediately solve the problem of low income people in the state. It is hoped that sometime in the not too distant future the economic problems of rural Alaska will begin to be solved, but I don't anticipate any major change in the living conditions in rural areas for at least five to ten years. Therefore, I think it is totally inappropriate for the kind of information which Congressman Quile used to be circulated throughout Washington, D.C.

I would be glad to discuss this with you further at anytime. I do plan to be in Washington, D.C. the week of March 20 and would be glad to talk with you then.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN SHIVELY,  
Executive Director.

GREEN BAY, WIS., PRESS-GAZETTE  
URGES PASSAGE OF MATSUNAGA  
LEGISLATION FOR SHORESIDE  
FACILITIES AT U.S.S. "ARIZONA"  
MEMORIAL

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA  
OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, strong bipartisan support has been demonstrated for my bill to provide shoreside facilities for use of visitors to the U.S.S. Arizona Memorial at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. Fully 135 Members of the House have sponsored the legislation.

Further evidence of the widespread favorable reception for my measure is a recent editorial in the Green Bay, Wis., Press-Gazette, urging passage. For the information of my colleagues and other

readers of the RECORD, I offer for inclusion at this point the text of that editorial:

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette,  
Dec. 7, 1971]

#### A MUSEUM FOR PEARL HARBOR

The United States has been shaken to the core on a number of occasions during its history, but few events have been as traumatic to citizens as the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor on Dec. 7, 1941—30 years ago today. The news that the attack had virtually destroyed the United States Pacific fleet in the harbor galvanized the nation to action and marked the beginning of our direct involvement in World War II against Japan, Germany and Italy.

The story of the Pearl Harbor attack is just that to many in the under-40 age category although it will go down in history as one of the nation's most crushing defeats in battle. More than 3,000 servicemen were killed in the attack, moving President Roosevelt to call Dec. 7 "a date which will live in infamy." A measure of the impact the sneak attack had on the nation is that most citizens living in 1941 can vividly recall what they were doing when the news was flashed over the radio shortly after noon on that Sunday three decades ago.

Today, one of the highlights of a visit to Hawaii is a trip to the Arizona Memorial in Pearl Harbor. The beautiful pure white memorial lies astride the battleship by that name which was sunk in the attack. The Arizona, whose outlines can still be seen just under the harbor's surface, holds the bodies of more than one thousand men. The memorial is reached by boat from a somewhat nondescript if neatly kept ferry landing where only a few faded photographs and some narrative accounts fail to show the ferocity and success of the Japanese mini-submarines and bombers.

Plans are now afoot to obtain congressional approval of funds to construct a museum and theater on a 9.5 acre site near the boat landing, from which some 700,000 visitors a year are taken to the Arizona Memorial. Both the National Park Service and the Navy support the memorial park plan which, in the words of its sponsors, "will add an educational dimension to this experience (visiting the Arizona Memorial) which does not now exist." The project deserves congressional support.

WHILE YOU ARE UP, GET ME A  
GRANT

HON. JAMES V. STANTON  
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, a tongue-in-cheek column by the talented Cleveland Press writer, Rudy Zappi, was called to my attention recently by Mayor Emil J. Lisy, Jr., the distinguished mayor of Maple Heights, Ohio. The column makes a point about which I have been particularly concerned in recent months: That although huge sums are appropriated for certain Federal programs, these funds, rather than going to fulfill the program's goals, are absorbed by the bureaucracy. I have been asserting this myself in connection with my emergency crime control bill, H.R. 11813, now heading for hearings before the House Judiciary Committee.

I commend Mr. Zappi's column to the attention of my colleagues:

WHILE YOU ARE UP, GET ME A GRANT

(By Rudy Zappi)

It's clear to me how Government money is spent to get things done.

Consider the omnibus bill which was constructed to fight crime. It makes lots of money available to help reduce the crime rate.

A city can do a great deal with, say, half a million dollars.

But first, the Government hires an administrator at a salary of about \$50,000. He hires 12 staff members at around \$20,000 each. The staffers start out by making a feasibility study at a cost of \$100,000.

The staffers conclude after a six-month study that crime ought to be reduced. So they put together a program.

A supervisor is hired to carry out the program, and an executive director is hired to help him. The program the staff put together authorizes the supervisor and his exec to come up with a plan.

They go to work. Their salaries total \$52,000, and the plan costs \$57,990. The supervisor and the exec come up with a plan to give the Police Department a new radio.

There is \$10 left from the original half million dollar grant, and the decision is made to give all of it to the Police Department.

Unfortunately, the radio costs \$16.52. So a committee is formed to tackle the problem. The members are local volunteers recruited from the Welcome Wagon.

The committee sponsors a spaghetti dinner in a pool hall and throws open the doors to the public. Expenses for the dinner come to \$75 and the take at the door totals \$78 for a \$3 profit.

In order to make up what is needed to buy the radio, the mayor lays off six firemen for three and a half minutes, thereby saving \$3.52 which is transferred to the police radio fund.

JIMMY DRIFTWOOD

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, a recent article appeared in an Arkansas publication reporting the work of Jimmy Driftwood, of Timbo, Ark.

Mr. Driftwood has skillfully promoted the folklore of Arkansas and the Ozark region for many years and is to be commended for his excellence, skill, and dedication to the restoration and preservation of those values which are proudly retained by those of us from the Ozark region.

I recommend this article to my colleagues:

JIMMY DRIFTWOOD

Is James Morris a successful school teacher-farmer who keeps the music of his ancestors alive as a hobby, or is Jimmy Driftwood a professional folksinger who relaxes with Hereford cattle, Hampshire hogs, and other farm activities?

Admittedly, he can't take whitefaced cows or banded hogs into New York's Carnegie Hall, the Newport Festival, or California's Berkeley Folk Festival, but he can take his homemade guitar, handed down from ancestors, out into the pasture to serenade his livestock, or even plink an ancient tune on the pickin' bow while Cleda, his wife, works with her bees.

Around Timbo and Mountain View, Ark., they are Mr. and Mrs. Jim Morris. In the

music and record world, he is Jimmy Driftwood.

When Jimmy Driftwood wasn't busy making the record "The Battle of New Orleans," which sold more than two million copies, or "Tennessee Stud," which also made platter history, he was helping farrow pigs or delivering calves on their Stone County farm in the shadow of Ozark Mountains, or helping Clede hive a swarm of bees, or take out a few supers of amber honey from their own sweet clover hayfields.

And, if need be, he can go back to setting up remedial reading clinics, while Clede teaches exceptional children as they did while they lived in Baton Rouge, La. He could even go back to his desk in the Snowball, Ark., school. He began teaching in an eight-grade, one-room school before he had finished high school, and for a quarter of a century, he was a teacher, principal of a consolidated school, superintendent of an independent system, county supervisor, and forever and always sawing on a fiddle, picking a guitar or banjo, and becoming "Doctor of American Folklore."

He also uses rhythm-percussion instruments, such as gourds with grooves filed crosswise on their necks, and rubbed with a stick, or a new switch on the weapon used by the Biblical Samson for killing Philistines, the jawbone of an ass. He rubs the teeth with a stick to produce a snare-drum-like effect, or he beats on the bone to get a sound something like that from a minstrel's bones.

The guitar he favors is odd shaped and it was made by his grandfather. His ancestor carved the neck from a fence rail, thin sides from an ox yoke; the top and bottom from the headboard of an old bedstead brought by his grandfather from Tennessee.

Hand him any of the traditional folk instruments, and Jimmy will play it. He spends considerable time experimenting with pickin' bows—they look like archery bows, with a single guitar string tuned to D, one end wound round an ebony key such as used on a violin or ukulele. It is plucked with a plectrum, or "Pick" as the Rackensackers call it. Jimmy makes pickin' bows out of barrel staves, pieces of home-cured walnut polished like a fine gunstock, and other kinds of wood—he's forever trying to find what wood produces the best sound.

He puts one end of the pickin' bow in his mouth, and changing shape of cheeks and lips, controls both pitch and volume, much as boys do with old-fashioned jewsharps. He says the pickin' bow may have been man's first musical instrument.

Jimmy plays fiddles too, but he tunes them in the mountaineer manner, rather than in the conventional GDAE range used by violinists.

With Jesse Stuart, the mountain poet of W-Hollow in Kentucky, Jimmy Driftwood is determined to preserve and perpetuate the rugged and simple art forms of our ancestors brought to this country from England, Ireland and Scotland. For years they have tried to get together on a stage at the same time, and they missed it recently by moments.

His songs and ballads, some of them handed down from mouth to ear for centuries, have set more than three and a half million platters spinning, and Prof. Jim Morris insists he can teach more history through folk music than some can with whole libraries of books.

#### IOWA FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION DOES OUTSTANDING JOB

### HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the First Congressional District of Iowa,

which I am privileged to represent, has seen a great expansion of industry. Along with this industrial expansion in southeastern Iowa, it is interesting to observe the input of the Farmers Home Administration, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, into the rural areas.

On December 31, just passed, a little over 1,000 families were living in modest but nice homes in the rural areas of my district as a result of having received loans to purchase or build from the Farmers Home Administration. These loans, made to low- to moderate-income families are not only providing a decent place to live for these families but also providing benefits to the community and industry.

The number of new homes being built or purchased with loans from the Farmers Home Administration is significant. Since the start of the current fiscal year, 55 loans have been made to purchase or build new homes in my district. This represents a significant impact on the homebuilding industry of the district, as well as providing an increased tax base in the community and a decent place for families to live.

Along with the housing loans in my district are 32 sewer or water loans to towns of less than 5,500 population. Most of these loans are in towns with a population of 1,000 or less. These loans represent a total of \$2,610,000. We could better look at this amount, Mr. Speaker, as being an investment in progress. An investment that will be repaid.

Let me give you a couple of examples of these loans. The town of Houghton, with 119 residents, now has a waste disposal system where just a few years ago they were faced with a lawsuit, because of drainage from their septic tanks. Denmark is an unincorporated town of about 350 residents where many local wells were providing water unsafe for human use. By the time this community holds its annual festival this fall, residents will be enjoying pure water from their new water system provided by a loan from FHA.

Farmers in my district have also received help from the services of the Farmers Home Administration. As of December 31, 1971, 552 families had operating loans and 1,286 families had farmownership loans. These operators of family farms are still in business and are contributing to their own and the community welfare, because of the loans and supervision received from FHA.

One of the real exciting services furnished by FHA is loans to young families to start farming. Mr. Robert R. Pim, Iowa FHA State director, is a big booster for this part of their program. He reports 38 families in my district have been helped to start farming the past 3 years. These families, mainly in their twenties, wanted to make farming their lifework and the Farmers Home Administration has provided the opportunity.

The record of the Farmers Home Administration provided in the First Congressional District of Iowa can be duplicated in every rural congressional district. The services provided by FHA help millions of Americans to have a better life. We owe a debt of gratitude to Administrator James V. Smith and

his staff for the excellent job they are doing all over our country.

One of the reasons the Farmers Home Administration has such an outstanding record in the First District and Iowa is the leadership provided by the FHA Iowa State director, Robert R. Pim. Bob Pim is doing an outstanding job. He and his staff are sensitive to the needs FHA can fill.

"CONGRESSMAN JOHN L. McMILLAN"  
BY ANN RICHARDSON

### HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter and paper written by Miss Ann Richardson, who attends Roy Hudgens Academy at Lake City, S.C.

You will note she received a grade of 99 on her paper. I hope the Members will take time to read this young lady's paper.

FEBRUARY 10, 1972.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McMILLAN: Thanks so much for giving me the material for this paper. My teacher seemed to like it very much.

I thought possibly you might be interested in how it turned out. Thanks again.

My family sends their best regards.

Sincerely,

ANN RICHARDSON.

CONGRESSMAN JOHN L. McMILLAN

(By Ann Richardson)

The Constitution provides "All Legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

Have you ever visited Washington, D.C., when Congress was in session? Two summers ago, we made such a visit, with the office of our Congressman at the top of our list. We had written him prior to our trip that we were coming, and he replied that he would arrange some tours for us that the average visitor to Washington would not see.

Upon entering the Sam Rayburn building, which houses the offices of most members of Congress, we found the office of our own Congressman just a few doors from the front door on the first floor. That in itself told me that he was very influential in Congress, since he could be assigned an office in the most prominent area of the building.

It gave me a thrill just seeing his name and South Carolina on a plaque on the office door.

Upon entering his office, we were thrilled to meet natives of our own area who were there serving on his staff. There were people from Florence, Marion, Mullins, Myrtle Beach, and other towns around our home.

We were given special passes to gain entrance into some places in Washington and upon leaving, we were given a personal escort from his office to visit the Library of Congress and the Capitol.

Now who is this man, whom any visitor would immediately feel had a great deal of influence in our nation's capital? He is of course none other than our own John L. McMillan, Congressman from the great state of South Carolina, Sixth District.

Almost his entire life since completing college has been spent in serving the people of his district of South Carolina. When Congressman Gasque died, John L. McMillan was then serving as assistant to Congressman



Gasque, so Mr. McMillan successfully ran for the office that was left vacant. He has served ever since, having never been defeated.

The Dean of South Carolina Congressman before Mr. McMillan had never been from this area, but now for a number of years, the dean of all Congressmen is Congressman McMillan from our area. He is also the sixth ranking Congressman in the entire United States Congress. He is known as the "mayor of Washington" since he has been chairman of the committee that rules the District of Columbia for so many years.

Who is this man and where did he come from? Here are some facts about his younger years and his accomplishments as gathered from official government records as published in Washington.

John L. McMillan was born on a farm at Mullins, S.C. He is the son of the late M. L. and Mary Alice Keith McMillan. He was educated at Mullins High School and attended the Universities of North Carolina and South Carolina. McMillan also attended the University of South Carolina Law School and National Law School in Washington, D.C.

McMillan was a member of the All Time Star football team of South Carolina. He was selected on the All-State Football team for four years and the All-Southern team for one year.

In 1938, McMillan decided to run for Congress of the sixth district. The sixth district has nine counties; they are Florence, Horry, Georgetown, Williamsburg, Tee, Marion, Dillon, Darlington, and Marlboro. He had a great advantage and this advantage was that he had been a clerk of the House Pension Committee for six years before he filed for Congress, and before completing his college career, he had worked as a congressional secretary for three years. McMillan was selected over five opponents.

In 1940, McMillan was reelected over one opponent by a majority of 18,000 votes. He was reelected in 1942 over two opponents by a majority of 17,000 votes. Then again in 1944 without opposition, McMillan was without opposition in 1948, 1950, 1952, 1954, 1956, 1958, and 1960.

In 1960, McMillan was selected by the Speaker of the House to represent Congress of the United States at the Interparliamentary Union in London, England. McMillan also represented the Congress at the Interparliamentary Union in Tokyo, Japan in 1961.

McMillan defeated his opponent by a vote of 48,000 to 10,500 in 1962. In 1964, he ran against a Republican opponent. He was reelected by a vote of approximately 50,000 to 25,000.

In 1966, McMillan was reelected over a Republican opponent by a vote of 43,000 to 26,000. He was reelected in 1968 primary over one opponent by a vote of approximately 23,000. In the general election over a Republican opponent, McMillan won by approximately 19,000 votes.

The last election, which was in 1970, McMillan had about a 28,000 majority vote. In the general election, he was elected over a Republican by 21,000 majority.

Since the first run in 1938, John McMillan has been elected every two years. Many times the election has been rough. McMillan will run again in 1972.

Congressman John McMillan has always been considered a conservative as reflected in his voting record while in Congress. While serving in Congress under five Presidents, he has constantly tried to reduce the budgets of Government thus saving the taxpayers money. His critics often make light of his being the "mayor of Washington", but his record shows that he has done quite a bit more than that. He has supported Industrial Development for his district, several funds for rivers, bridges and beach development, help secure military bases for this area, besides securing Federal Buildings and Post Offices for his people back home.

Since all Congressmen serve on committees in Congress, Mr. McMillan serves on the Agriculture Committee. He is now Vice-Chairman of the thirty-seven member Agricultural Committee. He is the Chairman of the Forestry, sub-committee and Vice-Chairman of the Tobacco Committee. He is one of the four Congressmen who created the Farm Home Administration which helps the farmers secure loans from the agency to build homes, buy equipment and other things. Since  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the United States Congressmen are not from farming areas, he is in a constant battle to help pass laws to improve the life of the people in the rural areas.

The economy of this area depends on tobacco, cotton and farm products. People from the west, midwest and north are not interested in the farm problems of our area, so all the help we get in Washington comes from Congressmen like Mr. McMillan and other Congressmen representing the interests of the people they serve.

When election time comes around again this year, you will again hear the name John McMillan for Congress, Sixth District of South Carolina. This will give you some background of the one who has represented us so well for 32 years. There is no substitute for seniority, power and prestige in the Legislative Halls of Congress.

#### INFORMATION

1. Meet the Member—Joseph McCaffrey, Dec. 10, 1969.
2. 1971 Congressional Directory, 92nd Congress, 1st Session, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
3. John G. McMillan, Portrait Acceptance, May 18, 1966, U.S. Government Printing Office.
5. Florence Morning News, Wednesday, November 17, 1971.

Graded 99 by Mrs. McLaughlin, Roy Hudgens Academy, Lake City, S.C.

#### ST. BENEDICT'S PREPARATORY SCHOOL CLOSES

#### HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the closing of St. Benedict's Preparatory School in Newark, N.J., an institution which has been committed to providing quality education and contributing to the viability of the city, is indeed a great loss. The following recent editorial which appeared in the Advocate well describes the problems with which St. Benedict's and other institutions and our cities are presently confronted.

I too wish to commend the dedication and invaluable contributions of St. Benedict's, the monks and lay personnel who for so long were a vital segment of our community. They will be sorely missed. It is my hope that in the years ahead we will meet the challenges which will permit and support the kinds of public and private ventures that are essential in providing the greatest number of options and diversity which have traditionally been available in our cities and which can provide a wide range of opportunities for the self-realization of our citizens.

#### ST. BENEDICT'S PREP

It is with sadness that we reflect on the announced closing of St. Benedict's Prep. The sadness is for many reasons, but especially for the loss of such quality education

as that which characterized St. Benedict's, and for the loss to the City of Newark of such an outstanding institution.

It would be tragic, however, if sadness over St. Benedict's closing obscured our concern for the problems to which St. Benedict's finally succumbed. If these problems hit St. Benedict's one at a time, it might have survived, but taken together, they proved impossible to overcome. The problems are more really described as sets of problems.

One of these sets of problems is that of the cities. At this point, to say that the cities of America are in crisis is a truism. What applies to any city in America applies more so to Newark. Its ills are legion. The fact that 45% of the housing in Newark is sub-standard provides one small glimpse of the extent of its problems. St. Benedict's could hardly be immune from the problems that have scarred the face of Newark.

Another set of problems centers on education. Education—public, private, and parochial—is beset with a welter of problems from the questioning of the viability of "school" as an institution to the methods of financing any segment of education.

A third set of problems centers on Catholic education and the particular burdens that accompany it. Too often the problems of Catholic schools have been oversimplified to the point that they are identified with the dwindling number of religious personnel. However, the situation of Catholic schools was radically altered before religious communities experienced a significant loss of personnel. In 1950 religious accounted for approximately 90% of the staffing in Catholic schools while in 1967 they accounted for 55% of the staffing. The ratio of religious to lay teachers was significantly changed before religious communities experienced notable losses in personnel.

We honor the monks of St. Benedict's for their century of commitment and we pray that they will find new alternatives to maintain their presence in Newark.

We ask you to honor as well the commitment of those who served so well, so long in other schools. We ask you, too, to consider the larger picture only sketched here.

The enormity of the problem demands among other things, courage, and courage is a lonely virtue.

#### SALUTE TO SYD CASSYD

#### HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, a quarter of a century ago, Syd Cassyd, a journalist who had produced his first television show in New York on May 7, 1945, saw the need for a group which would act as a central source of information on the arts and sciences of television, soon to become the world's most vital communications tool.

Becoming the fountainhead of this new group dedicated to the advancement of television, he called together a few men in borrowed quarters and spearheaded the formation of the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences. His peers at the meeting made him chairman pro tempore until the first president could be elected. He later became the president, after having declined the honor at the first few meetings.

In November 1949 the group changed its charter and Mr. Cassyd became president of the first National Academy of

Television Arts and Sciences with its base in Hollywood and with two branches, one in Washington, D.C., and the other in San Francisco. In 1955, when the charter was again revised, the organization added seven more chapters throughout the Nation.

Over the past 25 years, this professional society has functioned in many areas of education, government, and the television industry. It has set standards of performance and achievement which are recognized each year by the awarding of the famous Emmy Award. Many of the national prominent names in the television industry had their first contacts with leaders of the arts and the industry in the halls of the academy meetings.

Because of Mr. Cassyd's accomplishment and vision in foreseeing the necessity for a group which would embody the high ideals on which he based the structure of the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, some time ago he was presented with an Honorary Emmy Award.

At this time, as the presentation of the 1972 Emmy Awards approaches, I would like to offer by salute to the founder and first national president of the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, Mr. Syd Cassyd.

#### FISHERMEN SHOULD BE HEARD

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, an interesting editorial appeared in the March 3 edition of the Seattle Times which clearly explains the status given the American fisherman by the U.S. Government. Specifically, the editorial brings out the fears within the fishing industry that the State Department plans to use fisheries as "trading stock" to win defense-related objectives at the upcoming United Nations International Law of the Sea Conference.

It should be added that the fishing industry feels it is imperative that they have the best delegate possible to represent them at next year's conference. They want our colleague from Washington (Mr. Pelly) who is retiring from Congress at the end of this year to be their representative, and I wholeheartedly support this suggestion. I urge all support possible from the Congress so that Mr. Pelly will represent U.S. fisheries at the International Law of the Sea Conference.

Meanwhile, I insert the aforementioned editorial and a resolution from the National Federation of Fishermen at this point in the RECORD:

#### FISHERMEN SHOULD BE HEARD

Congressman Pelly took note the other day of some progress in both the Atlantic and the Pacific "in the long fight to protect both our United States fisheries and our American fishermen."

Pelly cited a Danish-American agreement

that will protect North American salmon from high-seas net fishing by the Danes and a recent stiffening of the State Department treatment of nations like Ecuador that harass and seize American fishing vessels on the high seas.

But a still bigger battle over American fisheries lies on the horizon: Preliminary meetings for the United Nations International Law of the Sea Conference, to be held this year in New York City and Geneva, and the conference itself next year in Geneva.

Pelly notes that "our nation's fishery interests could suffer reverses unless these meetings are attended by representatives of the American fishing industry."

Thus far, though, the administration has largely cold-shouldered such suggestions, leading to fears within the industry that the State Department plans to use fisheries as "trading stock" to win defense-related objectives at the conference.

It is a familiar story to American fishermen. They must first fight to win support within their own government before they can hope for success in dealing with foreign governments.

#### RESOLUTION

Whereas; the Law of the Seas Conference to be held in Geneva in 1973, is now in the preparatory stage, and

Whereas; the United States preliminary proposals are at this point neither satisfactory nor adequate to protect the United States fisheries, and

Whereas; it appears that the Department of State has disregarded demands of meaningful representation by the U.S. fishing industry and must provide legitimate representation to all facets of the fishing industry, and

Whereas; the National Federation of Fishermen represents groups of fishermen in all categories of fisheries, including, but not limited to, salmon, tuna, halibut, shellfish and bottom fish, and thus has an overriding interest in the world fishery and not just an individual specie, and

Whereas; because of this interest and numbers of fishery unions and associations we represent, we must insist on having a voice in the selection of people who in the final analysis will decide our future, and the future of the U.S. fishing industry, in the Geneva Conference,

Now therefore be it resolved, we insist on due recognition as the only national organization in this fishery field and that consultations between our Federation and the Department of State be initiated at the earliest opportunity on the representation question.

Be it further resolved, that in addition to other men who may be appointed, we must strongly recommend the Honorable Thomas M. Pelly, Congressman, whom we consider the outstanding advocate for the fishery affairs in the United States, be appointed to represent the U.S. fishing industry. His long service in the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House of Representatives, and his experience and intimate knowledge of fishery legislation and problems within the industry, must be utilized for the benefit of the industry and the American people who have a great interest in our ocean resources.

Be it finally resolved that this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, Richard M. Nixon.

Respectfully submitted by the Executive Board of the National Federation of Fishermen, this 17th day of February, 1972.

RALPH A. ENNIS,

President.

#### FIRST INTERNATIONAL GEOTHERMAL CONFERENCE

### HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 15 and 16 of this year the newly formed Geothermal Resources Council held its first meeting in El Centro, Calif. Over 600 participants attended.

This was the largest conference ever held and the first international one to discuss the exploration and development of geothermal energy.

This astonishing attendance from 46 States and several foreign countries bespeaks the widespread interest in geothermal energy and portends further development in this potential source of nonpolluting power and fresh water for the benefit of mankind.

It is altogether appropriate that the first meeting of the Geothermal Resources Council convened in El Centro, for the surrounding Imperial Valley is the site of the potentially most valuable geothermal deposit in the world.

For the information of my colleagues I insert below a newsstory on the conference from the San Bernardino, Calif., Sun-Telegram of February 28, 1972:

THEY ARE ALL GETTING ON THE GEOTHERMAL POWER BANDWAGON

(By Quentin Foley)

EL CENTRO.—If there were any lingering doubts that development of geothermal resources was an idea whose time had come, those doubts were erased at the first national conference held here by the Geothermal Resources Council.

The purpose of the newly formed international organization is to encourage the exploration and development of geothermal resources to produce power, obtain fresh water and extract minerals.

"If we had gotten 100 to come to our first conference we would have considered it a success," said one council official. Organizers planned for a maximum of 200.

When reservations topped 300, council officials began to suspect they were boosters of an "in" idea.

Reservations topped 400 and worried council officials tried to limit the number but reservations just kept coming. They exceeded 500, then went over the 600 mark before finally stopping at 640.

It was the largest group ever gathered in one place in the nation to discuss geothermal resource development. It was a chance for the geothermal lease holders, financiers and governmental people to get together with the power company people and make a package.

People came from all over 46 states and several countries.

The oil men were there from Oklahoma and Texas for geothermal leases are the same as oil leases, and geothermal wells are drilled just like oil wells.

The big money men were there from Philadelphia, New York and Boston for the depletion allowance is the same for geothermal well drilling as it is for oil well exploration.

The big government men flocked in from Washington, D.C., for geothermal is a novel way to build an empire and many governmental departments are involved in geother-



mal resource development and management.

The big land owners were there from places like San Francisco. At least four were there from Southern Pacific Land Co., which owns about 2.8 million acres of land in California alone, 1.5 million acres of it in Southern California.

Politicians were there in abundance because geothermal resource development, a "safe" thing to support, and this is a big election year.

The geologists and university professors were there with the engineers for they are the ones who have to furnish the theory and technical knowledge—the brains.

They were all there. The wildcatters, speculators and wheeler dealers.

One executive of a big oil company explained how he "had his neck clear out to here" since convincing the directors to "get their feet wet and invest a few bucks in this thing."

"We're a little late getting aboard the bandwagon," he said. "But we'll be on it right up to here, from now on."

Union Oil Co. was the oil company pioneer in geothermal development, combining leases in 1967 on 9,500 acres with 5,500 acres under lease to Magma Power Co. and Thermal Power Co. in the Geysers area of Northern California where currently Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is generating 192,000 kilowatts of electricity. This year PG & E's Geysers generating capacity will be increased to 302,000 kilowatts.

The Geysers, 90 miles north of San Francisco, was first discovered by a hunter-explorer-surveyor William Bell Elliott in 1847.

It was 1960 before its first power generating plant, a 12,000 kilowatt unit, was in operation.

The only geothermal field in the United States in operation today, its future capacity has been estimated at 1,000 to 2,000 megawatts of electricity compared to the capacity of the geothermal field in Imperial Valley which has been estimated at between 20,000 and 30,000 megawatts by the most optimistic. Currently 35,000 megawatts of power are used in all of California.

The United States is far behind other nations in developing geothermal resources.

Roman documents 2,100 years old tell of the steam field at Larderello, south of Florence, Italy. During the 19th century, the Larderello geothermal field was harnessed for industrial heating and mechanical power. Now it produces more than 400,000 kilowatts of electricity.

In New Zealand, the Wairakei field supplies 192,000 kilowatts of power and in Mexico, the Cerro Prieto field, about 10 miles south of Mexicali, will start producing 32,500 kilowatts in May or June and 75,000 kilowatts by August.

Japan and Russia are far ahead of us in utilizing geothermal resources. James Koenig, executive officer of the California Division of Mines and Geology, told the conference on opening day in the Imperial Valley Country Club near Holtville.

The Mexican geothermal power plant, in fact, uses Japanese special alloy turbines.

Koenig noted that most of the underdeveloped countries of the world seem to have the greatest potential for geothermal production.

Mexico has over 120 geothermal fields and has started exploratory and development work on some.

A 30,000 kilowatt plant is going into production in San Salvador which will supply a sizable chunk of that nation's energy demand, Koenig said.

"In some of the smaller nations, development of geothermal resources will enable that nation, to a great extent, to take its first major step into the modern era," he said.

The Japanese now import 70 per cent of their energy and by 1980 will import 90 per

cent of their energy. Western United States is an energy importer, Koenig said.

New Zealand was once an importer of energy, but no longer. Development of both natural gas and geothermal resources has enabled New Zealand to cease being an importer of energy.

"The United States and Japan would like to follow in New Zealand's footsteps," Koenig said.

The development of geothermal power is the only way they now see to accomplish this.

Other nations exploring geothermal possibilities include The Philippines, Nicaragua, Turkey, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Chile. All together some 25 nations are now entering the list.

In 1967 the Bureau of Land Management set aside over 1 million acres of public land for its geothermal potential and 892,351 acres were in California.

There are at least 17 known geothermal fields in California. Italy has developed a method of finding fields where there are no visible signs of geothermal activity on the surface such as geysers, volcanoes or hot springs.

Already the state legislature has appropriated \$50,000 more for geothermal studies in the Imperial Valley, and Congress has appropriated \$800,000 for a prototype power plant there. The Bureau of Reclamation will start drilling an exploratory well in the East Mesa area of Imperial Valley in late April or early May according to Robert L. Littleton, the bureau geologist at Boulder City, Nev.

The bureau has already put down a series of test wells in the area.

Southern California Edison Co. has announced it will do exploratory geothermal work with Getty Oil Co. in the Imperial Valley early this year after sinking two dry wells with Getty at Mono Lake.

"We have \$1.2 million in the budget for drilling exploratory geothermal wells this year," said Dr. C. M. Swinney, manager of energy resources research and development for Edison.

A predecessor company, Sierras Power Co., investigated geothermal resources in the Imperial Valley in 1925 by drilling near Mullet Island just west of Niland in the Salton Sea area. Edison has been out of the action, however, until this past year but is now coming back like many others.

#### ARTHRITIS AND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1029

#### HON. DAVID PRYOR

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, because of public apathy, chronic diseases have by tradition been given little priority by Federal health agencies, although they affect many more Americans than do the acute diseases. Therefore, I would like to speak to you regarding arthritis and House Joint Resolution 1029. It is apparent that we Americans prefer to react to crises, rather than to a continuing need for improved health care. Thus, the aging, the chronically ill, and the handicapped become second-class citizens—shunted aside with token Federal support.

In a chronic disease, such as arthritis with which over 17 million Americans are afflicted—one in every four families—there is no crisis point, no time

at which the progress of the disease can be dramatically reversed and the patient returned to a state of normalcy. The chronic disease comes to stay, often forever.

Can anything then be done to treat chronic disease? The answer is "Yes." Thanks to medical research and to the improved use of newly discovered drugs.

In the case of gout, for example, which is one of the some 80 forms of arthritis, the painful swelling and inflammation can be alleviated in all but a few cases through a continuing and regular treatment with certain prescribed drugs. And even in the most severe form of arthritis, rheumatoid, crippling can usually be prevented by prompt treatment as soon as the symptoms are properly diagnosed.

But how many of our physicians are properly trained to diagnose and treat an arthritic patient? There are only 2,200 members of the American Rheumatism Association, the only professional grouping of internists, orthopedics, pediatricians, physiatrists, and other medical specialists with special training and experience in the rheumatic diseases.

If the treatment of the 17 million arthritics were to be left to the "rheumatologists," therefore, there would be one specialist for every 7,725 arthritics. These specialists, like others, tend to cluster in the large metropolitan areas of the Nation where they are near to clinical research facilities. Few specialists are to be found in the less populated sections of the country such as Arkansas. Yet, Public Health Service surveys find arthritis to be more prevalent in rural than in urban areas. For example, in this State there are only seven rheumatologists and an estimated 180,000 arthritics. Thus, instead of the national average of one rheumatologist per 7,725 patients, which is sad enough, the Arkansas ratio is one rheumatologist per 25,795 patients.

Arkansas is very fortunate in two respects, that is it has: First, a very active arthritis foundation chapter with a program of home care physical therapy with more than 1,200 patients receiving care; and second, the Leo N. Levi National Arthritis Hospital in Hot Springs, a hospital designed especially for the treatment of arthritis.

There is no Arthritis Clinical Research Center in Arkansas, in fact there are only 34 such special centers in the country, and many are clustered in a few States such as California, Georgia, Illinois, Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and Virginia.

Federal funding of arthritis research has only recently reached \$10 million annually, although there has been a National Institute for Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases since 1951. The total budget of this Institute for 1972 is over \$150 million yet only slightly over \$13 million goes to support research and training in the field of arthritis and the rheumatic diseases.

To try to help make up the difference between the need for a greatly expanded research and training program and for much improved patient services, the Arthritis Foundation was established in 1949 to bring the arthritics' message of need to the American public. The four-

dations' 75 chapters, including our own in Arkansas, raise over \$9 million each year for local and national research, training, professional and public education, clinics, and a variety of patient services. Without this public support, the plight of the average arthritic in this country would indeed be tragic. Now, however, there is hope for those afflicted with this Nation's No. 1 crippling disease. There is a beginning, and we have to be thankful for that.

Yet, as a nation, we have not yet begun to give near adequate recognition to the serious proportions of arthritis which has disabled 3¼ million Americans, and, except for heart and respiratory conditions, causes more work absences than any other disease. It is time that such national recognition be given to such a major health problem.

It has been my privilege to introduce in the House of Representatives on January 26, 1972, a resolution for a National Arthritis Month, to be so proclaimed for the month of May 1972, by the President of the United States. I call on my fellow Representatives to join with me in the support of House Joint Resolution 1029 and to join with the Arthritis Foundation in the fight against this crippling arthritis.

CONGRESSMAN ARCHER ADVOCATES PLAN TO REDUCE CONSTRUCTION COSTS

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Congressman BILL ARCHER of Houston has always been active in productivity plans for correcting inflation. Last Thursday he made a thought-provoking talk to the Legislative Conference of the Associated Builders and Contractors here in Washington. He called on labor to lead the way by relating labor rates to increased productivity in building. This sound approach by Congressman ARCHER is a suggestion that merits careful consideration. The following is Congressman ARCHER's speech:

I want to express my appreciation for the opportunity to meet here with you tonight to say a few words concerning a topic of mutual interest, the need for repeal of the long-outmoded Davis-Bacon Act. As you know, last year, along with five of my colleagues in the House, I introduced a bill that would repeal that law. Since that time I have been encouraged by a demonstration of support from around the country, much of which, I might add, has come from members of ABC. Your national office has been of great assistance to me and my staff in this matter. But we have only scratched the surface, and much remains to be done to convince a majority in Congress that repeal is in the best interest of all Americans.

Our nation is now engaged in a complicated effort to combat the evil of inflation. But unless we address ourselves to the underlying causes, we will continue to treat only the symptoms of the inflationary spiral. The time has come to stop the mis-education of the American public and to admit openly and frankly that the chief cause of runaway in-

flation (aside from continual massive deficit spending by the federal government) is the monopoly power possessed by many large labor organizations. It must be recognized that, as in the case with most monopolies, including those in business, they cannot exist or continue without the assistance and protection of government.

The January 17, 1972 edition of the *Wall Street Journal* contains an editorial entitled, "Cross Purposes in Construction." Referring specifically to the operation of the Davis-Bacon Act, the editorial says: "While the pay board is struggling to get wages under control, a number of federal laws are working effectively to push wages up. It isn't exactly novel for the government to be working at cross purposes but this instance is especially astonishing."

"Especially astonishing" is exactly the correct phrase to use, for the irony is that, at the same time that the construction trades enjoy the highest wages of all industries, they suffer from the highest unemployment rate. During 1970, unemployment in construction averaged 9.7 percent, which was about twice as high as the 4.9 percent level for industry as a whole. I understand that unemployment in the construction industry continues to linger in the 9 to 10 percent range. As Dr. Howard Kershner points out in his new book, *Dividing the Wealth*, "When unions, supported by government, established rigid wage structures they make it impossible for the more highly paid workers to offer their output on a reciprocal level to less well paid men to whom they wish to sell their goods. Thus, they create unemployment for themselves."

The fact that the Davis-Bacon Act has operated to inflate construction wage rates above their fair market value is beyond question. Whatever justification that may have existed for the passage of this law in 1931 has disappeared with changed conditions over the years.

As you know, the principal stated objective of the Act was to protect communities from the depressing influence of lower wages at which workmen might be hired elsewhere and brought into the communities on construction work. The objective was to be accomplished through contract conditions requiring payment of not less than minimum wages based on wages prevailing in the communities to be protected. However, the latest report on the implementation of the Davis-Bacon Act, issued July 14, 1971 by the General Accounting Office, stated in part that the wage rates prescribed by the Labor Department under the Act "were significantly higher than the prevailing wages in the areas and had substantially increased the cost of construction borne by the federal government." The effect is significant, as the total dollar amount of federally financed contracts reached \$28 billion in 1970.

The Wage Determination Branch of the Labor Department, which according to recent figures has 127 authorized employees, was expected to determine wage rates on some 59,000 contract awards totaling about \$30 billion in value during 1971.

The GAO report determined that the Department of Labor has consistently engaged in practices which have resulted in increases in the cost of federally supported construction. GAO's reviews, made over the past decade for selected construction projects, indicated that, as a result of minimum wages being established at rates higher than those actually prevailing in the area of the project, construction costs increased 5 to 15 percent. Well, I don't have to relate many more specifics because most of you are painfully aware of the ill effects of Davis-Bacon. However, I would like to point out another example of how the Act causes the government to operate at cross purposes against itself. In a recently concluded study authorized by

the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Dr. John P. Gould, an economist at the University of Chicago, said, "High prevailing wage determinations appear to discourage nonunion contractors from bidding on federal construction. . . . This means that nonunion contractors are less competitive and that the government has to pay a premium price for construction work, and that the bargaining power of the unionized construction workers is strengthened substantially."

Dr. Gould goes on to demonstrate in some detail that the Davis-Bacon Act would tend to cause inflation even if local wages were accurately reflected in the determination of prevailing wages. He says, "This is because the Davis-Bacon Act per se may alter the market structure and the nature of competition in the industry."

What will happen in the industry without Davis-Bacon? We can look at a recent example, the period in early 1971 when President Nixon temporarily suspended the law. Unfortunately, the suspension lasted only a little more than a month. But the reaction of some union leaders was proof that the suspension was indeed operating to check the upward escalation of construction wages. In a syndicated column on April 10, 1971, labor reporter Victor Riesel made the following comment: "Why the sudden anger? Well, in one New England city some operating engineers' wages had been sliced from about \$6.50 an hour to \$3.50. As new bids were coming in after the Davis-Bacon suspension, contractors were cutting their wage costs. At Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Ohio, the bid on some family housing units came in for some \$400,000 less. At some projected family units in Arizona, the bid came in for \$50,000 less. At a proposed small El Paso, Texas, hospital the bid returned \$51,000 less than the previous bid. These were but symptoms—but there were hundreds of them."

There are some who will undoubtedly say that repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act is "anti-labor," but nothing could be further from the truth. Inflation hurts us all, and it must be brought under control. Repeal of Davis-Bacon is one major step in the right direction.

In closing, I want to thank you for your recent efforts in lobbying for repeal. I hope that you will continue those efforts. Specifically I would urge you to—

Write, or visit, your Congressman to urge support for this legislation;

Write to all Members of the House Committee on Education and Labor to urge immediate hearings on this matter;

Inform your employees of the pitfalls of Davis-Bacon; after all, it is their jobs which are at stake;

And lastly, please send to me the specifics of any ill effects caused by the Davis-Bacon Act which you can personally testify to.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to be here tonight, for without the support of persons such as yourselves, we could not hope to achieve any measure of success.

ANDY GENDRON AWARDED NATIONAL GOLD MEDAL FOR PATRIOTISM BY FREEDOMS FOUNDATION

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest pride that I bring to the attention of the Members of this body the award of



the Freedoms Foundation 1971 Annual George Washington Gold Medal Award for Patriotic Activities to my very good friend Andrew Gendron of my hometown of Pitman, N.J.

I have the greatest respect for Andy Gendron who is known to his community first as a true and loyal American, and his comment upon his selection of the Freedoms Foundation Award embodies an ideal to which we should all aspire:

I respect the privilege and responsibility of being an American and will continue to put forth every effort to extol and defend the great virtues of this country and our freedom. I will as vigorously continue to work for the improvement that is always possible in any society so our children, and our children's children, will be able to enjoy the wonderful heritage of a free people that our forefathers so intelligently conceived and fought to attain.

Mr. Speaker, a bit of the background that led to Andy Gendron's selection for this award is recited in the following article that appeared in the Pitman Review:

ANDY GENDRON AWARDED NATIONAL GOLD MEDAL FOR PATRIOTISM BY FREEDOMS FOUNDATION

The Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge announced this week that Andrew D. Gendron of Pitman was selected for national honors as the recipient of their 1971 Annual George Washington Gold Medal Award for Patriotic Activities.

The George Washington Gold Medal Award was presented to Gendron for a number of patriotic accomplishments in 1971 and recent years. The nomination consisted of a portfolio of his writings, speeches and related achievements. The portfolio was submitted by Mary Catherine Gendron, wife of the awards recipient.

The portfolio included an editorial featured in the Pitman Review titled, "The Most Wonderful Freedom of All." This editorial was on the United Fund and "Freedom's Golden Rule . . . the freedom to help your fellowman in need." The editorial was also submitted for special consideration in Gendron's behalf by Walter Sibley, Executive Director of the United Fund of Gloucester County.

When asked to comment on his selection as recipient of the Freedoms Foundation Medal, Gendron said, "I am indeed grateful to be so fortunate as to have lived all my life in so wonderful a country . . . and to be honored by an institution so highly respected by the great leaders and people of this nation."

Andy Gendron continued, "I respect the privilege and responsibility of being an American and will continue to put forth every effort to extol and defend the great virtues of this country and our freedom. I will as vigorously continue to work for the improvement that is always possible in any society, so our children, and our children's children, will be able to enjoy the wonderful heritage of a free people that our forefathers so intelligently conceived and fought to attain."

Gendron added that he was very proud to receive the honor because "it really means that I was able, in some small way, to help make my fellowman more aware and appreciative of the truly great privilege we enjoy as citizens of the United States of America."

The Freedoms Foundation is honoring Gendron for "Patriotic Activities," cited his "outstanding accomplishment in helping to achieve a better understanding of America and Americans."

The Freedoms Foundation is dedicated to the principle that freedom belongs to all people, "and that only by thoughts and acts

in their everyday lives can the American people preserve and extend their liberty under law."

The Foundation was established at Valley Forge in March 1949. It is a nonprofit, nonsectarian, and nonpolitical organization. The Freedoms Foundation acts to encourage all citizens to "speak up for freedom" through its National and School Awards program.

Andrew Gendron is an executive at RCA Parts and Accessories, where he is manager of Accessories Merchandising. He is a member of the RCA "P and A's" Management Club Steering Committee and a recently organized Environmental Committee.

Gendron is a Pitman Borough Councilman and President of the Council. In addition, he is Director of Public Safety with responsibility for the Police Department, Fire Department, Ambulance Corps, Rescue Squad, Court Clerk and Building Inspection.

Gendron is also Deputy Director of Public Property. He also writes a "Public Safety At Work" column which appears regularly in the Review.

Andy Gendron has been an active member of the Board of Directors and the Executive Committee of the United Fund of Gloucester County. In 1971, Gendron was General Campaign Chairman for the United Fund in Gloucester County.

Gendron was recently honored by the Southern New Jersey Council of the Boy Scouts of America for his "Service to Boyhood." In 1970, the Elwood Kindle Post No. 49 of the American Legion selected Gendron as "Citizen of the Year."

Several of Gendron's writings have been read into the Congressional Record. Gendron was instrumental in developing the idea for a special resolution called "Freedom with Responsibility" in addition to other writings associated with the "Appreciate America" campaign.

"I will particularly cherish the Gold Medal Award because it was made by a distinguished jury of men and women from throughout the country, who have high principles, loyalty and faith in the American way of life," Gendron asserted. "They are dedicated individuals who support the American credo with action and fervor. I respect their aims and accomplishments and am proud to be singled out by so honorable a group . . . and a foundation that has been acclaimed and held in high esteem for its patriotic objectives and achievements . . . the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge."

#### "COMMUNITY CONCERN": A BACKGROUND REPORT

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce into the RECORD, for the benefit of my colleagues, an outstanding example of volunteerism at the community level to help make the society we all live in better.

"Community Concern" is a sincere expression of five individuals who care about opening up the availability of services both to and for the community.

The theme of the report is indeed a noble and worthy concept. As the report states:

We believe it absolutely essential that the broadcast possible grassroots involvement be developed.

I agree.

I know my colleagues would be inter-

ested in what a group of concerned citizens is doing privately in cooperation with Government.

I want to lend my support to this project and strongly commend these individuals on their outstanding efforts on behalf of their community.

I wish them success, and pledge my best efforts to work with them for the benefit of our community and our country.

Mr. Speaker, I include a report on "Community Concern" at this point in the RECORD:

#### COMMUNITY CONCERN: A BACKGROUND REPORT

In a variety of ways, the lives of those who live in the Towns of Evans and Brant run parallel with many others. With others, we share similar styles of labor and leisure . . . similar joys and frustrations . . . similar hopes and dreams. And, with others, we share a certain fearfulness, generated by those continuing challenges which we see assaulting our traditional values.

In a recent survey, leaders of our community listed the following order of priority concerns:

1. Family Breakdown.
2. Drugs among youth.
3. Youthful offenders.
4. Alcoholism.
5. Marital enrichment.

As you will recognize, even those priority concerns are shared by others . . . and the only thing that makes them unique . . . the only thing that sets them apart as being special . . . is the realization that they are our problems. Others may have similar ones, but these are ours and they influence that context within which we are attempting to discover meaning . . . within which we are trying to raise our children, nurture our marriages, and spend our retirement years.

What we've said so far is really nothing new . . . we've all known that those areas of concern exist . . . we all know that from time to time certain groups of civic minded individuals have emerged in an effort to do something constructive about those concerns. But, if we take a realistic look at the situation, with full appreciation for all of those efforts that have thus far been expended, certain questions become obvious.

1. We have all been told that Erie County has a variety of services available for its residents. But who among us knows the correct contact to make to assure deliverance of the proper service at the moment of greatest need?

2. A handful of interested citizens may present their concerns to the county, but what kind of pressure can they realistically assert?

3. In order to develop and coordinate a meaningful program that is both therapeutic and preventive, a full time effort is required. Who among us has such time available?

4. We have been told that County, State, and Federal funds exist to provide meaningful programs to meet community needs. But those funds can only be released to legally incorporated groups which have been specifically authorized to deliver designated services, but where among us is there such a group?

5. All of us are aware that a united effort has more hope of being effective than does an individualistic one, so wouldn't a coordinated effort be advantageous?

In addition to those questions, a survey, conducted in our area in the Spring of 1970 by the Children's Aid Society for the Erie County Department of Mental Health, clearly indicated that community leaders felt a real need for a community mental health center that would be "Readily accessible to the people of the community; and that would be staffed by professionals and neighbor-

hood trained para-professionals. The para-professionals were seen as an important link between the professionals and the people seeking counseling services. Easy communication with those that seek help from a community health center was felt to be important if the center is to maintain a reputation in the community as a place where real help is offered . . ."

Out of those questions and concerns, a focus developed on the need for a legally authorized incorporation to provide "on the scene" assistance through a co-ordinated effort under the guidance of a full time staff. Consequently, the following men began meeting in the early summer (1971) to develop a plan of action:

Pastor Donald F. Anderson (Chairman), Holy Cross Lutheran Church, Farnham.

Mr. David A. Burchett, Assistant Superintendent, Lake Shore Central Schools.

Mr. Daniel J. Corgett, Field Representative, Erie County Migrant Committee.

Mr. Richard A. Horwood, Superintendent of Institutional Care and After Care, Erie County Family Court, Village Justice, Farnham.

Mr. Carl F. Ulmer, President, Evans National Bank of Angola.

With the legal assistance of Mr. Phillip Brothman, this group has now been incorporated by the State of New York under the corporate title of *Community Concern of Evans and Brant, New York, Incorporated* as a not for profit corporation to "by a community-based effort . . . provide a helping relationship to persons in social or emotional stress and, in conjunction therewith, to perform such services as family unit counseling with adults, youth, and children, crisis counseling and referral services. . ."

To be more specific, Community Concern sees its function as five fold:

1. To provide such training opportunities as are requested by existing groups in our community so that their expertise in dealing with individuals can be developed.
2. To develop additional programs to better enable our community to express its concern for its own.
3. To provide opportunities for community self help groups to meet under the guidance of an enabler.
4. To function in an advocacy role and to develop additional advocacy groups focused on matters of community or individual concern.
5. To act as a central referral and coordinating agency between our community and existing governmental programs so that a more rapid deliverance of service can be provided.

No one is more sensitive than are the incorporators that at the present time, their incorporation title, i.e. Community Concern, is at best a misnomer. At the present time, it is an expression of five individuals who care about opening up the availability of services both to and for the community.

We believe that it is absolutely essential that the broadest possible base of grass roots involvement be developed. Because of this concern, every possible attempt is being made to contact every organization in our geographic area, to share with them what we are attempting to do, and to urge them to nominate a representative from their organization to serve on a Community Advisory Board.

The purpose of this Community Advisory Board will be to reflect the composite of the community, to meet on a periodic basis, to review request for program assistance and developments and to thus assure that the concerns of the community will not only be heard but will be met. An additional function of those who would serve on such an advisory board would be to channel information back to those organizations which they represent.

We believe that in such a development, our combined focus will become more clear, our awareness of present and impending needs can be sensitized, our pooling of insights can be creatively utilized in enhancing our life together. If such a concern can emerge and be co-ordinated, our present thinking, which, of course, is open for negotiations, leads us to believe that the following staff positions need to be filled.

A full time administrator who can serve as a facilitator in the development of a community support system that can be reflective of, and address itself to, matters of community concern. It would be preferable if, in addition to strong administrative skills, this individual would have expertise as an enabler who could offer training sessions to community paraprofessionals and volunteers.

A second full time staff position would be filled by one who would concentrate his/her efforts on enabling meaningful concern to be expressed to youth and family related issues. We believe that the focus of this staff person should be on assisting those who have expressed a need for help . . . and that such assistance, if it is to be viable, must maintain the strictest of confidentiality.

A third full time staff position would be filled by one who would be able to assist area school officials, clergy, etc. as well as individuals to relate to proper county services that could be helpful in specific situations. An additional responsibility would be to assist the community to develop ways (such as FISH and advocacy groups) in which it can express its concern for its own.

Such a program will, of course, necessitate funding. But here, too, certain possibilities are being explored. The Upper New York Synod of the Lutheran Church in America has already guaranteed a grant of \$7,000.00 seed money which will be available in 1972. As a participant with two other similar groups . . . one in Collins/North Collins and one in Springville, Community Concern, through Gowanda State Hospital has applied for a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health.

Discussions are presently under way with the Erie County Department of Mental Health in an effort to obtain their approval of our proposed program so that they can match, on a dollar for dollar basis, the moneys that are locally raised. It is also possible that through their connections, Town, Village, and School officials might be able to open up some additional possibilities for funding.

In addition, we believe that there may well be at least some private citizens who may wish to make personal contributions. Some organizations may wish to do the same.

We believe that this program can become a reality and can be in operation by early fall of 1972. But, if that is to emerge, we need your interest. It's our community . . . and it will be and become exactly what we want it to be.

#### MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

#### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the winning Voice of Democracy Contest speech from the State of California. The winning speech was delivered by Mr. Gary Sterling Ness, of San Diego, Calif., a resident of my congressional district and a senior at Clairmont High School. All of us in San

Diego are very proud of Gary and I am happy to share with my House colleagues his thought-provoking speech, entitled "My Responsibility to Freedom":

#### MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

(By Gary S. Ness)

Do I have a responsibility to freedom? Maybe not. Maybe I can ignore my heritage and let the government tell me I'm free. Maybe the rights and privileges I have now can never be taken away from me by anyone. Maybe. That's an extremely dangerous word. And in this case it's wrong.

What would happen if I or anyone chose to ignore their heritage, their rights and privileges? Probably the government they lived under would tell them they were "free". And they would be. But they'd be free in the worst sense of the word. Because they'd be free from decisions. Decisions like where to live, where to work, and what to learn. They'd be free alright. But what freedom!

The "freedoms" that those people would be given would be freedoms from duties and responsibilities; but that type of freedom is freedom from liberty, honor, and, believe it or not, from freedom itself. I'm certain that what I've just said is ambiguous, but before you judge it let me explain my beliefs.

First, what is freedom? Above all, freedom is responsibility. Responsibility to yourself, to protect your inalienable rights that are guaranteed you in the Constitution of the United States of America.

But freedom is also responsibility to others. The responsibility of protecting other peoples' rights, as well as our own. Why protect other's rights? One example can be found in the statement of a man released from a Nazi concentration camp after the fall of the Third Reich. This is his story.

"First they came to get the Jews, but that didn't bother me because I wasn't a Jew. Then they came to get some of the devout Catholics, but that didn't really concern me because I wasn't a Catholic. Then they came to take the Protestants and I pleaded for help, but no one was left to help me."

That story shows how we must protect our freedom. Sure, we could recognize liberties and rights just for ourselves, but taking all the privileges we want for ourselves would sooner or later damage someone else's rights; and then what would happen when someone came to take away our rights? Then, just like the man in the concentration camp, there wouldn't be anyone left with the right to help us.

The United States was founded on the ideal of freedom as responsibility. We have freedom of the press, providing the publisher takes the responsibility of printing material that won't infringe upon the rights of the people who will be exposed to it. We have freedom of speech, but only when the speaker accepts the responsibility of not slandering other people's opinions and ideas merely because he doesn't agree with them. We have the freedom to pursue happiness in our own way, but only when the person seeking happiness accepts the responsibility of respecting other people's rights at the same time.

All the rights and freedoms given to us by the Constitution are based on one premise; the premise that the people who have those rights will be mature, responsible citizens.

We, as responsible citizens, must work to maintain the freedom of ourselves and our fellow-citizens. How do we do it? The answer is in the subject of this speech. Responsibility.

We can show our responsibility by showing our concern. We can tell our opinions to our elected officials and see that the government suits our needs through our power of voting. We can respect other people and their rights; the same rights we have. We can work within and for our government, through our laws.



Throughout my speech I've referred mostly to "we". The subject was "My Responsibility to Freedom". But, what I've said is valid because it applies to me, you, and every citizen who will bear the responsibility of freedom. I've stated our responsibility to freedom. Our responsibility that is freedom.

## PERSECUTION WITHIN THE SOVIET UNION

**HON. JOHN G. DOW**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, the persecution of intellectuals in the Soviet Union who dare to stand up in defense of the human and constitutional rights of the people of the Ukraine is not well documented in the West. During the week of January 10, the Ukrainian KGB again displayed their callous disregard for human rights by rounding up 19 prominent Ukrainian intellectuals. Their "crime" was that they had courageously demanded that the Soviet regime abide by its own laws in the Ukraine.

A concerned and articulate constituent of mine, Mr. Paul Nedwell of Poughkeepsie, N.Y., has long been a vocal opponent of such activities in the Soviet Union. Recently Mr. Nedwell has written to Peter Shelest, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist recent act of suppression in the Ukraine. In his letter Mr. Nedwell very perceptively points out that the Soviet policy is, in reality, nothing more than a vain attempt to stem the tide of national rebirth of the Ukraine nation by branding as criminals all those with the courage to speak up in defense of basic human rights.

I commend to my colleagues Mr. Nedwell's letter.

POUGHKEEPSIE, N.Y.,  
February 2, 1972.

PETER SHELEST,  
First Secretary of the Central Committee of  
the Communist Party of Ukraine, Central  
Committee Building, Ordzhonikidze  
Street, Kiev, Ukr. S.S.R.

DEAR FIRST SECRETARY PETER SHELEST: The recent news from Ukraine that 19 Ukrainian intellectuals had been arrested by the Ukrainian KGB during the week of January 10th in Kiev and Lviv for the "crime" of courageously standing in defense of the human and constitutional rights of the Ukrainian people has aroused the indignation of the entire Ukrainian Community in the West and has stirred Ukrainians young and old to protest against this new act of repression in Ukraine. These 19 men—among whom are numbered Vyacheslav Chornovil, Ivan Svitychny, Ivan Dzyuba and Evhen Sverstiuk, names well known to many in the West—acting through proper Soviet channels, simply demanded that the Soviet authorities in Ukraine abide by their own laws and that they respect the human and constitutional rights of the Ukrainian people. And what was the reply of the Soviet authorities to their legitimate, and entirely lawful, demands? Arrest and imprisonment!

Discarding all show of genuine justice, the Soviet authorities in Ukraine are attempting in vain to stem the tide of the national rebirth of the Ukrainian nation by throwing into prison all those who would dare to stand in defense of their own people's human and

constitutional rights. And to all who would question the justice of their actions, they merely reply that these defenders of the rights of man are mere "criminals." You would do well to heed the words of another persecuted Ukrainian intellectual, Valentyn Moroz, written in his recent statement, "Instead of a Last Plea," which was presented to the court during his second illegal trial in Ukraine. In this statement Moroz said:

"You persist in repeating that those who are in prison are just criminals. You close your eyes and act as though there were no problem. Very well. With such an unwise assumption you might be able to last for perhaps ten more years. But what then? The new processes in Ukraine and all over the Soviet Union are just beginning. The rebirth of Ukraine is not yet a mass phenomenon, but do not be quick to rejoice. It will not always be that way. In an era of total literacy, when there are 800,000 students in Ukraine and everyone owns a radio, every social phenomenon becomes a mass phenomenon. Is it possible you do not understand that you will soon have to deal with social trends on a mass scale? The new processes are only beginning, and your repressions have already ceased to be effective. What will happen next?"

It is not too late to restore the reign of justice in Ukraine. It is not too late to renounce the outdated politics of repression. But there is only one way out for the Soviet regime in its present precarious situation. And for some enlightenment on this one way out, you would again do well to note Moroz's words in his above-mentioned statement. Touching on this one way out, Moroz wrote: "There is only one way out: renounce the outdated politics of repression and find new forms of coexistence with the new trends which have already anchored themselves irrevocably in our life. Such is reality. They have appeared without asking permission to do so and have generated new circumstances which demand a new approach. For persons called upon to handle governmental matters there is enough to think about."

I herein protest against the illegal actions of the Soviet authorities in arresting these 19 Ukrainian intellectuals and appeal to you, in the name of justice, to restore freedom to these men, and also their former jobs. If not, your regime will only be weakened a little more by the righteous indignation you arouse in the Ukrainian masses by your actions in regard to these honest men.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL NEDWELL.

## THE CHINA TRIP

**HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, James T. Housewright, president of the Retail Clerks International Union and editor of its publication, the Advocate, commented in the March edition about President Nixon's trip to China.

Mr. Housewright urges Americans to be patient and not to expect miracles from the China trip and the scheduled visit to the Soviet Union. I fully support the points made in Mr. Housewright's editorial and I am including it in the RECORD at this point:

MR. NIXON: WE SALUTE YOUR JOURNEY EAST

As I write this editorial, President Nixon is making history. His trips to China and Russia are perhaps the most dramatic events in his years as President, and I hope they lead to his most successful accomplishments.

The stakes are extraordinarily high, for the trips may well presage a new period in international relations, one where the peoples in our troubled world can breathe more freely.

President Nixon realizes how crucial, yet how difficult, is this task. The news commentators, unusually impressed by his meticulous preparation for the trips, reported him spending many hours studying the intricacies of Sino-Soviet politics. He plowed through the transcripts of the Kissinger-Chou En-lai conversations, and immersed himself in a mountain of briefing papers. So he went forth prepared. And without illusions.

However, many Americans may be so swept up in the drama that their expectations become impossible to meet. This will be unfortunate for, I fear, hard world realities are sure to deflate fanciful expectations.

Let us remember what the President is attempting. As he said in his State of the World message, "There has been virtually no contact between Mainland China and the American people for two decades." Relations with Russia of course existed, but they too have been remote and strained.

Indeed, for all his vaunted ability in the international field, President Nixon would need superhuman finesse to show immediate, significant and tangible results from the China trip.

The President is more hopeful about his visit to Russia, but again I urge people to be patient.

In fact, in their very nature the trips must produce some good. They open up lines of communication, and more importantly, they create face-to-face relationships. These are intangibles, so hard to measure or get excited about, yet so necessary to ease international tensions.

And this goes to the core of our support for the trips. As James Reston pointed out, even a slight easing of world tensions makes the President's gambit, in Reston's words, "a useful journey."

We would put it more strongly.

All of man's hopes and achievements have been marred in the past two decades by a terrible background threat, nuclear holocaust.

It is to Mr. Nixon's credit that he is grasping a chance to ease this danger, for as he has said, "Contact now might help avert a disastrous catastrophe later."

So we salute the journey East and wish the President success in the quest we all seek together: world peace.

## STRIP MINE BILL HAS TEETH

**HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, the February 29, 1972, issue of the Dayton, Ohio, Daily News, carried a column by its outdoors editor Dave Bowring on strip mining legislation, H.R. 12443, introduced by my friend and colleague Congressman JOHN D. DINGELL, of Michigan.

I would like to share Mr. Bowring's thoughts with all of my colleagues and I include the text of his column at this point in the RECORD:

STRIP MINE BILL HAS TEETH

(By Dave Bowring)

Not everybody has his finger in the coal mining pie.

At least not Rep. John D. Dingell (D-Mich.), whose HR 12443 presently awaits the

pleasure of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The bill reveals a loss of patience on the part of federal government in waiting for individual states to enact and enforce effective legislation governing the reclamation of strip mined lands in the U.S.

Rep. Dingell's bill, in brief, calls for federal jurisdiction before and after mining has taken place. The legislation would require the Secretary of the Interior to draw up "a national plan for the restoration of all lands in the United States upon which any strip mine operation has been or is being carried out." The plan would control the minimization of adverse effects on the environment, and require that mined lands be returned to "their condition prior to the date which any such mining operation began."

You can't ask for plainer language than that.

Should the bill pass, no owner or operator of a mine not covered by an Interior-approved reclamation plan, would be permitted to sell coal in interstate commerce.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to purchase, or acquire by condemnation, any stripped lands provided (1) no plan for restoration of those lands has been approved by the Secretary, or (2) the lands are covered by an approved plan, but the owner or operator does not comply with the plan.

The Secretary is also given authority to restore any unreclaimed land, and to assess the owner or operator the fair market value for such restoration. Such land would then become wildlife and recreation lands under state or federal administration.

In a letter to this writer, Rep. Dingell explained his reasons for submitting the bill. "The intent of my legislation is that mine operators shall be obliged to pay the cost of restoring strip mined lands as a cost of doing business. Unless they undertake to do so according to a plan approved by the Secretary of the Interior, the operator would not be able to sell or offer for sale in interstate commerce, any coal or other material obtained from his mine."

Rep. Dingell continued, "After considerable reflection upon the need to be able to utilize our natural resources in accordance with sound environmental principles, I reached the conclusion that a program along the lines proposed in my bill would be in the public interest."

Ohio should support HR 12443 fully, but it won't. Not while Hanna Coal Co. president Ralph W. Hatch insists Hanna will have to shut down operations if the "tough" strip mine bill is not watered down to the point where profit margins for stripped coal remain unchanged.

Not while a state senator indicted for illegal strip mining on national forest land serves on a senate committee hearing amendments for that "tough" bill.

And not while Daily News-tested strip mine ponds, called "sweet water reservoirs" by their creator, tests out at an acid pH below 3.0. The pond in point is near McArthur, O., but is typical of such impoundments throughout southeastern Ohio.

Rep. Wayne N. Aspinall (D-Colo.) serves as chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs committee. Rep. Aspinall has a long history in giving such legislation as Rep. Dingell's every bit of non-support he can muster.

It is not likely HR 12443 will pass the committee, at least not as proposed. There must be loopholes, or the bill will be pigeon-holed to die a natural death.

But those wishing to see Ohio and the entire country benefit can write to Reps. Wayne Aspinall, John P. Saylor, or any of the 37 other representatives on the Interior and Insular Affairs committee voicing support. There are no Ohioans on the committee.

Address your letters to either Rep. John D. Dingell, or the above-named individuals care of the U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515.

Let's make mine reclamation more than just "lipstick on a corpse."

#### MONTEREY PARK CLERK APPOINTED TO ELECTION LAW ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, for several years the Nation has been crying out for reform in our election laws. I am proud to note that in my own State of California the legislature has decided to do something about it and has established a joint committee for the revision of the California Elections Code, together with a select advisory committee to aid the joint committee in its efforts.

I am even more proud that one of my constituents Laurie McMillan, the city clerk of Monterey Park, has been appointed to serve as a member of that advisory committee.

Mrs. McMillan becomes one of four city clerks to serve on the advisory committee—there are 477 city clerks in cities throughout California. The committee also includes the State Attorney General and the Secretary of State in California.

Qualifications used in selecting members include: Integrity, knowledgeable experience, education, length of service in office, honesty, intellect, professionalism, and qualifications based upon service in matters of election legislation and administration.

It is an honor for Monterey Park and the 29th Congressional District to have Laurie McMillan serving in this very important and vital capacity. I am attaching two newspaper articles that give additional information on the task of this committee and on the experience and affiliations of Mrs. McMillan:

[From the Monterey Park (Calif.) Progress]  
CITY CLERK NAMED TO COMMITTEE

City Clerk Laurie McMillan has been appointed by Senator Mervyn M. Dymally to the Advisory Committee to the Joint Committee for the Revision of the Elections Code.

During the 1971 Session, the California Legislature established a Joint Committee to revise the California Elections Code.

An Advisory Committee was established to aid the Joint Committee in its deliberations.

#### COMPOSITION

The statewide committee is comprised of 19 appointees, four of whom are City Clerks from a field of 477 City Clerks in the state. Mrs. McMillan is the only Clerk from a general law city and will represent this segment of municipal government.

Other members of the committee include State Attorney General Evelle Younger and Secretary of State Edmund Brown, Jr.

Joint committee members are Senator Mervyn M. Dymally, chairman; Senators Dennis E. Carpenter and Arlen Gregorio, Assemblymen William L. Brown, Jr., Paul Priolo and Henry A. Waxman.

Mrs. McMillan said, "to be selected for appointment on this committee is indeed a

high honor and a privilege, not only for me personally, but to my City of Monterey Park and its citizens.

"I shall be proud to serve on this august body and dedicated towards making contributions which will assist legislative determinations for the revision of the California Elections Code.

#### STUDY FACTS

The Committee is authorized and directed to ascertain, study and analyze all facts relating to the revision of the elections code.

#### OFFICES

City Clerk McMillan holds affiliations and office with the following organizations:

Director, Southern California City Clerk's Association; Editor, "A Matter of Record," So. Calif. City Clerk's Assn. tabloid; Charter Secretary, California State Association of Local Elected Officials; Political Activity Committeewoman, International Institute of Municipal Clerks.

Vice-Chairman, Legislative Action Committee, So. Calif. City Clerk's Assn.; sole City Clerk representative to the County Clerks' Association and the Joint City and County Legislative Action Committees; 8th term on the League of California Cities Election City Clerk's Handbook Revision Committee, with the special assignment of revising and re-writing the chapter relating to elections; So. Calif. City Clerk's Association liaison representative to the California State Legislature; and a Deputy Registrar of Voters.

#### CLERK GAINS STATE POST

City Clerk Laurie McMillan has been appointed by Senator Mervyn M. Dymally to the Advisory Committee of the Joint Committee for the Revision of the Elections Code.

During the 1971 session, the California Legislature established a joint committee to revise the California Elections Code. As prescribed by law, an advisory committee was established to aid the Joint Committee in its deliberations.

The background of each committee appointee was thoroughly investigated regarding integrity knowledgeable experience, education, length of service to office honesty, intellect, professionalism and qualifications based upon service in matters of election legislation and administration with city and county professional associations from government agencies of various levels and the League of California Cities.

The prestigious statewide committee is comprised of 19 appointees, four of whom are city clerks from a field of 477 city clerks in the state, Monterey Park's City Clerk, McMillan, is the only city clerk from a general law city and will represent this segment of municipal government.

As set forth in the new law of the government code, other members of the committee include State Attorney General Evelle Younger, Secretary of State Edmund Brown, Jr., San Diego County Registrar of Voters Charles Sexton, Alameda County Registrar of Voters Rene Davidson, and former Secretary of State, H. P. "Pat" Sullivan, who is now Assistant to the Registrar of Voters of Los Angeles County. The latter has been named chairman of the Advisory Committee.

Joint committee members are Senator Dymally, chairman; Senator Dennis E. Carpenter, Senator Arlen Gregorio, Assemblyman Willie L. Brown, Jr., Assemblyman Paul Priolo, and Assemblyman Henry A. Waxman, vice chairman.

In accepting her appointment, Mrs. McMillan said, "to be selected for appointment on this committee is indeed a high honor and a privilege, not only for me personally, but to my city of Monterey Park and its citizens, and I shall be proud to serve on this august body and dedicated towards making contributions which will assist legislative determinations for the revision of the California Elections Code."



This is the first time legislation to revise the elections code has materialized. There have been many proposals considered by the State Legislature over the years. The last revision of the elections code was in 1935, and only on a modicum basis, when the section of the California laws relating to elections was removed from the public code. This also is the first time in the state's history that the committee will be funded by the legislature, with its members receiving no compensation.

#### A TRIBUTE TO FREDERICK LOEWE

### HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most outstanding composers of our time is Frederick Loewe, whose home is in my district. The residents and communities of the Coachella Valley in California have honored him by declaring March 11 Frederick Loewe Day, and I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the man whose music for the stage and screen have given us such timeless and beautiful melodies as "It's Almost Like Being in Love," "The Heather on the Hill," and "On the Street Where You Live."

Born in Vienna, Austria, on June 10, 1904, Mr. Loewe was the son of a famous operetta tenor, the original star of Oskar Strauss' "The Chocolate Soldier," and creator of the role of Prince Danilo in Franz Lehar's "The Merry Widow." At the age of 2 he accompanied his father on tour in the United States. Already a skillful pianist at age 4, at 9 he composed the tunes for a music hall sketch in which his father toured Europe, and at 15 he wrote "Katrina," a popular song that sold 2 million copies in Europe. He studied piano with two noted European musicians, Ferruccio Busoni, and Eugene d'Albert, and at 13 he had begun his concert career, as soloist with some of Europe's leading symphony orchestras. He was awarded the Hollander Medal in Berlin in 1923 and studied composition and orchestration with Nikolaus von Reznicek before deciding to accompany his father to America in 1924.

Arriving in the United States, Mr. Loewe gave a concert at Town Hall in New York, followed by a week's engagement at the Rivoli Theatre. Since neither of these led to concert engagements, he tried teaching music and played at Greenwich Village night clubs. When music failed to provide a living, he worked as a bus boy in a cafeteria and as a riding instructor at a New Hampshire resort. A brief career as a flyweight boxer ended with a knockout in his ninth bout, after which Mr. Loewe decided to test his luck out West, trying cowpunching, gold mining, and carrying mail on horseback over the mountains in Montana, before returning to New York City.

He found work playing a piano in a Yorkville brauhaus, and in 1935 his song, "Love Tiptoes Through My Heart" was bought for the musical play "Petticoat Fever." His musical, "Salute to Spring,"

was presented in St. Louis in 1937, and in 1938 his musical play "Great Lady" reached Broadway. Unfortunately, it ran for only 20 performances, despite a notable cast including Dorothy Kirsten and choreography by Jerome Robbins.

At the Lambs Club in 1942 Loewe met the lyricist Alan Jay Lerner, and they shortly joined forces to become one of the most successful teams in theatrical history. With Lerner contributing the words and Loewe the music, they produced together such outstanding musical plays as "Paint Your Wagon," "Brigadoon," "My Fair Lady," "Gigi," and "Camelot."

The musical is a uniquely American contribution to the entertainment world, and its development in the past three decades owes a great deal to the talent of Frederick Loewe, whose songs will continue to be enjoyed for generations to come.

Frederick Loewe Day is indeed a special day for all of us who enjoy exceptional music.

#### THE TRIP TO CHINA

### HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to me to see an editorial from the newspaper of one of the oldest towns in the country that praises President Nixon's recent trip to China in his continuing effort for world peace.

I am speaking of a recent editorial in the Plymouth, Mass., Old Colony Memorial.

The editorial, entitled "The Trip to China," looks, briefly, at the President's past posture regarding China and his apparent transition in the cause of peace and the cause of understanding.

It notes that when one considers the President's frame of reference prior to the visit, one must credit him with having enormous amounts of courage to reverse our policy on Vietnam, and even more courage to seize the "forbidding nettle of China."

The editorial concludes that the trip to China was a lunar landing of sorts, across unfathomable political spaces. That landing, I feel, is a giant step toward world peace.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to offer this worthwhile editorial from the Old Colony Memorial from Plymouth—which is generally conceded to be America's hometown—to my fellow Congressmen:

#### THE TRIP TO CHINA

What will come of President Nixon's trip to China? Why did he go there in the first place? Millions of Americans have been asking themselves these questions.

Well, always remember it is the prerogative of all Presidents to change their minds on big issues. They can hardly avoid it, as the whole world bears down on them.

Still, with Nixon anti-communism has been a political way of life, his very stock in trade. For years and years, with unwavering conviction, he portrayed communism as the

devil's invention, spawned in treachery and conspiracy, a political abortion. It is perfectly obvious, as in the case of Russia or China, that communism may arise spontaneously in certain historical situations. But Nixon never gave an atom's weight to this objective consideration.

Even as late as 1968 Nixon was running Red China into the ground. Again and again he vowed never to come to terms with Peking, in any way, shape or fashion. The tie to Formosa and Chiang Kai-shek was sacred.

Did Nixon, the 1968 campaigner, really mean what he was saying? Or was he merely playing up to his conservative constituency, the diehards who stuck by him and financed his comeback all through years of frustration?

He was in fact buttering them up, we think, telling them what he knew so well they loved to hear. Inside Nixon's head the scene was quite different. By the time he got into the White House he had become a much different man from the Nixon of the Alger Hiss and vice presidency days.

In the interim he had traveled widely, enduring intense political adversity in the wilderness. During this period he had ample time to face up to hard facts. It became crystal clear to him, we believe, that it is folly to expect other nations and peoples, however desirable for them or us, to think, feel and behave like Americans. The weight and thrust of the past, language, race economics simply do not permit it.

By the time Nixon reached his supreme goal and was safely installed on Pennsylvania Avenue he had advanced to what might be called a Machiavellian level of sophistication in affairs of state. And "Machiavellian" here is not all intended to be a negative description.

He had come, that is, to see the world, however dangerously explosive a mixture of forces and forms it might be, as something to be accepted and to be dealt with coldly in its own shifting terms. He had ceased to think in terms of absolutes, of black and white, right and wrong, good and bad. To be a world statesman, and we think that of all Nixon's ambitions this is the most powerful, he had come to feel he needed a more flexible idiom than the one peculiar to American conservatism.

It was this change—or inner growth, if you view it objectively—which led Nixon to take the truly bold step of disengaging from Vietnam, though of course with long terminal bombings to keep the generals and the conservatives happy. It was exactly the kind of thing a man of Machiavellian persuasion might do. We think that it is in the same hard, calculating and cautious spirit that President Nixon is exploring the enigmas of China.

Meanwhile, and this is the most deep-seated motivation, he is ensuring himself a permanent niche in history, a position of such manifest importance, fail or succeed, that even the most disappointed conservatives and skeptical liberals must fall silent.

Considering the narrow frame of reference from which Nixon sprang it took enormous courage to reverse policy on Vietnam and even more guts to reach out and seize the forbidding nettle of China. Nixon has come a long, long way since the days when he was monotonously cutting up Helen Gahagan Douglas for "being soft on communism."

It is a fascinating spectacle, a real drama of the spirit. But will anything come of it, for us and for the world?

Just to see and be seen in itself is a good thing. Also reassuring is the fact that Nixon proved himself big enough to take the initiative and go to China, rather than wait for the Chinese to come here. It is a tonic thing when a man dares to walk right into the erstwhile enemy camp. In a word, Nixon has accomplished a kind of lunar landing across unfathomable political spaces, proving it can

be done, setting a spectacular diplomatic example. This is heartening, too.

All Americans, we strongly feel, should wish him the very best of luck on his great adventure.

## MANY PROBLEMS FACE VIETNAM VETERANS

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 29 of this year the Honorable Richard L. Roudebush, a former member of this body who is now Assistant Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, was the keynote speaker at a meeting of the Columbus, Ga. Kiwanis Club. In his excellent address, Mr. Roudebush presented an in-depth discussion of the problems which face many of our Vietnam era veterans—and what we can do to help alleviate these problems. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the full text of Mr. Roudebush's remarks.

The remarks follow:

### MANY PROBLEMS FACE VIETNAM VETERANS

It was good of you to invite me to be with you today. I must say . . . the South has not lost its charm . . . as evidenced by that fine introduction . . . and the warm reception I have received since arriving in your city.

This area is not unfamiliar to me. Four years ago . . . next August I spent several weeks in traction in the La Grange, Georgia hospital. Two of the persons in the plane crash with me were hospitalized here in Columbus.

Following my recovery . . . my good friend and former colleague . . . "Bo" Calloway "jokingly" sent me a bill to cover the cost of replacing a few acres of pine woods he said were destroyed on his property . . . attempting to land our plane on the 10th hole of the La Grange golf course. I am sure many of you will recall when this happened.

Seriously, we were terribly lucky in that experience and I can't say enough about the splendid care I received while hospitalized . . . or the warm friendship of the people who called on me.

Before discussing some of the things we are doing in the Veterans Administration . . . I would like to share with you my impressions of your city. In terms of recent growth . . . I understand you have done rather well.

No doubt your expansion has caused some growing pains . . . but to the visitor . . . it would seem you are handling these problems very well . . . and frankly . . . I am impressed with what I have seen.

Proud as you must be of your growth and prosperity . . . I need not remind you that Columbus is not only competing for new industry with every other city in Georgia . . . but with every other city in the United States as well . . . and the fact that you are moving forward . . . simply means there has to be an excellent "team-effort" here in your undertakings.

I know that many of you in this room have a voice in the decision-making process of Columbus so it is a privilege for me as we discuss ways to help the Vietnam era veteran.

Just as no one city or state or nation can go it alone . . . you by your actions . . . have said to the Vietnam veteran in Columbus that he need not go it alone. Here . . . and

on behalf of America's nearly 29 million veterans . . . and our VA family of 183,000 employees . . . we salute you for the manner in which you are approaching some of the special problems of the Vietnam era veteran. I assure you our job would be a lot easier if there were more leadership displayed as you have in Columbus.

Through the miracle of television . . . these past days we have shared with our President . . . the historical visit to the People's Republic of China. Television has become a personal thing with us. We depend on it for our news. We have little difficulty relating to events because the eyes of the camera . . . have become our eyes. Few would deny that the TV news media has had a terrific impact on our opinions . . . consciously or unconsciously . . . especially as we have watched the news accounts of the war in Vietnam. TV is a great creator of public opinion . . . sometimes for the better . . . sometimes for the worse.

Please don't misunderstand. I am not suggesting that we refrain from watching television news broadcasts . . . what I am saying is that we are now unable to escape the realities of situations graphically presented to us.

But the fact remains during the past 7 or 8 years . . . we have been with our young men in uniform trudging through the rice paddies of Vietnam. We have seen the helicopters in evacuation situations. We have visited . . . through the television media . . . the field hospitals . . . and shared Christmas and Thanksgiving dinner with our men in Vietnam. There isn't an individual in this room that hasn't felt as if he has been there. There isn't an individual in this room that hasn't had a lump in his throat on many occasions.

It has been a long and grueling war.

But now . . . thank God . . . our thoughts are turning to a full generation of peace. Our desire to end the war . . . in an honorable way . . . in a way that will hopefully realize this generation of peace. American involvement has all but ground to a halt . . . and our attention in this hour is focused on the veteran. And this is as it should be. The problem is that this winding-down process has not been an easy one. History tells us the transition from wartime to a peacetime never is. Thus we find an average of 90,000 men being separated from service and returning to the labor market each month . . . about one million last year . . . and unemployment of the unskilled is taking its toll.

And while we are on the subject of unemployment, I recall Treasury Secretary Connally's recent response to a congressional committee member's question relating to "what would be an acceptable rate of unemployment to the Nixon Administration?" After a point by point exchange the inquisitor finally got down to a figure of our percent asking would this be acceptable. If my memory serves me correctly Secretary Connally said "There is no acceptable rate of unemployment." And on this point I think we all agree.

Now we have all heard a great deal about the unemployment rate hovering around 5.5 or 5.9 percent, but I think it would serve a useful purpose if we put these figures into proper perspective. Just who are we talking about?

The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor tells us there were 5,216,000 Americans unemployed in December 1971, representing a national rate of 5.5 percent. Of this total figure, a little over 2 million were males 20 years of age and over, 1.7 million were females 20 years of age and over. And interestingly nearly 1.4 million were "teen-agers" between 16 and 19 years of age.

Of the 2.1 million men nationally "without jobs" we were told 341,000 were veterans.

That is 341,000 too many. But let me continue as I call your attention to the results of a Louis Harris survey recently conducted nationwide on this subject. This was a stratified random sampling of 2,003 Vietnam era veterans, 786 employers and 1,490 households researched in this poll.

Ninety-three percent of the veterans and 88 percent of the employers agreed that employers were interested in hiring the vet . . . yet only 53 percent of the employers agreed that veterans should be given hiring preference. This we should change, and I think we can. Next, of the employed veterans interviewed more than half reported receiving special attention because of their military service. I am not so sure you can average averages but before commenting on the next item, I would like to offer an obvious opinion of my own. One of the things that is going to have a bearing on the outcome is what is the picture at each end of the spectrum you are averaging . . . and this was really brought home in the Louis Harris report. The portion of minority ex-G.I.'s not working was found to be 21 percent and 31 percent for those without a high school education. Any way you slice it, this is staggering. Think about it, 31 out of every 100 minority veterans is out of a job, according to the Harris report. If you would ask me for a quick solution to this problem I can give it to you in one word, education. This is the only answer. Educate these men in some kind of trade or skill so they can be useful, productive members of society. And I would add, we, in the Veterans Administration have the tools to help do this through our OJT and apprenticeship programs and the Department of Labor's manpower development training programs. The laws are already on the books for us to do these things, and we are making progress, and we will continue to make progress as long as cities like Columbus and States like Georgia continue to lead the way.

While the Nation's unemployment rate was hovering around 5.5 or 5.9 percent at the end of December, Georgia's unemployment rate was 3.4% . . . the sixth lowest in the Nation. Your achievements are no accident. It just did not happen. As early as 1966, Pete Wheeler, Georgia's State director of veterans service, had the foresight and wisdom to conduct a "supermarket of veterans benefits" at your auditorium here in Columbus. In my own mind this one-day counseling service set the pattern for the rest of the Nation to follow. Recognizing Mr. Wheeler's contributions as I do, I am hard put to single out one individual in this community because as I said earlier you have had a "team effort" here, but I would be remiss if I didn't compliment your mayor, J. R. Allen, for his selection of Charles Daley to chair his "jobs for veterans task force." Mr. Daley's outstanding military record and his civic contributions are known to us in Washington and Mayor Allen could not have selected a more capable person with a genuine interest in veterans affairs to head his jobs for veterans task force.

I suppose there would be merit in trying to describe the "typical" Vietnam veteran to you . . . but I am not going to do this today. Because we cannot think of the Vietnam veteran only in terms of statistics. The Vietnam veteran is an individual. He has likes and dislikes. The Vietnam veteran has hopes and aspirations. The Vietnam veteran is no different than we once were. The Vietnam veteran served his country well and with distinction and he fought in . . . the longest, loneliest . . . least-understood war . . . in our Nation's history.

Times have changed since the days of World War II. Today's world somehow seems more complicated. For many of you that are businessmen . . . I would venture your methods of operation are a lot more complicated than when you entered business. Inflation . . . cost of doing business continually on the rise . . . taxes . . . pressures of



meeting the payroll. For a businessman to survive today requires your best efforts 365 days a year. You and I understand these problems. Unfortunately, however, not all of the Vietnam veterans entering the labor market . . . many for the first time, understand these things. Many will be approaching you with few skills to offer. I would remind you that instead of having the opportunity to learn a trade or furthering their education . . . their recent past has been occupied in our military. Others do have specialized skills. But as a whole . . . the Vietnam veteran presents a maturity and dedication . . . a willingness to learn . . . which will make him a fine employee.

You and I both know that through our tax dollars we are going to see that the medical needs of the disabled veteran are met. You and I both know your Government is going to continue to show sympathetic understanding and provide assistance to the widow and orphan. This same grateful Nation is too going to make it possible that this veteran receives education and training . . . rehabilitation if needed and will provide subsistence . . . while receiving such benefits.

But what about the veteran who just somehow doesn't have the desire or the aptitude for college? This is the veteran that causes us great concern. This is the man who wants a "piece of the action." This is the man that only the private sector of the economy can help. And this is where you as the business and industrial leaders of Columbus fit into the picture. In America we like slogans. We like catchy tunes and jingles that relate to the products we buy. This is true of administrations too. I can recall . . . as I know many of you can "The New Deal". Then there was "The Fair Deal". The "Great Society" came along and others. I would like to think the Vietnam era veteran is going to get "A Square Deal". And I think he will. If we all pull together. Though the employment of veterans is not a Veterans Administration responsibility. . . . We do look upon our role as a full partner and we need your help in hiring the veteran.

What we do ask of you is that you consider the veteran . . . in a preferential way.

First, we feel he will be a better employee (and worker) for having served in the Armed Forces. Experience has taught us he is more mature. Experience has taught him that discipline and sacrifice make him more aware of the value of a good job . . . with a future.

Think back when you were getting started in business. You worked hard. You earned your way. You probably had a family along the way, and you probably had an understanding wife by your side . . . hard work . . . honesty . . . faith in God . . . this is the American way. And this is what the Vietnam veteran wants. A chance to earn his way and build a future. To share in the good life he defended with his life.

Competition is keen . . . we have already established that. But let's keep in mind that these young men are entering the labor market . . . many for the first time. Let us show the Vietnam veteran understanding and compassion . . . Let us give him a chance . . . He took a chance for us in defense of freedom.

I am beginning to sound like our preacher criticizing the faithful Sunday morning worshippers . . . these words should be for other ears . . . so let me repeat what I said a moment ago. I wish more of our cities and States across this great land had the leadership and concern that seem to exist here in your city and Georgia.

Now for a few brief remarks about some of our programs in the Veterans Administration. One of the most important is, of course the delivery of medical care. Through our complex of 166 hospitals, we last year treated over 800,000 patients in-house and more than 8 million on an outpatient basis.

Interestingly, as an endorsement of VA medicine the President's budget for 1973 calls for more dollars to operate the VA medical programs than ever before. Also included in this budget was the largest request for hospital construction and modernization expenditures in the past 21 years. In December the President signed into law a 6.5% increase in nonservice connected pension rates for approximately 1.6 million veterans and widows. The Veterans Administration is conducting first time in history combat briefings to servicemen on veterans benefits. Since this program began nearly 2 million G.I.'s have been briefed on Federal benefits designed to assist them, by trained VA specialists.

The VA has opened assistance centers . . . we call them USVAC's . . . as part of our massive outreach program in an effort to search out the veteran and tell him of our programs rather than to wait for him to come to us.

In the area of education, G.I.'s are returning to colleges at record rates and we expect legislation will soon be passed to increase the monthly education allowances by about 14 percent. In addition to the many many things we are doing, our VA people are counseling soon to be released service personnel right here at Fort Benning.

As an employer the Veterans Administration is trying to set the example, with nearly 14,000 Vietnam veterans on our payrolls. The VA has operated or co-sponsored more than 100 job fairs or job marts throughout the U.S. for veterans where we try to bring together the recruiters and job seeking veteran. It would be difficult to estimate how many thousands of veterans have responded to these efforts, but through our 72 U.S. veterans assistance centers we helped find employment for more than 55,000 Vietnam era veterans.

One final measure of our growth and success of the G.I. bill program would be to note the cumulative total enrollment under the present Vietnam era G.I. bill . . . which is less than six years old . . . already far exceeds the 2.4 million veterans trained in the 13 years of the Korean G.I. bill.

I really get "wound up" on this subject . . . but I see by the clock I must let you go as many of you must get back to your offices and places of business. Before closing, however, I would like to leave one thought with you. True, we haven't produced any hard job offers today, but I would hope there is greater awareness . . . keeping in mind that one of the really great strengths of this Nation is that in time of need we somehow find a way to accomplish our objectives. So I won't say today marks the beginning because you have already started in Georgia. The awareness is here and for your efforts and the efforts of all Georgians . . . on behalf of veterans . . . from the bottom of my heart . . . thank you.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON IS KEEPING HIS WORD

**HON. ROBERT McCLORY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, last week the President of the United States withdrew an additional 4,500 soldiers from Vietnam.

On January 20, 1969, there were 532,500 Americans enduring the perils of an Asian war. Today, there are 119,600 Americans in Vietnam who are planning to come home.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon is keeping his word.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF AIR PRODUCTS IS INTERNATIONAL SUCCESS STORY

**HON. FRED B. ROONEY**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a dramatic story of industrial success has been written during the past quarter century by an industry which settled in the Lehigh Valley of Pennsylvania in 1946 and, during the intervening period, has grown from an employer of 140 persons to an international employer of more than 9,000.

Air Products and Chemicals, Inc., its corporate headquarters occupying a large new complex at Trexlertown, Pa., near Allentown, is among the leading producers of industrial gases and a pace setter in the field of cryogenics—the science of ultracold temperatures.

Founded in Detroit in 1940 by Leonard P. Pool, now chairman of the board, Air Products began its rapid growth on a concept of producing industrial gases on site, adjacent to major customers. Its developments in the field of cryogenics have given Air Products a role in America's space exploration. It has developed a line of liquid nitrogen food freezers and in 1971 its processes and cryogenic equipment were utilized in the development of the world's first liquefied natural gas plant in Libya.

Recently, the spectacular growth of this firm was featured in a report published by the Sunday Call-Chronicle, of Allentown, Pa. I invite the attention of my colleagues to that article which traces the development of this important industry.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF AIR PRODUCTS IS INTERNATIONAL SUCCESS STORY

When Air Products and Chemicals, Inc., first settled in the Lehigh Valley area in 1946 the entire company, then called Air Products, Inc., consisted of just over 140 people and a small facility in nearby Emmaus. Today the company employs over 9,000 people worldwide, including over 1,300 in the Allentown area alone. That first small building now serves as offices for just one of the company's various departments, as Air Products' corporate headquarters were moved in 1958 to a larger complex in Trexlertown.

Air Products and Chemicals, Inc., was founded in Detroit late in 1940 by Leonard P. Pool, present chairman of the board. The company based its existence on a new concept of industrial gas supply—building gas-producing facilities adjacent to major customers—creating "on-site" supply of industrial gases. This new concept was coupled with cryogenics (the science of ultra-cold temperatures) and creative marketing to make Air Products a pacesetter in the production and marketing of low-cost industrial gases.

After locating in the Lehigh Valley, Air Products set out to establish its industrial gas business. In its early years the company had primarily been a supplier of oxygen generators to the government but now sought to

expand into the commercial industrial gas market.

In 1947 Air Products built a tonnage oxygen plant for the Weirton Steel Co. of Weirton, W. Va., having a production capacity that was equal to about 1/4 of the entire oxygen production in the United States at that time.

#### SALES \$20 MILLION

Air Products' sales and geographic coverage steadily increased through both acquisitions and expansion of the company's existing technological capabilities. By the end of the 1956 fiscal year, after 10 years in the Lehigh Valley, the company's sales were just over \$20-million.

The company continued to expand worldwide, increasing its industrial and medical gas coverage, diversifying into chemicals and catalysts and moving into such specialized technical areas as miniature cryogenic systems for space, communications and electronics applications, specialty gases, food technology, liquefied natural gas (LNG) and liquefied helium programs.

Air Products and Chemicals, Inc., ended its 1971 fiscal year, after 25 years in the Lehigh Valley, with sales of almost \$308 million. It was the company's 11th consecutive year of record sales, net income and earnings per share. The company's Industrial Gas Division provided a major contribution to successful operations in 1971, with sales of merchant industrial gases as bulk liquids and in high pressure cylinders achieving record levels. The Specialty Gases Department continued its strong growth during the past year. Its activities were expanding to include markets interested in specialty chemicals, primarily on the research and development level. Air Products recently announced the addition of over 300 chemical intermediates to this department's existing product line. These new markets are expected to play an important role in the department's progress in 1972.

The company's line of Cryo-Quick liquid nitrogen food freezers experienced continued growth worldwide. A new freezer model was introduced offering ease of cleaning, economy of operation and increased processing capacity. The new Cryo-Quick freezers are already being used as the exclusive freezing method by one of the world's leading processors of quality frozen hamburger patties.

The company's liquefied natural gas (LNG) programs experienced significant progress in 1971. Air Products' processes and cryogenic equipment were an integral part of the world's first major LNG plant, successfully started in Libya during the year. Four giant cryogenic heat-exchangers were completed and shipped. These units will be used in what will be the world's largest LNG plant, now under construction at Brunel, on the Island of Borneo. The company is also involved in two domestic LNG plants in New England.

A joint venture was formed by Air Products with a major New England utility to purchase one of the plants. Air Products also constructed above-ground storage facilities for this plant. The company designed, manufactured, and is presently completing construction of the second LNG plant for another New England utility. Air Products has long-term operating and maintenance contracts for both domestic LNG plants.

The company's Chemicals Group activities were significantly expanded with the acquisition early in 1971 of the Chemicals and Plastics business of Airco, Inc. (formerly Air) were integrated and reorganized along major product lines.

Air Products' Industrial Gas and Chemicals business should continue to make strong progress. Although capital expenditures for 1972 will be substantially below 1971 levels, it will be higher than that spent in 1970. Much of the record 1971 capital expenditures were made in Europe for new plants which increased fixed assets there by 50 per cent, thus providing capacity for sales in future

years. Capital expenditures are expected to grow beyond 1972.

As worldwide markets for traditional products continue to grow, Air Products is also developing new markets by offering new products, resulting from research and development efforts.

#### SUCCESS PREDICTED

These ingredients indicate another successful year of operation in 1972—the 26th year in the Lehigh Valley.

As Air Products grew with the Lehigh Valley, and Allentown in particular, the company became increasingly interested in community affairs. The company contributes both time and financial support to numerous organizations in the Lehigh Valley and Allentown, involved in such worthwhile areas as youth groups, education, hospitals, health services, and other civic groups. Air Products' employees are also encouraged to take active interest in the affairs of the community, as indicated by significant employee involvement in such worthy programs as Junior Achievement of Lehigh Valley and the Lehigh Valley United Fund, among others.

After 25 years of operation in the Lehigh Valley, Air Products and Chemicals, Inc., remains sincerely interested in contributing to the further growth and advancement of the home of the company and the numerous Lehigh Valley residents who, as Air Products employees, have made the past 25 years rewarding, not only for the company's business success, but for the many lasting relationships developed over the years.

#### A MIGRATION

### HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, O. B. Augustson, publisher of the West Central Daily Tribune at Willmar, Minn., is a veteran historian of the rural scene.

His newspaper circulates in the heart of our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District countryside. We have long stood shoulder to shoulder fighting for a rebirth of countryside America.

Recently I read an editorial by Mr. Augustson which I would like to share with my colleagues and all of those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

These are not new words, nor new ideas. They are being repeated over and over again by those who know and understand the problems of the countryside in the hope that a wider understanding can be developed and workable remedies brought forth.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I insert this editorial by Mr. Augustson in the RECORD:

#### A MIGRATION

A news article in our issue of Wednesday surely caught our eyes. A statement by former Governor Harold LeVander and a comment he made at a Republican gathering in Hennepin County. LeVander took occasion to make a major point on grave national problems and cited so many of them in the large cities.

Said Gov. LeVander: "Maldistribution of population in the United States is the No. 1 cause of the country's problems." And again: "Thirty years of mass migration from farms to the cities has left the cities suffocated with festering slums and many serious problems while the small towns are starving for jobs."

Amen to all this. And we rejoice to hear these remarks and these observations from the Governor. But may we be pardoned for saying it—Isn't that exactly what we have been yelling about out here in rural Minnesota the past ten to fifteen years? Probably during a period when few would listen or even noticed the handwriting on the wall?

This has been the cry of rural America for a decade and a half ever since Ike got into the White House—a man by the name of Ezra killed 90% parity and a group called the Committee for Economic Development decided that millions of farmers should be forced off the land.

In the meantime those big cities were worrying about the food surplus even tho they should have known that all Americans were not well fed and that half of the world goes to bed hungry. They also worried about the federal funds for parity even tho they should have realized that was the finest investment the nation could make and was the finest shot in the arm of the nation's economy.

But now the chickens have come home to roost. Finally they see that the nation has gone down the wrong road. Now they sense that a bum deal was made. Now it is apparent that a thoughtless course is one to be regretted.

So with the mistakes of the past some are now scurrying to do something about the situation in rural America—trying to pick up the pieces. They did not worry one iota about how rural America was being wrecked. Not a crocodile tear was shed. It was all right. But now that the big cities have found themselves in trouble—now because the trouble is in their own laps—how feverishly they want to do something. Sounds like the old saying—closing the barn door after the horse is gone.

In high places the price of commission—in the big cities the price of omission. But don't blame the Governor—blame all the big wigs in the federal administrations and then include a vast urban population that was bent on killing the golden goose and biting the hand that was feeding them.

#### RURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT APPROVED

### HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, we recently approved the Rural Development Act, which I had the pleasure of supporting in an effort to revitalize our agricultural communities. At the time that vote was taken, the remarks of a constituent were freshly imprinted in my mind, and I want to take this opportunity to share them with my colleagues. They need no word of explanation, except to tell you that W. LaMar Bollinger is a professor of economics at the College of Idaho in Caldwell and he has recently concluded a study on the economic and social impact of rural depopulation in the northern Magic Valley of Idaho. His remarks follow:

America's love affair with the city has ended and the people are suing for divorce. The Watts riots in 1965 came exactly 100 years after the conclusion of the Civil War in 1865. During that entire century, cities were regarded as the Promised Land, and young adults abandoned the countryside by the millions, eagerly seeking fortune and adventure in the glamorous cities of our land. Within five short years the enhancement of



the cities disappeared. Ghettos, racial tensions, uncontrolled crime, traffic snarls, rising taxes, and smog which choked man and plants alike abruptly severed America's love affair with cities.

Now all eyes are focused on the dilapidated towns of Rural America. The price tag for saving our cities is prohibitively high. With a much smaller public investment the public facilities in our rural towns could be upgraded and people would rediscover a quality of life that satisfies them.

Following is a clipping from the Idaho Free Press, published in Nampa, Idaho, January 1, 1972, outlining some of the preliminary conclusions which Professor Bollinger reached in his study of rural depopulation. The full report will be published by the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future in a volume entitled "Population Redistribution."

The clipping follows:

#### RESIDENTS CALL LOW POPULATION BIG ADVANTAGE

CALDWELL.—Low population density, long an economic and political liability to Idaho, has become the number one advantage of this state. Prof. LaMar Bollinger of the College of Idaho Economics Department reached this conclusion after analyzing a poll taken from a 20 per cent sample of alumni from 10 Southcentral Idaho high schools in Jerome, Gooding, Lincoln, and Camas counties, for these alumni registered a strong preference for low population density with its attendant advantages as the number on criteria for evaluating the livability of a geographic region.

The advantages which these alumni associated with low population density were identified in very specific terms as follows: closer personal relationships, relaxed atmosphere, a better place to raise a family, greater community participation, low level of pollution, absence of big-city problems, lower cost of living, and to some people, small schools are regarded as an advantage because they offer closer personal relationships and opportunities for leadership to a larger percentage of students.

The significance of these particular characteristics is enhanced by the fact that open-ended questions were used in the questionnaire for the purpose of avoiding any distortion of the results either by choice or arrangement of the characteristics selected by the questioner. Only four per cent of 538 respondents failed to write down in his own words the values which he regarded most advantageous to the communities in which he had spent his youth. Therefore, the conclusions have greater validity and significance than if the respondents had been asked to check a selected list of characteristics. Bollinger pointed out.

A valuable aspect of this study is that the respondent group was in a unique position to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the quality of life in Idaho, since 81 per cent of them were born in Idaho and all of them graduated from high schools north of the Snake River in Southcentral Idaho. Fundamentally, they had a common economic, social, and geographic background for the first 18 years of their life and, as a group, they know this region very well and were not expressing an opinion concerning a region on the basis of limited knowledge.

After graduating from high school, 85 per cent of the respondents took some form of advanced education, ranging from short-term courses in trade schools to doctorate degrees. Despite the fact that there are no colleges or trade schools within the four-county area, 68 per cent of these alumni stayed in Idaho for post high school education.

Thereafter, their paths separated widely

and half of them remained in Idaho and half of them migrated elsewhere.

An especially interesting finding of this study is that the alumni, who migrated elsewhere in search of better job opportunities had occasion to experience and judge the advantages and disadvantages of Southcentral Idaho very similarly to the group which elected to spend their adult years in Idaho, Bollinger reported. In a fast-changing world, it is pertinent to observe that twice as large a per cent of the alumni who migrated out-of-state—most to metropolitan areas—specified the relaxed atmosphere in Idaho as an advantage.

When asked to list advantages in order of importance to them, Idaho's much-heralded outdoor recreation was voted second as the number one advantage and placed first as the number two advantage. This priority indicates that outdoor recreation is a much-appreciated avocational activity available primarily for weekend or vacation enjoyment, but an increasing number of people in the late Twentieth Century have become disillusioned with the economic attractions of metropolitan areas and are rearranging their priorities in favor of an environment in which they are not submerged as individuals and can rediscover the identity in the community and experience more satisfying relationships with other people.

Low population density has its disadvantages as well, and the Idaho and non-Idaho alumni both reflect awareness of the following limitations: educational opportunities, especially higher education; shopping facilities; recreational facilities; medical facilities; and cultural deprivation. All of these characteristics subtract from the livability of a region, but the two really big disadvantages unquestionably account for the heavy stream of outmigration which resulted in a continuous population decline for two successive decades in Camas, Gooding, Jerome, and Lincoln counties. Limited job opportunities and low wages are both economic "gut" issues which virtually determine the scale of living in a commercial, as contrasted with a subsistence, economy and heavily constrain the lifestyle of its people. Here it is significant to observe that the alumni who moved out-of-state reveal their frustration concerning the limited job opportunities, especially for professional people, in their home communities.

In general, the Idaho and non-Idaho alumni perceived the advantages of Southcentral Idaho similarly, but the non-Idaho alumni by a ratio greater than 2:1 expressed their disappointment in not finding jobs in their home towns to match their ambition. On the other hand, Idaho alumni show more sensitivity to the low wage scale, a fact well-established by the U.S. Department of Commerce which shows Idaho alternating with New Mexico as the lowest per capita income state in the West. Idahoans read in the newspapers about union-management wage settlements on the East or West Coasts which seem fantastic to them, friends and relatives who stop to visit them speak disapprovingly of the low wages in this area, and each payday confirms the reality of this disadvantage. Not unexpectedly, however, eight per cent of the Idaho alumni expressed their strong satisfaction with this region by writing (usually in bold print) NONE for disadvantages.

It is now apparent that the crisis in our cities which surfaced in the late 1960s has produced a decided shift in values regarding a desirable place to live. The uncontrollable rise in crime, confrontation in the streets between the law and lawless, distressing congestion of traffic, occasion explosive tension between different racial and ethnic groups, and the soaring rise in smog has tarnished the glamour of the city, accelerated the flights from the urban core to the suburbs, and is now pushing people into the open country-side beyond. In one century the farm-to-city

migration has moved into reverse gear and the 1970 U.S. Census of Population attests that the rural non-farm population rose sharply during the last decade.

Bollinger's conclusions from his survey of high school alumni offers a very timely interpretation of the July 1, 1971, population estimate for Idaho released by the Census Bureau last week. As of July 1, 1971, Idaho's population was estimated to be 732,000, a gain of 15,000 people over the estimate for the same date in 1970 and 19,000 people more than the 1970 census taken in April. Since the population gain for Idaho for the entire decade of the 1960s was 46,000, the average annual increase was 4,600.

Accordingly, the Census Bureau estimates that the growth of population during the last year exceeded by three times the average growth for the previous decade and reversed a 30-year drought of outmigration. Currently the excess of births over deaths in Idaho approximates 8,000 people a year. It follows, then, that the net migration into Idaho during the twelve months between July 1, 1970 and July 1, 1971 was about 7,000.

Undoubtedly current economic conditions are partially responsible for this reversal of migration, but this 20 per cent sample of 3,970 graduates for the decade 1957-66 from the high schools in Jerome, Gooding, Lincoln, and Camas counties signifies a recent fundamental shift in personal values of the American people which may portend a whole new array of problems for Idaho as it copes with a new generation of migrants.

This past summer Bollinger prepared a study on "the economic and social impact of rural depopulation upon selected counties in Southcentral Idaho" for the U.S. Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. This report will be released by the Commission in 1972. This study endeavored to discover the basic economic and social impact of the agricultural revolution upon farmers, the business and professional people in rural towns, and the consequences of these changes for youth. A report on "What happened to yesterday's Youth?" is to be released by Bollinger sometime this month and he will analyze results from his alumni survey concerning advanced education, the selective factors in migration, occupational status, and hopeful signs that Idaho's Brain Drain has been significantly reduced within the last five years. At that time the advanced education and geographical distribution of alumni of the individual high schools sampled will be reported.

#### BUFFALO, LACKAWANNA HOST TO NEW POLISH AMBASSADOR

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago my home district of Buffalo and Lackawanna, N.Y., had the honor of playing host to the new Polish Ambassador to the United States, Witold Trampeczynski. It was his first visit in the United States outside the Nation's Capital.

Our community, one of the largest centers of Americans of Polish descent, rolled out the red carpet and all levels of government joined with our citizens in giving the Ambassador a fine welcome.

The Ambassador's visit came at a time when our Nation is looking to a stimulation of trade with Soviet bloc countries including Poland.

Indeed, there are authoritative reports that Poland is seeking permission for a \$20-million loan from a Buffalo bank. Poland is said to be seeking a total of nearly five times that amount from banks in the United States.

Ambassador Trampczynski was the guest of Charles R. Diebold, president of the First Empire State Corp. Mr. Diebold is one of our more prominent citizens who has a great and dedicated interest in both our community's cultural and economic welfare and in its relation to our county of Erie and State of New York.

Assisting with arrangements for the Ambassador's visit was my good friend, Henry J. Osinski.

Mr. Speaker, in the light of the great interest in the trade potential with Soviet bloc countries, I include as a part of my remarks an editorial on this subject.

I am also including a story and editorial on the Ambassador's visit:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, Mar. 2, 1972]

#### FACILITATE TRADE WITH POLAND

The Nixon administration has taken an active role in stimulating trade with Soviet-bloc countries, and following a trip there last year, Commerce Secretary Stans spoke optimistically of increasing exports to Russia, now only about \$200 million a year, by billions of dollars. Already sales of several hundred million dollars worth of grain, machinery and other equipment have been arranged, with highly beneficial effects in cutting the U.S. trade deficit.

Mr. Stans is reported to have recommended to President Nixon the granting of export credits and the dropping of high tariff rates in order to further expand American sales behind the iron curtain. There is some indication that any final decision is being delayed pending the outcome of negotiations on a wide range of political subjects. There has been speculation that an announcement may come at the time of the summit talk in Moscow in May.

In the meantime, however, Mr. Nixon has congressional authority to remove trade barriers with other Communist countries when it is, in his judgment, in the national interest to do so. He has already extended Export-Import Bank credits to Romania, a maverick Communist country with which Mr. Nixon has established a special relationship. Another country under active White House consideration for the same Export-Import Bank treatment is Poland.

Poland already has the benefit of regular U.S. tariff rates, but the problem of financing is holding up American export deals just waiting to be made—some substantial ones right here on the Niagara Frontier. Poland spent some \$90 million in the U.S. last year, and is reported hoping, with proper financing, to raise this to about \$200 million. Secretary Stans spoke out for the granting of credit to Poland on his trip there last year, noting that "the opportunities to increase industrial cooperation with Poland are quite large."

While these encouraging developments in the way of nourishing international trade are taking place, it is disconcerting to note actions in Albany that point in exactly the opposite direction, toward the self-defeating trap of protectionism. The Assembly has passed a bill that would sharply limit the purchase of foreign goods by municipalities. The result, of course, would be higher costs for the taxpayer and an invitation to foreign countries to erect similar barriers to our own exports. We trust the State Senate will show more sense and reject this bill.

[From the Am-Pol Eagle, Buffalo, N.Y., Mar. 2, 1972]

#### AN AMBASSADOR COMES TO BUFFALO

Witold Trampczynski, named just three weeks ago as Poland's Ambassador to the United States, made his first visit outside Washington, D.C. last weekend and the city chosen for this historic occasion was Buffalo.

We feel that it should be considered an honor for Buffalo that the ambassador chose our city for his first official visit outside Washington. The choice of Buffalo is testimony to the strength of Buffalo's Polish American community. It is also testimony to the great reputation for hospitality that Polonia has earned through its welcome for other visiting Polish dignitaries.

The political implications of Ambassador Trampczynski's visit to Buffalo should not be considered. His visit here was not of a political nature.

Instead, he came to Buffalo as a Pole who wished to meet with Americans of Polish descent. Of course we do not deny that some official business was conducted during his stay in Buffalo; discussions concerning an economic agreement with a local bank which would result in increased trade between Poland and the United States were held and so were discussions about the possibility of an academic exchange program between Krakow's Jagiellonian Institute and a local university.

But the primary purpose of the Ambassador's visit remained social. He wanted to meet with persons in the community and this he did. Polonia satisfied this desire and welcomed the Ambassador, a fellow Pole, in a manner in which we are confident he will not soon forget.

Such a display of warmth and hospitality for all persons who share our Polish heritage is something we have been hoping for since this newspaper began publication. We are gratified to see that our Polish community has accepted the fact that a Pole is always a Pole before he is anything else.

[FROM THE AM-POL EAGLE, Buffalo, N.Y., Mar. 2, 1972]

#### POLISH AMBASSADOR VISITS AREA

On February 7 of this year Witold Trampczynski presented to President Nixon Letters of Credence accrediting him as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Polish People's Republic in the United States. Ambassador Trampczynski remained in Washington for the first three weeks in his new position but soon decided that it was time to see something of America and visit with Americans who shared a Polish heritage with him.

Chosen as the first stop on a three-week tour that will take him to a number of major American cities was Buffalo. Ambassador Trampczynski said Buffalo was chosen because it has the highest percentage of Polish Americans in the United States. It is believed, however, that also taken into consideration is the reputation for hospitality that Buffalo has earned in previous welcomes for Polish dignitaries.

The ambassador arrived in Buffalo late Thursday evening accompanied by Consul General Kazimierz Cias, Dr. Mieczyslaw Klimaszewski, rector of the Jagiellonian Institute in Krakow and vice president of the Polish government, and Stanislaw Biniek, secretary to the ambassador.

His official tour of the Western New York area began early Friday morning with a stop at One M & T Plaza to view a lobby display of Polish Poster Art. He then met with County Executive Edward V. Reagan and Mayor Frank A. Sedita who extended welcomes to the visiting Polish dignitary. Next stop on the agenda was a tour of Stan Jasinski's WUTV-Channel 29 studios on Grand Island, Mr. Jasinski, the first Polish American to be granted a television license by the Federal Communications Commission in this country, taped a half-hour program with the ambassador. The program will be shown at a later date.

Following the tour was a luncheon hosted by the ambassador at the Polish Village Restaurant. Attending the luncheon were 50 community leaders who had an opportunity to meet with Poland's newest representative in the United States in an atmosphere of congeniality and friendship. Later that afternoon Ambassador Trampczynski met with Dr. Robert L. Ketter and Dr. E. K. Fretwell, presidents of the University of Buffalo and Buffalo State University College. An evening reception at the Adam Mickiewicz Library and Dramatic Circle on Fillmore Ave. honoring the dignitaries accompanying Ambassador Trampczynski to Buffalo concluded Friday's formal program.

An important meeting forced Ambassador Trampczynski to fly to Washington late Friday but he returned to Buffalo early Saturday morning for a tour of Niagara Falls. After a luncheon held in his honor at a Niagara Falls restaurant, the ambassador returned to Buffalo for a tour of Villa Maria College.

Saturday evening's program was taken up with a dinner reception at the Buffalo Club hosted by officials of the Manufacturers and Traders Trust Company and attended by some 50 guests. By far the most extravagant event in honor of the ambassador's visit to Buffalo, the reception was hosted by Charles R. Diebold, president of the First Empire State Corporation, and Claude F. Shuchter, president of M & T Bank. Arrangements for the gala reception were handled by M & T vice president Henry J. Osinski.

It has been reported that Poland is seeking a \$20 million loan from the M & T Bank to expand its trade in the United States. The loan is currently awaiting approval of the Import-Export Bank. The loan is said to be just one of a series of loans totaling \$116 million sought by the Polish government in various cities throughout the United States.

Ambassador Trampczynski left Buffalo early Saturday morning. His next two stops on his American tour will take him to New York City and Boston.

#### THE HOWARD P. MACE NOMINATION: AN ADDENDUM

#### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, February 9 I wrote to the Secretary of State requesting his comments on a letter to Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 117, part 29, pages 38105 and 38106.

I have received an answer from David M. Abshire, Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations in the State Department. He writes, in part:

The letter in question alleged that the employment of Mr. Charles Mace, the brother of Mr. Howard Mace, in an important position in the United Nations came about as the result of improper pressure within the Department of State. Specifically, it suggested that Mr. Howard Mace induced Deputy Assistant Secretary Herz to use his influence to secure the position in Geneva for his brother. . . . The Department has checked its records



and is in a position to categorically refute these allegations and innuendoes as totally baseless.

Mr. Speaker, the State Department's response to the charges in the letter previously printed in the RECORD merit our attention. The Abshire letter follows:

FEBRUARY 29, 1972.

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

DEAR MR. FRASER: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of February 9 in which you requested us to comment on the letter of Mr. John D. Hemenway that appeared in the Congressional Record of October 28, 1971 (p. 38105). Even though the nomination of Mr. Howard P. Mace as Ambassador to Sierra Leone is no longer pending, certain misstatements about the Department contained in Mr. Hemenway's letter should be corrected in order that the record be clear.

The letter in question alleged that the employment of Mr. Charles Mace, the brother of Mr. Howard Mace, in an important position in the United Nations came about as the result of improper pressure within the Department of State. Specifically, it suggested that Mr. Howard Mace induced Deputy Assistant Secretary Herz to use his influence to secure the position in Geneva for his brother. A chronology of "pertinent facts" was supplied by the letterwriter, which was supposed to show a cause-and-effect relationship between Mr. Herz's own assignment in the Department and "considerable pressure on the executive area of IO (Mr. Herz's area)" to secure the UN assignment for Mr. Charles Mace.

The Department has checked its records and is in a position to categorically refute these allegations and innuendoes as totally baseless.

Mr. Martin F. Herz was assigned to the Department of State in April 1970 and reported for duty in June 1970. Our records show that on March 18, 1970 the High Commissioner for Refugees, Prince Sadruddin Aga Khan, interviewed a panel of American candidates in Washington for the post of Deputy High Commissioner. On May 13, 1970 our Mission in Geneva informed us that Prince Sadruddin Aga Khan had recently selected Mr. Charles Mace to be his Deputy. Our records also show that Mr. Mace was known to Prince Sadruddin from his earlier assignment to the U.S. Mission in Geneva and that he had personally applied for the position directly to the UN High Commissioner. Neither Mr. Herz nor Mr. Howard Mace had any part whatsoever in the process of recruitment or appointment of Mr. Charles Mace to the position of Deputy High Commissioner.

The letter addressed to you also contained an insinuation—to make it appear that some kind of deal had been made—that Mr. Howard Mace may have been responsible for the designation of Mr. Herz as Deputy Assistant Secretary in the Bureau of International Organization Affairs (IO). This is not so. Mr. Herz was personally selected for that position from a number of available officers by the Assistant Secretary, IO. Actually, neither Mr. Mace nor anyone in his office had recommended Mr. Herz for the appointment.

The substance of the foregoing was conveyed by me to Chairman Fulbright in a letter dated November 17, 1971.

You also inquired about the status of Mr. Howard Mace's nomination as Ambassador to Sierra Leone and about his present position. At the request of Mr. Mace, his nomination was not resubmitted when the Congress reconvened in January. He is being assigned to the position of Consul General in Istanbul.

I hope that the above information will be

helpful to you and will serve to clarify the record.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID M. ABSHIRE,  
Assistant Secretary  
for Congressional Relations.

# TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH L. VICITES, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

## HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Mr. Joseph L. Vicites, the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, testified before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

As a member of the Veterans Committee, I certainly support the objectives of the VFW and pledge my full support of programs which will aid the veterans of our Nation.

His testimony is so timely that I want to insert it in the RECORD at this point and hope that all Members will take the time to read it:

### STATEMENT OF JOSEPH L. VICITES

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is a great privilege for me and my comrades to appear before this distinguished Committee to present the current legislative program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Each of us is aware, Mr. Chairman, that you and the members of your Committee honor not only our organization, but all American veterans by permitting us to come here year after year.

We are deeply grateful for your understanding of our problems; the generosity you demonstrate; the intelligent and enlightened programs you initiate; and the support and assistance you invariably provide to veterans and their dependents.

In our opinion no other Congressional Committee is so completely dedicated to non-partisan service and the purpose for which it functions.

As most of you know, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States had its de facto origin in 1899. Veterans of the Spanish-American War met almost simultaneously in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Columbus, Ohio, and Denver, Colorado, to discuss the plight of their comrades. They subsequently joined forces at a meeting in Denver, where Post No. One, of our organization still prospers, and carries on the work of its founders.

From the humble beginning, the Veterans of Foreign Wars has grown steadily—until today, we have one million, seven hundred thousand members.

This is the twentieth consecutive year in which we will have realized a substantial increase in our membership. In August, we expect to go to our National Convention in Minneapolis with one million, eight hundred thousand men; and a half million ladies in our Auxiliary.

Our many programs of service to the veteran and his dependents; to our communities; and to the nation, are principally responsible for this continued growth. These programs, however, do not function or produce results by themselves. Hard work and effective leadership, on every level, are essential to their success.

Many of the men who are responsible for this success are with me here this morning. They are the Department Commanders, their

Staff officers, National Committee members, and Post and District Officers, who have come from all over this great nation, and from several foreign countries, to attend our annual Washington Conference. Many of them will be visiting with the members of your Committee throughout the day, as well as tonight at the Sheraton-Park Hotel.

Neither time nor the purpose of my appearance here will permit me to review the varied programs of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. There is one, however, which both tradition and pride compel me to call to your attention. I refer to our annual Voice of Democracy Program.

This is a script-writing contest, annually participated in by high school students throughout our fifty states, the District of Columbia, the Pacific Areas, and the Panama Canal. The theme this year is: "My Responsibility to Freedom."

Five college scholarships, totaling \$22,500, will be awarded to the winners of that competition at our banquet tonight. The first-place winner will deliver his or her speech, and receive the first prize of \$10,000, to be used to further his or her education at the college or university of his or her choice.

Mr. Chairman, may I present the state and territorial winners to you and your Committee at this time. They are seated directly behind me, just a few rows back. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, the legislative program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is the product of resolutions officially adopted at our annual National Convention. Approximately three hundred such resolutions were approved at our most recent Convention, which was held in Dallas, Texas, August 13 to 20, 1971.

Immediately following that Convention, our National Legislative and National Security and Foreign Affairs Committees met here in Washington to review those resolutions. As a result of that meeting, a representative list of organizational mandates was selected, recommended, and approved by the various Committees, and by me as Commander-in-Chief, to make up our "Priority Legislative Program" for the current year. That program has been printed in an attractive brochure, and a copy has been furnished to each member of Congress, as well as other persons who have a responsibility to implement and carry out veterans programs.

It would be deeply appreciated, Mr. Chairman, if a copy of the Digest of our National Convention Resolutions, adopted in Dallas, and a copy of the brochure containing our V.F.W. Priority Goals for the current year might be made a part of my remarks and incorporated in my statement.

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, I think there can be no doubt that the most pressing of my organization is the future of VA hospitals.

On the one hand, the Office of Management and Budget has been pursuing a policy of reduction for many years, with the design of cutting veterans' medical care to an average daily patient load of 60,000 by 1975. On the other, are the efforts of your Committee and organizations such as mine to frustrate this soulless indifference to the medical needs of those who fight our nation's wars.

As you know, this fiscal year, the Congress found it necessary to halt an attempt by the Office of Management and Budget to cut veterans medical care in VA hospitals from 86,000 to 79,000.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars deeply appreciate the tremendous effort made by this Committee to provide and maintain adequate funds and personnel for VA hospitals, in spite of the dollar signs which apparently run through the blood streams of the Office of Management and Budget, in so far as veterans are concerned.

Your Subcommittee on Hospitals, headed by Chairman David Satterfield produced

undeniable evidence that the VA medical care system needed more, instead of less, personnel and services.

The House Appropriations Committee agreed, and added over two hundred million dollars to this year's VA budget to prevent such a cut.

Even more important, the House Appropriations Committee wrote into the bill a prohibition against reduction, and that is now a part of the law. I quote from Public Law 92-78:

"... the foregoing appropriation shall not be appropriated to provide for less than an average of 97,500 operating beds in Veterans Administration hospitals or furnishing inpatient care and treatment to an average daily patient load of less than 85,500 beneficiaries during the fiscal year 1972."

In spite of this clear and legal Congressional mandate, I am advised that the Veterans Administration is taking care of only 83,000 patients, and cannot possibly care for the authorized number of 85,500 average daily patient load during this fiscal year. Obviously, the Office of Management and Budget has found a way to circumvent the will of Congress.

Yet there are waiting lists at many VA hospitals; and the rejection rate in some of them is excessive—running as high as sixty percent. The Veterans of Foreign Wars is deeply disturbed at this condition. And you may be sure, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, that we will expend every effort in support of your Committee and the Congress to see that this Congressional mandate is carried out.

We all know that the VA hospital system was created by the legislative acts of many Congresses, and the expenditure of many billion of dollars. It has been a vast and comprehensive undertaking by the official representatives of the people of this nation.

If I may summarize, for the record, the Veterans Administration is presently operating 166 hospitals; 202 outpatient clinics; 16 domiciliarys for elderly veterans; 76 nursing homes; 6 restoration centers; 3 blind rehabilitation centers; and 32 drug units.

This VA medical system, with its annual budget of approximately two billion dollars, took care of seven million of the nation's twenty-eight million veterans last year.

It is staffed by approximately 150,000 physicians, dentists, nurses, and paramedical health employees, on a full time basis. In addition there are about 83,000 private physicians who take care of veterans on a fee-for-service arrangement in their local communities.

The Veterans Administration is also a major source of medical education, training, and research. For example, the VA system provides training for one-half of the third and fourth year medical students in the nation. During the past year alone it provided training for 53,000 individuals in 60 different categories of health sciences.

VA hospitals and clinics are affiliated with 81 medical schools; 51 dental schools; 287 nursing schools; and some 400 universities, colleges, and junior colleges which provide training for both professional and technical health workers.

In addition, the Veterans Administration has led the way in the field of medical research. It developed the cardiac pacemaker, and drugs for treating TB. Both veterans and non-veterans are reaping the benefits of this giant of the health care business.

My organization is gravely concerned for the Veterans Administration's future role should a national health care system be established. We are concerned because the Office of Management and Budget has indicated in correspondence with members of Congress that the future of the VA hospital system is connected with national health insurance proposals now under active consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is greatly encouraged by an article prepared by the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable Wilbur D. Mills, entitled "No, to Takeover of VA" which appeared in the February, 1972 issue of our V.F.W. Magazine.

Congressman Mills stated, in the next to last paragraph: "I am convinced we should not recommend federal health care legislation until the Administration provides firm information as to plans for the future of the VA program."

It will be deeply appreciated, Mr. Chairman, if a copy of the article by Congressman Mills, as it appeared in the February Issue of the V.F.W. Magazine may be made a part of my remarks at this point. Thank you. It is our fervent hope that the Congress will agree with him.

My organization is also deeply concerned over the status and the condition of our Vietnam Veterans. And, I am proud to report to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the members of this Committee, that the Veterans of Foreign Wars boasts approximately 450 thousand members who are veterans of that war.

Our boasting ceases, however, when we consider the fact that the unemployment rate among these young men remains excessively high, in spite of every effort to reduce it.

One of the most successful programs ever established by the Congress is the GI Bill. All veterans are grateful for it. The nation as a whole has profited by it.

Your Committee has developed and recommended a bill which carries out in greater part a priority goal of the V.F.W. for increased assistance to veterans taking education and training under the GI Bill. Your bill, as reported by this Committee, and approved by the House, will increase the rates for tuition, books, and fees by 14 percent.

It is noted too, that another provision in the bill proposes a 48 percent increase in on-the-job and apprenticeship training rates for jobless veterans under the GI Bill.

With no disrespect intended, Mr. Chairman, I note also that the distinguished ladies in your Committee appear to have struck a blow for "Women's Lib." A provision in H.R. 12828 accords women veterans the same status as male veterans, in so far as the veteran's spouse is concerned, under Veterans Administration laws. We in the V.F.W. support this provision.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars strongly supports the legislation pending in this Committee which would transfer the jurisdiction over national cemeteries to the Veterans Administration. Our national cemetery system should be continued and expanded. Burial in a national cemetery is a perpetual honor. It should be every veteran's right.

Certainly it should be distinguished from a plot allowance, or other subsidy, which is nothing more than an economic benefit to the veteran's survivors.

We in the V.F.W. have long campaigned for at least one national cemetery in each state, so that every veteran who so desires may be laid to rest in a national cemetery reasonably near his home. We urge the enactment of legislation which will carry out this recommendation.

Another matter of great importance to our membership is that of keeping the Veterans' Administration intact. Every year there are attempts being made to transfer VA programs to other agencies. This year there seems to have been a movement in the Congress to diminish the Veterans' Administration's jurisdiction over veterans programs. The most conspicuous example is legislation establishing a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention. This legislation creates a Drug Czar who will have the power of life and death over the VA regarding the treatment of veterans suffering from drug addiction.

We applaud your efforts, Mr. Chairman, to exempt the VA from this legislation. We also

applaud Congressman Satterfield who, as a member of the Commerce Committee, had language put in the bill which tells this Drug Czar, in effect, to leave the Veterans' Administration alone. Your Committee, Mr. Chairman, has already developed and reported a veterans drug bill, now pending in the Senate, which is the traditional and proper way to handle this problem in so far as veterans are concerned. I refer to H.R. 9265, which was endorsed at our Dallas Convention. This is the bill that the V.F.W. will be pressing the Senate to approve.

Our organization will be working closely with your Committee for cost of living increases in the compensation rates for the more than two million service connected disabled veterans.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is as anxious to see the end of the Vietnam War as anyone else, but we want that end to be an honorable one. For that reason we stand firmly behind the President on his eight-point proposal for peace in Indochina to bring American POW's home.

We strongly oppose bills now pending in Congress which would grant amnesty to draft dodgers who have fled to foreign countries in order to avoid military duty in our armed forces. If these draft dodgers wish to return to this country now that the war is practically over, they should be prepared to suffer the consequences for their crimes. They should never be permitted to return as heroes.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I again express my sincere gratitude for this opportunity to appear before this distinguished Committee.

It is our hope that each of you will be with us tonight at our annual Congressional Banquet at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, where we will be honoring one of your distinguished colleagues—the Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Honorable Thomas E. Morgan of Pennsylvania. He will be the ninth recipient of our V.F.W. Congressional Award for outstanding service to the nation.

The dinner will begin promptly at 7:00 P.M., with a reception beginning at 6:00 P.M.

Thank you for your attention.

#### THE WORTH OF GOLD

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the January 1972 issue of the South Africa International quarterly on the worth of gold, written by Dr. J. E. Holloway.

Since the House will shortly be debating the dollar devaluation bill, which recently passed the Senate, and since there are great differences of opinion between students of economics and monetary affairs on the role of gold in international monetary systems, this article is both timely and informative.

Dr. Holloway, one of the world's foremost authorities on gold, looks at possible alternatives for international monetary systems and says why in his view gold holds the key to an equitable solution.

Dr. Holloway's credentials are impeccable. Having received his doctorate from the London School of Economics, he became a lecturer and professor between 1917 and 1925 in South Africa. He later



served as Director of Census and Statistics from 1925-33; economic adviser to the Treasury, 1934-37; Secretary for Finance, 1937-50; South African Ambassador to Washington, 1954-56; South African High Commissioner in London, 1956-58; South African delegate to Bretton Woods Conference, 1944; former alternate governor of the International Monetary Fund; director of companies; economic consultant to leading mining house, and executive trustee of the South African Foundation.

The brilliance and clarity of Dr. Holloway's article becomes readily apparent to the reader, and I heartily recommend it to my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

#### THE WORTH OF GOLD<sup>1</sup>

(By J. E. Holloway)

Twenty years ago I had the honour of presenting to the two societies here represented a paper called 'The Debacle of Money'.<sup>2</sup> In that paper I ventured a prophecy in the following words: '... if gold is not correctly priced it will in time work havoc with any monetary mechanism, whether that mechanism be the gold standard or a managed currency'.

A devaluation is basically a change in the gold content of a currency. Dr. Franz Pick states that 400 devaluations in 82 countries took place between 1949 and 1969. The aspect of gold with which I shall deal is not its price, but I shall have something to say about the havoc which has overtaken managed currencies.

There is much confusion and lack of understanding not only among the general public but also among some economists about the worth or utility of gold. On the one side there are those who refer to it contemptuously as 'a barbarous relic' or 'only fit to adorn lavatories'. At the other extreme it is being used to an increasing extent to facilitate some of the most advanced processes undertaken by man, such as electronics and flying into outer space.

In between these, gold is being used to an ever greater extent in jewelry, the arts and a variety of other industrial productions. Furthermore an attempt to demonetise it has been firmly resisted by the great majority of central bankers who know that for every dollar by which the monetary price is reduced the central banks of the world would have to write off more than a billion dollars as losses in their balance sheets.

Why do I speak of the 'worth', and not of the value of gold? The English language is fortunate in having two words in which to express these two related but widely different concepts. This is of great assistance for clear logical or scientific thinking. One also finds the terms 'value in use' and 'exchange value', but 'worth' is more concise and accurate, because *worth* derives from the intrinsic properties or qualities of an article or a service. As long as these properties or qualities remain unchanged the worth remains unchanged. It is something measurable by objective standards. Value can be changed by a change in human wants, for example by what is called the demonetization of gold, but the intrinsic properties of the metal remain constant.

Value is the personal or subjective appreciation of the utility to a given person at a given time of the properties or qualities of an article. It is changeable under the influ-

ence of a great variety of circumstances or needs. It is entirely subjective and therefore can never be intrinsic. One need only think of the difference in the value of a cup of water in the middle of a desert and in the middle of a lake to understand that value is never intrinsic. The use of the word 'value' is more likely to confuse than to assist clear thinking.

It is the worth of gold with which this dissertation is concerned.

The value of an article to the individual derives from its ability to satisfy a human need. The word 'worth' therefore can be equated with utility but worth is a more definite word. Marshall defined utility as the capacity to satisfy wants. The satisfying of human wants is a fundamental concept in all economic thinking. The individual is the only judge of that utility to himself. The reason why the individual desires to possess a given article is beside the point. It is this desire that gives it value.

Against this background let us try to classify the various utilities of gold in the scheme of the present-day desires of human beings to possess it. For this purpose a second distinction must be defined. Gold has a use as a commodity, but it has another use as a service.

In the use of gold as a commodity, it generally becomes part of another commodity; a watch, a brooch, a tooth, an electronic circuit and so on. In the use of gold as a service it generally retains its identity, qualified by weight—a commercial bar, a kilo or tola bar, or a coin—or by caratage, and it retains its anonymity.

The confusion in the minds of many people who regard the utility of gold as limited, is that they think in terms of gold merely as a commodity, and overlook the far greater utility which it possesses when it renders a service. The economics of the two utilities differs greatly. In the economics of a consumable article, the producer wants its monetary value to be high, and the user is interested in its cheapness. In the case of an indestructible, such as a service which does not wear out, both the producer and the user want the price to be high. This has a significant bearing in the worth of gold in a monetary system.

The most common use of gold as a commodity is ornamental. In this guise it is truly protean: jewelry, gold thread for the ornamentation of vestments and regalia or the saris of Indian women, objects of religious veneration, articles of artistic excellence—the list is inexhaustible. As long as not only human veneration and human vanity but also human love for beauty and the arts persists so long will this demand for gold persist.

The second commodity use is that of conserving the ever useful human teeth. Although numerous substitutes are used this demand remains so substantial as to require nearly 100 tons of the metal annually.

A third category is found in the wide field which one might describe as other industrial uses. This comprises gold entering into industrial processes in which, unlike the case in ornamental use, the gold loses its identity. The list includes gold salts, alloys and gold leaf, but very important are the growing needs of the electronic and space industries where the resistance of the metal to atmospheric forces makes it particularly useful and in some cases almost indispensable.

The importance of isolating these uses from the monetary or service use of gold is that large industries must have the metal to enable them to remain in business. The demand, therefore, is continuous and rather inelastic. It has been estimated by various research agencies that in the non-communist world the present demand for gold as a commodity of industry is at least equal or even greater than the current production, and that the demand grows at an annual rate of between 7 and 12 per cent.

We must now give attention to the function of gold as a service. The first and much the largest use of the metal for this purpose is the gold reserves of central banks and state treasuries. These consist largely of the hoards accumulated over the past ages of human history. These may be defined as the *public monetary hoards*, or gold reserves.

There is, secondly, a substantial accumulation of *private monetary hoards*. The size of these is difficult to estimate. It is frequently overlooked that this is a monetary use. This private hoarding is resorted to by persons who prefer to keep their own gold reserves. Basically these consist of bars, coins and medallions, but there is also a great variety of other forms, which fall primarily into the next category, and, therefore, increase the difficulty of making a quantitative estimate of their size.

The next classification is a combination of monetary and commodity uses of gold deeply rooted in the social customs of many countries. In France the custom of keeping a family reserve of gold is deeply rooted. In India and other Eastern countries the giving of gold presents on definite occasions, e.g. births and marriages, is part of the way of life and sometimes of the religious mores of the community. Similarly the compulsory use of durable saris by various groups in contradistinction to the western use of annual fashions absorbs a large amount of gold thread. Although these uses are primarily commodity uses, they can be converted into monetary uses under the influence of economic stress. The failure of a monsoon in India after the gold revaluation in 1933 brought out a very large quantity of the metal to pay for imports of grain.

Associated particularly with the last two uses, there is, in a market in which the price of gold fluctuates, a further demand for the metal by what may best be described as the dealer element. In all markets there are people who make a living by buying what they consider is cheap, and selling when they consider that this is advantageous or necessary to balance their books. This involves carrying certain, not necessarily very large stocks, but constitutes a highly sensitive demand element for gold. Economic text-books generally point out that this dealer element is a stabilising price factor, but these so-called 'speculators' have recently come in for a considerable amount of unjustified abuse. Let us now have a brief look at the marketing of gold. The principal service demand comes from central banks. Under the Bretton Woods plan an official price was fixed by international agreement for dealings between members of the International Monetary Fund, a limitation which is often overlooked. There is, however, another demand side, which includes both the commodity and the service uses. That is the private demand for gold. In 1948, and on subsequent occasions, the price in this market became substantially higher than the official price.

The Fund Gold Policy of 1947 had sought to secure an almost complete demand monopoly for the Fund by attempting to prevent its members from dealing in the market, except at the official price and subject to conditions laid down by the Fund. South Africa demonstrated in 1951 that this was in conflict with both the wording and the intent of the Agreement. The Fund's Gold Policy was quietly dropped. Members of the Fund, however, continued exercising a measure of control by rationing supplies for the private demand at the fixed price.

In 1960 the private demand again outbid the official hoarders. This led to the establishment of the Gold Pool, which sold gold freely at the official price to all comers, except to the citizens of countries which made private possession of gold illegal.

By 1968 the private demand had again outbid the official hoarders by depriving them of a very large quantity of gold. This caused

<sup>1</sup> A paper delivered before the Economic Society of South Africa and the S.A. Institute of International Affairs at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg on 27 October, 1971.

<sup>2</sup> S.A. Journal of Economics, June 1951.

the collapse of the Gold Pool and the two tier system was inaugurated.

The next stage was reached when the succession of international monetary crises caused the collapse of the international agreement by which the official price was fixed. The U.S.A. and the most important members of the Fund withdrew from the obligations they had undertaken to maintain that price, and the market price remained the only effective demand price.

So much for the broad distinction between the commodity and the service utilities of gold. The commodity use is readily understood. The service use is that of serving as a means of final payment between debtors and creditors.

There can be various stages at which final payment is made. A gold coin standard places payment in gold within everybody's reach, a gold bullion standard places it within the reach of only relatively rich persons, a gold exchange standard places it within the reach of governments only. The details of how these standards work are concerned with the type of monetary mechanism and need not detain us here. The important point is that at all stages gold is the means of final payment.

A means of final payment is clearly essential in any monetary mechanism. There is no one so foolish as not to see that if there is no means by which creditors can be paid, there will in time be no new credit and the monetary system will collapse, but is gold the only conceivable final means of payment? This is the crux of the question of the service worth of gold.

In certain circles of monetary thought the question has been raised whether it is not possible to render this service to mankind in a way that is more efficient or at least not less efficient, and which is less costly, or at least not more costly than digging gold out of the ground. On this question there has emerged in our time a great cleavage in the thinking of monetary economists. Since the service use of gold is by far its most important use, it follows that an affirmative answer to this question must have a serious bearing on the question of the worth of gold. The choice between these alternatives leads us directly to the fundamental question: what are the essential desiderata of money?

The most fundamental concept is that money would never have been invented until there was use for it. This means, in simple language, that there must have been production, surplus to the personal or family needs of the producer, before money could have been invented.

The principle is that money is the result and not the cause of production, and that money is only a link in the chain of production. Today this is frequently lost sight of. People, observing the rôle of credit in production confuse credit with money.

If a person has a surplus to his requirements, which he wishes to exchange, a device called money can be of very great use to him. All text-books make this plain. It is the magnitude of this utility which lead a distinguished author, Geoffrey Crowther, to say: "Money is one of the most fundamental of all man's inventions." This is no overstatement since the division of labour and particularly the international division of labour would be severely restricted but for this invention.

If in primitive times a person had to exchange the product of his labour for something which he knew would not have equal worth to him, he would have preferred to hold on to his own surplus. No exchange would have resulted, and no money would have been invented.

It is, therefore, a fundamental desideratum of money that worth must be compensated with equal worth. It is not accurate to say value for equal value because value cannot

be intrinsic and is a most volatile concept. It follows also that the longer in point of time the worth remains equal, the greater the advantage, not only to the production of commodities, but also to the equitability and the maintenance of distributive justice in the whole social system. The invention of money was possibly the first essay in human history in the art of conservation.

Capital, as an economic force, is the surplus of production which can be used for further production. Without capital accumulation and its use in investment there can be little material progress.

The accumulated capital, like the accumulation of all goods, requires a receptacle or store in which it can be kept safely, with as little deterioration as possible. For capital to operate most efficiently, one of the prime requirements is that it should be possible to withdraw it from the store at short notice.

There are therefore two desiderata with which money must comply if it is to carry out its salutary function in the process of production and in the maintenance of distributive justice. These are as follows:

(a) worth must be compensated with equal worth in order to make money a satisfactory measure of exchange. I shall call this *the principle of integrity*; and

(b) the money received must retain its quality of worth for a long time so as to make it a satisfactory store or receptacle in which surplus production can be preserved safely, and from which it can be retrieved at short notice when it is required for further production. I shall call this *the principle of enduring worth*.

Not only is a final means of payment essential. It is also essential that the means of payment shall be equitable. On this depends such vast utilities in human endeavour as the division of labour on an international scale, the sanctity of contracts, the possibility of long term contracts involving vast constructions and millions of wage earners without the necessity for periodical renegotiation, caused by a change in the denominations in which values and prices are expressed. An instrument of payment, which does not provide for this stability must inevitably involve the great international mechanism of production in recurrent crises. I repeat that it is production which is the cause of money, the supreme purpose for the existence of a monetary mechanism.

Let us now return to the alternative conflicting views on what constitutes money. It is clear that the exchanger of goods or services must receive "a something" to serve as proof that he is entitled to receive an equivalent return for the worth with which he has parted.

What shape must this "something" take? The first and older school of monetary thought maintains that this must be a commodity which human beings want and continue to want. This school makes the point that a commodity has intrinsic properties and measurable dimensions. There can be no test of equality where there is no possibility of measurement. If the point that it must be a commodity is conceded, there is no argument that gold has beaten all other commodities which can be considered for this rôle.

The opposing school, however, does not concede the point that the "something" must be a commodity, claiming that a fiduciary instrument, created and maintained by proper authority, can serve this purpose equally well, and that it can be created with a minimum of effort, unlike gold which demands expensive mining operations. This approach is, therefore, essentially authoritarian.

Theoretically the possibility of such an ideal instrument serving the purpose of money may be conceded though even as a commodity money must satisfy certain essential requirements in regard to the inherent and intrinsic properties of the chosen

commodity, so also must authoritarian money comply with essential requirements in regard to the attributes of fiduciary instruments.

If these conditions are satisfied it can be claimed that mankind has a choice between two forms which money can take, viz. a suitable commodity or a suitable fiduciary instrument. Through the ages no other device to serve as money has been found. We have a choice of one or the other. We have no third choice.

What is the common factor in these intrinsic properties in the case of commodity money and in these attributes in the case of authoritarian money? The common factor can be summed up briefly in the two essential desiderata of money: the principle of integrity and the principle of enduring worth. *These are the moral principles of money.*

The world has had thousands of years of experience of the way in which commodity money has complied with the moral principles of money. It knows that the compliance has never been perfect; but it also knows that the validity of the principles has never been questioned.

The world is not without experience of the way in which money, dependent for its worth on the decrees or actions of established authority, has complied with the moral principles of money.

The question which faces us today is the manner in which established authority has maintained the essential attributes of fiduciary money. The experience of history, however, includes also the manner in which established authority has behaved towards the intrinsic properties of commodity money.

The record is not reassuring; quite the contrary. Throughout the ages, authoritarianism has made repeated onslaughts on the moral principles of money. To quote but a few examples we have the authoritarianism of the Roman Caesars (which in the time of Diocletian caused the Empire to fall into near anarchy); the debasements of Philippe le Bel in France, and of the early Tudors in England; the monetary schemes of John Law, the *assignats* of the French Revolution; the total collapse of all money in Germany under the Weimar Republic.

The most searching experiment into the feasibility of a monetary mechanism, in which all citizens have had to place their reliance in the maintenance by authority of the worth of a fiduciary instrument, has been made by our generation. During the currency of this experiment the richest and most powerful nations have denied the citizen, whatever may be his standing and importance in the productive sphere, the right of being paid in the alternative instrument, which constitutes money, namely a worth-possessing commodity. All other nations have had perforce to follow suit.

We have reached a critical phase now in the conduct of this experiment: the emergence of a tantalising series of crises. It is well, therefore, to evaluate the manner in which fiduciary money has stood up to the test, set by the desiderata of real money. The fiduciary instrument, a promise to pay, has lost all semblance of reliability. Worth given for it has continuously been requited with lesser worth. It has lost the quality of enduring worth to such an extent that it is no longer a store of worth.

Until recently, while the citizen has had no option but to accept it, central banks were still in the favoured position that they could exchange it for a commodity possessing final worth. This, too, has gone.

The authoritarian system has led the world to a pass where there is now no final means of payment. What still served in this capacity until recently is securely locked up by its custodians who manifest a remarkable obstinacy in keeping it to themselves. The producers are left out in the cold.

The richest and most powerful country



has declared in the words of its President that it will for the time being decline "... to convert dollars held by foreign central banks into gold or other monetary assets".

This is the greatest default in the long history of money. It has been committed by the greatest capitalist country in the world. Not in vain did Lenin say that "the best way to destroy the capitalist system was to debauch the currency".

We must face the fact that there is no real money operating in the world today. All the real money is securely locked up in the vaults of central banks or in the safe depositories of dealers and private hoarders. None of it is operative even between central banks except for small quantities and in exceptional circumstances.

There is no means of final payment. Instead of this, vast quantities of acknowledgments of debts are floating round the world under the guise of money and nobody knows what they are going to be worth next week or next year. Nowhere are the issuers of these promises to pay prepared to honour their bonds in something that has real worth.

Our generation has experienced the ultimate in the operation of Gresham's law. All the good money has been driven out of circulation. The only means of payment in circulation, even among central banks, consists of unredeemed I.O.U.'s. Gresham's law evidently requires reformulation: 'Bad debts will drive good debts out of circulation.' The process is already in operation.

Real money is the only real worth in the monetary mechanism. Unredeemable promises to pay are but unsubstantial *ersatz*.

It is not possible to run a monetary mechanism without real money. Fiduciary instruments of payment have reached the end of the road. They have lost their respectability and have destroyed their credit-worthiness. The only thing that is left over for central banks, which have reposed their faith in them, is to write off colossal losses.

Of the two instruments of payment available to mankind there is only one left, only gold.

"If gold is not correctly priced it will in time work havoc with any monetary mechanism whether that mechanism be the gold standard or a managed currency."

The price of gold has now done that to both. Nowhere in the world is real money available to the citizen, be he rich or be he poor; but it would be a mistake to think that the problem set by a moneyless money-economy can be solved by merely changing the price of gold. More is needed.

The worth of gold as a service to mankind lies in its ability to make the monetary mechanism function smoothly and efficiently. To borrow an analogy with biological processes, it serves like a vitamin or a trace element to keep the body healthy. The quantities required for this purpose are exceedingly small. The working presence of those small quantities is a *sine qua non*.

The working presence: in any monetary mechanism, unless authority is prepared to leave the instrument of final payment free to operate without let or hindrance of any kind whatever, nationally or internationally, the working presence will not be there. This absence in time will work havoc with the mechanism, whether that mechanism be the gold standard or a managed currency.

#### FULTON SALUTES SERVICE RETIRES' ASSOCIATION

**HON. RICHARD H. FULTON**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, retirees from the U.S. uniformed services—

men and women who have devoted 20 years or more to the service of their country—deserve the appreciation of all our citizens. Therefore, I take special interest in an organization, the Retired Association for the Uniformed Services—RAUS—which seeks to help assure these retirees' financial security.

This is a relatively new organization, established in June 1970. Its national headquarters are in Nashville, Tenn.

RAUS is a nonprofit organization dedicated to the purposes of upholding and defending the U.S. Constitution; supporting the national defense; and promoting the personal security and welfare of its membership by supplementing or replacing benefits lost on retirement.

RAUS' membership consists of officers and enlisted men and women either retired or pending retirement from the seven uniformed services—the Army, Air Force, Navy, Marines, Coast Guard, Public Health Service, and National Oceanographic Atmospheric Administration.

In December, RAUS opened its job-placement service, which assists members and nonmembers alike. Members pay no fees for the service. Experienced, professional employment counselors who have complete knowledge of general business and job requirements and specifications in their particular areas are provided.

Other services RAUS is providing or intends to provide include a monthly newspaper for members; a retiree credit union; housing assistance; group-rate insurance; a member discount program; special assistance to widows and senior citizens; a legislative committee in Washington; and welfare programs sponsored by local chapters.

So RAUS is a useful, working organization, and it continues to grow. It is, I understand, the first national organization of its kind whose membership is open to all uniformed-services retirees. I welcome this chance to bring it to my colleagues' attention.

#### WEST'S THIRST FOR WATER IS QUESTIONED

**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of January 17, 1972, carried a lengthy analytical article under the heading "West's Thirst for Water Is Questioned." I insert the text of the article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### WEST'S THIRST FOR WATER IS QUESTIONED (By Anthony Ripley)

DENVER, January 16.—The constant hunt for water, an expensive and almost compulsive tradition in the American West, is coming under increasing criticism, and the big projects designed to bring more of it to arid land are running into trouble.

The 17 states west of the 100th meridian, which cuts north and south through Dodge City, Kan., have always been chronically short of rainfall.

Ambitious men have solved that shortage with dams, canals and water diversion projects that are among some of the greatest civil engineering works in the nation.

Now, it appears, a fundamental reassessment is beginning of the need for future projects of this sort. The reassessment runs squarely into the teeth of the ancient Western belief that water alone is the key to all growth in the West and that the future rests in bringing in more water regardless of the cost.

Many people are coming to the shocking conclusion that, dry though it is, the Southwest in particular has plenty of water if man would only cure his sloppy and wasteful habits.

Some of those habits include leaky municipal water systems and a failure to recycle municipal sewage water. But the most extravagant and wasteful habits, these critics say, belong to the farmers of the Southwest and they raise a basic national question:

Should the Government pay farmers not to till the soil in states with high rainfall while it subsidizes farm irrigation in states with low rainfall?

From the beginning, little effort has been made in the Western states to impose any restrictions on the use of water. As a result, in the view of the critics, the distribution of the available supply is often unbalanced and sometimes highly irrational.

In Arizona, for example, 90 per cent of the water supply goes to agriculture, which contributes only about 10 per cent of the state's economy.

A dramatic picture of such water use is visible to passing motorists on Interstate Highway 10 in Pinal County, Ariz., between Phoenix and Tucson.

So much water has been drained from underground wells to irrigate farmland that the land has literally sunk and cracked apart.

John Kulonovich, district engineer for the Arizona Highway Department, says he does not know how deep the split in the earth is nor does he know of any permanent solution to the problem. He only knows it goes for miles across the nearby fields.

#### SPLIT KEEPS COMING APART

The split keeps coming apart as the land subsidizes so highway workers fill the crack and patch it two or three times a year.

Many farms in Pinal County have sucked the underground water table so dry that the sinking earth has twisted and broken off their well casings.

The giant diesel pumps stand idle at the Battaglia farms near Eloy this time of year as an occasional farmer nearby plows up his land, leaving a heavy trail of dust behind the plow.

In Arizona, underground pools of water supply most of the water used. The supplies are being drained at an annual loss of 3.5-million acre feet of water. (An acre foot of water is the amount it takes to cover an acre of land one foot deep or 326,000 gallons.) That is almost the precise amount used yearly to irrigate lands for feed grains and animal forage, low value crops easily grown in high rainfall areas of the Eastern United States, according to a 1966 study by economists at the University of Arizona.

But the defenders of the status quo are adamant. One of their leading spokesmen is Ellis L. Armstrong, commissioner of the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation. His agency has built \$6-billion worth of dams and irrigation projects in 17 Western states since 1902.

In a speech to the University Council on Water Resources in July, 1970, Mr. Armstrong said: "Water is hard to come by (in Arizona) as it is in most of the West. So don't seriously talk to Arizonans about giving up any existing water or abandoning any plans for further development unless your shooting iron is ready for the quick draw."

#### BIG PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

The Bureau of Reclamation is sending out for more water in the traditional way. It is drawing plans that make its spending for the first 70 years look tiny.

But as Bureau of Reclamation engineers

work on drawings and studies and graphs a number of changes are stirring that may blunt their most ambitious plans:

In Arizona, politicians are beginning to say privately that the \$1.4-billion Central Arizona Project to bring Colorado River water to Phoenix and Tucson is not a necessity but only a fringe benefit, a marginal insurance policy for the future.

In Washington, the National Water Commission is drawing up national plans and policies to be ready by 1973 on such subjects as whether water should be used in the dry Southwest to irrigate farmland for low-value crops that can be grown without irrigation elsewhere.

The Army Corps of Engineers, builder of flood control dams and projects, is taking a broader view than its traditional engineering projects. Instead of proposing dams, levees and river channel straightening projects it is considering such alternatives as flood-proofing houses, and discouraging builders from putting up construction on areas prone to flooding.

Municipal water departments are beginning to consider the recycling of waste water from sewage treatment plants. Tucson, Ariz., is trying to sell its treated waste water to farmers and copper mines in the area. Denver is quietly investigating public attitudes on using purified waste water in the city's drinking water system.

Groups like the Sierra Club and Friends of the Earth, spurred by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, usually called the Environmental Protection Act, which requires a list of alternatives to major Federal projects, are forcing re-examination of water plans both in the courts and among the administrative agencies of government.

"We're passing over the threshold to a new sort of approach," said Dr. Gilbert F. White of the University of Colorado's Institute of Behavioral Science.

#### WATER HABITS CALLED WASTEFUL

Dr. White, a professor of geography, has headed a number of national water study groups, among them committees of the National Academy of Science and the National Research Council.

American water habits, he maintains, have always been wasteful. More than 11 years ago he spoke of this public attitude in a lecture at the University of Arizona.

He said: "Many an area has been like the proverbial drunkard who thinks the best corrective for excessive use is another little drink, or a large one early the next morning."

Professor White said he had been encouraged by changing attitudes at the Corps of Engineers. He said it was once one of the nation's most rigid and bureaucratic agencies but now has softened its approach to rigid dam building.

Also encouraging, he said, was a realization on the part of many cities that they must be more prudent in handling water. Leakage in municipal water systems, he said, runs 10 to 30 per cent in many municipalities and up to 50 per cent in some sections of Chicago.

Sending out for more water rather than wide use of the present supply is what Dr. White calls "the quick technological fix" and is still in great style in the United States.

California's program is now 99 per cent finished, water officials in the state said, with a \$2.8-billion system of aqueducts and dams to bring water from the rivers near San Francisco to the Los Angeles area.

#### HUGE PROJECT IN ARIZONA

The central Arizona project, which took more than 20 years to guide through the Congress, is beginning to stir. It will bring Colorado River water from Lake Havasu behind the Parker Dam on the western Arizona border across the state and down to Phoenix and Tucson.

In Texas, voters by a slim margin turned down a \$3.5-billion bond issue. The vote only

temporarily delayed plans to bring Mississippi River water west across Louisiana, then through reverse flow up the Sabine and Red Rivers, into the Rio Grande Valley and into the Rio Grande Valley and into the high plains area of West Texas, according to officials of Water Inc., of Lubbock. Most of the entire program, which is expected to cost \$10 to \$12 billion, will be paid for, they hope, by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers.

But perhaps the most ambitious scheme, still in the talking stages, is called the North American Water and Power Alliance. It would take water from the Peace and Fraser Rivers in Canada, move them into the Columbia River System, then to the Central Valley of California, then south to the lower Colorado River Basin.

Southwest water problems arise because of a geographic accident of the West. The great heavy clouds of moisture that form and blow ashore from the Pacific Ocean lose most of their wetness over the Sierra Nevada and coast ranges.

The southwest states stand in their arid shadow, except where tall mountains reach up for a share of light rain in the summer and dry, powdery snow in the winter.

When the snows of winter melt, the water runs down the rivers, most of it evaporating and some of it seeping into underground pools to recharge them.

#### POOLS DON'T RECHARGE

In West Texas, however, the pools do not recharge. Irrigators there are pulling up ancient ground water for irrigation from the southern bed of the immense Ogallala Pool that extends under five states. Farmers take a depreciation allowance on their taxes for the used water and wait for the giant Texas water plan to solve future problems. In 1970, 65,214 wells in the high plains of Texas were drawing out 5.5-million acre feet of water a year.

In Arizona, farmers appear to be the only ones that will immediately benefit from the Central Arizona Project, along with speculators who have purchased holdings along some proposed aqueduct routes and dam sites.

For the cities of Tucson and Phoenix, the project appears only as a marginal one, at high cost to city dwellers.

Frank Brooks, director of water and sewers in Tucson, noted the city had grown from 35,000 in 1940 to 350,000 in 1970 and is the largest city in the world to get all of its water from underground wells.

"We know the city of Tucson is not going to run dry in the next 20 years," he said in an interview.

Jack D. Johnson, associate director of the Office of Arid Lands Studies at the University of Arizona sees much more water, a 100- to 300-year supply under Tucson.

"Nobody knows," Dr. Johnson said. "They've never bothered to determine what's there."

At present in Phoenix, the Salt River Project, an early Bureau of Reclamation effort has transformed itself into a major public utility and provides water for about \$3 an acre foot.

Water from the central Arizona project is expected to cost \$50 to \$70 an acre foot to Phoenix, while costs to irrigating farmers is set at only \$10 an acre foot.

#### OVERDRAWING BANK ACCOUNT

Wesley Steiner, executive director of the Arizona Water Commission, which was formed to handle the central Arizona project on a state level, noted the annual overdraft of well water.

"The real question is, when do you face up to the future?" he asked in an interview. "You know you are overdrawing your bank account. The project is the cheapest new source of supply that will ever be available to you, but it's going to cost a lot more than you are now paying."

Because it is unpopular to speak out publicly against the project, most prominent Arizona men keep silent if they have any doubts.

One, who asked that his name not be used, said that the need for the project was marginal, the price high and the amount of water coming into the area insufficient to cover the annual loss from draining off well water.

Not everyone has been silent. Such groups as the Sierra Club and Ralph Nader's Center for the Study of Responsive Law, along with economists, geologists and geographers, have raised questions about the project and, sometimes have been publicly attacked for their efforts.

Environmentalists managed to defeat a key portion of the project before it passed Congress in 1968. They blocked construction of two hydroelectric power dams in the Grand Canyon that were to help finance the project and provide power for its pumps to move water over hills and mountains into Central Arizona.

Instead of the twin dams, a giant coal-fired power plant is being built at Page, Ariz., which will burn 22,000 tons of coal daily from the Black Mesa deposits on the Navajo Indian Reservation.

There is widespread opposition to the project, too, because it will flood out most of the Fort McDowell Indian Reservation where 300 Yavapai-Apaches live. And many environmentalists and wildlife experts are also appalled at one provision that calls for chopping down riverbank trees that supposedly drink too much water.

#### STATE DEPARTMENT DEMOTED BY NIXON

#### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, now that the duties and prerogatives of the State Department have been taken over by Herr Kissinger and his handful of self-appointed international experts, the traditional State Department bureaucracy is anachronous.

What annoys the State Department hierarchy most are the embarrassing discussions at cocktail parties. The super foreign agents no longer call at the State Department; they are received by and converse with Henry personally.

The schism has become so pronounced that in Washington it makes the front page of the paper. It is further brought to light by a copy of a letter I received on Department of State letterhead, dated February 15, 1972:

#### SICKNESS AT FOGGY BOTTOM

The State Department is sick, some say dying.

"If I thought this humiliation were going to go on for another 20 years, I'd get out tomorrow," said one middle-level Foreign Service officer.

"Morale is worse now than at any time since the days of McCarthy's witch-hunt," said another angrily.

They both were speaking of the way the Nixon administration has demoted the State Department from the upper reaches of major U.S. foreign policy making in most areas.

But does it matter? Does it matter that Secretary of State William P. Rogers did not attend the President's meeting with the legendary Chairman Mao, or that Henry A. Kis-



singer—who did—has set up a "little state department" in the White House?

On the top floor of the State Department, the reply is an emphatic no. Rogers and his chief aide, Undersecretary of State John N. Irwin II, both are soft-spoken, gentlemanly and quite likeable men. First and foremost, they consider themselves to be loyal members of a team led by a President more experienced in foreign affairs than they.

For them, the things that matter more than the parochial malaise of Foggy Bottom, with its hand-wringing and hurt feelings, are the real achievements of Nixon's own foreign policy.

"The first question ought to be whether the system is working well overall for the good of the nation," said Irwin, in a rare interview. There, in the inner sanctum of his paneled office, he spoke slowly, quietly, making points with the careful hesitation of the 59-year-old aristocratic New York lawyer he is.

"It may well be that the Department of State plays a different role than before," he said, noting that Nixon has moulded the National Security Council system in the White House to his own liking.

The State Department pours more information into that foreign policy mechanism than ever before, Irwin maintained—through committees chaired by Kissinger or by regional assistant secretaries of state.

(He did not say so—although he could have—that one of those assistant secretaries, Joseph J. Sisco, with all the aggressiveness of Kissinger, has broken the White House monopoly on decision-making in one key area. He clearly is in charge of policy toward the Middle East, under Rogers.)

Irwin noted that the longstanding personal friendship between Rogers and Nixon is another guarantee of a State Department voice at the top.

"The ascendancy of the White House you speak of," he continued, "is after all the ascendancy of a President, of a man with great experience and ideas in foreign relations."

#### PROUD OF ROLE

"Looking back over three years, I think it has been a successful foreign policy. But the media always approach it from a negative, critical point of view . . . The media always seem to seek after who did most the developing policy, rather than after whether it is successful overall."

Down the hall, Rogers, in a separate interview, took up where Irwin left off.

"I am very proud of the way foreign policy is being conducted by the Nixon administration," he said with uncommon force. "I cannot think of a time that foreign policy has been so strongly supported by the public. I am proud to play a part in the formulation and execution of that policy, and I am proud of the role of the State Department in it."

That is where Rogers parts company with increasing numbers of the 3,000 professional Foreign Service officers under him. Some of them are not proud of the State Department role in Nixon foreign policy. Indeed, many doubt that they have any more than a fact-gathering and messenger-type role to play.

No one disputes the President's constitutional right to conduct his own foreign policy, nor are the general lines of that policy a matter of much argument among the professionals.

#### WHO SHOULD ADVISE?

They do worry, however, that President Nixon's unique conduct of foreign policy with Kissinger's apparatus may be maiming a vital institution of government. Nixon has taken the skeletal National Security Council system run by McGeorge Bundy and Walt Rostow in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations and turned it into an institution which rivals—even dominates—the State Department.

What is in question is who or what should be the chief adviser and coordinator of foreign policy advice going to the President. Rogers and Irwin, with their passion for secrecy—particularly about what goes from them to the President—have created the lowest of profiles for the department.

"What we want is the knowledge that we influence policy, not only collect and report the facts that go into it in the White House," said one youngish but highly regarded officer, obviously irritated over the way State Department advice was ignored in the recent Nixon "tilt" toward Pakistan in the Indo-Pakistan war.

The suspicion has grown that, from the beginning, Nixon's aim was to whittle down the influence of the professionals. Nixon's suspicion of the foreign affairs bureaucracy dates back to his days as vice president in the 1950s when the liberalism and apparent inefficiency of the State Department were a frustration to the militantly anti-communist Nixon of those days.

In 1969 he began his own presidency by appointing Henry Kissinger to be his right hand man in the White House. The dynamic geopolitician from Harvard University had written the previous spring, months before his appointment, about how he would circumvent the bureaucracy in important decision-making.

"Some of the key decisions are kept to a very small circle while the bureaucracy continues working away in ignorance of the fact that decisions are being made . . ." wrote Kissinger in an essay for the Security Studies project of the University of California.

"One reason for keeping the decisions to small groups is that when bureaucracies are so unwieldy and when their internal morale becomes a serious problem, an unpopular decision may be fought by brutal means, such as leaks to the press or congressional committees. Thus the only way secrecy can be kept is to exclude from the making of the decision all those who are theoretically charged with carrying it out."

In this scheme of things the secretary of State is not meant to be chief formulator of foreign policy, chief adviser on foreign policy, or even its chief spokesman. In retrospect, it seems Nixon indicated as much in a televised spectacular when presenting his Cabinet to the nation in January 1969. His close friend, Rogers, was chosen, Nixon said, because he is a "superb negotiator," the lawyer best suited for the coming "period of negotiations."

That implied a mechanical job for Rogers. In practice, the critics charge, Rogers has acted for three years as an affable trail boss riding herd over the bureaucracy, reminding professional subordinates where their loyalties should lie and curbing any public show of independence.

"He always tells us we are here to help the President, not to feed our own egos," said one man who has seen the operation firsthand.

#### HE LOOKS THE PART

"He does not have any real confidantes in the department," said an officer close to the top. "His interests, unlike Kissinger's, do not lie in overall conceptions of foreign policy, nor even in the nuts and bolts of carrying it out. He still acts very much like the corporate labor relations lawyer he is, working behind the scenes to arrange, to fix things for the boss."

"He's a secretary of State right out of central casting," said another. "He looks the part, he likes the part. But what really concerns him is how things look, not the way they are done."

These brutal assessments may or may not be true of the real "Bill" Rogers.

But curiously enough, the Rogers formula has effectively controlled the department. It has worked because the Foreign Service officers corps traditionally is disciplined and

loyal. It has worked because generally the foreign affairs bureaucrat, by nature, will not take action unless pushed to do so. And the formula has worked because Rogers, behind his wall of public diffidence, is a strong-willed man able to keep dissident subordinates in line.

One thing that does appear true is that Kissinger's early prophesy of secrecy has been self-fulfilling under the Nixon system. The centralization of all decision-making in the White House has led to less and less information being circulated in both the State Department and Pentagon.

#### FEARS ARE FED

The resulting disaffection, no doubt contributed, as Kissinger predicted, to the famous leak (although apparently not from the State Department) of the "Anderson Papers," which gave details of secret meetings on policy in the Indo-Pakistan war.

The leak plus others about ambassadors' recommendations from overseas, have fed a kind of paranoia about secrecy in the State Department. Last summer, when the New York Times revealed new U.S. proposals in the strategic arms talks before Washington had even communicated them to the Russians, Rogers asked key officers in the department to undergo lie detector tests. It subsequently was argued that he wanted only to prove to the President that State was not responsible for the leak. But the impact inside the building was quite the opposite—the incident was taken as a poignant reminder that the days of McCarthy might not be gone forever.

Today, according to informed sources, the top floor of the department has put strict limits on circulation of messages from U.S. ambassadors among the country desk officers who are fundamentally concerned with sorting out policy toward those countries. The messages, part of a numberless quantity arriving daily, now are read first by the regional assistant secretary for State concerned, and then forwarded to Rogers' secretariat for decision on wider distribution.

#### RECEIVES AMBASSADORS

While the restrictions multiply in Foggy Bottom, over at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue Henry Kissinger and his staff of 175—many of them talented Foreign Service officers "on loan"—have steadily taken over more of the prized prerogatives of State.

For instance, Kissinger now receives leading ambassadors—such as Soviet ambassador Anatoly F. Dobrynin and French Ambassador Charles Lucet—on his own. Their meetings are unpublicized, and they deal with the most delicate decisions of foreign policy.

"It's gotten so that no ambassador in town considers himself worth his salt unless he has been to see Kissinger. That leaves the State Department for more 'routine' affairs," scoffed one Foreign Service officer.

Kissinger's on-the-record and off-the-records briefings for the press are also regarded as another nail in the coffin of the State Department. While Rogers is not notably articulate—he detests press conferences—Kissinger emerges as the brilliant spokesman speaking with all the assurance of first-hand knowledge.

Former Undersecretary of State George Ball has written that this White House "court" conduct of diplomacy must have predictable results. He and others charge that professional ambassadors, such as William J. Porter at the Vietnam peace talks in Paris, see their roles downgraded as Kissinger takes on secret negotiating missions for his President. The inevitable outcome is a crippling of the institution they represent.

Blank has testified to the fact. A year ago he caused an uproar by attacking on the floor of the Senate Kissinger's role and by sympathizing with Rogers. The secretary of State, he said, had become the laughing-stock of the cocktail circuit.

This January Symington returned from a fact-finding trip to Asia and Europe with details of how this Kissinger role—which bypasses Congress—is undermining the status and authority of the State and Defense departments.

#### SECRETARIES IGNORED

"As but one illustration," he said of his talks in the field, "various people asked if I thought they could meet certain members of the White House staff if they came to Washington; but not one person, at any time, mentioned either the secretary of State or the secretary of Defense."

An even more immediate example is the current trip around Asia of Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian Affairs, Marshall Green, who was in the presidential party in China. His job is to reassure U.S. allies of continuing American devotion. After a press report last week that the Japanese government did not feel reassured—partly because Green was not in the Nixon-Kissinger talks with Chou En-lai—the State Department issued a formal statement affirming that Green is the "senior Asian expert" in the U.S. government, acting on the advice and responsibility of the President.

"The trouble is that this steady sapping of self-confidence is self-perpetuating," said one worried senior official. "Up until recently I thought all the talk of bad morale was the usual background music, but now I really fear that it can undermine the institution."

Matters have reached the point where the chief manager of the department, Deputy Undersecretary William B. Macomber, openly speaks of the danger.

#### REFORMS OVERSHADOWED

"Denigration of the State Department by people either inside or outside the department," he said during an interview, "is contrary to the national interest. If it keeps up, it will eventually weaken this essential asset to the government."

For Macomber and those around him, the tragedy is that this talk of sagging morale and seething revolt overshadows the real reforms Rogers has introduced in the department. By most accounts, Macomber—with Rogers' backing—has laid over the past two years the groundwork for a more humane and efficient State Department.

Computers have been introduced in a big way to streamline the paperwork. A new system of case-by-case, country-by-country studies of overall U.S. policy called Policy Analysis and Resource Allocation (PARA) is operating. For the first time also the State Department is soon to have a union charged with representing the rights of all 9000 permanent foreign service personnel.

Furthermore Rogers has set up a grievance system, where there was none before. It allows officers to appeal slights in promotion or illegal use of authority. Although critics charge that the "interim" system is not independent enough of the State Department management, it is generally expected that pressure from Congress and from the new union will produce an acceptable compromise by this summer.

Under Rogers, Macomber has also moved to soften the brutality of the "selection-out system"—whereby officers failing of promotion were forced to resign without adequate pension. Under a new "threshold" design, any officer who crosses into middlegrade ranking after a five-year "apprenticeship" is guaranteed 20 years tenure and full retirement benefits later.

#### COMPETITION GROWS

Ironically, though, the bulge of talented middle-level officers resulting from this more humane system, coupled with an excess of top-grade officers left over from previous days—is feeding the morale problem. For instance, Class 4 officers, most of whom have 15 years of experience, find themselves in cut-throat competition with their fellows

for dwindling overseas assignments and for hard-to-get promotions to the next higher grade.

Add to that the forced elimination of jobs—cutbacks totalling 24 percent ordered for budget-cutting purposes by the Johnson and Nixon administrations—and you have the ingredients for an enormous morale problem. Career officers find themselves competing for fewer and fewer jobs which simultaneously seem less and less important to the conduct of foreign policy.

Rogers appears unruffled by the crescendo of criticism coming his way. If the National Security Council system did not exist, he said in the interview, it would have to be created.

"National security policy cuts across many departments of government," he explained. "There is a need for a mechanism in the White House to get an above-the-department view for the President on major matters, where there are conflicts within the government."

Rogers knew, he said, that the "many talented people" in State felt disappointed about not being in on the early stages of planning for Nixon's trip to China. "Everyone likes to be in on the action," he said. But once the trip was announced, he said, the President made maximum use of State Department expertise and was most appreciative of it.

#### CANNOT ALWAYS TRAVEL

Both Rogers and Irwin maintained that what escapes the press is the capable handling by the State Department of that 98 percent of American foreign policy which is unglamorous but vital.

If morale were so bad, asked Rogers, why were Foreign Service applications almost doubled last year—up to 15,000 from 8,000 in 1970? (Some observers attribute the increase as much to the tight job market and greater State Department emphasis on recruits for administration and consular affairs as to enhanced status of the diplomat.)

Rogers refused to talk on-the-record about Kissinger's personal excursions in secret diplomacy in Paris and China. But in a recent interview with another reporter he was quoted as noting that "as secretary, I can't take all the trips, if only because of the protocol involved. . . ." Presumably he meant that his highly visible position in the government precludes secret trips abroad.

But a senior department officer, while respecting Rogers and his view of the office, disagreed. He recalled that John Foster Dulles, Eisenhower's powerful secretary of State, had once considered setting up shop in the White House basement to oversee American foreign policy without the encumbrance of ceremony or publicity.

"But he finally rejected the idea," said the officer. "Dulles saw that you cannot have authority without responsibility." The tight shop run by Kissinger is "riding for a fall," he added, because too many able men with essential information are being cut out of the policy-making process.

After all, he agreed, it probably would be better for the institutions of government—for Congress, for the State Department, even for the presidency—if the dynamic Mr. Kissinger were Secretary of State and the diffident Mr. Rogers moved over to the White House.

But neither he nor any other student of the Nixon method thinks that switch is likely.

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, D.C., February 15, 1971.

Hon. BLANK,  
The Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We, the State Department officers, are alarmed by a steady decline of the Department participation in our foreign policy. As concerned citizens we are compelled

to express our concern about many serious consequences of decisions undertaken without any participation of the State Department, and in many cases even against its better judgement.

The American foreign policy, as shaped by the presidential advisers like Mr. Rostow and Mr. Kissinger, has involved our country in wars which are damaging to our international prestige. There was no doubt that the President could have moved faster to get out of Vietnam; considering his campaign pledge that he would end the war, it is remarkable that the U.S. is still involved three years later, and at a cost of 20,000 American lives.

The involvement of the United States in conflicts in Asia and the Middle East has brought about the neglect of some other very important regions such as Latin America where Communism is spreading larger and larger. The State Department has not prepared the most important policy-making moves like the Chinese one. As a result we have only a fragmentarily shaped foreign policy and this deprives the Congress of its constitutional prerogative of control over one of the most important government activities. The President and Mr. Kissinger worked alone over the problem of what the U.S. interests are in the Indian subcontinent. While the State Department officials concluded that India would be satisfied with a victory limited to East Pakistan, the White House came up with what was described as "certain" knowledge that India aimed at threatening the survival of West Pakistan itself. The U.S. interests in South Asia were wrecked by American support of the loser, and our bargaining position in far more important areas was seriously threatened.

The State Department needs a lot of reforms to make American diplomacy more creative and effective for the 1970's. But the Department is downgraded to control no more than seven per cent of all our foreign policy resources. Even in U.S. embassies abroad only about 20 per cent of officials and employees are listed as State Department personnel.

There is a puzzle as far as the role played by Mr. Rogers is concerned. By tradition, the Secretary of State is supposed to be the President's chief adviser in foreign policy. Mr. Rogers is an experienced negotiator. He has a great feel for public opinion. He knows that present commitments abroad are way out of whack with the national mood. He has been more often right than wrong on most of the broad issues.

How could it happen that his effectiveness as Secretary of State is being reduced to next to nothing? The truth is that Mr. Kissinger is getting more and more control over the Foreign Service. The critical aspects of intelligence analysis has been taken out of the hands of professionals and vested in the President's chief adviser who is insulated from Congressional scrutiny. And this is a point for discussion how Congress will succeed to retain a measure of at least restraining influence over our foreign and military policies.

The State Department is being steadily pushed out of its natural track and Mr. Kissinger plays a cool game from the posture of strength. All concerned Americans consider that the presidential adviser shouldn't conduct the NSC meetings. This function should belong to a member of the Executive. We strongly feel it should be the Secretary of State.

And who is Mr. Kissinger? He is a naturalized citizen and a man who often behaves like a fun-loving Rasputin. The point is: Is he good enough as the President's chief adviser? It is needless to say that after three years of his tenure we are still very deeply involved in South East Asia. Backing Israel the Nixon administration is losing \$2 billion a year in the Middle Eastern oil revenues. Careful consideration ought to be given to that loss because of our already embarrass-



ingly unfavorable balance of payments. Many previously pro-U.S. lands as Jordan or Turkey, are now simmering with dislike for the U.S. and it could be but a matter of not too long a time before similar emotions spread to Saudi Arabia. We doubt whether the first priority given to the trip to China is motivated strongly enough by our raison d'etat. We are of the opinion that Mr. Nixon should go to Moscow first and to Peking later. Committing himself otherwise he has lost a good bargaining position. It is doubtful whether abandoning our ally in Taipei would set a good example to other nations. Besides, Chinese emigre circles may turn pro-Communist.

We are deeply puzzled and dismayed by some policy statements coming from the White House and concerning the Middle East. These statements have undercut—perhaps fatally—some delicate diplomatic initiatives undertaken by Mr. Rogers. Mr. Kissinger's comments on the Middle East and the India-Pakistan war reinforced the impression that it had been the White House alone that had decided, without any consultation with the Department, to talk tough to Moscow on behalf of Israel and Pakistan.

In summary, we cannot stand the situation that Mr. Kissinger outranks Mr. Rogers in exercising his influence upon the course of American foreign policy. We hope that time will come when State Department will take a strong lead in the making of our foreign policy for the benefit of all Americans.

We believe the time is ripe for an effort to change this situation and we trust you will give this letter a proper consideration.

We do not sign this letter because we are aware of the consequences the disclosure would have for our career prospects.

Sincerely yours,

STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICERS.

#### THE 122D ANNIVERSARY OF THOMAS GARRIGUE MASARYK

#### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, March 7, marks the 122d anniversary of the birth of the great liberator and first president of Czechoslovakia, Thomas Garrigue Masaryk.

During the 19th Century, a Czech and Slovak national revival flowered under the leadership of intellectuals amid general conditions of economic improvement. Influenced by the rising tide of political nationalism enveloping Europe during 1848, the peoples of Bohemia and Slovakia, along with the Hungarians, revolted against the all-German rule of the Austrian Emperor. These revolts were ruthlessly suppressed. In 1867, the Hungarians achieved the status of equality with the Austrians in the newly created dual monarchy of Austria-Hungary, but the Czechs and Slovaks remained a subjugated people until World War I.

Masaryk was educated at universities in Vienna and Leipzig and became a professor of philosophy and sociology in a university in Prague in 1882, writing extensively on philosophical, sociological and political subjects. He served as a member of the Austrian parliament from 1891 to 1893, and again in 1907.

When World War I broke out, Masaryk was still in the Reichsrat, but escaped to

the West in December 1914. For the next 4 years, he and his pupil, Eduard Benes, along with other Czechs and Slovaks, carried on their campaign for freedom and independence from various countries of Europe and the United States. Masaryk and Benes inspired people wherever they went, and enlisted the support of thousands of Czechs and Slovaks to fight on the side of the Allies.

The Czechoslovaks were fortunate in having Thomas G. Masaryk as their most prominent spokesman. Equally fortunate were the Slovaks in having Milan R. Stefanik as their leader. Both men saw the destiny of their respective nations best achieved in political unity. On October 14, 1915, Masaryk, then in Paris, officially inaugurated the movement for independence, and in January of the following year organized the Czechoslovak National Council with Stefanik, Dr. Eduard Benes, and himself as its leaders.

Masaryk believed that if the aspirations of his young nation were to be achieved, they had to establish a military force which could contribute to the Allied cause in the war and thus win for the Czechoslovaks the right to become a participant in the negotiations for a peace. Accordingly, Czechoslovak legions were formed abroad to serve in the Allied forces and an underground organization was also established to work within the homeland.

Finally, Masaryk believed that the Czechoslovaks must get the support of America, specifically agreement with Americans of Czechoslovak extraction and the political support of President Wilson. In 1918, the United States provided support, for which Masaryk expressed his gratitude to President Wilson and the American people.

From this moment onward, the movement toward independence coincided with the waning military fortunes of the Central Powers. The Czechoslovak National Council won recognition as Czechoslovakia's legitimate government. An interim government was established in Paris on October 14, and on October 18, 1918, this government proclaimed the independence of the Czechoslovak nation by a declaration published in Washington.

Independence having been won and proclaimed, the Czechoslovaks thereupon set out to establish their first republic, with Thomas G. Masaryk as President.

The constant reelection of Masaryk served as testimony to the enormous affection and respect the Czechoslovak people had for their founding father. He resigned in 1935 due to advanced age and ill health, and was followed by Dr. Benes to the presidency. The death of Masaryk on September 14, 1937, spared him from the perfidy of the Munich agreement and its aftermath.

After struggling against the Nazis, in 1948 the proud and democratic Czechoslovak people were taken over by the Communists.

Since that time, the Communists have tried every imaginable means to destroy the spirit of Masaryk, and failing that, they have tried to make him a prophet of communism. They have gone so far as to destroy the monuments of Masaryk. However, none of these tactics have worked

and the inspiration and guiding example of Masaryk is greater today than ever before. "Be honest—tell the truth—I shall continue to watch over you," Thomas Masaryk used to tell the Czechs. His words still echo throughout the country, to the consternation of the Communist rulers.

Even the spectacle of the Russian tanks rolling into Czechoslovakia in 1968 could not alter the peoples' feelings for freedom and liberty, for they know that long after communism is nothing more than a heap of rubble in the pages of history, they will again have a republic guided by the hand of their greatest statesman and founding father, Thomas Garrigue Masaryk.

Mr. Speaker, it is with the greatest respect and honor that today I pay tribute to the memory of Masaryk on the 122d anniversary of his birth.

#### THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT'S ROLE IN BUILDING A BETTER AMERICA

#### HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, recently, former Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard became the 10th individual to receive the distinguished citizen award of the Palo Alto Chamber of Commerce. This was awarded in recognition of the great contributions Mr. Packard made while serving as Deputy Secretary, as well as contributions to his home community of Palo Alto.

As a trustee of Stanford University and industrialist in the San Francisco Bay Area, Mr. Packard has taken the lead in assisting minority races and upgrading the social and economic status of underprivileged citizens in the area. He has truly earned the title of "Distinguished Citizen."

In accepting the award, Mr. Packard delivered an excellent address which throws the light of truth upon government and the role the Defense Department plays in building a better America. His efforts in the Department of Defense were in fact a continuation of the constructive steps he took in behalf of minorities and the underprivileged as a businessman in Palo Alto, Calif.

I have taken the liberty of titling Mr. Packard's remarks as "The Defense Department's Role in Building a Better America," and wish to insert the full text of that speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I commend it to all of my colleagues:

#### REMARKS BY DAVID PACKARD

Mrs. Packard and I want to thank you for the warm and friendly welcome home from Washington. You do me a great and undeserved honor to place me in the company of the nine persons previously named Distinguished Citizens of the Palo Alto Chamber of Commerce. And tonight, in these brief remarks, I'd like to begin with some words of one of those past recipients of the award, the late President Herbert Hoover.

Fifty years ago Mr. Hoover published a slim volume titled *American Individualism*. In it was a sentence which should be written on these walls tonight:

"We cannot ever afford," said Herbert Hoover, "to rest at ease in the comfortable assumption that ideas always prevail by some virtue of their own."

"There have been periods of centuries," Mr. Hoover wrote, "when the world slumped back toward darkness merely because great masses of men became impregnated with wrong ideas..."

Surely he must have had in mind the great power of Government propaganda, which had been so evident on both sides during World War I. And certainly all of us, as individual American citizens, must continue to evaluate critically the official explanations of any public authority.

But there is another sort of propaganda about which I presently am even more concerned: Call it the anti-Government line, or—if you dare to be as vague as the peddlers of the line—call it "anti-establishment."

Probably most of the businessmen and industrialists in this audience have been targets of such propaganda attacks. You have been told that your profits are excessive and your products shoddy. If you engage in commercial operations beyond the borders of this country, you are automatically labeled "imperialists."

None of you have received the great honor from these anti-American propagandists and hate mongers that I have. If there are mad bombers in this country, they are probably in front of Rickey's tonight.

There is, of course, more noise than substance in such charges, but the cumulative effect of their constant repetition can be very persuasive.

There is an old adage which says "For evil to triumph, good men need only do nothing." This can also be stated in this way—For evil ideas to prevail, good men need only to remain silent.

Fortunately, good men and women of the Stanford community did not remain silent, and the purveyors of evil ideas have been exposed at the University.

Unfortunately, some of these purveyors of evil ideas have moved into your high schools and it is high time for at least a few good men and women in Palo Alto to speak out.

And nowhere, during the past three years, have the assaults been more vicious and less deserved than in the campaigns against the military profession. The fate of the ROTC and the recruiting officers on many of our most prestigious university campuses, including Stanford, is one unfortunate result of this anti-military campaign.

Because I've had the opportunity, over the past three years, to become acquainted with a good many professional soldiers, I'd like to use my remaining time to speak out on their behalf.

I'll start at the top with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They are not only outstanding American citizens—professionals of the highest ability—but at the same time knowledgeable about, and sensitive to, the problems of our society.

As I worked with the men and women in the Defense Department over these three years, I became greatly impressed with the high caliber of people who serve their nation in defense. I worked closely with the Joint Chiefs, the other top officers in each Service, and I had many occasions to visit with men and women in units large and small all over the world. You will find no more capable, dedicated, fine American men and women in any business organization, any city or county government, any school or university, than you will find in American military units and bases wherever they may be. This country can be proud of the military people who provide its security. It has been especially disturbing to me to witness the bitter, often vicious, criticism of the military in the press, on TV, in many of our more liberal universities, and even by Congressmen—who, of all people, should know better.

I can understand disillusionment with Vietnam policy going back to 1966 or so, but the military does not deserve criticism for the policy—it was dictated and completely directed from 1964 on by the civilians in the Administration and in the Department at that time. The officers and servicemen and women in the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marines simply did what they were asked to do. They were asked to do an almost impossible job, and they did it well.

We asked our military people in the spring of 1969 to re-orient the emphasis to Vietnamization—to help the South Vietnamese develop their own defense capability so American forces could come home. The Vietnamization policy has been successful beyond everyone's expectation—most of our forces, over 400,000, have been brought home—South Vietnam can now defend itself from the Communist invaders without help from American forces. When the emotion on this issue dies down this will be recognized as a great accomplishment by American military people.

One point that is often overlooked is that the role of our military services has not been just to defend America. It has also been to develop America. One of the earliest examples of this is the part the Army played in the western movement in American history—in winning of the West.

One of the most exciting things I was able to do while I was in the Pentagon was to encourage a renewal of involvement by military people in attacking some of the serious social problems of America. Early in 1969 Secretary Laird and I set forth a statement of Human Goals for the Defense Department. These goals were stated as follows:

To attract to the defense service people with ability, dedication, and capacity for growth;

To provide opportunity for every one, military and civilian, to rise to as high a level of responsibility as his talent and diligence will take him;

To make military and civilian service in the Department of Defense a model of equal opportunity for all regardless of race or creed or national origin, and to hold those who do business with the Department to full compliance with the policy of equal employment opportunity;

To help each serviceman at the end of his service in his adjustment to civilian life; and  
To contribute to the improvement of our society, including its disadvantaged members, by greater utilization of our human and physical resources while maintaining full effectiveness in the performance of our primary mission.

Let me cite some of the results of the application of these Human Goals to Defense affairs.

We established a Domestic Action Program. In 1971 the Department hired 46,000 young people, 76% of whom were disadvantaged youths.

In addition, we asked every military base and every military activity in the country to use their resources to support educational, recreational, and cultural programs for disadvantaged youths. Over 2.4 million young people participated in these programs across the country last year. In 1969, the year I came to the Department, there were only 250,000 young people involved. I am kind of proud that ten times as many youngsters had a better summer in 1971 because of what we could do in the Defense Department.

People all over the country including you people in Palo Alto are being exposed to a largely distorted story about many aspects of your government—in particular about the military—about the fine men and women in the Defense Department who make it possible for you to sleep safely and soundly in your homes. You can be proud of the people who serve you in the uniform of their country. Don't let them down.

Mrs. Packard and I are pleased to be back

in this great community, and I am deeply grateful for this award. Thank you very much.

## CONGRESS MUST HALT FURTHER RAIDS ON PROPERTY OWNERS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND GOUGING OF U.S. TAXPAYERS

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to saddle upon the taxpayers of the entire country the construction of a sports arena and so-called convention center in Washington, D.C., at a cost of more than \$100 million, is beyond belief.

Not only will this be a rape of property owners in the city whose businesses and properties it is proposed to take from them by condemnation proceedings if they do not supinely surrender, but it will take these properties from the tax rolls and again Congress will hear the leeching demands of the city government that still more money must be taken from the U.S. Treasury to cover the loss in tax revenues.

All this in the name of fun, sport, and amusement.

Mr. Speaker, the city of Washington, D.C., is worse than insolvent. It cannot peddle bonds for municipal purposes such as construction without a Federal guarantee of such bonds. Until it puts its financial house in order Congress must put a stop to its annual raids on the U.S. Treasury and the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing in the RECORD at this point a petition, certain newspaper articles, and other material bearing on this subject:

A PETITION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE HOUSE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

(Presented by Mount Vernon Religious, Civic, Chinese & Business Associations, Washington, D.C.)

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GROSS: We send you for your information and comment the following items:

1. A *Chicago Tribune* article, "Chinatown Asks Nixon's Help" of March 2, 1972 by Willard Edwards. This article was published on the editorial page, and shows the great and growing national concern about the proposed convention-sports center to be built with Federal tax funds.

2. A letter from the Chairman of the Prince Georges County Council, Winfield M. Kelly, to Rep. Kenneth J. Gray, Senators Mathias and Beall, and Rep. Hogan, about the sports arena-convention center-motel complex at nearby Largo, Md. Chairman Kelly writes that "The site is in close proximity to the Capital Beltway an existing Metroliner Station and a Metro Station programmed for 1975-76. In addition, since there are no existing buildings on the tract, the developers do not face the problems of relocation of residents and businesses that will be involved at the Mount Vernon Square location. . . . In light of the resistance the downtown complex is encountering from organizations and individuals in the Mount Vernon Square area, we thought we should provide you with this report on the status of the Prince Georges County project." Note that this complex is being built without Federal funds, and that



the Mount Vernon Square project would compete with it, and jeopardize its success, by use of Federal tax funds.

3. A letter from Mayor Walter E. Washington to the Reverend S. Everett Guilles of Turner Memorial AME Church. Referring to the threatened destruction of Greater New Hope Baptist Church, and Turner Memorial AME Church, and the destruction which the project, even as scaled down from 25 acres to 15 acres, the letter points out that he had learned from Capitol Hill that as a result of the opposition expressed, Congressman Gray publicly announced that the proposal would be reconsidered; that he appreciated how "the responsible citizen leadership view the proposition," and that he hoped "that from the exchange of views there will emerge a mutually agreeable conclusion." Mayor Washington shows here a genuine concern for people and justice.

4. A WMAL-TV editorial of March 1, 1972 saying that: "We don't believe that trading off a large section of Chinatown, the Greater New Hope Baptist Church, and the stores that make up 'Furniture Row' for a sports-convention complex, no matter what its financial potential, is a good bargain. If the idea is to revitalize an area, then revitalize what is there, keeping intact the character of the neighborhood. If location and convenience is paramount, then why not the previously-considered Union Station site. The room to build is already there. Metro is coming and so are the freeways. So is a visitors Center. By moving the sports-convention complex, we could have all of this, and Chinatown, too."

We believe the American voters and taxpayers are entitled to know all about what is planned for the American Revolution Bicentennial and as a Memorial to President Eisenhower, so we request that you include this letter and its attachments in the *Congressional Record*.

5. The statement of the Rev. S. Everett Guilles to the House Public Buildings Subcommittee on February 17 in which he says: "I also plead for preserving not only our churches, but the 129 large and small businesses, the 3,000 jobs they provide, the city's tax base, the historic Chinatown area, the employees, the families, the residents of our area. We all ask, why destroy 3,000 good jobs to provide 1,500 jobs where our Black employees can hawk beer, sell peanuts, and park cars? We ask, isn't fulfilling the needs of the people, many of whom are still without enough to eat and lacking job opportunities and decent housing, more important than building a place to shoot hoops, blow noisemakers, and park 5,000 cars?"

6. The *Washington Post* editorial, "The Convention and Sports Arena Complex" of February 23 which says that "to build this complex, as originally proposed [by the House Public Buildings Subcommittee] across eight city blocks south of Mount Vernon Square, would further impair rather than restore the economic health of the downtown business district. To destroy the 129 business establishments of Chinatown and furniture row, to say nothing of two active churches, is hardly a way to 'revitalize' them." The *Post* editorial makes clear that the whittled-down plan of 15-acres would, at most, save only "the heart of Chinatown, along I Street NW, between 6th and 7th Streets, as well as the Turner Memorial African Methodist Church from the bulldozers. But that did not satisfy the opponents of the Mount Vernon Square site." Why should it?

Mrs. Igna G. Yaeger, Chairman of Businessmen Opposing the Convention-Sports Center, and co-chairman of the Mount Vernon Religious, Civic, Chinese, and Business Associations, in a recent petition to Congress and the House Public Works Committee, says the entire sports-convention com-

plex is illegal because the Public Buildings Act of 1959 requires that any building costing more than \$100,000 must be justified by President Nixon as being in "the national interest", and since the Public Buildings Act of 1959 is the Act of Congress under which this \$100-million project is being advanced, to avoid a probable defeat on the House Floor, it is clear that a Presidential-detailed-justification that this complex is in "the national interest" must be provided. We respectfully hereby request the Congress and the House Public Works Committee members, and President Nixon, to provide such a detailed "justification determination" at once, before any further steps are taken on this huge project. We also request full conformance with the National Environmental Policy Act, and the National Housing Act. Respectfully yours,

For the Mt. Vernon Religious, Civic, Chinese & Business Associations: William Yee, Leon Weinraub, Inga G. Yaeger, George Moy, George Frain.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 2, 1972]

#### CHINATOWN ASKS NIXON'S HELP

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON.—Now that his Asian travels are over, President Nixon has found another Chinese problem on his very doorstep.

He is being implored by desperate Chinese-American business leaders to save an area 10 blocks from the White House from destruction by bulldozer.

They have been joined in the plea by black leaders, including the ministers of two large churches, hundreds of home owners, and more than 125 merchants from the section known as Washington's Chinatown, who would be driven from the neighborhood.

On the 25 acres thus cleared, a \$108 million convention center, sports arena complex, and 5,000 car parking facility would be erected and financed by tax-supported, tax-guaranteed bonds. It would be named for the late President Eisenhower.

The controversy aroused by this proposal might be considered only a local issue, but it has, in fact, implications to all taxpayers. It involves the often arbitrary methods of urban renewal planners who use federal power to clear out established owners and tenants for the benefit of powerful interests. If the subsequent projects incur deficits, all taxpayers lose.

In this case, the interests are indeed mighty.

They include the Washington Board of Trade, the Bicentennial Committee preparing for the celebration in 1976 of the 200th anniversary of the nation's independence, the Board of Realtors, and the District of Columbia City Council.

Congress initially appeared willing to go along. The House public buildings and grounds subcommittee, headed by Rep. Kenneth J. Gray [D., Ill.] approved the project a month ago and prepared to urge full committee approval.

Then a storm broke. Residents of the area protested that the subcommittee listened only to proponents of the proposal, refusing to hear those who would be displaced. Speeches on the House floor noted that Congress has been deceived in the past by plans for memorials that were originally advanced as involving no cost to taxpayers but ended up costing millions. The Robert F. Kennedy Stadium and the John F. Kennedy Arts Center are both in financial trouble.

Gray will never forget the ordeal he suffered five years ago when he sponsored a headquarters for foreign governments and was accused by Rep. H. R. Gross (R., Ia.) of seeking to establish "an international drinking club" at taxpayers' cost. The Women's Christian Temperance Union inspired thousands of protesting letters from his district. He is thus sensitive to the political conse-

quences of financing memorial buildings with public money.

Belatedly, Gray gave a hearing to the spokesmen for the Chinese community, the ministers of the two churches, and the proprietors of several large furniture stores in the area. Impressed by their arguments, he suggested the 25 acres might be whittled down to 15 acres and pledged that "Whatever happens, Chinatown, the two churches, and furniture row will be saved."

Opponents remained unsatisfied. In a letter to Nixon, they asked him to visit the area and decide for himself whether a sports arena would not create more problems than benefits.

They noted that the government owns nearly half the land area in the District of Columbia. Why undergo huge acquisition costs, to the profit of land speculators, when there were available federal sites now vacant which would be equally suitable? Why destroy homes, businesses, jobs, and a taxpaying area to erect another white elephant which would eventually become another burden to the taxpaying public?

"We are united here, black, white, Chinese, churches, and businesses," the residents wrote. "We are dedicated to living in harmony with our fellow man. Shouldn't this be your goal, as well as ours?"

These are good questions deserving of answer. They have too often gone unanswered in a society which, in recent years, seems bent on improvement of cities by demolition, regardless of injustices to individuals.

PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY COUNCIL,

February 24, 1972.

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY,  
House of Representatives,  
Public Works Committee,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GRAY: The purpose of this letter is to apprise you of the developments concerning the proposal for a sports arena-convention center in Prince George's County, information that bears directly upon the recent action of the Public Buildings Subcommittee is approving funds for a similar facility in the Mount Vernon Square area.

You may be aware that a suburban Maryland concern, Potomac Sports Ltd., entered into an agreement last August with the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission for use of a site at Largo for a sports arena-convention center-motel complex. The site is in close proximity to the Capital Beltway an existing Metroliner Station and a METRO Station programmed for 1975-76. In addition, since there are no existing buildings on the tract, the developers do not face the problems of relocation of residents and businesses that will be involved at the Mount Vernon Square location.

No less than two years has already been invested in the planning of the Prince George's complex and the principals in the venture are very confident that they can win any race with those promoting similar facilities in downtown Washington. Moreover, they have been encouraged in their discussions with major ice hockey and basketball league officials about the prospects of obtaining major league franchises.

From information we have received from Potomac Sports Ltd., it appears that they will soon have firm financial commitments, clearing the way for construction and opening of the facility in late 1973.

In light of the resistance the downtown complex is encountering from organizations and individuals in the Mount Vernon Square area, we thought we should provide you with this report on the status of the Prince George's County project.

With kindest regards, I remain

Sincerely,

WINFIELD M. KELLY, Jr.,  
Chairman.

GOVERNMENT OF THE  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,  
February 28, 1972.

Rev. S. EVERETT GUILLES,  
Turner Memorial,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REVEREND GUILLES: Mayor Washington asked me to acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 4, 1972, in regard to the proposal to establish a convention hall-sports arena in the neighborhood of yours and Reverend C. H. Hamilton's church.

Please attribute the tardiness of this acknowledgement to me, and accept my apology.

Subsequent to the delivery of your letter, the Mayor told me that he had had personal contacts both with you and Reverend Hamilton. He also learned from Capitol Hill that as a result of the reactions voiced and the opposition expressed, Congressman Gray publicly announced that the proposal would be reconsidered.

The Mayor asked me to thank you and Reverend Hamilton for your explicit delineation of the impact of this proposal on your churches, and on your community; and the alternative site that you recommended.

Your communication was timely and invaluable, he said, in its reflection of what is at stake and how the responsible citizen leadership view the proposition.

The Mayor observed that he thoroughly understands and appreciates the concern that were set out in your letter. He also appreciates the rationale of the Administration. It is hope that from the exchange of views there will emerge a mutually agreeable conclusion. You may be assured that he will do what he believes is best in contribution toward that end, the Mayor said.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT L. TAYLOR,  
Special Assistant to the Mayor.

#### WMAL EDITORIAL: CENTER SITE

Last month we renewed our support for the proposed convention center and sports arena in downtown Washington.

But we omitted mentioning the proposed Mt. Vernon Square site, and for good reason. At the time we were not completely sold on that location. In the weeks since, we have become considerably less enamored of that site. It's expected these days that any project planned for the center city is going to displace someone or something, urban density being what it is.

However, in this case, we don't believe that trading off a large section of Chinatown, the Greater New Hope Baptist Church, and the stores that make up "Furniture Row" for a sports-convention complex, no matter what its financial potential, is a good bargain.

If the idea is to revitalize an area, then revitalize what is there, keeping intact the character of the neighborhood. If location and convenience is paramount, then why not the previously-considered Union Station site?

The room to build is already there. Metro is coming and so are the freeways. So is a Visitors Center. By moving the sports-convention complex, we could have all of this, and Chinatown, too.

#### STATEMENT OF REV. S. EVERETTE GUILLES TO THE HOUSE PUBLIC BUILDINGS SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CONVENTION-SPORTS CENTER

I cannot understand how your committee can see only good in the proposed convention center-sports arena, which is the latest instance of "Negro removal by urban renewal".

I am privileged to speak here today on behalf of the Greater New Hope Baptist Church, and my own Turner Memorial Methodist Church and our combined membership of nearly 4,000 families; both of these great churches which serve the inner city Negro population, would be destroyed.

I also plead for preserving not only our churches, but the 129 large and small businesses, the 3,000 jobs they provide, the city's tax base, the historic Chinatown area, the employees, the families, the residents of our area.

We all ask, why destroy 3,000 good jobs to provide 1,500 jobs where our Black employees can hawk beer, sell peanuts, and park cars?

We ask, isn't fulfilling the needs of the people, many of whom are still without enough to eat and lacking job opportunities and decent housing, more important than building a place to shoot hoops, blow noisemakers, and park 5,000 cars?

How can anyone be for a convention-sports arena as a plan to benefit the city in view of the Kennedy stadium which is a financial disaster? Why destroy "Furniture Row" on 7th Street with its \$20 million annual business volume, its jobs, and its taxes?

Why not avoid the displacement and heart-break by building the project on government land, at Union Station, or in the suburbs?

We have gone to Congress to bring this situation to the attention of many Congressmen and their staffs! we have met with Rep. Fauntroy, Rep. Gude of Maryland, and Rep. Dorn.

Congressman Grover's staff told us many Committee members are opposed to the project, and that probably a majority of the Committee are with us.

We ask this Subcommittee and Congress to give mature, responsible study to our side of this issue.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 23, 1972]  
THE CONVENTION AND SPORTS ARENA COMPLEX

We share the Board of Trade's enthusiasm for building a convention center and sports arena in downtown Washington in time for the bicentennial celebrations in 1976. But to build this complex, as originally proposed, across eight city blocks south of Mount Vernon Square, would further impair rather than restore the economic health of the downtown business district. To destroy the 129 business establishments of Chinatown and furniture row, to say nothing of two active churches, is hardly a way to "revitalize" them.

This argument, ardently advanced by the Chinese community, the furniture store owners and the ministers of the two churches at a lengthy hearing last Thursday night, seems to have persuaded Rep. Kenneth J. Gray (D-Ill.), chairman of the House Public Buildings and Grounds Subcommittee, of the need to whittle down the project from 25 to 15 acres. This would at least save the heart of Chinatown, along I Street NW, between 6th and 7th Streets, as well as the Turner Memorial African Methodist Episcopal Church from the bulldozers. But that did not seem to satisfy the opponents of the Mount Vernon Square site.

Many of them concede that a convention hall would be nice to have in the central business district. The majority of convention goers arrive by air, so they don't need much parking. They tend to spend liberally on hotels, restaurants, amusements and shopping sprees. And they would take all this in on their way from the meetings to the cultural and sightseeing attractions on the Mall.

A sports arena, on the other hand, brings downtown more problems than benefits. Most sports fans would come by car from the suburbs. They would further congest the city streets and require a great deal of parking space. They would spend little downtown. Hockey and basketball teams insist on easy access for their franchises. The Metropolitan Washington Planning and Housing Association, among others, suggests therefore that the sports arena be separated from the convention hall and located elsewhere.

But this, we fear, might defeat the whole project. There are many advantages in com-

bining the two facilities. The sports arena could supplement the convention hall meeting space for the large conventions that constitute half of the market for which Washington wants to compete. The two facilities would share parking and effect other economies of scale. And Congress, which holds the purse strings is probably more interested in the sports than in the convention aspect of the complex, which is to be named in honor of Dwight D. Eisenhower.

So we would keep the package intact and move it back to Union Station where it was originally to be located. At Union Station the combined convention center and sports arena would be directly accessible by both Metro and freeway. There is space for ample parking over the railroad tracks. There would be no displacements of businesses and homes. The complex would be right next door to the new Visitors Center and all its services, including the tour-mobiles to take convention goers around.

If the downtown business district is made attractive and conveniently accessible from Union Station, as provided for under the recently adopted urban renewal plan, the convention goers will still take their money there. In fact, new apartment houses and hotels at Mount Vernon Square and a refurbished Chinatown with all its potential charm and bustle would give them an added incentive.

#### CULTURAL GENOCIDE

#### HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I was a guest of the Soviet Union and toured Russia with my colleagues on the Select Subcommittee on Education.

While there, I also took the opportunity to visit and talk with a number of Jews about their life. The repercussions of our trip—particularly my activities and those of Congressman SCHEUER—received national coverage.

I believe it unnecessary to recount the details of these incidents but it is still significant to note once more that the publicity our visit elicited clearly illustrates the extreme sensitivity of the Soviet Government to one of their more serious domestic problems, and it is encouraging to witness their awareness of this difficulty.

I made it a point following this trip that a process of "cultural genocide" is being directed against the Jewish people in the Soviet Union, and in support of this view, I offer a letter which was forwarded to me by a group of Soviet Jews, including several whom I met in Moscow.

Even though emigration policies have become somewhat less rigid in Russia during the last few years, I think the free world has an obligation to keep itself informed about this matter. And since this letter poignantly describes the plight of some Soviet Jews today, I strongly recommend careful consideration of its contents. The letter follows:

#### APPEAL TO THE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

To you, members of Congress, the highest legislative organ of the United States of America, appeals a group of Jews of the Soviet Union.



In correspondence with the Soviet law and clauses of the General Declaration of Human Rights (art. 13, cl. 2) we submitted to the authorities of the USSR a petition about our departure for Israel. But against the obligations of the USSR Government to fulfill regulations, stipulated by the articles of the General Declaration we are for a long time unlawfully refused in permission to leave.

All of us were compelled to leave our former jobs and most of us don't work anywhere for a long time. Thus neither at present nor in future we are of any value for the Soviet Union as specialists. But nevertheless Soviet authorities feel, probably, sort of satisfaction, opposing our useful activity for the welfare of the Jewish State, for the good of mankind. We believe that such inhuman policy of the Soviet authorities, aimed at suppression of socially useful activity of a whole category of people just because they have decided to move to their national Motherland, can not but meet censure from the part of international public.

Having in vain used all possibilities of appealing to Soviet authorities, we appeal to you for the first time. We are kept in this country like hostages, like slaves contrary to international law, contrary to common sense, contrary to the interests of human society. But hostages and slavery are the disgrace to civilized world living in the last quarter of the 20-th century. Even two centuries ago your great predecessors Lincoln and Jefferson called to society to put an end to slavery and injustice and we hope that you, members of the Congress of the USA will follow these best traditions and use your vast influence to help us in the name of restoration of human rights, in the name of justice.

Yours respectfully

Polsky Victor, Lerner Alexander, Abramovitch Pavel, Begun Yosef, Korenfeld Yilia, Slepak Vladimir, Prestin Vladimir, Shapiro Gavriol, Svechinsky Grigory.

Gurwitz Sergey, Orlov Boris, Lwovsky Petr, Machlis Vladimir, Gershovitch Ada, Kogan Boris, Lubarsky Lazar, Klyachkin Michail, Markish David, Smelyansky Emmanuil, Goldbers Stella.

#### SOCIETY IS INDEBTED TO ITS LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

**HON. B. F. SISK**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, the work of those who insure that we have an orderly framework of society around us to pursue our individual goals in life, are too little appreciated and not often enough given the moral and psychological support they need.

A valued constituent of mine, Mr. Raymond C. Johnson of Fresno, has called my attention to this with a copy of an article which he wrote and which was printed in the Fresno Guide on December 6, 1971.

I should like to submit it for the consideration of all Members of Congress. I include the text of Mr. Johnson's article at this point:

SHOULD APPRECIATE POLICEMEN

(By Raymond C. Johnson)

Whenever we see a policeman; a deputy sheriff or for that matter any law enforcement officer, doing his work, a feeling of pride should be felt. For these are men who first have a conviction of protecting others, and

seeing that the law is enforced which protects society.

This type of work is no longer just a job, but a highly trained profession. Behind that uniform is a qualified man.

Without laws to govern us, we are faced with the grim picture of anarchy. So the law enforcement officers job is extremely important.

Society is indebted to these men—for everyone of us is aware that an over abundance of hardship faces today's law enforcement officer. Just last year over 14,000 of these dedicated men were beaten, stabbed, or shot. About 150 died in the line of duty. These men had families and children, who will continue to suffer, because of the maladjusted behaviour of some crackpot with a criminal mind.

During a meeting of the 25th anniversary held in Washington, D.C., for former agents of the F.B.I. on Oct. 22, 1971, Director J. Edgar Hoover remarked that: "Disregard for law and order is encouraged by hatemongers, extremists and others who assert that revolution against society is justified and necessary—and that men should be permitted to murder, rob, loot and pillage with impunity to achieve their goals". Hoover further asserts that: "Disregard for law and order is the anarchistic banner for those who want the rule of no rule—who profanely proclaim that all of the values of the past have failed mankind and that real progress can only be achieved by discarding tradition, demolishing our democratic institutions, and ultimately destroying our existent society."

It is truly unfortunate that some educators on our college campuses teach a doctrine which encourages today's youth to disrespect law and order. And if they don't like a law, to break it. Such educators are not true Americans but agents of a foreign power who have a hatred for America and seek the destruction of this nation by falsely educating today's youth.

This nation, which our fore-fathers proudly conceived has resulted in the greatest nation on earth. Let us not sell this country short, but instead re-educate those who seek to destroy America.

#### A SICKNESS AT STATE

**HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday evening's Washington Star contained an interesting article by Mr. George Sherman entitled, "A Sickness at State." Mr. Sherman's article raises some very basic questions about the role of the State Department, the morale of the Department, and the role of Mr. Kissinger.

Mr. Sherman's article bears further unfortunate testimony to the fact that the Henry Kissinger-Richard Nixon administration is destroying in a calculated manner, the morale and aggressiveness of the Foreign Service Corps and the State Department itself. "State" is sick and neither Mr. Nixon, Dr. Kissinger, nor Secretary Rogers seem to care.

Unquestionably the State Department's importance in the formulation and execution of American foreign policy has diminished markedly during the past 3 years. Mr. Sherman writes.

The suspicion has grown that, from the

beginning, Nixon's aim was to whittle down the influence of the professionals. Nixon's suspicion of the foreign affairs bureaucracy dates back to his days as vice president in the 1950's when the liberalism and apparent inefficiency of the State Department were a frustration to the militantly anti-communist Nixon of those days.

James Reston once said that the State Department buildings look distressingly similar to a chewing gum factory in downtown Los Angeles. Today the mythical chewing gum factory may very well have the same kind of impact on the making of U.S. foreign policy as the State Department. The White House and Dr. Kissinger are openly acknowledged as the origin of most of our foreign policy planning, with Secretary Rogers retaining a somewhat ceremonial position.

The question for the Congress is not whether the Secretary of State is relegated to the role of a glorified press spokesman, the President properly should design the role for his Cabinet officers, for it is the President who has the ultimate responsibility for their actions. However, the present arrangement, by design, prevents the Congress from getting the kind of information it needs to make the kind of intelligent decisions required. Dr. Kissinger is in fact the Secretary of State, but unlike Mr. Rogers, the cloak of executive privilege drapes Dr. Kissinger.

The President in a letter to Representative JOHN E. MOSS on April 7, 1969, said that—

The scope of executive privilege must be very narrowly construed.

The President went on to say,

Under this Administration executive privilege will not be asserted without specific Presidential approval . . . This administration is dedicated to insuring a free flow of information to the Congress and the news media—and thus to the citizens.

The reality of the situation is the administration is dedicated to clandestine diplomacy. Dr. Kissinger has not testified before Congress either in public hearings or executive session, despite the fact that it is he, along with his White House State Department, who formulates U.S. foreign policy. It is a blatant misrepresentation of fact for this administration to claim that it is dedicated to insuring a free flow of information to the Congress when in reality the little "free flow" we have seen in the past has come from enterprising columnists and others.

We face two problems. First, immediate steps must be taken to revise the use of executive privilege. The problem with Dr. Kissinger has become so acute that as Mr. Sherman's article suggests,

It probably would be better for the institutions of government—for Congress, for the State Department, even for the presidency—if the dynamic Mr. Kissinger were Secretary of State and the diffident Mr. Rogers moved over to the White House.

Recognizing that Dr. Kissinger is not likely to be named Secretary of State, Mr. Nixon should allow Dr. Kissinger to testify before Congress without having the Congress have to seek legislation

methods to force the President to do so. Second, Mr. Nixon must assume his thus far abdicate responsibility to rebuild the morale and efficiency of the State Department. If Mr. Nixon does not take major initiatives to build the Department, major policy blunders such as the U.S. treatment of the Indo-Pakistani war will become common place.

I commend Mr. Sherman's article, "A Sickness at State" to your reading:

DEMOTED BY NIXON—A SICKNESS AT STATE

(By George Sherman)

The State Department is sick, some say dying.

"If I thought this humiliation were going to go on for another 20 years, I'd get out tomorrow," said one middlelevel Foreign Service officer.

"Morale is worse now than at any time since the days of McCarthy's witch-hunt," said another angrily.

They both were speaking of the way the Nixon administration has demoted the State Department from the upper reaches of major U.S. foreign policy making in most areas.

But does it matter? Does it matter that Secretary of State William P. Rogers did not attend the President's meeting with the legendary Chairman Mao, or that Henry A. Kissinger—who did—has set up a "little state department" in the White House?

On the top floor of the State Department, the reply is an emphatic no. Rogers and his chief aide, Undersecretary of State John N. Irwin II, both are soft-spoken, gentlemanly and quite likeable men—first and foremost, they consider themselves loyal members of a team led by a President more experienced in foreign affairs than they.

For them, the things that matter more than the parochial malaise of Foggy Bottom, with its hand-wringing and hurt feelings, are the real achievements of Nixon's own foreign policy.

"The first question ought to be whether the system is working well overall for the good of the nation," said Irwin, in a rare interview. There, in the inner sanctum of his paneled office, he spoke slowly, quietly, making points with the careful hesitation of the 59-year-old aristocratic New York lawyer he is.

"It may well be that the Department of State plays a different role than before," he said, noting that Nixon has moulded the National Security Council system in the White House to his own liking.

The State Department pours more information into that foreign policy mechanism than ever before, Irwin maintained—through committees chaired by Kissinger or by regional assistant secretaries of state.

(He did not say so—although he could have—that one of those assistant secretaries, Joseph J. Sisco, with all the aggressiveness of Kissinger, has broken the White House monopoly on decision-making in one key area. He clearly is in charge of policy toward the Middle East, under Rogers.)

Irwin noted that the long-standing personal friendship between Rogers and Nixon is another guarantee of a State Department voice at the top.

"The ascendancy of the White House you speak of," he continued, "is after all the ascendancy of a President, of a man with great experience and ideas in foreign relations."

#### PROUD OF ROLE

"Looking back over three years, I think it has been a successful foreign policy. But the media always approach it from a negative, critical point of view. . . . The media always seem to seek after who did most the developing policy, rather than after whether it is successful overall."

Down the hall, Rogers, in a separate interview, took up where Irwin left off.

CXVIII—483—Part 6

"I am very proud of the way foreign policy is being conducted by the Nixon administration," he said with uncommon force. "I cannot think of a time that foreign policy has been so strongly supported by the public. I am proud to play a part in the formulation and execution of that policy, and I am proud of the role of the State Department in it."

That is where Rogers parts company with increasing numbers of the 3,000 professional Foreign Service officers under him. Some of them are not proud of the State Department role in Nixon foreign policy. Indeed, many doubt that they have any more than a fact-gathering and messenger-type role to play.

No one disputes the President's constitutional right to conduct his own foreign policy, nor are the general lines of that policy a matter of much argument among the professionals.

#### WHO SHOULD ADVISE?

They do worry, however, that President Nixon's unique conduct of foreign policy with Kissinger's apparatus may be maiming a vital institution of government. Nixon has taken the skeletal National Security Council system run by McGeorge Bundy and Walt Rostow in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations and turned it into an institution which rivals—even dominates—the State Department.

What is in question is who or what should be the chief adviser and coordinator of foreign policy advice going to the President. Rogers and Irwin, with their passion for secrecy—particularly about what goes from them to the President—have created the lowest of profiles for the department.

"What we want is the knowledge that we influence policy, not only collect and report the facts that go into it in the White House," said one youngish but highly regarded officer, obviously irritated over the way State Department advice was ignored in the recent "tilt" toward Pakistan in the Indo-Pakistan war.

The suspicion has grown that, from the beginning, Nixon's aim was to whittle down the influence of the professionals. Nixon's suspicion of the foreign affairs bureaucracy dates back to his days as vice president in the 1950s when the liberalism and apparent inefficiency of the State Department were a frustration to the militantly anti-communist Nixon of those days.

In 1969 he began his own presidency by appointing Henry Kissinger to be his right hand man in the White House. The dynamic geopolitician from Harvard University had written the previous spring, months before his appointment, about how he would circumvent the bureaucracy in important decisionmaking.

"Some of the key decisions are kept to a very small circle while the bureaucracy continues working away in ignorance of the fact that decisions are being made . . ." wrote Kissinger in an essay for the Security Studies project of the University of California.

"One reason for keeping the decisions to small groups is that when bureaucracies are so unwieldy and when their internal morale becomes a serious problem, an unpopular decision may be fought by brutal means, such as leaks to the press or congressional committees. Thus the only way secrecy can be kept is to exclude from the making of the decision all those who are theoretically charged with carrying it out."

In this scheme of things the secretary of State is not meant to be chief formulator of foreign policy, chief adviser on foreign policy, or even its chief spokesman. In retrospect, it seems Nixon indicated as much in a televised spectacular when presenting his Cabinet to the nation in January 1969. His close friend, Rogers, was chosen, Nixon said, because he is a "superb negotiator," the lawyer best suited for the coming "period of negotiations."

That implied a mechanical job for Rogers. In practice, the critics charge, Rogers has acted for three years as an affable trail boss riding herd over the bureaucracy, reminding professional subordinates where their loyalties should lie and curbing any public show of independence.

"He always tells us we are here to help the President, not to feed our own egos," said one man who has seen the operation first-hand.

#### HE LOOKS THE PART

"He does not have any real confidantes in the department," said an officer close to the top. "His interests, unlike Kissinger's, do not lie in overall conceptions of foreign policy, nor even in the nuts and bolts of carrying it out. He still acts very much like the corporate labor relations lawyer he is, working behind the scenes to arrange, to fix things for the boss."

"He's a secretary of State right out of central casting," said another. "He looks the part, he likes the part. But what really concerns him is how things look, not the way they are done."

These brutal assessments may or may not be true of the real "Bill" Rogers.

But curiously enough, the Rogers formula has effectively controlled the department. It has worked because the Foreign Service officers corps traditionally is disciplined and loyal. It has worked because generally the foreign affairs bureaucrat, by nature, will not take action unless pushed to do so. And the formula has worked because Rogers, behind his wall of public diffidence, is a strong-willed man able to keep dissident subordinates in line.

One thing that does appear true is that Kissinger's early prophesy of secrecy has been self-fulfilling under the Nixon system. The centralization of all decision-making in the White House has led to less and less information being circulated in both the State Department and Pentagon.

#### FEARS ARE FED

The resulting disaffection, no doubt contributed, as Kissinger predicted, to the famous leak (although apparently not from the State Department) of the "Anderson Papers," which gave details of secret meetings on policy in the Indo-Pakistan war.

That leak plus others about ambassadors' recommendations from overseas, have fed a kind of paranoia about secrecy in the State Department. Last summer, when the New York Times revealed new U.S. proposals in the strategic arms talks before Washington had even communicated them to the Russians, Rogers asked key officers in the department to undergo lie detector tests. It subsequently was argued that he wanted only to prove to the President that State was not responsible for the leak. But the impact inside the building was quite the opposite—the incident was taken as a poignant reminder that the days of McCarthy might not be gone forever.

Today, according to informed sources, the top floor of the department has put strict limits on circulation of messages from U.S. ambassadors among the country desk officers who are fundamentally concerned with sorting out policy toward those countries. The messages, part of a numberless quantity arriving daily, now are read first by the regional assistant secretary of State concerned, and then forwarded to Rogers' secretariat for decision on wider distribution.

#### RECEIVES AMBASSADORS

While the restrictions multiply in Foggy Bottom, over at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue Henry Kissinger and his staff of 175—many of them talented Foreign Service officers "on loan"—have steadily taken over more of the prized prerogatives of State.

For instance, Kissinger now receives leading ambassadors—such as Soviet Ambassador Anatoly F. Dobrynin and French Am-



bassador Charles Lucet—on his own. Their meetings are unpublicized, and they deal with the most delicate decisions of foreign policy.

"It's gotten so that no ambassador in town considers himself worth his salt unless he has been to see Kissinger. That leaves the State Department for more 'routine' affairs," scoffed one Foreign Service officer.

Kissinger's on-the-record and off-the-record briefings for the press are also regarded as another nail in the coffin of the State Department. While Rogers is not notably articulate—he detests press conferences—Kissinger emerges as the brilliant spokesman speaking with all the assurance of first-hand knowledge.

Former Undersecretary of State George Ball has written that this White House "court" conduct of diplomacy must have predictable results. He and others charge that professional ambassadors, such as William J. Porter at the Vietnam peace talks in Paris, see their roles downgraded as Kissinger takes on secret negotiating missions for his President. The inevitable outcome is a crippling of the institution they represent.

Sen. Stuart Symington has testified to the fact. A year ago he caused an uproar by attacking on the floor of the Senate Kissinger's role and by sympathizing with Rogers. The secretary of State, he said, had become the laughing-stock of the cocktail circuit.

This January Symington returned from a fact-finding trip to Asia and Europe with details of how this Kissinger role—which bypasses Congress—is undermining the status and authority of the State and Defense departments.

#### SECRETARIES IGNORED

"As but one illustration," he said of his talks in the field, "various people asked if I thought they could meet certain members of the White House staff if they came to Washington; but not one person, at any time, mentioned either the secretary of State or the secretary of Defense."

An even more immediate example is the current trip around Asia of Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian Affairs, Marshall Green, who was in the presidential party in China. His job is to reassure U.S. allies of continuing American devotion. After a press report last week that the Japanese government did not feel reassured—partly because Green was not in the Nixon-Kissinger talks with Chou En-lai—the State Department issued a formal statement affirming that Green is the "senior Asian expert" in the U.S. government, acting on the advice and responsibility of the President.

"The trouble is that this steady sapping of self-confidence is self-perpetuating," said one worried senior official. "Up until recently I thought all the talk of bad morale was the usual background music, but now I really fear that it can undermine the institution."

Matters have reached the point where the chief manager of the department, Deputy Undersecretary William B. Macomber, openly speaks of the danger.

#### REFORMS OVERSHADOWED

"Denigration of the State Department by people either inside or outside the department," he said during an interview, "is contrary to the national interest. If it keeps up, it will eventually weaken this essential asset to the government."

For Macomber and those around him, the tragedy is that this talk of sagging morale and seething revolt overshadows the real reforms Rogers has introduced in the department. By most accounts, Macomber—with Rogers' backing—has laid over the past two years the groundwork for a more humane and efficient State Department.

Computers have been introduced in a big way to streamline the paperwork. A new system of case-by-case, country-by-country studies of overall U.S. policy called Policy

Analysis and Resource Allocation (PARA) is operating. For the first time also the State Department is soon to have a union charged with representing the rights of all 9000 permanent foreign service personnel.

Furthermore Rogers has set up a grievance system, where there was none before. It allows officers to appeal slights in promotion or illegal use of authority. Although critics charge that the "interim" system is not independent enough of the State Department management, it is generally expected that pressure from Congress and from the new union will produce an acceptable compromise by this summer.

Under Rogers, Macomber has also moved to soften the brutality of the "selection-out system"—whereby officers failing of promotion were forced to resign without adequate pension. Under a new "threshold" design, any officer who crosses into middle-grade ranking after a five-year "apprenticeship" is guaranteed 20 years tenure and full retirement benefits later.

#### COMPETITION GROWS

Ironically, though, the bulge of talented middle-level officers resulting from this more humane system, coupled with an excess of top-grade officers left over from previous days—is feeding the morale problem. For instance, Class 4 officers, most of whom have 15 years of experience, find themselves in cut-throat competition with their fellows for dwindling overseas assignments and for hard-to-get promotions to the next higher grade.

Add to that the forced elimination of jobs—cutbacks totalling 24 percent ordered for budget-cutting purposes by the Johnson and Nixon administrations—and you have the ingredients for an enormous morale problem. Career officers find themselves competing for fewer and fewer jobs which simultaneously seem less and less important to the conduct of foreign policy.

Rogers appears unruffled by the crescendo of criticism coming his way. If the National Security Council system did not exist, he said in the interview, it would have to be created.

"National security policy cuts across many departments of government," he explained. "There is a need for a mechanism in the White House to get an above-the-department view for the President on major matters, where there are conflicts within the government."

Rogers knew, he said, that the "many talented people" in State felt disappointed about not being in on the early stages of planning for Nixon's trip to China. "Everyone likes to be in on the action," he said. But once the trip was announced, he said, the President made maximum use of State Department expertise and was most appreciative of it.

#### CAN'T ALWAYS TRAVEL

Both Rogers and Irwin maintained that what escapes the press is the capable handling by the State Department of that 98 percent of American foreign policy which is unglamorous but vital.

If morale were so bad, asked Rogers, why were Foreign Service applications almost doubled last year—up to 15,000 from 8,000 in 1970? (Some observers attribute the increase as much to the tight job market and greater State Department emphasis on recruits for administration and consular affairs as to enhanced status of the diplomat.)

Rogers refused to talk on-the-record about Kissinger's personal excursions in secret diplomacy in Paris and China. But in a recent interview with another reporter he was quoted as noting that "as secretary, I can't take all the trips, if only because of the protocol involved. . . ." Presumably he meant that his highly visible position in the government precludes secret trips abroad.

But a senior department officer, while re-

specting Rogers and his view of the office, disagreed. He recalled that John Foster Dulles, Eisenhower's powerful secretary of State, had once considered setting up shop in the White House basement to oversee American foreign policy without the encumbrance of ceremony or publicity.

"But he finally rejected the idea," said the officer. "Dulles saw that you cannot have authority without responsibility." The tight shop run by Kissinger is "riding for a fall," he added, because too many able men with essential information are being cut out of the policy-making process.

After all, he agreed, it probably would be better for the institutions of government—for Congress, for the State Department, even for the presidency—if the dynamic Mr. Kissinger were secretary of State and the diffident Mr. Rogers moved over to the White House.

But neither he nor any other student of the Nixon method thinks that switch is likely.

#### BLACKBURN OPPOSES CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

#### HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 6, I had the privilege of testifying before the House Judiciary Committee in opposition to the busing of schoolchildren to achieve racial integration.

In my statement, I oppose a constitutional amendment on the grounds that this approach is unwise, unnecessary, and too cumbersome. I believe that the Congress should enact legislation and that it has the right to do so under clause 5 of the 14th amendment.

For the information of my colleagues, I am inserting my statement in the RECORD:

#### TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN BEN B. BLACKBURN

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: Hearings are being conducted today because policies affecting the operation of public school systems throughout the United States have been instituted by court decrees. These policies, which are meeting a broad resistance from all areas of the country, generally require the transportation of schoolchildren from the school facilities most convenient to their homes to school facilities at varying distances from their homes in order to achieve, what the courts have determined to be, a desirable racial mix in individual schools.

Parents, demonstrating a very human instinct to keep their children as close to home as possible during their educational periods, are objecting to these policies. School boards and school revenue authorities, finding that the financial burdens imposed by such massive transportation requirements, combined with the increased complication of scheduling classes, are protesting likewise. In some school systems extracurricular activities have been curtailed, if not eliminated, because of the combination of financial burdens and scheduling complications. Many parents and school boards are expressing fear that the quality of education is suffering under the policies now being promulgated and implemented under Court decrees.

I personally fear that their concerns are valid. When courts initiate policies which the majority of the people do not support, then grave questions arise as to the proper role of government in the affairs of the citizens in a

democratic society. The courts are an instrument of government. In a constitutional democracy, the ultimate authority for government action is the will of the people. The will of the people is expressed first in the legal document which gives authority to government, the Constitution itself. It has always been my understanding that the role of the courts in our government is to protect the citizenry against abuses of the executive or legislative branches of government when either of these two branches, or both, exercise authorities not granted in the Constitution.

These hearings are testimony to the fact that the people of the United States are becoming alert to the danger that their desires can be subverted by the courts themselves. The courts are no longer content to prevent excesses of authority by the other two branches of government but have now assumed the role of a legislative body.

When the courts assume a legislative function and promulgate policies that are not supported by the will of the people, then a duty arises on the elected representative branch of government, that branch which reflects the will of the people, to take affirmative and responsible action to bring national policies into a position more consistent with the will of the people. To fail to do so is to permit a tyranny of the Judiciary.

Indeed, I am of the opinion that the courts are themselves in violation of clear constitutional limitations. For example, Article I, Section 7, Clause 1 of the Constitution provides that revenue measures arise out of the Lower House: "Article I, Section 7. All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives. . . ."

It is obvious that in the enactment of the Constitution, the people of this country demonstrated a high concern for the protection of their pocketbooks. So that unpopular invasions into their pocketbooks could be rectified by calling to account at the next general election those who impose tax burdens, the people insured a direct link between themselves and the policymaking organ of government which exercises the most direct impingement upon their financial affairs.

When the courts impose substantial financial burdens on the school systems of our country, the courts are imposing a tax. Local taxing authorities and school boards either have the option of decreasing the quantity, or quality, of academic services in order to meet the cost of additional transportation expenses to comply with busing requirements or, such authorities must increase revenues by increasing tax burdens on local citizens. Yet, the citizenry who must bear the additional taxes cannot call to account the court responsible for imposing.

A challenge has been posed to the Congress. Recent public opinion polls reveal that currently approximately 80% of Americans oppose the transportation of school children over long distances where such transportation is not necessary.

It is the Congress which is the instrument of government charged with the responsibility of reflecting the will of the people in government policy. When government policy runs counter to the will of the people, then government has ceased to be the servant of the people. Do we as Congressmen have the right to remain silent when the people who have placed such trust in us are demanding relief from government abuses. The fact that these abuses have arisen from the judicial branch of government makes them no less onerous and makes our responsibility to respond even more clear.

The court decisions which are creating the problem arise under the provisions of the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment. In the enactment of the 14th Amendment, the framers of that amendment specified the authority of the Congress to enforce the provisions of that Act.

Specifically, Clause 5 of the 14th Amendment

states, "The Congress shall have the power to enforce the provisions of this article." The Supreme Court regards Clause 5 as a positive grant of power by the people to the Congress to be used in the enforcement of the 14th Amendment. In *Ex parte Virginia*, 100 U.S. 339, at page 345 the Court states: "It is the power of Congress which has been enlarged. Congress is authorized to enforce the prohibitions by appropriate legislation. Some legislation is contemplated to make the amendments fully effective."

When the 14th Amendment was on the Floor of the Senate under discussion in 1867, Senator Jacob M. Howard of Michigan described Clause 5 as "a direct affirmative delegation of power to the Congress," and added, "It casts upon Congress the responsibility of seeing to it, for the future, that all sections of the amendment are carried out in good faith and that no state infringes the rights of persons or property. I look upon this clause as indispensable for the reason that it imposes upon Congress this power and this duty. It enables Congress in case the state shall enact laws in conflict with the principles of the amendment, to correct that legislation by a formal congressional enactment." *Con. Globe*, 39th Cong., 1st Sess., 2766, 2768 (1866).

Clause 5 of the 14th Amendment is a logical extension of Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution in which the Congress is given the general power "... to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution..." the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States.

There have been proposals advanced before this Committee that to meet the demands of the public for relief from court-ordered transportation schemes the Congress should enact a constitutional amendment prohibiting "busing" of school children. I am not in agreement with such suggestions. The United States Constitution is a document intended for promulgation of statements of broad public policy. One of its principal purposes, as repeated throughout THE FEDERALIST PAPERS, and as specified in the first 10 Amendments, is to limit the parameters of Federal activities as they might impinge on individual freedoms. The Constitution should not become a legislative vehicle to deal with particulars of the day-to-day mechanics of government operation.

The proposal for a constitutional amendment is unrealistic in the present political climate. The Senate, within the past week, by a narrow vote has defeated legislation dealing with the subject matter of school busing. To suppose now that the same Senate would adopt by a 2/3 vote a strong constitutional amendment is unrealistic.

Securing ratification of a constitutional amendment requires the cooperation of state governments as well as federal action. The mere mechanics of securing passage of a constitutional amendment complicates and would delay the granting of relief to the American public. Thus, on several grounds, I am opposed to the proposed constitutional amendment as being unwise, unnecessary, and too cumbersome.

It is my suggestion that the Congress exercise the authority which it now possesses under Clause 5 of the 14th Amendment. I suspect that the courts, having plunged into the thicket of school administration and financing would welcome congressional direction. The courts were never intended to be legislative bodies. They operate in the confines of narrow rules of evidence. Conflicting attorneys, in presenting their cases are seeking to serve the immediate needs of their clients. The courts can only act on the basis of facts presented before them and differing skills and resources of legal counsel have a great influence on the factual basis upon which a court can act. In short, a court, proceeding in accordance with established

rules of evidence and legal procedures is not equipped to legislate or formulate new public policies which have wide-ranging and direct effects on our citizenry.

The question of racially segregated versus racially integrated schools has been long since laid to rest both in the courts and in the minds of our citizens. The matters of increasing concern to our citizens are those of quality and equality in educational opportunity to all of our children in the public school systems and, increasingly, the convenience and expense involved in delivering those educational opportunities.

Let me suggest that legislation embodying the following general principles would be adequate. (1) There shall be equality of educational services in each school in a school system; (2) Each child shall be first designated to attend the school most convenient to his home, providing that school attendance zones are not created in such a manner as to create or perpetuate segregation and (3) It shall be provided that any child will have the right to transfer, upon reasonable notice, to any other school within the same school system at no expense to the school system.

In the final analysis we are dealing with a question of the will of the people when their desires are being overruled by an instrument of government, the courts. The legislative branch of government is a co-equal branch with that of the courts. As that branch of government most responsive and responsible to the will of the people, it is our duty to act as a co-equal branch of government and specify limits and conditions within which the judiciary may act in establishing government policy.

#### PAR VALUE MODIFICATION ACT, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

HON. JAMES A. MCCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. MCCLURE. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Banking and Currency has recently concluded hearings on the proposal to devalue the U.S. dollar. The Senate has already approved the devaluation, and I understand that the matter will be before us here in the House very soon.

Because the issue is so vital, I feel it is important that my colleagues give the many, many schools of thought their most careful consideration.

At the time I offered my testimony to the committee, I had the pleasure of arranging for the remarks of Mr. Charles R. Stahl, president of Economic News Agency and publisher of Green's Commodity Market Comments, to be read into the proceedings. I insert at this time these pertinent comments into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of the Members.

The comments follow:

PAR VALUE MODIFICATION ACT, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(Transcript of the full and prepared text of the testimony submitted on March 6, 1972, by Charles R. Stahl, president of Economic News Agency and publisher of Green's Commodity Market Comments)

My name is Charles R. Stahl and I live in Princeton, New Jersey. I am president of Economic News Agency and publisher of a



biweekly review devoted solely to monetary matters and precious metals. I believe that some of the distinguished members of this Committee are aware of my publication. Senator Sparkman once read excerpts from one of my editorials on the floor of the Senate and then gave the article to President Nixon who studied it before discussing monetary matters with Charles de Gaulle, the President of France. The title of that editorial was "In Defense of the Dollar" and it was reproduced in the Congressional Record of February 17, 1969, page 3449. Two of my other articles were introduced into the Congressional Record, one by Congressman Brooks from Texas on October 23, 1967, page 29616 and one by Congressman Reuss from Wisconsin on November 23, 1970, page 38407.

The name of my publication may be a misnomer; it is called *Green's Commodity Market Comments* even though it deals strictly with precious metals and monetary matters. We are known, among other things, for the unique record as far as predicting the fluctuations in the price of gold are concerned. In the last five years we called correctly every important swing in the upper tier gold price. The Wall Street Journal paid me the compliment of being "consistently right about gold." Incidentally, in 1967 I was the one who was first on record with the proposal for the two-tier gold system which was adopted in March 1968.

A short review of the dollar's role in recent years may be helpful in understanding the 1971 monetary crisis and the reason for the December 18th realignment of currencies including the necessity to revalue the price of monetary gold by not less than 7.89%. The United States gold reserves reached their peak of \$24.6 billion in 1950. Twenty years later, by the end of 1970, they stood at about \$11 billion and the loss of gold accounted at \$35 per ounce represented a decline of about \$14 billion in U.S. reserves assets. It was a splendid business proposition and another proof of Yankee ingenuity.

During those 20 years the book value of U.S. foreign assets and investments rose from \$54 billion to \$166 billion, a net increase of \$112 billion. The market value of those assets, of course, exceeds the book value considerably. The yearly income from U.S. investments abroad amounted to \$10.5 billion in 1969. It was \$11.4 billion in 1970 and I estimate that it was about \$16 billion in 1971. In excess of \$3 billion of the 1971 foreign earnings represent profits for those U.S. multinational corporations who hedged in the foreign exchange markets or, to put it more bluntly, who went short U.S. dollars against purchase of Japanese yen, German marks, Swiss francs, etc. This windfall profit of about \$3 billion may or may not appear in 1971 income statements of those companies because some of the forward currency transactions, even though showing a profit at the end of 1971, might not have been completed at that time.

But whatever the case, the net result of the realignment of currencies must have caused a windfall profit to U.S. corporations and/or their affiliates abroad in excess of \$3 billion. The income from U.S. foreign investments in 1971, without counting the windfall profits from currency realignments, should be somewhere between \$12-\$13 billion and that is approximately the amount of the dollar value of all the gold we lost during the 20 years if accounted at \$35 per ounce. So the decline in the total gold reserves from \$24.6 billion in 1950 to the current level of \$9.6 billion was extremely beneficial to the expansion of U.S. economic influence the world over and it helped create the largest earner of foreign currencies. In spite of the outflow of dollars as well as gold from the U.S. to acquire those assets abroad, the dollar remained strong and its hegemony remained, for all practical purposes, unchallenged un-

til the end of 1969, with the exception of the last quarter of 1967 and the first quarter of 1968 when the foreign dollar pool amounted to \$30.5 billion, of which more than 50% were owned by central banks. Whenever more than 50% of dollars abroad are owned by central banks the red flag of impending monetary trouble is up. However, the adoption of the two-tier gold system in March 1968 saved the day and thereafter the dollar holdings of central banks declined from \$15.6 billion to \$11.9 billion by the end of 1969, at which time they just about equaled the U.S. gold stocks of \$11.8 billion. Those \$11.9 billion were the only dollars that could have been exchanged for U.S. gold since the balance of dollars in foreign hands—at that time approximately \$28 billion—was wandering along the paths of the Eurodollar market and could not have been converted into gold unless first acquired by central banks. Because foreign central banks need about \$15 billion in working balances, there was no danger of a run on U.S. gold reserves at the end of 1969. Including reserve position in IMF and convertible foreign currencies, U.S. reserves assets at the end of 1969 amounted to \$16.9 billion, a very comfortable amount reflecting well the strength of the world's leading currency and by far the single largest reserve assets of any country member of the IMF.

When the dollar was riding high in 1969 and the gold price in the free market declined from \$43.82½ in March of that year to below \$35 by the end of the year, that was the best time to make changes in our monetary system. In June 1969 I wrote an article on the subject and suggested that it was in the best interest of the U.S. to perpetuate this system of dollar convertibility into gold at the fixed parity of \$35 per ounce and I am quoting from *Green's Commodity Market Comments* issue of June 25, 1969:

"There are approximately \$35 billion held abroad; \$10.7 official plus \$24.3 Eurodollars. The value of gold held by the U.S. Treasury at the end of April (accounted at the monetary price of \$35 per ounce) was \$10.9 billion and exceeded the \$10.7 billion held by foreign central banks and other official organizations that have the right to claim gold for their dollars. At the present time, \$24 billion of the Eurodollar market are not convertible into gold.

The moment is propitious to demand that henceforth any transfer of dollars from individuals, private corporations or banks to national banks or international organizations, be accompanied by an affidavit declaring that such dollars came into foreign hands as a result of legitimate commercial transactions. No justification should be required on any amount up to and including the \$10.7 billion currently held by foreign central banks. However, a chain affidavit should be submitted on all dollars over and above the \$10.7 billion setting forth full details as to the ownership and origin of these dollars from the moment they left the United States.

In June, July and August 1969 I had an exchange of correspondence on the subject of the above proposal with The Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, Paul A. Volcker. The Under Secretary first thought that my proposal would require the institution of exchange controls and it was his belief that such measures should be avoided whenever practicable. My argument that the traffic of dollars in and out of the U.S. would be completely free under my proposal and the only difference it would cause would be that dollars obtained through commercial transactions would have a higher exchange rate than non-purpose dollars brought an admission from The Under Secretary that maybe my proposal "... does not involve exchange controls. ... Nevertheless, the mechanics of implementation require essentially the same paraphernalia of con-

trols, and I think we could agree such a system would leave much to be desired compared to a unitary rate structure at realistic exchange rates." My warning was repeated in the beginning of 1970 and I quote from the March 25, 1970 issue of *Green's Commodity Market Comments*:

"... the Eurodollar market could be the first step towards real internationalization of the capital market. However, if it remains unregulated, it might become the harbinger of destruction to our monetary system. From this country's point of view, it is important to prevent Eurodollars 'owned' by foreign commercial banks or branches of U.S. banks abroad from becoming potential claims against U.S. gold if acquired by the central banks of foreign nations.

"The role of gold in our monetary system is diminishing but at the present time, it has not diminished sufficiently to accept lightly the threat of another run on U.S. gold. 49% of the world's liquidity is still represented by gold. During the second half of this decade, gold will be demonetized or nearly demonetized but this is a long way off. Therefore, the present calm on the monetary front should be used for further strengthening the system. ... Transfer of dollars from individuals, private corporations or commercial banks to foreign central banks or international organizations should be accompanied by an affidavit declaring that such dollars came into foreign hands as a result of commercial transactions. Dollars for which no chain affidavit can be produced will have to find their own market level and will sell at substantial discount. The two-tier dollar market ... would prevent flight of capital from the United States and would preserve U.S. gold reserves. The value of U.S. gold reserves at the present time corresponds to the approximate amount of dollars held by foreign central banks. Because the current level of central banks' dollar holdings is at a working minimum, no conversion to gold is envisaged unless central banks have to absorb huge quantities of Eurodollars."

Since the above was written the dollar holdings of foreign central banks have increased by more than 400%. By the end of 1970 the amount of dollars owned by central banks had jumped by about \$10 billion and represented close to 50% of the total foreign pool of \$43 billion. At the end of 1970 total U.S. reserves assets amounted to \$14.5 billion out of which gold represented approximately \$11 billion. The deterioration of the dollar's status accelerated in 1971. This was due to the policies of benign neglect which was not only detrimental to the prestige of the dollar but arrogant in its posture to our friends abroad because it disregarded the needs of smaller nations for whom balance of payments problems always had a greater importance than for the U.S. The U.S. balance of payments deficit represents only a fraction of our GNP. But the economic policies of smaller countries are disrupted if they have to accept more dollars than are required for the maintenance of adequate reserve assets; the influx of dollars creates unneeded liquidity in foreign banking systems, thereby contributing to the inflationary trends in different countries. Central banks which accept dollars print (increase the supply of) local currency in exchange.

A glance at one of the Swiss National Bank's weekly statements gives a good illustration of the potentially destructive forces of irresponsible money movements. During the week ending August 13, 1971, two days before President Nixon's speech on August 15, the Swiss National Bank's foreign exchange reserves increased by more than 200%. In one week, over \$2 billion moved into Switzerland, swelling the balance sheet of the Swiss National Bank by 40%. Since a country whose Gross National Product is only \$22 billion cannot possibly absorb in one week an influx of dollars

representing 10% of its yearly GNP, it had to turn around and try to get rid of those dollars, but it could not obtain gold for them, nor find any willing takers. Nolen's volens, the Swiss had to issue (print) 8.8 billion Swiss francs (to prevent the build-up of inflationary forces, 5.6 billion of those francs were temporarily frozen). This influx of dollars into a country which only a few months before had to revalue its currency by 7% and whose exports run at about 80% of its imports must ultimately end in a catastrophe, especially since the Swiss foreign trade represents over 31% of its GNP. Switzerland cannot absorb a further influx of dollars, because it either will be ruined by inflation or be obliged to revalue its currency ad nauseam, thereby provoking a depression.

Incidentally, the influx of dollars into foreign central banks' coffers had the effect of diminishing the percentage of gold as a reserve asset. At the end of 1960 gold represented 63% of central bank reserves. By the end of 1969, the ratio had dropped to 49%, and currently gold represents slightly less than 37% of the free world monetary reserves. The gold holdings of central banks actually changed very little, but because of SDR distribution, and particularly because of the flight away from dollars which central banks had to buy, gold now represents a smaller percentage of world liquidity. The world liquidity now exceeds \$100 billion and in excess of 50% is represented by dollar holdings. Those dollar holdings of foreign central banks corresponds to about 80% of the total foreign dollar pool of approximately \$62 billion.

Since the dollar will be eliminated as a reserve asset, obviously gold will have to play a more important role than heretofore, at least during the transition period until a new reserve asset is agreed upon. When President Nixon announced the divorce of the dollar from its gold convertibility in August 1971, this single move, as paradoxical as it may seem, put gold precisely back into the spotlight of the international monetary system from which the U.S. Treasury has been trying to remove gold for years! If the cancellation of the dollar/gold convertibility had not been announced in 1971, the Treasury would probably have been successful in its endeavor to demonetize or nearly demonetize gold sometime in the second half of this decade. However, the premature cut of the dollar/gold link will not only strengthen the position of gold in the monetary system, it will also preclude the use of any national currency as a reserve asset by central banks in the future.

To better understand the reason behind the statement just made by me, one should compare dollars to chips in a gambling casino: it was the Bretton Woods agreement which provided the United States with a license to operate the casino—the only casino in the world where all players were obliged to use American chips. In order to get those chips, some nations gave their national currency; others mortgaged their industrial growth, or sold their industries to U.S. businesses. For more than a quarter of a century, the players trusted the management of the casino to be willing to cash in the chips on demand. However, on August 15, 1971, the management of the casino declared that from now on the chips were no longer convertible, and those who did not like it could go fly a kite.

Before suspending the rights of players to cash in their chips, the United States had allowed every Tom, Dick and Harry to help themselves to the use of its chips, and to flood the world with them. And flood they did. At the end of 1970, the United States' assets abroad had a book value of \$166 billion. For those assets, which earned about \$12-\$13 billion last year alone, the sellers got our chips—now unredeemable. The sus-

pension of the dollar/gold convertibility has effectively destroyed the very foundation on which our monetary system was built. However, repudiation by a country of its pledge to exchange paper currency into gold is not an American invention. Other nations have gone back on such pledges before; as a matter of fact, the list of those nations is quite impressive, and includes England, France, Germany, etc.

Because of this sad experience, it is now generally agreed, and surprisingly enough this view also appears to represent the current position of the U.S. Treasury, that, in the future, neither the dollar nor any other national currency should be used as a reserve asset. Please do not misunderstand me. The role of the dollar will still be very important, because it will remain the intervention currency. But it will not be considered a reserve asset, which means that foreign central banks will not be obliged to add dollars to their reserves. This will have the effect of eliminating the inflationary pressure abroad which was caused by the flight from the dollar.

The currency realignment of December 18 will help diminish the U.S. balance of payments deficit provided that the flight of the non-purpose dollars will stop. The average realignment in favor of the U.S. is about 12% when weighted according to the volume of trade done with major U.S. trading partners (except Canada which continues to float its currency). To facilitate the proper functioning of the new exchange rates a minimum U.S. concession is required and that is the agreement to change dollar gold par value from 1/35 troy ounce of gold being equivalent of \$1.00 to 1/38 troy ounce of gold being the equivalent of \$1.00. The realignment of currencies including this revaluation of the price of monetary gold in terms of dollars will aid our balance of payments position and a speedy Congressional approval of the Par Value Modification Act will cement the first step to bring the western world away from a monetary chaos. Before suggesting some additional measures which I believe could help restore the dollar's standing and create an improved monetary system, a short review of the Eurodollar market may be in order.

Contrary to popular belief, the Eurodollar market was not invented by some ingenious American or hard-bargaining Swiss, but by a Communist banker. This market came to life in 1957 because the Soviet Union was reluctant to keep its dollar balances in the United States. In order to prevent a potential seizure by the U.S. Government, the Soviet Union kept its dollars hidden behind the flags of Great Britain and France via Russian-owned banks (Moscow Narodny Bank in London and Banque Commerciale pour l'Europe du Nord in Paris). By the end of 1958, other European countries joined the Eurodollar game. It coincided with the time when their balance of payments problems were resolved. An accumulation of dollars by leading European countries began partly as a result of their trade surplus and partly because of heavy U.S. industrial expansion in Western European countries and the highly sophisticated methods employed by certain Americans to avoid paying taxes. Today the multi-national corporations are a major factor in the Eurodollar market. These multi-national companies now produce \$450 billion worth of goods and about one-half of this sum represents sales by foreign affiliates of American companies. Over-exporting of American know-how as well as the American dollar to invest in direct production facilities abroad had to boomerang. We are now in Phase II of this phenomenon. The first phase was the creation and growth of the uncontrolled Eurodollar market which resulted in the breakdown of our monetary system on August 15, 1971 when the freeze on domestic prices and wages was imposed

and the chill of our relations with our friends abroad accomplished. The multi-national companies represent an economic power second only to that of the United States. The corporate affiliates of U.S. companies alone represent the fourth greatest economic power in the world. U.S. direct investments abroad by exporting jobs and importing products manufactured in low-wage countries contributed to the slowdown of our domestic economy. Please do not misunderstand me. I am not against direct investments abroad, but a better control must be exercised over the multi-national companies than heretofore. As I mentioned before, the pressure on the dollar came because of hedging and short-selling activities of the American corporate affiliates abroad. It was they and not the gnomes of Zurich who were dumping the dollars by the billions. Those multi-national companies must be subjected to the priorities of the national economy of the country which provided the original capital and know-how, otherwise an irreparable damage to our system might occur.

All dollars deposited with banks in locations outside the United States, whether they are banks of a foreign country or branches of U.S. banks, are called Eurodollars regardless of whether they are owned by the Americans, Japanese, Canadians, or Europeans. One would assume that the dollars abroad are there as a result of some legitimate commercial transactions, through American tourists spending abroad or through purchases or grants by the U.S. Government. This is how it should be but "it ain't necessarily so!" Many Americans who had a friend at The Chase Manhattan Bank were persuaded to transfer their dollar accounts from domestic branches of this bank to its foreign establishments. Some were likewise induced by other prominent financial institutions in this country.

Statistics recently released show that in 1970 assets of overseas branches of U.S. banks, members of the Federal Reserve System, again dramatically increased by \$11.5 billion, or 28%. As of December 31, 1970, the total assets of overseas branches of U.S. banks stood at \$52.6 billion. Seventy-seven new branches were opened during the year, bringing the total of U.S. banks' overseas branches to 536, a new record. U.S. banks have 44 branches in the United Kingdom and Ireland, with assets of \$29.6 billion; 72 in continental Europe, with assets of \$9.5 billion; 61 in the Bahamas, with assets of \$4.4 billion; 79 in the Far East, with assets of \$4.4 billion; 223 in Latin America, with assets of about \$2 billion, plus some other branches scattered around the world. Since Eurodollars on deposit with those banks are subject to few regulations, they cross borders at will, and occasionally cause irreparable damage to the Western world's economy.

If it were not for the close to 15 billion Eurodollars' injection in 1969-70 "to help" the banking and corporate liquidity in this country, the Administration's original economic plan would have worked and the inflationary period as well as the recession (made to order) would have been a matter of the past by now. As it happened, the \$15 billion "foreign loans" helped to promote the continuation of the inflation and necessitated a longer period of tightening domestic money screws, thereby prolonging the recession. The net result was that inflation receded at a slower rate than expected and the recession or whatever the Administration called it, extended beyond the period originally projected.

There now exists another danger that once the liquidity of the Eurodollar market is curtailed as it must be, a chain of bankruptcies of major financial corporations or banks in Europe (foreign or American-owned) may be triggered. Private banks which operate in the Eurocurrency market



create money either without reserve requirements or in a manner normally reserved for central banks only. For example, any short sale of forward dollars against Japanese yen, German marks, Swiss francs, or whatever, creates a "new supply" of forward dollars, thereby increasing temporarily the liquidity of the Eurodollar market. A proof of the destructive forces in the Eurodollar market was offered when at the end of August, 1971 yearly interest rates in excess of 200% were paid for overnight use of Eurodollars by those wanting to cash in profits on their purchases of foreign currencies.

Before the end of August 1971, I proposed an eight-point plan on how to overcome the monetary chaos. I presented my plan to the Treasury and it was also published on September 8 in Green's Commodity Market Comments. Portions of the plan were since adopted and various speakers at the International Monetary Fund meeting last September in Washington advocated some of mine or similar proposals. Six points of my plan remain unfulfilled and they are as follows:

1. Stateless money like Eurodollars, Euromarks, etc., which were one of the main causes of the breakdown of the monetary system, should fall under the jurisdiction of the IMF as a first step towards the creation of a worldwide central bank.

2. SDRs at the present time are not convertible into gold, but they do have a gold par value. In the future, SDRs should be convertible into gold in the same proportion as gold is maintained in the assets of the IMF.

3. Settlements of balance of payments deficits should not be permitted through any means other than transfer of SDRs. Those nations which do not have enough SDRs would have to borrow them for that purpose from the IMF.

4. 10% of each central bank's assets should be transferred to the IMF in exchange for SDRs, and thereafter at the rate of 5% of the remaining assets per year until a certain pre-determined quota is reached. Such quota may be based on the current voting percentage of each IMF member or on a new system yet to be determined.

5. The dollars held by foreign central banks should be repurchased by the U.S. over a period of 20 years at the rate of \$1.5 billion per year.

6. The direct expenses connected with the defense of the Western world and incurred by the U.S. abroad should be split evenly.

The August 15, 1971, repudiation of the dollar/gold convertibility will be recorded by monetary historians as a landmark decision concerning not only those directly engaged in gold warfare, but also many in the hinterland. Over the last 6,000 years, innumerable gold wars were fought. The Roman civilization grew on such wars; so did the empire of Alexander the Great, whose capture of Ecbatana earned him 10 million ounces of gold, and that of Persepolis, 7 million ounces of gold. The Egyptian Pharaohs Thotmes I and Amenhotep II fought Syria to seize her gold treasures; the sea power of Crete collected gold from the North Aegeans, Carpathia and Ireland. Emperor Trajan captured 8 million ounces of gold from the Dacians; Pizarro, the conqueror of Peru, got 200,000 ounces of gold from the Inca Atahualpa, etc.

With the progress of civilization, gold wars became more sophisticated. During our generation, gold wars were fought not on battlefields but in the privacy of the world's chancelleries or the majesty of the White House. Our generation's Gold War I ended in January 1934, when President Roosevelt decided to increase the price of gold from \$20.67 to \$35.00 per ounce. Gold War II was terminated in March 1968 when the drainage of large amounts of gold from the pool operated by central bankers brought the two-tier gold system into being.

The outcome of Gold War III will be decided by the action of this Congress.

The original gold standard was started in England in 1816 and lasted until 1914. During 92 years out of those 98 years, the value of gold remained fixed at the rate of £13.17.10½ per ounce. But in the previous century, between 1700 and 1800, when the gold standard did not even exist, the price of gold was also stationary. After World War I, the exchange rate flexibility, hailed today as a superior monetary system by those who did not study history, proved disastrous. The gold exchange standard did not fare any better. Since time immemorial man's folly has created monetary problems with recurring consistency, and neither the pure gold standard, nor the semi-gold standard, nor flexible rates, nor rigid rates, have been able to steer the foreign exchange markets through calm waters forever. Deflation and inflation, prosperity and recession have occurred under each of the monetary systems ever invented by man. Debasement of money existed even at a time when paper money was not in use. For example, the gold content of French coins fell from 3.2 grams to fine gold in 1351 to 0.29 gram in 1795, a debasement of over 90%, and the gold content of British coins fell by almost 80% between 1257 and 1816. Of all the world's monetary systems, the most successful one, in absolute terms as well as proportionately, was the one agreed upon at Bretton Woods in 1944. It was based on the dollar/gold convertibility. The main objectives of the International Monetary Fund, to help members attain economic growth and to expand world trade, were achieved; the world trade increased from \$60 billion in 1950 to approximately \$300 billion last year. But the mechanism to correct the balance of payments deficit of countries whose currencies were used as reserve assets failed. This potential danger was recognized more than ten years ago, and those who wanted to protect our monetary system pointed out the absurdity of using national currencies as international reserves. The creation of Special Drawing Rights was intended to take the burden from national currencies acting as international reserves. But before the SDRs were able to prove itself, the suspension of the dollar/gold convertibility played havoc with our monetary system. Still it will be ultimately through the use of the SDRs that the proper functioning of the free world monetary system will be restored.

As far as the acceleration of the reflow of dollars from abroad is concerned, and in order to prevent future flights from the dollar, the repeal of the prohibition for U.S. citizens to own gold may be helpful. Legalization of gold ownership in this country would effectively eliminate the need for private individuals and corporations to seek foreign haven in order to protect themselves against real or imaginary dangers of holding dollars. It is estimated that in excess of \$6 billion worth of gold bullion stored outside the U.S. is illegally owned by U.S. citizens or corporations. An amnesty would bring, if not all of this gold into the U.S., at least a substantial part of it and, therefore, no outflow of dollars would take place for new purchases of gold from abroad. Further, a higher price for the yellow metals would make certain gold deposits in the U.S. economically minable.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Mines, we could mine in this country 25 million ounces of gold up to the price of \$46 per ounce; 176 million ounces up to \$110; and 237 million ounces up to \$140. We pay a subsidy to farmers for not growing grain. We could well justify payment to miners for producing gold. Incidentally, those 237 million ounces of gold at the free market price represent close to \$12 billion worth of gold, or about \$9 billion at the monetary price. If added to our current reserves, it would double our present monetary gold stock. The U.S. industrial consumption of gold oscillates between 6 and 7

million ounces per year and we have to import between 4 and 5 million ounces. Domestic production in 1970 was 1.7 million ounces but due to a copper strike in 1971 it was slightly less last year. Our imports of gold for industrial purposes represents an outlay of between \$220-\$280 million per year. A subsidy paid to the domestic mining industry would eliminate this drag on our balance of payments.

I am one of the few persons who does not have a hang-up on gold—one way or another. I realize that gold is an important store of value, and justifiably exercise great monetary influence; but the improvement of communications networks now permits the transfer of money from one country to another by telephone, cable or telex and accomplishes an exchange from one currency to another simultaneously, thereby diminishing the role of gold as a store of value and as a protection against inflation, confiscation, devaluation, etc. Besides not being electronically transferable, gold has another disadvantage: it can be easily stolen, even from a bank vault. I am speaking from experience. My family owned what was known before World War II as the largest jewelry concern in Middle and Eastern Europe. We owned watch factories, silverware factories, manufactured jewelry and had a wholesale organization as well as retail jewelry stores in several countries. When the Soviet troops marched into Poland in 1939, most of our merchandise was stolen or confiscated. When the Soviet troops entered Hungary in 1944, the wall to one of our stores which was built inside a huge vault was dynamited in order to permit entry to steal the loot. Since we anticipated that this could happen, we had deposited a vast number of gold and diamond objects with the Swiss Embassy in Budapest, hoping that at least this part would be safe, but the troops violated the extra-territorial rights of the Swiss Embassy and our deposit was lost. Let this be a memento to all those who believe that gold provides the ultimate security as far as conservation of assets is concerned. On the other hand, I must state that the gold, platinum and diamonds which my wife and I carried on ourselves during World War II or had hidden personally were of enormous assistance to us. The moral of this story is obvious. Too much gold will not necessarily help you but it is prudent to have some.

There were times when I advised the purchase of gold bullion to U.S. licensed dealers and those of my foreign readers who could legally do so. Other times I advised short sales of gold bullion. From the very beginning, I was in favor of the creation of the SDRs and in favor of demonetization or near-demonetization of gold sometime before the end of this decade. However, I am a realist and when the gold/dollar convertibility was stopped on August 15th, it became obvious that a hike in the monetary gold price would be the least concession the U.S. would have to agree to in order to straighten out its problems with other members of the Group of Ten and the IMF.

Contrary to popular belief, I don't think that once the gold ownership in this country is legalized that the price will run out of sight. I expect that the price of gold will oscillate between \$47-\$53 per ounce for a good while with maybe an occasional flare-up to esoteric level immediately after trading gold bullion begins on U.S. commodity exchanges. In the long term, of course, it is a question of economics and the price of gold in the free market will be ruled by the supply and demand factors. I am on record that by the end of the decade, the price of gold should be in excess of \$130 per ounce. South African proven gold reserves are only 500 million ounces at the \$35 per ounce level. But if the price increases by 100% then South African gold reserves would increase by 150%. Still not enough to satisfy the growing industrial demand. The Bureau of Mines estimated the range of demand in the

U.S. for primary gold in the year 2000 to be between 19 and 30 million ounces. The low and high forecasts over the next 30 years correspond to annual growth consumption rates of 3.4 and 4.8% respectively. Assuming the low growth figure for gold consumption, the cumulative demand for gold between now and the year 2000 would be close to 360 million ounces in the U.S. At the high growth figure, approximately 480 million ounces of gold would be used between now and the year 2000. The range of demand for the rest of the world in the year 2000 is confined to between 43.4 and 69.2 million ounces. The cumulative total for the rest of the world would amount to 966 million ounces on the low side and 1.2 billion ounces on the high side. The combined cumulative demand (U.S.+world) between now and the year 2000, at the high consumption figure, would be approximately 1.7 billion ounces. Obviously, the production of gold in the next 30 years cannot keep up with demand and this might be true regardless of the price. It has been estimated that gold recovery over the last 6000 years represented a total cumulative production to date of slightly over 2½ billion ounces. 30% of this total was mined in the last 20 years. Over the years, South African mines have produced 960 million ounces which at \$35 per ounce represented more than \$33 billion.

There is very little likelihood that a discovery of major new gold fields can be made, except in the Soviet Union, where prospecting so far has not been very thorough. It is known, however, that recently the Soviet Union has begun a new search for gold, and has had some success in this endeavor. South Africa's current production is about 32 million ounces per year and this represents approximately two-thirds of the world production. The figure usually mentioned is about 75%-80% of world production but I believe that the Soviet Union's gold production is larger than generally accepted, hence the lower percentage for South Africa's share. There are more than 50 gold mines in South Africa, which are controlled by seven holding companies. South African statistics show that in order to produce one ounce of gold, 3 tons of ore have to be processed, requiring 38 man-hours to do the job and 1,400 gallons of water. The electrical power used for that purpose would equal what an average household uses in 10 days. In addition, it takes 300 to 600 cubic feet of compressed air and varying quantities of chemicals, including cyanide, zinc, acids, lime and borax. All this effort to produce one ounce of gold could only start after an initial \$50 million was spent to establish a deep-level mine in order to reach ore economically minable. In South Africa, about 75 million tons of rock are brought to the surface every year and crushed to yield finally about a ten-foot cube of pure gold. All of this activity creates a flow of newly-mined gold that in recent years added little to the monetary reserves of central banks. The commercial consumption by 1975 will equal new production and thereafter should exceed it. Obviously, gold cannot remain forever a component of our monetary system. At the moment, however, it is too early to think in terms of demonetization or near-demonetization of gold.

Our Treasury and some newspapers often gloat in their condemnation of the so-called foreign gold speculator. I think that this may be a good place to clarify the record. There are very few gold speculators that I know of in the sense we define the word speculation. Ninety-nine percent of the people abroad buy gold solely for protection as a kind of insurance of the last resort. A real gold hoarder could not care less whether he makes any money on his gold holdings as long as he does not lose any. I never heard of any substantial gold hoarder who bought gold for capital appreciation purposes. It is only since 1967 when the American money

abroad began active and illegal participation in gold bullion market that some purchasers of gold thought in terms of buying gold in order to double or triple their money. The people of India, Mid-East, France and other places where gold hoarding is a tradition buy gold because it offers advantage over paper money at times of distress. Gold can be easily verified as to its genuineness. A simple acid test will do. Who knows, however, if some foreign paper currency is counterfeit or not. Besides who knows about the rate of exchange between one currency and another at a time of war or riots when one is cut from the rest of the world.

There is no valid reason why the U.S. citizens should be prevented from gold ownership. I am convinced that such gold ownership can have no detrimental repercussion on our monetary system even during the period of transition when gold is still being used as a component of the monetary reserves. As a matter of fact, I believe that legalization of the gold ownership in this country would be beneficial to our balance of payments problems because it will act as a deterrent to the outflow of dollars from this country. Further, a higher gold price—in both tiers, monetary and free market—will improve our chances for trade with the Soviet Union and People's Republic of China. Both countries have substantial amounts of gold bullion. I estimate that the Soviet Union's gold assets accounted at the free market price represent the equivalent of \$7-\$8 billion and that of China \$3-\$4 billion. If we really want to trade with them then there is no reason to cry about Russia and China having more chips. And as far as South Africa is concerned, the increase in the monetary price of gold would have no influence on the amount of gold sold by that country for its balance of payments reason since already for a second year in a row the entire gold production of South Africa is being disposed on the free market.

#### ANNUNZIO URGES ISSUANCE OF A COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP IN HONOR OF 500TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF NICHOLAS COPERNICUS, THE FATHER OF MODERN SCIENCE

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to authorize the Postmaster General to issue a special commemorative postage stamp in 1973 in honor of the 500th anniversary of the birth of Nicholas Copernicus—the great Polish astronomer and father of modern science.

Copernicus was born in Poland in 1473, but he gave so much to the world, that he has been honored the world over for his achievements. In tribute to Copernicus and in recognition of the notable contributions of Polish Americans to the advancement of our own country, I feel it is indeed fitting and appropriate that a postage stamp of this kind be issued to coincide with the quinquennial celebration in 1973 of Copernicus' birth.

Copernicus was outstanding in many fields—he distinguished himself as a theologian, scholar, painter, poet, physician, lawyer, economist, soldier, statesman, and scientist. But above all, he was

such an eminent astronomer that his theories formed the basis for modern astronomy. It was he who disproved the idea that the earth is in the center of the universe and formulated the theories which led to modern-day space exploration.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I include a brief biography about Nicholas Copernicus which appeared in the Autumn 1971 edition of *Promień*, the Polish National Alliance Youth Leaders magazine.

The article follows:

#### NICHOLAS COPERNICUS

Copernicus is rightfully called the Father of Modern Science because his teachings permitted thousands of successive scientists to unfold human knowledge in a multitude of fields to the point where the United States was able to make a successful landing on the moon. Incidentally, the large Copernicus crater on the moon, one of its most prominent landmarks, was named after the astronomer in 1651 by Father G. B. Riccioli of Bologna.

Copernicus' theory stirred the minds of men of many nations. In the constantly expanding realm of scientific achievement, the fundamental work of Copernicus looms as more and more important. The saga of space exploration is bewildering.

The true nature of matter, time and motion has been given tremendous impetus during the International Geophysical Year (July 1, 1957 through December 31, 1958). A most ambitious program was dependent not only on the 30,000 scientists and technicians from sixty-six countries who combined their efforts on a gigantic scale with huge funds and most highly developed equipment, but employed the accumulated and combined knowledge of every kind of mathematician, physician, astronomer and other scientists over the centuries. Rockets, satellites orbiting the earth, craft directed to other celestial bodies and endless similar projects depended on many men of many nations.

An extraordinary man of the world of enormous vision, who filled an important niche in mankind's knowledge of the heavens, was Nicholas Copernicus. It was he who disapproved the theory that the earth is in the center of the universe in very much the same way and at about the same time that others were proving the earth was round and not flat. He placed the sun in the center, thereby evolving the solar system with the earth but one of the planets in the complex. It was said that "he stopped the sun and bade the earth to spin".

This planet of ours in its dash around the sun makes 1,110 miles a minute. In its daily rotation a point on the equator makes about 1,000 miles an hour. Our entire solar system is but a detail in the stupendous galaxy of stars which requires 200 billion years to complete its orbit. In addition to galaxies, astronomers are today concerned with quasars which are 100 times brighter than galaxies and strong emitters of radio waves. We and our planets are, relatively speaking, mere specks of dust.

Nicholas Copernicus was born in Toruń, Poland on February 19, 1473, so he was but a young man when America was discovered. He studied canon law and kindred subjects at the Universities of Krakow, Bologna, Padua and elsewhere. Sciences in general and astronomy in particular attracted him, however, he was interested in celestial motions and observed their phenomena with the naked eye to prove his calculated predictions. This was a hundred years before Galileo introduced the telescope and nearly 400 years before photography was developed, so that Copernicus made drawings



of star and planet positions to support his theory.

After four years of study in Krakow where Copernicus made great strides in acquiring knowledge in science and in the humanities, he was attracted to Italy to continue his studies there. This was a period of impressive achievements in navigation, discoveries and the fine arts—all emanating from northern Italy. It was a period when Columbus made efforts to prove that the earth was round and not flat, when his voyages led to the discovery of America. It was a period when Michelangelo impressed the world with his genius as a sculptor, painter and poet. It was the time when Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519) was making a name for himself as painter, sculptor, architect, military strategist and inventor. This was also the time when the paintings of Raphael (1483-1520) were attracting attention to the eminent draftsman and colorist—when these great Italians were enlarging the horizons of man's knowledge, skill and achievements. It is little wonder that Copernicus was attracted to Italy which was bustling with progress in every direction.

Through the protection of his uncle, Lucas, the Bishop of Varmia, Copernicus was made a canon of the church with a substantial stipend which allowed him to supplement his study of medicine with his particular scientific work. After the bishop died, Copernicus was administrator of the domain, and had occasion to propound a monetary law on currency.

About 1515, he began to concentrate all his efforts on the heliocentric system, and gathered data in support of his theory. He spent long solitary years in his work, concentrating on his calculations and observations which finally formed the basis of his *De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium* (Concerning the Revolutions of the Heavenly Spheres). After many setbacks the book which immortalized Copernicus became a reality with the first printed copy reaching the great scientist on his very death bed on May 24, 1543.

Many copies of this first edition published in Latin in 1543 are still preserved and most of these have come to light in 1943 during the widespread observances of the 400th anniversary of the death of Copernicus. It is interesting to note that on Feb. 22, 1923, Frederick E. Brasch reported in the Boston Herald "As far as is known, the Boston Athenaeum Library and the library of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology are the only libraries in the United States possessing a copy". In Prof. Stephen P. Mizwa's 1943 book on Copernicus, the title page of a copy of the first edition at the Royal University at Uppsala, Sweden, is shown and mention is made of another copy in possession of the New York Public Library. By the time the Copernicus celebrations ended (late in 1943), Prof. Mizwa, president of the Kosciuszko Foundation, acting as secretary of the Copernican Quadricentennial throughout the United States discovered seventeen copies in the United States without the MIT copy which in the meantime had disappeared.

It would be well to keep in mind that the first book, from movable type as the Holy Bible, invented by Johann Gutenberg (1397-1468), was printed in 1452, only 21 years before Copernicus was born and only 91 years before Copernicus' book was printed.

The book forms the basis of all modern astronomy on which Kepler discovered the ellipticity of the planetary orbits, Sir Isaac Newton worked out the physics of celestial motion, Albert Einstein his theory of relativity, etc. Copernicus made it plain that the fixed stars, including the sun, were a comparatively rigid group and that other bodies like our planets including the earth, as well as our moon had peculiar motions of their own as compared with the fixed stars. The starry heavens were given a fixed foundation

with the planets and their satellites correctly staged. This was a bold act on the part of Copernicus in view of centuries of faulty doctrines, deeply rooted in and supported by the church.

Copernicus was a true scholar, a thinker with broad interests and achievements, a theologian, a painter and a poet, a physician and a lawyer, an economist, a soldier, a statesman and a scientist. The world knows him as an astronomer. The great American astronomer, Simon Newcomb, has noted that "there is no figure in astronomical history which may more appropriately claim the admiration of mankind through all time than that of Copernicus".

The 500th anniversary of Copernicus' birth will be aptly observed by all high institutions of learning, by astronomical observatories, by historians, mathematicians, scientists and bibliographers. Musical compositions have been inspired to honor Copernicus. Tributes will be paid from far and wide. Quincentennial observances will be conducted in all parts of the world. The Copernicus University in Wroclaw is preparing an impressive program. The many monuments and memorials will gather huge crowds of admirers.

Many countries will issue postage stamps to recall the achievements of Copernicus and it becomes paramount for the United States, as the leader in the space race, to add its postal tribute to a great scholar. We hope that the issue will be in keeping with the dignity of America in its dominant position among nations.

The stature of Copernicus, even before the present nuclear competition, has been so great that Poland and other countries have honored him with postal issues for the past 50 years. While we could dwell on the many tangible ways in which Copernicus is being and will be venerated on his 500th anniversary, we will limit this booklet to the postage stamps that have been issued to honor the man and his works.

Inasmuch as Copernicus belongs to the great mass of humanity as much as he belongs to Poland, and inasmuch as American citizens of Polish descent form a large industrious, creative and otherwise helpful segment of our population, we are suggesting that the postal issues be a common effort, that similar or identical stamps, save for the name of the issuing country and for the denomination, be identical or nearly so. This would create a significant bond among nations where unity is now so sorely needed.

Above all, here is a tabulation of the Copernicus stamps and is followed on subsequent pages by illustrations and descriptions. Stamps issued by Poland up to June 1971 are shown on page 8 and stamps issued by others than Poland up to June 1971 are shown on page 9. The last column in both tabulations refers to the page on which the stamp is illustrated and described. As mentioned on page 31, it is the intention to issue a supplement for the stamps that will be issued after June 1971 for the Copernicus quincentenary.

#### MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

**HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 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?

#### ANOTHER BOUT OF REPRESSION IN THE U.S.S.R.

**HON. JAMES G. O'HARA**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, the secret police of the Soviet Union carried out a new wave of repression against intellectuals in Ukraine—one of the captive nations which has been under Soviet domination for nearly half a century.

Unhappily, most of the American people were unaware of these newest attempts to throttle those in Ukraine who dare speak out in defense of human rights—even though these human rights are supposed to be "guaranteed" by the Constitution of the Soviet Union.

The Associated Press carried a brief story on its wires, and the New York Times published this story on January 15, in something less than a prominent position. The Baltimore Sun of the same day carried a story of similar length which originated in that newspaper's Moscow bureau. Certainly there were no glaring headlines, such as have accompanied other instances of oppression in the Soviet Union. There has been no public outcry in this country or abroad. As a nation, we seem to have lost our capacity to care about the repression of citizens of Ukraine, who have been arrested for the expression of views unpopular to the Soviet Government—even though their actions have remained well within the law.

Radio Free Europe, in a research paper prepared for the use of its editors and policy staff, has put its finger on the problem with the following analysis of this newest wave of repression:

The one common feature in this unedifying spectacle is, apparently, that no ruling Communist party of any hue is strong enough to tolerate opposition, even when it is expressed by legal means and even when it operates within the bounds of the constitution.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should voice our strongest condemnation of these latest infringements of basic human rights. I would hope that the United Nations Human Rights Commission will investigate the conditions in Ukraine, before this systematic destruction of the Ukrainian cultural heritage achieves the goals of the leaders in the Kremlin: The forced Russification of the Ukrainian people.

Mr. Speaker, I include, at this point in my remarks, the articles from the New York Times and the Baltimore Sun, as well as the Radio Free Europe research paper of January 17, 1972, on this subject:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Jan. 15, 1972]

UKRAINIAN DISSIDENTS REPORTED HELD

Moscow.—In a sweeping action against Ukrainian "nationalists," Soviet secret police

have arrested 11 leading dissident intellectuals in the Ukraine, reliable sources said yesterday.

Among those held by police is Vyacheslav Chornovil, author of the "Chornovil Papers," an account of the trial and prison camp experiences of 20 Ukrainian intellectuals convicted in 1966 for nationalist agitation.

After the account was written, Mr. Chornovil was sent to prison in 1967 for three years. It was published later in the west.

#### ARRESTED IN LVOV

He was one of seven persons arrested Wednesday in Lvov, a city in the Western Ukraine where nationalist feeling against Russians is reported to be especially strong.

Four people were taken into custody in the Ukrainian Republic capital, Kiev, Thursday. They include Ivan Svitlichny, a former literary critic who has been particularly active in the nationalist movement.

The sources said the arrests were preceded by a series of raids by Soviet secret police on the homes of intellectuals in Kiev and Lvov.

Those held are all charged with dissemination of "deliberately false fabrications defaming the Soviet state." Conviction on the charge carries a maximum, three-year sentence.

Despite the round-up of dissidents that led to the 1966 trials, the Ukraine has continued to be a source of trouble for Moscow. Like the dissidents centered in Moscow, the Ukrainians have their own underground newspaper, the Ukrainian Herald, to chronicle their battles with the authorities.

Some of them, disturbed by what they consider to be the Russification of the Ukraine, have called for secession from the Soviet Union—a right technically guaranteed in the Constitution.

In the most famous recent case, Valentin Moroy, a teacher, was sentenced in 1970 to nine years in prison and five years in exile on a charge of anti-Soviet agitation.

Mr. Chornovil was called as a witness at that trial, but refused to testify on the grounds that it was being held secretly, in violation of Soviet law.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 15, 1972]

#### SOVIET ARREST OF 11 IN UKRAINE REPORTED FOR ANTI-STATE ACTS

Moscow, January 14.—The Soviet secret police have arrested 11 Ukrainians apparently on suspicion of nationalist activity, reliable sources said today.

All were held under an article or the Ukrainian criminal code that prohibits dissemination of "deliberately false fabrications defaming the Soviet state," the source said. The article carries a maximum sentence of three years' imprisonment.

Four of the persons were arrested Thursday in Kiev, the Ukrainian capital, the sources said. Among them, they added, was Ivan Svitlichny, a literary critic.

A Ukrainian underground publication, Ukrainsky Visny (Ukrainian Herald), says that Mr. Svitlichny is one of several intellectuals whom the security police have tried to discredit.

The sources said that the seven other arrests were made Wednesday in Lvov, the main city in the western Ukraine and generally considered one of the strongest centers of Ukrainian nationalism.

The seven arrested were reported to have included a former television journalist, Vyacheslav Chornovil. Mr. Chornovil, in his early 30's, was sentenced in November, 1967, to 18 months in a labor camp for compiling an underground account of secret police methods used in rounding up about 100 Ukrainian intellectuals in 1965 and 1966.

About 20 of those arrested then were eventually tried in secret in 1966 on charges of anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda.

They were sentenced to labor-camp terms ranging from six months to six years.

#### ANOTHER BOUT OF REPRESSION IN THE U.S.S.R.

##### SUMMARY

In mid-January 1972, the largest wave of arrests and house-searches in the USSR since December 1970 was reported. In the Ukraine Chornovil and Svitlichny were arrested, while Dzuba's house was searched, as well as the flat of Pyotr Yakir in Moscow. The action includes a case in Leningrad, and upwards of forty victims may be involved. This paper explains the background and attempts to find a reason for the current bout of nervousness and repression in the Kremlin.

The biggest wave of repressive action in the USSR since the arrests connected with the alleged attempt at hijacking an aircraft in December 1970 took place last week. Preceded by a number of house searches carried out by the Ukrainian KGB, including a search of the house of Ivan Dzuba, the prominent literary critic, it appears to have begun in earnest on January 12, when seven people were arrested in Lvov.<sup>1</sup> Among them were Vyacheslav Chornovil, the author of "The Chornovil Papers."

On the following day, the action spread to Kiev, where another four arrests were made, and this time the most prominent victim was Ivan Svitlichny, another literary critic. All are so far charged with "spreading deliberately false fabrications defaming the Soviet state," for which the maximum penalty is three years imprisonment.

On January 14, there were eight police raids on homes in Moscow, including the flat of Pyotr Yakir, the prominent member of the civil rights movement who is the son of the Red Army general liquidated in 1937.

Pyotr Yakir was told by the KGB men who searched his apartment that the action was connected with a case in Leningrad, about which nothing is yet known except that it was referred to as "No. 38."<sup>2</sup> There is some reason, therefore, for thinking that there may be about forty separate people involved, although the Moscow raids have not, apparently, yet led to arrests. But since the KGB were searching for papers, books and documents, of which they removed a large number from Yakir's flat, it seems probable that they are accumulating the evidence for future arrests in the capital.

This marks the first occasion on which administrative action has been taken against Yakir, who in recent years has seemed to be protected by his famous name and by the Party's guilty knowledge of the terminal injustice perpetrated against his father during Stalin's purge of the Red Army leadership.

The issue in the Ukraine is apparently the age-old problem of "Ukrainian nationalism," which is known to have caused Pyotr Shelest, the hard-liner who is First Secretary of the Ukrainian CP, to make several threatening and ominous speeches in recent months. Chornovil, for example, has only been at liberty for about two years since his last release, having been sentenced to detention in November 1967 for his detailed account of at least fifteen trials of Ukrainian writers, scientists, lecturers and others in the nationalist faction.

Ivan Dzuba, whose house was searched by the KGB, has been in the spotlight since 1969, when a study written by him called "Internationalism or Russification?" led to his expulsion from the Kiev branch of the Ukrainian Writers' Union.<sup>3</sup> Dzuba himself denies that he is a nationalist, but he would not deny that he is against excessive Russification. It is the latter stand which has probably led to the KGB's invasion of his home on this occasion. Dzuba was a member of the group of Ukrainian writers called the *Shestidesyatniki* (the "men of the sixties"), which had a program of cultural freedom and of active propagation of the national language as a defense against the intrusion of Russian.

Ivan Svitlichny has long been of interest

Footnotes at end of article.

to the KGB. A University lecturer from Lvov, Mikhail Osadchy, who was sent to prison for two years in 1965 as a nationalist, has written an autobiographical novel, *Bilmo*,<sup>4</sup> in which he graphically describes his interrogation by the KGB concerning Svitlichny:

"Surely the conversation was not only about literature? You certainly talked about politics as well. He must have had comments, asserted or denied something. Of course, we understand that you didn't say anything like that to him, but he told you, and you as an honest and respectable man should tell us everything. . . ."

"Svitlichny owns a large library, which books did he lend you? Which did you take home? You, as an educated man, must have noticed that he had a number of rare books which could have been given to the Academy's library. Why did he not do so? . . . Everybody complained that the article 'The Trial of Pogruzhal'sky' was confiscated from you, that the library was burnt, that valuable books were destroyed which were much needed by the Ukrainians. Why didn't Svitlichny replace the burned books? He could have helped the public much more than by merely lending them to you; and then you pass them on to someone else and so it goes—you know—the whole irresponsible gamut."

At the 1965 trial of Osadchy, Svitlichny was called as a witness, and part of the indictment against Osadchy claimed that he had "received anti-Soviet literature from Svitlichny." It looks as though the new trials now pending will be remarkably reminiscent of the 1965 one, and also of the trial of Shevchenko (the Ukrainian national poet, 1814-1861) under the Czars. Osadchy recalls bitterly that the examiners more than a hundred years ago put the same questions to Shevchenko as the magistrate had to him:

"Why did you write the poems? . . . Who are these people, and why did you mention their names in your letters?"

Truly it can be said that with Russian and Soviet attitudes to nationalism, *plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose*.

One of the reasons for the raid on Yakir's flat in Moscow was probably the KGB's desire to take revenge on him for his memoirs, the first part of which is called "Childhood in Prison," and describes his fourteen years in Stalin's jails after the arrest of the whole family in 1937.<sup>5</sup> So far only the first part has appeared, covering the years 1937-1944, and the KGB may be understandably anxious to prevent the second part, which presumably covers 1937-1944, and the KGB may be understandably anxious to prevent the second part, which presumably covers 1944-1951 from appearing even via *Samizdat*.

But there is also a direct link between Yakir and the Ukrainian arrests, in that one of those arrested in Kiev is Leonid Plyuschch, who is known to have signed several protest petitions in which Yakir had played a prominent part, and to which he was a co-signatory.

The savage sentence passed on Vladimir Bukovsky, who has spent a quarter of his life in jail and is now behind bars again for another seven years, with five more in exile to follow, and the public attack in *Literary Gazette* last week on Solzhenitsyn taken together with the expulsion from the U.S.S.R. of Congressman J. H. Scheuer for merely calling on Professor Lerner (a distinguished Jewish cyberneticist who has been dismissed from his job for asking to be allowed to emigrate to Israel) all seem to indicate that the Kremlin is having a bad fit of nerves at present. No adequate explanation of this nervousness has been forthcoming, if one excludes *Pravda's* article by B. Bolshakov on January 13, which finds Messrs Strauss-Hupe, Kintner, and Possony guilty of declaring an eternal conflict against the U.S.S.R., Mr. Dean Rusk of fanning liberalism among the CPs of Eastern Europe, the West of "inciting" the nationalist fever in



the Croatian Party, Messrs. Rostow, Whitman, Tinbergen and Sorokin of founding the "convergence theory," Prof. Brzezinski of "bridge-building," Herman Kahn of predicting a "softening" of the Soviet regime, Dr. Morton Schwartz of foreseeing "one-party pluralism" in Czechoslovakia, and the anti-communist strategists in general of encouraging "dissidentstvo" in the socialist countries.

The fact that Bolshakov leaves the word for dissidence in English, giving it only a Russian ending, suggests strongly that the present Politburo gambit is to try to blacken the civil rights movement and the nationalists in the U.S.S.R. by smearing them with the charge of collusion with foreign powers. Bolshakov argues that Sik, Loeb, Garaudy, Fisher *et al.* are only followers of the "renaissance Kautsky," who also believed in convergence between "democratic capitalism" and "democratic socialism." He fears the use made by "the cohorts of anticommunism," i.e., Maoism, since Mr. Sulzberger revealed that in the early fifties the State Department had foreseen that the Maoists might one day be "as unfriendly to Russia as to the U.S.A."

Bolshakov is especially worried about the differentiated approach now used by the West towards the socialist countries, because of a "secret memorandum" from USIA dated 1967, which advocated "using every opportunity to strengthen Mao's supporters because the U.S.A. desired his group to remain in power since its work is directed against the CPSU and other CPs." This "memorandum" was dug up by Bolshakov out of the columns of a weekly published in Ceylon called "Tribune".

The serious aspect of this type of fabrication is that it indicates the true source of the Kremlin jitters—the obsessive fear that President Nixon may get on fairly well with Chairman Mao when it comes to containing the U.S.S.R. This fear is apparently so great that the present moment, when even the most liberal ruling Party in the world finds itself compelled to purge its nationalists (in Croatia) on a large scale, when Husak is carrying out a wave of arrests of dozens of Czechoslovak liberals, and when the Chinese Party is busily sweeping away the remnants of Lin Piao's followers, is seen as an opportunity to settle accounts with some of the dissident leaders in Moscow, Leningrad and the Ukraine.

The one common feature in this unedifying spectacle is, apparently, that no ruling Communist party of any hue is strong enough to tolerate opposition, even when it is expressed by legal means and even when it operates within the bounds of the constitution.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Reuter, 14 January 1972, citing *Ukrainsky Vysnik*.

<sup>2</sup> Reuter, 15 January 1972.

<sup>3</sup> See CAA Report No. 0441, "The Case of Ivan Dzhuba," *RFER*, 16 January 1970.

<sup>4</sup> *Suchasnist*, Munich, Nos. 11 and 12, November and December, 1971. See CAA Report No. 1253, "Bilmo-Glaucoma," *RFER*, 3 January 1972.

<sup>5</sup> *Russkaya Mysl*, Paris, 28 October 1971, 11 November 1971, 2 December 1971.

## U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT TELLS HOW A PRESIDENT IS CHOSEN

**HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the prestigious weekly magazine *U.S. News & World*

Report often performs notable public services with its articles.

The March 6, 1972, issue carries a special report on "How a President Is Chosen," which is without doubt the best I have ever seen on this subject. It is especially timely and pertinent. *U.S. News* is to be congratulated for this, and I am happy to insert the article into the **CONGRESSIONAL RECORD**:

#### HOW A PRESIDENT IS CHOSEN

In simplest outline, how is a President chosen? First, a candidate campaigns within his own party for its nomination. He must win his party's nomination at a national convention. If a candidate is himself a President seeking reelection, the nomination is usually his for the asking.

After the convention comes a period of competition with the nominee of the other major party and perhaps the nominees of a third or fourth party. The showdown arrives on Election Day. He must win more votes than any other nominee in enough States and the District of Columbia to give him a majority of the electoral votes. If he does all these things, then he has won the right to the office of President of the United States.

What qualifications does the Constitution lay down for those who would become President? A President must be at least 35 years old, must have lived within the U.S. for 14 years, and must be a "natural-born citizen." What a natural-born citizen is, as a presidential qualification, has never been legally defined. No person can be elected President more than twice. Nor can a President be elected more than once if he has served better than half the term to which another President was elected.

When will the nominees of the two major parties be known? As the sitting President, Richard Nixon will be the nominee of his party, barring completely unforeseen events, and is to be nominated at the Republican National Convention that starts in San Diego, Calif., on August 21. The Democratic nominee will not definitely be known until the Democratic Convention meets in Miami Beach, Fla., beginning on July 10.

When does a candidate begin to campaign? Often a year and half or two years before Election Day, he starts to travel extensively about the country to discuss national and international issues. He keeps in touch with State leaders of his party. He tends to visit the politically important States more and more frequently. His supporters raise money for his expenses. Gradually he builds a staff that writes his speeches, works on research and contacts Governors, State chairmen and prospective contributors. Sometimes he declares his candidacy openly, sometimes not. In any case, it is usually apparent that he is a candidate by the start of the election year.

Talking about candidacies, what is meant by the term "dark horse"? A dark horse is a potential candidate who is relatively unknown and given almost no chance for the nomination. James A. Garfield in 1880 and Warren G. Harding in 1920 were Republican dark horses who reached the White House. Wendell Willkie in 1940 was one who did not. John W. Davis, a dark horse, won the Democratic nomination in 1924. This year few if any presidential aspirants are considered real dark horses.

What is a favorite-son candidate? He is a party leader, often a Governor or Senator, who seeks to control his State's delegation to the national convention. He is seldom considered a serious contender. His motives may vary. He may wish to avert a party split in his State as presidential candidates fight over convention delegates. Sometimes a favorite son is advanced by party leaders as a way of keeping their State's delegation independent until signs point clearly toward a winner.

Or a favorite son may use his delegation for bargaining purposes, hoping to swing it to the winner at a crucial moment in the convention.

What is a bandwagon movement? In a successful bandwagon movement, a candidate creates the impression he is the inevitable winner. He pressures important party leaders to "hop aboard the bandwagon" by declaring their support of his candidacy, implying that otherwise they risk his disfavor. His supporters point to primary victories as sure signs of his nomination.

Similar tactics may be used at the convention. In 1960, John F. Kennedy, a Catholic, won a primary victory in West Virginia, one of the most Protestant States in the country. This gave bandwagon impetus to Mr. Kennedy's campaign. The bandwagon, however, does not roll for many candidates.

#### PRIMARIES IN THE STATES

How are delegates to a national convention chosen? In several ways. They can be elected by the voters in State primary contests. They can be chosen by party conventions in the States. In some States, central committees select some delegates. In a few States, at-large delegates will go to the Republican and Democratic national conventions because of the office they hold, such as membership on their party's national committee.

This year, Georgia Democrats have introduced an entirely new procedure. A mass meeting open to any Democratic voter will be held to elect four delegates in each of the State's 10 congressional district. Later, the 40 delegates thus chosen will select 13 delegates-at-large to complete the Georgia delegation.

How does a State presidential primary work? There are two kinds of primaries: One, a delegate-selection primary in which delegates to the national convention are chosen. Two, a presidential-preference primary, in which voters over a whole State express a direct choice on which presidential candidate they prefer.

In some States, a single vote for a candidate is also a vote for a slate of delegates expected to vote for him at the convention. In some other States, the voter casts two ballots: one in the presidential-preference contest and another for convention delegates.

What State offers an example of a primary combining delegate selection and presidential preference? Florida, among other States, has this type of primary. The Democratic National Committee allotted 81 voting delegates to Florida. Of these, 61 are elected by the voters in 12 congressional districts. In each district the presidential candidates' names are listed on the ballot. A vote for a candidate is a vote for a slate of convention delegates committed to him.

That one vote is also a vote for the candidate in the Statewide presidential-preference contest. This preference contest determines which candidate wins the 20 other delegate votes. Twelve of the 20 delegates go to the winner of the Statewide presidential-preference poll. The remaining eight delegates are selected by the Florida Democratic State Executive Committee. They, too, must go to the winner of the presidential-preference vote.

All told, how many presidential primaries are there in 1972? Twenty-three. They are: New Hampshire, March 7; Florida, March 14; Illinois, March 21; Wisconsin, April 4; Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, April 25; District of Columbia, Indiana, Alabama and Ohio, May 2; Tennessee, May 4; North Carolina, May 6; Nebraska and West Virginia, May 9; Maryland and Michigan, May 16; Rhode Island and Oregon, May 23; California, New Jersey, New Mexico and South Dakota, June 6; New York, June 20. Arkansas was scheduled to hold a primary on June 27 this year, but it now appears likely that the State will drop its primary.

Do all States that have Democratic primaries hold a presidential-preference contest? No. This year four States—Alabama, Ohio, South Dakota and New York—hold primaries for selection of convention delegates, but voters will not be able to express a presidential preference. In California the names of the presidential candidates are listed on the ballot, but the contest, as in some other States, is usually not regarded as a presidential-preference poll because voters are technically voting for a slate of delegates, not the candidates.

Ten States, in addition to the District of Columbia, hold both a delegate-selection and a presidential-preference primary: New Hampshire, Florida, Illinois, Wisconsin, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Nebraska, Maryland and Oregon.

Some States are given the option of holding or not holding a preference primary.

What is a binding presidential-preference primary? Florida is an example. The delegates to the national convention elected in congressional districts are bound to vote in the convention for the winning candidates in their districts. The at-large delegates and those selected by the Democratic State Executive Committee are bound to vote for the State-wide winning candidate. Many other States have similar rules.

How long must the bound delegates vote for their candidate? In Florida's case, a delegate must vote at the convention for his candidate until that person receives fewer than 35 percent of the votes needed for nomination, or until the candidate tells the State delegation it can vote for somebody else, or until two convention ballots have been taken.

The rules binding delegations vary somewhat from State to State. In most States, delegates are not bound to stay with one man to the end if a deadlock develops.

Are some presidential-preference primaries nonbinding? Yes. In a few States—for instance, Illinois and West Virginia—the results do not bind the convention delegates to vote for the winning candidate. They are advisory only.

What is an "uncommitted delegation"? In some States, slates of delegates are pledged to a candidate. Some delegates are listed only as favorable to a candidate. And some delegates are shown as uncommitted to any candidate. In many instances these delegates are genuinely uncommitted. But in other cases delegates uncommitted to a presidential candidate are unofficially committed to a party leader. For instance, Mayor Richard Daley of Chicago, the most important Democratic leader in Illinois, has seen to it that uncommitted slates are entered in congressional districts in the Chicago area and in a few districts downstate. Actually, the delegates in these slates will be controlled by Mayor Daley.

Are voters of one party allowed to vote in the primary of another party? This is not permitted in most State primaries, but there are exceptions. Wisconsin holds an open primary where voters can cross over from one party to another. Democrats can vote in the Republican primary rather than in their own, and Republicans can vote in the Democratic primary. This year, some Wisconsin Republicans are expected to vote for the Democratic candidate they figure would be easiest for Mr. Nixon to defeat. Or they may vote for the Democratic candidate most in line with their own thinking on issues.

There are a few other States where voters can cross over by complying with a few technical qualifications. Political analysts find it difficult to determine why or how many voters cross party lines.

How is a candidate's name placed in a presidential primary? In Florida, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, Tennessee, Nebraska, Maryland and Oregon, State authorities place a candidate in their primaries if he is mentioned prominently in the news as a presi-

dential possibility. He can take his name out by signing an affidavit stating he has no intention of becoming a candidate—except in Oregon and possibly in Nebraska.

In some States a candidate can get on the ballot by filing a petition signed by a required number of voters. Often a filing fee must be paid. Always there is a filing deadline, about a month or two before the date of the primary contest.

Senator Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts insists that he is not a candidate for the 1972 Democratic presidential nomination. Will his name, nevertheless, be entered in the Oregon primary? If Senator Kennedy's name is entered by the Oregon secretary of state, a Republican, there will be nothing he can do to remove it. Oregon will be one of the most closely watched primaries because of the array of Democratic candidates competing there.

Under Nebraska law, Senator Kennedy's name may be placed in the Nebraska primary regardless of Mr. Kennedy's wishes, provided it is entered in the Oregon primary.

There is often talk of a write-in campaign for a candidate in some State primaries. What does this involve? Some States allow a voter to cast a ballot for a person whose name has not been entered in the primary. The voter simply writes in the person's name on the ballot. In a few cases, write-in votes have been important. In the 1968 primary in New Hampshire, 27,520 voters wrote in President Lyndon Johnson's name—4,257 more write-in votes than the regular votes received by Senator Eugene McCarthy.

However, the relatively strong showing of Mr. McCarthy, who had vigorously attacked the record of the President, was considered a damaging blow to any re-election plans of the President. He announced shortly afterward that he would not run again.

Why does a candidate go through the grueling business of one State primary after another? Why not just concentrate on a few? One reason: There is no better way for him to prove widespread support—that he is a winner. Also, ducking a primary is often taken as a sign of weakness. Sometimes a candidate who needs to become better known feels a primary victory will bring his candidacy to national attention. There is another important reason, particularly true this year when there are so many primaries: A candidate can pile up a considerable number of delegate votes by winning these contests.

Primary victories provide momentum to a bandwagon movement, too. In 1960, John F. Kennedy won all the primaries he entered. After that he was unstoppable.

In 1960, Mr. Nixon lost the presidential election and two years later he was beaten for the California Governorship. But in 1968 a string of primary victories helped Mr. Nixon shake his reputation as a loser.

This year the primaries are likely to prove crucial for the Democratic contestants. More than 2,000 voting delegates will be selected in primaries. That is approximately two thirds of all the delegates who will vote at the Convention. No one candidate will, of course, win all these delegates. But a good showing in the most populous primary States could prove an enormous help to a candidate.

Why is the California primary considered so important? A huge block of delegate votes at the Democratic National Convention—271—is at stake. That is more than any other State's except New York's 278. Of particular importance: California's is a winner-take-all primary. The victorious candidate goes to the Convention with all of California's 271 votes in his pocket. That's almost 18 per cent of the votes needed to win the Democratic nomination. Moreover, the California primary is set for June 6, little more than a month before the Convention. The momentum could carry over to the Convention and put the California winner over the top.

Are there other winner-take-all primary

States? Yes. There is Massachusetts, with 102 delegate votes at the Democratic Convention; South Dakota, with 17; Oregon, with 34; and Rhode Island, with 22. The District of Columbia, with 15 delegate votes, also holds a winner-take-all primary.

How do party conventions within the States select national-convention delegates? In the Democratic Party, most often members gather in wards, townships or precincts and elect delegates to an intermediate convention, say a county convention. This convention chooses delegates to a State convention who usually meet at the congressional district level also.

This year, in the Democratic Party, no more than 25 per cent of the National Convention delegates from a State can be selected in the State convention. The rest must be picked at a lower-level convention, mostly at the congressional-district meetings. The exceptions to this rule are Alaska, Delaware, Nevada, North Dakota, Vermont and Wyoming. All these States are too small in population to warrant a multitiered convention system.

What States hold conventions to pick delegates? These States: Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington and Wyoming. Arkansas is likely to become another convention State. The following States combine conventions with presidential-preference primaries: Indiana, Michigan, North Carolina, New Mexico and Tennessee.

How are the convention and primary methods combined? Take Tennessee as an example: Congressional-district conventions elect 80 per cent of the State's delegation to the Democratic National Convention. The State convention selects 20 per cent. A binding presidential-preference primary on May 4 determines how the National Convention delegates vote. The delegates selected by the congressional-district conventions are bound to the presidential-preference winner in their districts. The delegates selected at the State convention must vote for the State-wide presidential-preference-primary winner.

Does the Republican Party use the State primary and convention systems to select delegates? Yes, and in many of the same States as the Democratic Party. However, the Republican primaries and conventions this year will attract far less attention than the Democratic, since it is taken for granted that virtually all the National Convention delegates will go to President Nixon.

#### THE NATIONAL CONVENTIONS

Just what is a presidential-nominating convention? It is a large meeting within a political party made up of delegates chosen from the States, the District of Columbia and the territories. The convention meets every presidential-election year and picks the party's presidential and vice-presidential nominees. In both major parties, a simple majority of the delegate votes is enough to win the nomination. At the Democratic Convention, this is 1,509 votes out of a total of 3,016; at the Republican, 674 out of 1,346.

At the Democratic Convention, there will be 87 more delegates than delegate votes. The reason is that some of the delegates will cast fractional votes.

At the Democratic National Convention, how are the delegate votes allotted? There are a total of 3,016, divided as follows:

Alabama	37
Alaska	10
Arizona	25
Arkansas	27
California	271
Colorado	36
Connecticut	51



Delaware	13	Rhode Island	8
D.C.	15	South Carolina	22
Florida	81	South Dakota	14
Georgia	53	Tennessee	26
Hawaii	17	Texas	52
Idaho	17	Utah	14
Illinois	170	Vermont	12
Indiana	76	Virginia	30
Iowa	46	Washington	24
Kansas	35	West Virginia	18
Kentucky	47	Wisconsin	28
Louisiana	44	Wyoming	12
Maine	20	Guam	3
Maryland	53	Puerto Rico	5
Massachusetts	102	Virgin Islands	3
Michigan	132		
Minnesota	64		
Mississippi	25		
Missouri	73		
Montana	17		
Nebraska	24		
Nevada	11		
New Hampshire	18		
New Jersey	109		
New Mexico	18		
New York	278		
North Carolina	64		
North Dakota	14		
Ohio	153		
Oklahoma	39		
Oregon	34		
Pennsylvania	182		
Rhode Island	22		
South Carolina	32		
South Dakota	17		
Tennessee	49		
Texas	130		
Utah	19		
Vermont	12		
Virginia	53		
Washington	52		
West Virginia	35		
Wisconsin	67		
Wyoming	11		
Canal Zone	3		
Guam	3		
Puerto Rico	7		
Virgin Islands	3		

At the Republican Convention, how are the votes allotted? There are a total of 1,346, divided as follows:

Alabama	17		
Alaska	12		
Arizona	18		
Arkansas	18		
California	96		
Colorado	20		
Connecticut	22		
Delaware	12		
D.C.	9		
Florida	40		
Georgia	24		
Hawaii	14		
Idaho	14		
Illinois	58		
Indiana	32		
Iowa	22		
Kansas	20		
Kentucky	24		
Louisiana	20		
Maine	8		
Maryland	26		
Massachusetts	34		
Michigan	48		
Minnesota	26		
Mississippi	13		
Missouri	30		
Montana	14		
Nebraska	16		
Nevada	12		
New Hampshire	14		
New Jersey	40		
New Mexico	14		
New York	88		
North Carolina	32		
North Dakota	12		
Ohio	56		
Oklahoma	22		
Oregon	18		
Pennsylvania	60		

What if a delegate becomes ill, or cannot vote at the convention for some other reason? If a convention delegate is unable to vote, his place is taken by an alternate delegate. The Democrats will have 1,897 and the Republicans 1,346 alternate delegates.

Are there laws laid down for conduct of the national conventions? No, a presidential-nominating convention operates outside State or federal law. It organizes itself and sets its own rules. It oversees the seating of delegates. It draws up a platform of positions the party supports. It hears a keynote speech and installs a permanent chairman. Most important, it selects the presidential and vice-presidential nominees of the party. Through its national committee, the convention also organizes the party for the campaign and for the period extending to the next national convention four years later.

Will the 1972 national conventions differ from those of previous years? Yes, particularly the Democratic. A major goal of both conventions is to tighten the convention agendas to hold the attention of nationwide television audiences.

The Democrats will limit nominating and seconding speeches for each candidate to 15 minutes. Demonstrations are banned, but if a demonstration does occur, it will subtract time from the 15 minutes allotted to the demonstrators' candidate. Seating of State delegations in the Convention hall and the order in which the State ballot have been selected by lot, rather than by alphabetical order as in the past. Members of the major Convention committees—rules, platform and credentials—are elected, not appointed. The platform committee will hold at least eight regional meetings over the country to discuss issues.

The biggest Republican change: The Convention is scheduled to last three days instead of four as in 1968. Generally, speeches will be fewer and shorter. Demonstrations will be allowed, but participants will be limited to delegates and alternates. President Nixon is almost certain to appear in person to deliver the acceptance speech.

Both Democratic and Republican conventions will have more women, young people and representatives of blacks and various ethnic groups among their delegates than in the past.

There has been widespread talk of reforming procedures for selecting delegates to the Democratic Convention. What has been done? Since its 1968 Convention, the Democratic Party has adopted many reforms. Among them: State delegations are to include women, young people and minority groups in reasonable proportion to their numbers in each State. Limitations are placed on the selection of a convention delegate who is a Governor, U.S. Senator or other officeholder. The entire process of delegate selection must be carried on in the calendar year of the Convention, and voting by proxy has been abolished. The matter of how and when candidates' slates for Convention delegates are to be chosen is to be given adequate public airing. In States that use the State convention method, at least 75 per cent of the delegates must be elected in congressional districts or smaller governmental units. Although not mandatory, States that use the

primary method are encouraged to elect at least 75 per cent of their delegates in congressional districts. The purpose is to give wide geographical representation to a State's delegation.

One of the Democratic reforms does away with the unit rule. What does that mean? Under the unit rule at a convention, a bare majority in a State's delegation—one more than half the members—decides how all its members vote. The Democrats have now forbidden use of the unit rule, not only at the Convention, but anywhere in the delegate-selection process, from the lowest level on up. The unit rule has long been banned at the Republican Convention.

Is there a possibility that a deadlock—in which no candidate can get a majority—will develop at this year's Democratic Convention? History shows chances are much against a deadlock. The winner in 20 out of all 35 Democratic Conventions held to date was picked on the first ballot. The nominee was selected on the second ballot in three Conventions, and on the third in one Convention. Franklin D. Roosevelt, in 1932, and one other nominee won on the fourth ballot. A deadlock can be said to start developing after the fourth ballot.

Only nine times has the voting gone beyond the fourth ballot. One of those times was in 1860 at Charleston, S.C., when 57 ballots failed to produce a nominee. A second Convention in Baltimore nominated Stephen A. Douglas on the second ballot.

The worst deadlock came in 1924 when John W. Davis was nominated on the 103rd ballot.

Before 1936, Democratic Conventions nominated by a two-thirds majority. That year the Convention changed to requiring only a simple majority. In the nine most-recent Conventions, all nominees have won on the first ballot except in 1952, when Adlai Stevenson won the third ballot.

How is a vice-presidential nominee chosen? With a few exceptions, he is chosen by the presidential nominee. Usually a presidential candidate keeps his own counsel on his choice for a running mate until after his own nomination. The reason: Should premature word leak out, rejected vice-presidential aspirants might swing votes to other candidates.

After a candidate wins the presidential nomination, he huddles with party leaders. They weigh several factors. Sometimes geographical balance for the ticket is sought by picking a man from another section of the country. Religious balance sometimes comes into play. Often ideological balance is sought—a "moderate-conservative" to go with a "liberal." At other times, a presidential nominee may seek to promote party unity by giving the nod to a running mate who is not well known and thus noncontroversial. Sometimes a presidential nominee may pay off a political debt in making his choice.

After the decision is made, the convention goes through the routine of balloting for a vice-presidential nominee. But the presidential nominee is virtually certain to get the man he wants.

Does a vice-presidential nominee really swing many votes to the ticket? No, at least not in great numbers, say the experts. Many practical politicians feel that about the best that can be expected of the No. 2 man is for him to swing his own State. However, at times, that one State can be vitally important. In the close race of 1960, Lyndon Johnson, the Democratic vice-presidential nominee, was given much credit for helping his home State of Texas go for John F. Kennedy. Mr. Johnson was also credited with nudging some of the other Southern States into the Democratic column. The influence of the vice-presidential nominee is not usually as evident as it was that year.

How and when are the party platforms drawn up? The Republican Resolutions (platform) Committee meets this year in San

Diego a week before the Convention. The Democratic Platform Committee is holding regional hearings over several weeks before the Miami Beach Convention starts.

Each State picks a man and a woman Convention delegate for the Republican committee, making a panel of about 100 members. The Democratic committee consists of 150 members appointed according to the population of the States. Both committees submit to their conventions a set of principles and policies on issues—the platform. Minority reports may be filed. Then the conventions vote on the committee recommendations and on amendments.

When a President is running for re-election, he has the dominant voice in shaping his party's platform. Many political analysts say that platforms usually are far less meaningful than the campaign statements of the contending nominees.

What is the function of the credentials committee of a convention? A credentials committee rules on disputes over seating of delegates. For instance, in 1912, the Republican Convention's Credentials Committee rejected supporters of former President Theodore Roosevelt in favor of delegates pledged to President William Howard Taft. The Roosevelt men bolted the party, formed the Progressive (Bull Moose) Party, causing a split in Republican ranks that led to the election of the Democratic nominee, Woodrow Wilson.

Forty years later, in 1952, another Republican credentials fight involved Robert A. Taft, the former President's son. The credentials committee favored Taft supporters, but strategists of Dwight D. Eisenhower challenged them on the Convention floor and won.

At the 1968 Democratic Convention, fights flared over seating delegates from a number of States. The credentials committee ruled in favor of a racially integrated delegation from Mississippi that challenged the "regular" delegation because it included only one Negro. At the same time, the committee turned down challenges from supporters of Eugene McCarthy who sought to bar delegates partial to Hubert Humphrey. The Convention itself backed up the credentials committee.

#### WHEN CAMPAIGN GETS UNDER WAY

Once the conventions are over, what are the next steps? First the Republican and Democratic nominees huddle with their top advisers to map out strategy. They decide which States will be pivotal, and plot a campaign that concentrates on those States. Staffs are enlarged and speaking schedules roughed out. Voting-registration drives are planned. As the days pass, money starts to flow into a wide range of activities. Much of it is poured into television programs, some nationwide. Special appeals are made to various segments of the electorate—ethnic, professional, sometimes religious. "Citizens" groups are formed to attract dissident members of the opposite party and independents.

Vast armies of party workers are sent out to distribute campaign literature, ring doorbells, make phone calls, drum up rallies. At the same time, the presidential and vice-presidential nominees are crisscrossing the country by airplane, addressing carefully staged meetings, holding press conferences, conferring with local politicians, touching base with major contributors, shaking hands with thousands of people.

The big labor organizations and the big-city political "machines" generally fall in line behind the Democratic nominee. The Democratic nominee is sure to appeal for party loyalty—there are more registered Democrats than registered Republicans. This year, he will attack the Nixon Administration's record. President Nixon, as the Republican nominee, will defend his record. But the chances are that he will not make as many

personal appearances as his Democratic rival.

When does the campaign really hit full stride? After Labor Day the campaign is well under way. But many political observers say that the mass of voters does not start to think seriously about politics until the baseball World Series ends in early October. By then, the campaign issues are pretty well drawn. The nominees are hammering on the main themes over and over again, with local variations. They try to take advantage of news developments, sometimes trip themselves up with ill-considered, off-the-cuff remarks. They spring surprises to capture headlines.

Sometimes a President not running for re-election will make dramatic announcements to help the nominee of his party. On Oct. 31, 1968, for example, President Johnson called a halt to the bombing of North Vietnam, a move regarded as helpful to Hubert Humphrey, the Democratic nominee. A President running for re-election maintains much maneuverability. He is in a position to take actions that get headlines. There is speculation that President Nixon will come up with some surprising announcements in October as Election Day nears.

Do public-opinion polls influence the outcome of presidential elections? The voters, the party professionals, and the nominees themselves follow the leading polls carefully. It is debatable whether voters are actually swayed by the results of public-opinion polls. Most experts say they are not. But, though not infallible, the polls do give a fairly good idea of how the campaign is going, whether one nominee is far ahead or whether it will be a race down to the wire. In addition to the opinion surveys that appear in the papers, many private polls are taken for the nominees, to determine what issues are most important to the voters.

How much money is spent on presidential campaigns? It is impossible to nail down exact amounts, but spending by both parties runs into millions. One estimate is that 10 million dollars was paid out just to win Mr. Nixon the Republican nomination in 1968, and that more than twice that amount was spent by the Democratic candidates in the 1968 primaries.

Campaign spending after the conventions has been estimated at 25 million dollars for Mr. Nixon, 10 million or more for Mr. Humphrey, and 9 million for Governor George Wallace, the third-party nominee. Estimates for Mr. Nixon's entire 1972 re-election campaign run from 34 million to 40 million.

Where does the money go? It is spent on staff salaries, office rent, hiring halls, television programs, airline fares, radio and newspaper advertising, telephone bills, public-relations and advertising agencies, printed material, billboards, stickers, hotel rooms, private polls, mailing charges, and many other things.

Do the Republicans usually spend more than the Democrats? Not always, but in recent years the Republican Party has been better financed than the Democratic Party, which started 1972 more than 9 million dollars in the red. The Democrats are expected to have more trouble raising money for the 1972 campaign than the Republicans. For one thing, the large field of Democratic contenders in the primaries soaks up much available Democratic money even before the Convention starts. The Republicans have no such problem. Their prospective nominee, the President needs comparatively little money for primary races.

However, the Democrats have one big factor in their favor: Labor unions, with a few exceptions, are geared to help the Democratic nominee. The AFL-CIO, through its political offshoot, COPE (Committee on Political Education), puts on registration drives, distributes millions of pamphlets, works to get out the vote through telephone

drives, house-to-house canvassing, transporting voters to the polls and by other means.

Exactly what has Congress done to limit spending by presidential candidates? The bill recently approved by Congress and signed by the President puts some limits on campaign spending, but it does not set an over-all ceiling. Before the conventions, each presidential candidate may spend up to 13.9 million dollars on advertising of all sorts. After the conventions, each presidential ticket is limited to another 13.9 million dollars on advertising. There is an escalator clause that allows for an increase of several hundred thousand dollars in both amounts because of inflation. Only 60 per cent of the pre-convention and post-convention advertising funds can be spent on radio and television commercials. Neither a presidential nor a vice-presidential candidate may spend more than \$50,000 of his own or his family's money. Aside from these restrictions, and those on advertising, a presidential candidate can spend all he wants.

Is the much-talked-about youth vote expected to affect the 1972 election? More than 25 million people aged 18 through 24 will be eligible to vote this year in their first presidential election. Nearly 11.5 million youths aged 18 to 20 were recently enfranchised by the 26th Amendment to the Constitution.

Many of these young people will not take the time to register and vote. Even so, in sheer numbers, the youth vote this year is almost certain to be larger than ever before. In a very close race, it could swing the balance in some States. So far, many more young voters are registering Democratic than Republican.

#### SHOWDOWN ON ELECTION DAY

How many people usually vote in a presidential election? In 1968, more than 31,785,000 people voted for Mr. Nixon and a little more than 31,275,000 for Mr. Humphrey. Mr. Wallace received 9,906,000 votes, and minor-party nominees were given 245,000 votes. The total of more than 73 million set an all-time record. Experts say that, with millions of young people newly eligible, the total vote this year could go beyond 80 million.

The turnout of voters in 1968 amounted to 67.8 per cent of the voting-age population of 116,535,000 at that time. In that year, the proportion of young people voting—those up to age 25—was less than for any other age group. A higher percentage of men voted than women, more whites than nonwhites, and more employed people than unemployed.

The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that the voting-age population in 1972 is 139,642,000.

If a party's nominee dies between convention time and Election Day, how is he replaced? The national committee of his party has the authority to select a new presidential nominee.

How is Election Day established? Federal law places it on the Tuesday immediately after the first Monday in November, in the fourth year after the previous election of a President. This year, Election Day comes on November 7.

And is the President actually elected on that day? No, not strictly speaking. The presidential electors, popularly known as the Electoral College, are elected that day. However, except in rare cases, it is easy to translate the nationwide popular vote into electoral votes. Thus, almost always, the next President is known. The real winners—the presidential electors—are ignored in the news.

#### ROLE OF ELECTORAL COLLEGE

What role do the presidential electors play? When the voters go to the polls on Election Day, they are actually voting for the electors, who later meet to elect the President and Vice President. For instance,



the person who votes for the Democratic nominee really votes for the electors in his State who are selected to vote later for the Democratic nominee. If a person wants to vote for the Republican candidate, he votes for a different set of electors.

Some States list only the names of the electors on their ballots under party headings. In others, the names of the presidential and vice-presidential nominees together with the names of the electors are listed. But most States print merely the names of the presidential and vice-presidential nominees on their ballots.

Do the presidential electors vote by States? All the victorious electors in one State vote for the presidential nominee who captures the most popular votes in that State. The electors are not divided proportionately among the presidential contenders within a State. It's a winner-take-all proposition. However, there is one exception—Maine's four electoral votes must be divided this way: Two electoral votes go to the Statewide winner, the other two to whoever wins in each of the State's two congressional districts.

In the past, there have been instances where States' electoral votes have been split, but they have been rare.

Could President Nixon lose the 1972 election, even if he draws more popular votes on November 7 than his opponents? Yes, he could win more popular votes and yet lose. That is because the electors vote by States. Assume this situation: Mr. Nixon carries some of the highly populated States by overwhelming margins, but loses other populous States by narrow margins. It then would be possible for him to win more popular votes on November 7 than his Democratic opponent and yet not get enough electoral votes to win.

Has a nominee ever won more popular votes than an opponent and yet lost the Presidency? Yes. In 1824 Andrew Jackson achieved a margin of more than 37,000 popular votes over John Quincy Adams, but not enough electoral votes to gain the Presidency.

In 1876 Samuel J. Tilden, a Democrat, won approximately 250,000 more popular votes than Rutherford B. Hayes, a Republican. A commission of eight Republicans and seven Democrats awarded 22 contested electoral votes to Mr. Hayes for a total of 185 electoral votes to Mr. Tilden's 184. Mr. Hayes became President by a margin of one electoral vote.

In 1888 Grover Cleveland, a Democrat, drew better than 90,000 more popular votes than Benjamin Harrison, a Republican. Yet Mr. Harrison became President because he won a majority of the electoral votes.

It is interesting, too, that several Presidents have been elected even though they did not get a majority of the total popular vote although they won more votes than their competitors. In these cases, there were more than two nominees. These "minority" Presidents include Abraham Lincoln in 1860, James A. Garfield in 1880, Grover Cleveland in 1884 and 1892, Woodrow Wilson in 1912 and 1916, Harry Truman in 1948, John F. Kennedy in 1960, and Mr. Nixon in 1968. But all won a majority of the electoral votes, and thus the Presidency.

How many electoral votes will it take to win in 1972? It will take 270, which is a bare majority of the total 538 electoral votes of the States and the District of Columbia. The same applies to electing a Vice President.

When and where do the electors meet? This year the electors meet on December 18 in their State capitals. The District of Columbia electors meet in Washington, D.C. Each elector casts one vote for a presidential nominee and one vote for a vice-presidential nominee. The results are sent by registered mail to the president of the U.S. Senate, the incumbent Vice President.

Must an elector always vote for the presidential nominee of his party? No, but in almost every case he does. For instance, a Republican elector elected on November 7

is personally committed to vote on December 18 for the Republican presidential nominee. Some State laws even require that an elector vote for the nominee of his party. However, if he does not, and votes for the nominee of another party, his ballot must be counted as he actually voted. There have been rare cases where electors switched their votes.

How are electors allotted among the States? Each State gets a number of electors equal to its full delegation in Congress—the number of its members in the House of Representatives plus two Senators. There is one variation of this, and it applies this year:

When a presidential election comes two years after a census, then the allotment of presidential electors is based on the size of the State delegations in the new Congress to be elected at the same time the President is elected. For instance, as a result of reapportionment of congressional districts based on the 1960 census, 38 Representatives have been representing California in the House. This entitled California to 40 electoral votes—38 men in the House plus two Senators—in the 1968 presidential election. However, because of population growth as measured by the 1970 census, California will be entitled to 43 seats in the new House to be elected this year. Thus, 45 presidential electors, not 40, will cast votes next December 18 in California.

Are there other changes in congressional delegations that affect the electoral-vote count this year? Yes. These States gain one electoral vote each: Arizona, Colorado and Texas. Florida gains three. The following States lose one electoral vote each: Alabama, Iowa, North Dakota, Ohio, Tennessee, West Virginia and Wisconsin. New York and Pennsylvania lose two electoral votes each.

How many electors does each State and the District of Columbia get? In 1972 the States get the following number of electors or electoral votes:

Alabama	9
Alaska	3
Arizona	6
Arkansas	6
California	45
Colorado	7
Connecticut	8
Delaware	3
Florida	17
Georgia	12
Hawaii	4
Idaho	4
Illinois	26
Indiana	13
Iowa	8
Kansas	7
Kentucky	9
Louisiana	10
Maine	4
Maryland	10
Massachusetts	14
Michigan	21
Minnesota	10
Mississippi	7
Missouri	12
Montana	4
Nebraska	5
Nevada	3
New Hampshire	4
New Jersey	17
New Mexico	4
New York	41
North Carolina	13
North Dakota	3
Ohio	25
Oklahoma	8
Oregon	6
Pennsylvania	27
Rhode Island	4
South Carolina	8
South Dakota	4
Tennessee	10
Texas	26
Utah	4
Vermont	3

Virginia	12
Washington	9
West Virginia	6
Wisconsin	11
Wyoming	3

A special case is made of the District of Columbia which has no voting delegation in Congress. It receives 3.

Can a President and a Vice President come from the same State? Yes, although it is extremely unlikely that a convention would nominate two men from the same State. The Constitution says that the presidential electors of a State can vote for only one man when both presidential and vice-presidential nominees come from their State. They cannot vote for one for President and the other for Vice President.

To pose a hypothetical example, assume both presidential and vice-presidential nominees are from Kentucky. The electors of all other States and the District of Columbia could vote for both candidates. However, the presidential electors of Kentucky could vote for only one of the two men because both are residents of Kentucky. Presumably, they would vote for the head of the ticket, rather than his running mate.

However, if the presidential nominee from Kentucky won by a decisive margin in the Electoral College, he probably would carry his vice-presidential nominee into office without Kentucky's electoral votes.

What happens if the winner of the popular vote on November 7 dies before the Electoral College meets on December 18? Remember, a President is not actually elected until the electors meet. Also, the electors are technically free to vote for whomever they wish. There are no good precedents to follow in case a nominee dies during this period. Many experts say that apparently the national committee of the deceased nominee's party would attempt to provide another nominee.

Where are the electoral votes counted? At 1 p.m. on Jan. 6, 1973, members of the Senate and House meet in the House chamber. The president of the Senate, who is the incumbent Vice President, presides. Certificates showing how the electors voted are opened and counted.

How is a President selected if no nominee gets a majority of the electoral votes? The Constitution requires a majority of the full Electoral College for election. If no presidential nominee gets a majority, then the decision is turned over to the House of Representatives. It chooses a President from among the three men with the most electoral votes. The House votes by State delegation, with each delegation casting one vote. A majority of the members of each delegation determines how the State's single vote will be cast. If members of a delegation are evenly divided, then that State's one vote is not counted. A majority of all the States is needed for election. The District of Columbia's nonvoting delegate is not entitled to vote.

Has the House of Representatives ever decided an election? Yes. The election of 1800 resulted in 73 electoral votes each for Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr. Jefferson won on the 36th ballot in the House. The election of 1824 gave Andrew Jackson 99 electoral votes. John Quincy Adams 84, William H. Crawford 41, and Henry Clay 37. Since no one received a majority, the election went to the House. Adams won on the first ballot.

How is a Vice President chosen if no nominee wins a majority of the electoral votes? In that case the Senate selects a Vice President from the two men with the most electoral votes. Each Senator casts one vote, and election requires a majority of the full membership.

Could a third-party nominee this year throw the presidential contest into the House of Representatives? It's possible, but not likely. More likely is a strategy of swinging the balance in the Electoral College. If

neither the Republican nor Democratic nominee commands the needed 270 electoral votes this year to win the Presidency, a third-party nominee with a block of electoral votes might bargain with both the major-party nominees and then turn his electoral votes over to the nominee who more nearly conforms to his own views, giving that nominee enough votes for the Presidency.

What happens if the President-elect dies after the Electoral College elects him, but before he takes office? The Vice President-elect becomes President when the new term starts.

What happens if the election has been thrown into the House and that body is deadlocked over its choice when the new term starts? The Vice President-elect acts as President until a President qualifies for office.

When does the new President take office? The present presidential term ends at noon on Jan. 20, 1973. The President-elect starts functioning as President the second he is sworn in.

#### ROAD TO THE WHITE HOUSE CANDIDATE

A candidate takes two main paths to win delegate votes at his party's national nominating convention—one in States that choose delegates in primaries, the other in States that choose delegates in party conventions.

#### PRIMARIES

Voters in primary States choose delegates to the national convention in two general ways—in some States, by electing delegates directly; in others, by showing a preference for a presidential candidate.

#### LOCAL CONVENTIONS

Precinct or township meetings in a State choose delegates to county conventions, which in turn elect delegates to congressional district and State conventions.

#### DISTRICT CONVENTIONS

Conventions of congressional districts select the bulk of the State's delegates to the national convention.

#### STATE CONVENTIONS

A State convention chooses the State's remaining delegates to the national convention.

#### NATIONAL CONVENTIONS

Delegates choose the nominees of each major party—with the Democratic Convention this year starting July 10, the Republican, August 21.

#### ELECTION DAY

Voters, in choosing between candidates, actually pick presidential electors, known as the Electoral College—people expected to support a specific candidate. Election Day this year is November 7.

#### ELECTORAL COLLEGE

Presidential electors meet in State capitals on December 18 to cast their electoral votes, to be officially counted in Washington on Jan. 6, 1973. A majority of electoral votes—270 out of 538—is needed for election as President. The winner will be sworn in on Jan. 20, 1973.

#### CLAYTON ACT AMENDMENT

### HON. RICHARD H. FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a bill opposing monopoly, prohibiting sales of goods below cost for the

purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competitor.

While it is true that unfair pricing legislation already exists in the form of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, this bill is unique in its allowance of Clayton Act penalties for private-sector loss compensation. Such penalties could take the form of injunctive relief or monetary damages.

This measure would help protect small, independent businesses in industries where too often, predatory pricing is a way of life. It would allow businessmen injured by unfair pricing—and in Nashville, those especially hurt are independent bakeries and dairies—to sue industrial cutthroats. It would open a path for recouping of some, if not all, undercut losses. It would encourage the voluntary halt of this unscrupulous practice.

Mr. Speaker, there are today only one-tenth as many independent bakeries and dairies as there were at the end of World War II. I believe unfair pricing has been a primary cause of this shrinkage in producer numbers.

And I believe this legislation—applied in every industry—would be a most effective means of reversing what to me, and I am sure to most of my colleagues, has been a most unwholesome and competition compromising trend.

#### FLORIDA YOUTH PRIMARY CONVENTION

### HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I recently received some materials describing a unique undertaking by the high school youth of Florida which I find highly commendable.

Student representatives from 500 high schools throughout Florida will participate in a Florida Youth Primary Convention and vote. The purpose of this primary is to give the young citizens of Florida a firsthand opportunity to meet with the candidates running in the Florida presidential primary, to hear the candidates' views on the major issues and to pose questions of concern to the candidates. Almost all of the candidates for President of both political parties will address the convention and respond to questions from the delegates. After the candidates have appeared, ballots will be cast, and a winner from each party will be announced.

This convention is scheduled for March 10 and 11 at the North Miami Beach Senior High School. The program is being sponsored by "Teen's Voice: Students Interested and Active in Government," a nonpartisan group of students interested and concerned in public affairs.

While I am not a candidate in the Florida primary and will not be attending this convention, I heartily applaud the efforts of these young people to involve themselves in the important political activities of the Nation. They are making every effort possible to inform themselves

on the many issues and candidates involved in this year's presidential campaign. The youth of Florida have clearly demonstrated that they truly deserve the responsibility and trust that Congress belatedly bestowed upon them in lowering the voting age to 18.

I have long supported lowering the voting age for I knew that when given the opportunity our young citizens would react responsibly. My faith in the ability and maturity of our teenage citizens has been amply rewarded by the efforts of these young people in Florida.

To those who opposed and feared the enfranchisement of our younger citizens, I would suggest that they study the amazing response and interest that the high school students of Florida have displayed. Their response and interest in the important political affairs of our Nation is little short of amazing. They have a keen desire to be informed, knowledgeable citizens. I would suggest that these students might well be more informed and aware of the vital issues facing our country than a great many people who already have the right to vote.

The great amount of effort expended on this undertaking by the Teen's Voice organizers and the attending delegates is to be heartily applauded, for they have set a high standard for all the youth of our Nation. It is quite likely that this is the largest effort of its type in the Nation. But while this may be the most comprehensive youth group effort, it is merely indicative of the activities and interest being displayed around the Nation by our youth.

I certainly wish the very best to these students who have displayed so much maturity and invested so much effort to make this statewide Florida Youth Primary such a magnificent project. I know that the convention and primary will be an outstanding, unqualified success.

#### BUSING: THE BIG FREEDOM ISSUE

### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, despite the attempts of several Presidential aspirants to sweep the busing furor under the rug by stressing that quality education, not busing, is the question of paramount importance, forced busing continues as the No. 1 freedom issue.

The contention that quality education can take place only within a setting where there is a mixture of white and black students by percentages determined by the whim of a Federal judge or an unelected HEW bureaucrat is without proof of improving anything. To the contrary, education and the children suffer.

Forced busing to achieve integration is not an end in itself but is being pursued to set the stage for neighborhood and housing integration, to destroy ethnic cultures, to promote mongrelization, and to condition parents by a gradual process of total surrender of their children as wards of the Federal Government. These



conditions are necessary for the controlled society being forced upon the American people by the social planners.

All Americans must face up to the fact that can no longer be hidden from view—the attempt to forcefully integrate this country's schools is a tragic, costly failure.

A recent article on busing as the big issue points out the widespread nationwide opposition to forced busing. I insert the news article and an editorial on the "Un-Neighborhood School" at this point:

[From The Evening Star, March 7, 1972]

BUSING: THE BIG ISSUE, 3—NEW PROBLEMS ARISE

(By John Mathews)

Pontiac, Mich. and Pasadena, Calif. are 1,965 miles apart by air and are widely different in history and local tradition, yet both are now experiencing the painful wrench of complete, court-ordered desegregation and busing.

Beyond that initial trauma, both cities are beginning to face a new generation of problems, pushed to the surface by desegregation and busing, which could be shared in the future by many communities in the North and the South.

Pontiac is a gray industrial city 25 miles north of Detroit, the blue collar home of General Motors' huge Pontiac Motor Division and its GM Truck & Coach Division. It was the scene Aug. 30 of the dramatic firebombing of empty school buses and of angry, chanting, bus-blocking pickets when schools opened under a systemwide school busing plan, the result of a federal court's desegregation order.

Pasadena is the smog-shrouded, palm-studded, established Los Angeles bedroom suburb, proud possessor of the California Institute of Technology and Jet Propulsion Laboratory, and home also of a substantial black and Chicano population, some the grandchildren of the servants of the rich. It was the first large, non-Southern city to fully desegregate its schools under a federal court order, beginning in September 1970.

Last Friday at 8:45 a.m., Dr. Dana Whitmer, Pontiac's gray-haired school superintendent, was telling a reporter that the atmosphere of city schools was relatively calm and he was hopeful it would remain that way. Suddenly, the "hot line" phone on his desk rang. He picked it up. "You've got a sit-in at Lincoln, Don?" he asked. "How many kids? Where are they? Oh, outside the office. We'll send some help right away."

Immediately the cool professional swung into action. He summoned to his office some experienced troubleshooting aides to dispatch to Lincoln Junior High School, which is several blocks from the school department's service building on North Saginaw where the buses were bombed last August.

"Who's involved—black or whites?" an aide asked as he reached for his coat. When he was told both races, he answered, "Good, that might be a healthy thing."

And a healthy thing it seemed to be.

There, sitting in Lincoln's auditorium, were the white sons and daughters of Pontiac Motor factory workers, many originally from Appalachia, who walk to school; and black kids, who are bused in from southwest Pontiac below Orchard Lake Road; and middle-class whites who live in the comfortable Indian Hills area north of Orchard Lake, where official street signs pointing towards the blacks' side of the street proclaim: "Criminals Beware, Neighborhood Watched By Area Citizens."

All those 14-, 15- and 16-year-olds—black kids, white kids, rich and poor kids—were no longer fighting each other as they had back in September when buses carrying blacks had to go through lines of white

pickets shouting "Nigger Go Home," and the buses carrying whites were branded "Nigger Lovers."

Those Lincoln students were now getting together to protest, as they put it, "the lousy food they throw at us here," and what they consider overly tight discipline. "They won't let us go to the John during the class, they're so uptight," said one teen-ager, clad in work boots and dungarees.

Just a week ago, another gray-haired school superintendent, Pasadena's Dr. Ralph W. Hornbeck, also had a problem with a Lincoln School, this time an elementary school in the California city.

At a public hearing in Pasadena last Tuesday, Hornbeck had to face an angry audience of blacks from the Lincoln School neighborhood in the western section of the city and whites from Southeast Pasadena. Hornbeck had recommended to his school board that it close Lincoln to save money and to maintain the racial balance required by the courts.

Before desegregation in Pasadena a year and a half ago, Lincoln was a virtually all-black school in a rundown black neighborhood where the story has it the sixth graders used to get an arithmetic lesson by counting the human traffic in and out of some houses of dubious repute across West Peoria Street from the school.

Since desegregation in September 1970, Lincoln has been an integrated school with white students in the 4th, 5th and 6th grades bused 6½ miles across town from the white Southeast. The blacks in kindergarten through third grade ride buses 20 minutes in the other direction to attend school in the white neighborhood.

The school board of the Pasadena Unified School District—five members: the board president, a Chinese-American; a blackman; an Italian-American and two "Anglo-Caucasian" women—heard speaker last week oppose the closing of Lincoln.

Blacks objected vehemently to their children having to give up the benefits of attending a neighborhood school for at least three of their seven years of elementary schooling. Whites wanted the non-neighborhood school for them kept open, because if their children had to be bused, they said, at least they shouldn't be switching schools every year and they particularly shouldn't be leaving a school where everyone seemed to have confidence in the staff.

In an emotion-choked voice, Hornbeck stunned the audience by announcing that he had changed his mind and was now asking the school board to keep Lincoln open. The board ratified his change of heart on a 4-1 vote which some thought was a surrender to community pressure.

Black and white parents, teachers and some students stood and cheered lustily, and the school board went back to trying to find other ways to save money and avoid a \$1.8 million deficit. On some future agenda, the board also would have to confront the issue of how to keep a racial balance at schools like Lincoln, a problem caused by the 3 percent rate at which whites are leaving the school system for all-white communities around Pasadena.

The student sit-in in Pontiac and the Pasadena school board's decision are in a sense symbolic illustrations of a whole new array of real problems school districts are facing now in the war of the initial trauma of desegregation.

Many of these "second generation" problems exist regardless of the fact of desegregation, although they definitely are pushed to the surface because of it.

The second generation problems go to the heart of basic educational questions such as these:

How can the nation's public schools guarantee equal educational opportunity, not only to low-income, low-achieving students in an integrated setting resulting from bus-

ing, but also to average and above-average middle-class students?

Are the schools really committed for the first time historically in the elementary schools and in the junior highs to mixing children by race, but perhaps even more significantly to mixing children of differing social classes and economic backgrounds?

Will teachers and school administrators, accustomed to teaching only white students or black or the poor or the affluent, learn rapidly how to deal with schools and classrooms with a truly democratic racial and economic mix?

Will middle-income parents—black and white—stick with the schools and wait until the needed money and expertise arrive to bring off successfully racial and class integration?

Or, will an irritated and angry public intentionally starve city schools and accelerate the phenomenon of white flight to the suburbs?

As Pasadena's Hornbeck said last week a few hours before he faced that angry audience of Lincoln parents:

"My prime interest in integration is educational, rather than sociological. Integration here in Pasadena has shaken us out of our ruts and forced us to think about what we are doing as educators."

Only a few minutes before he received that "hot line" call about the student sit-in, Pontiac's Whitmer had a similar thought:

"Progress in education seems to occur only when people are forced to change. Maybe we will look back in a few years, and we may be able to say that the changes taking place today made us change for the benefit of all the kids. But the jury is still out on that one."

That sit-in at Pontiac's Lincoln Junior High School was not a racial incident, everybody seemed to agree. "It's whites and blacks against teachers," said a girl with an Afro. The sit-in was an instant replay of that surge of student disaffection with schools that has occurred thousands of times before in junior and senior high schools across the nation.

No one was hurt during the sit-in. A fire extinguisher was deliberately squirted or accidentally knocked off the wall and trash littered the hallways.

Some students were serious about discussing the issues with the trouble-shooters sent from the school administration building. But most students took off for a nearby hamburger carryout, and school officials shut down the school around noon.

It was the first early school closing in Pontiac this year, said John F. Perdue, director of school community and human relations, compared with countless other closings because of racial incidents during the half dozen years before desegregation.

What was surprising to an outside visitor was not that Lincoln had a sit-in, but that it had not happened sooner and had not been more serious. If any school anywhere has had to bear the brunt of the often meat-ax approach of instant school desegregation, it has been Pontiac's Lincoln Junior High School.

Lincoln, the city's five other junior highs, its two senior high schools and its 27 elementary schools had to desegregate last September because U.S. District Judge Damon Keith ruled that the school district for 15 years had followed a "purposeful pattern of racial discrimination" in locating schools and drawing attendance zones.

Last May, the 6th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals sustained Keith's decision, and, in October, the U.S. Supreme Court let it stand.

As in most desegregation cases, Keith did not draw up a busing plan but directed the school board to propose a desegregation plan, which obviously would include more busing.

The board decided to have no more than

40 percent minority students in any school and no less than 20 percent. As of last October when the count was taken, Pontiac schools had 21,286 students: 57.7 percent white, 37.3 percent black and 5 percent with Spanish surnames.

The intricate plan devised by school administrators required the busing of about 8,700 students, some 5,500 more than the previous year, for trips averaging about 20 minutes one-way. The busing costs around \$700,000 from a total school budget of nearly \$22 million.

On the elementary level, the desegregation plan shuffled students in order to get rid of neighborhood school segregation which included six schools last year with black enrollments of 90 percent or more and 11 schools with 90 percent or more white enrollments.

Now, most elementary schools are around 60 percent white and 40 percent black, with the exception of two schools where whites and Spanish-Americans add up to a bare 50 percent.

Elementary schools are paired. In each pair, one school houses 1st through 3rd or 4th grade and the other school 4th or 5th through 6th grade. Kindergarten pupils still walk to what used to be their neighborhood schools. As a result, all children go to a neighborhood school for three or four years of their first seven in school.

Boundary changes took care of Pontiac's two senior high schools, which were fairly well desegregated previously. The real crunch came at the junior high level. On each side of the city, the three junior highs which previously each enrolled grades 7 through 9 were made single-grade schools, meaning students would go to a different junior high 3 years in a row.

In fact, a child attending Pontiac schools for a full career of 13 years—kindergarten through the 12th grade—can now expect to go to at last six different schools. In the past, the normal was three schools.

For Lincoln, designated a 9th-grade school, it meant that two-thirds of its students were new to the school, and virtually all the newcomers resented not being able to graduate from their old schools after spending two years there. Many of the students had never been exposed to students of different races or class and economic groups.

Half of Lincoln's teachers were new also, many shifted there to effect racial balance of faculty ordered by the court. If that were not bad enough, the school also has had to operate on a 5-hour day instead of the former 6-hour day, with two instead of four counselors and with much less in the way of supplies and equipment, all because of the school district's multi-million dollar financial crisis.

But, as Donald DeVoe, the Lincoln principal said, "The straw that broke our back" was the anti-busing demonstrations that lasted intensely for two days and then the boycott by parents of up to 200 white students that went on for weeks. "We really haven't yet recovered from it all," DeVoe said.

Confronted with a host of not strictly educational problems, Lincoln has been groping its way trying to deal with its new educational problems of race and class mixture.

In most classrooms, students reflect the school's racial percentages. Ability grouping is used for mathematics classes only. Special programs deal with the reading deficiencies of old and new students at the schools.

Both students and teachers say the higher achieving students, most of whom went formerly to the well-integrated Washington Junior High, suffer the most. It's like a review of the 8th grade," said one student who says he cannot get the type of advanced course at Lincoln that Washington offered to 9th grade students last year.

Another cause for concern is that some elective subjects have heavy concentrations of white or black students. Whites, for example, favor foreign languages, drafting or band and blacks tend to concentrate in physical education or metal shop.

As Pontiac's Whitmer summed up the situation:

"Teachers are facing a disparity of educational needs in their classrooms now that requires almost a superhuman task. They have to learn to deal with that, but parents on the other hand are saying, 'We don't want you to learn now to teach at my child's expense.' What the effect will be on quality education; whether we can really meet the needs of all children; whether we can pull it off under these circumstances, I really don't know. It's too early to tell."

That public hearing last week in Pasadena at which the school board decided to keep the Lincoln Elementary School open underscored two of the most significant problems tied to school desegregation and busing: White flight from the cities and the horrendous financial plight of urban school systems.

White flight has become the new watchword of desegregation. In a sense, it's a misnomer for middle-class flight, since both middle-class blacks and whites have been leaving the cities to lower income blacks and whites.

Although the phenomenon of white flight has been accelerated with increased desegregation and busing, the exodus began long before courts started dismantling segregated school systems.

In Pasadena, for example, whites (known as "Anglo-Caucasians" in a community that also has Chicanos, Orientals, American Indians and other groups) were leaving the school system at about a 2 percent rate or 1,000 students a year before U.S. District Judge Manuel L. Real ordered complete desegregation beginning in September 1970.

The rate, however, did zoom to nearly 5 percent or more than 2,200 students just before desegregating and cross-busing of whites and blacks began. Last year, it leveled off to just less than 3 percent or 1,800 students.

In 1966, Pasadena schools were 65.6 percent white. Last October, when the last racial count was taken, they were just 50.3 percent white. Over-all, Pasadena now has 27,547 students—4,400 fewer than five years ago—but it has 7,100 fewer whites, 2,100 more blacks, 800 more "Spanish-surname" students, a few more American Indians, about 200 fewer Orientals and fewer "other non-whites."

Since large-scale busing began two years ago, about 4,000 white students have left the school system for private schools or public schools in the white suburban ring around Pasadena.

In Pontiac, now 57.7 percent white and 37.3 percent black, white flight has been equally dramatic. Just two years ago, there were about 7 percent or 3,600 more whites.

White flight is raising havoc with Pasadena's desegregation plan, which attempts to maintain a racial balance in every school. The overhanging racial percentage means children probably will be switched back and forth between schools. That instability factor worries school officials tremendously, because they know that even parents who are accepting integration worry about what constant change may do to their children.

When Judge Real found Pasadena guilty of deliberate school segregation two years ago, he did not order a specific racial balance. He did decree, however, that no school should have a majority of any minority group. In other words, whites must be the majority group in each school, although a combination of blacks and Chicanos, for example—could outnumber the whites.

The Pasadena school board decided not to fight the court as the Pontiac school board

did. Instead, the Pasadena board directed Hornbeck and his staff to develop the "Pasadena Plan" for complete racial desegregation.

About 12,500 of the school system's 27,547 students are bused this year, compared to only a few thousand before desegregation. Bus trips average about 20 minutes one-way, with the longest 35 minutes. The cost is more than \$1 million a year for a contracted service, but the state picks up all but \$348,487 of the cost.

Schools have opening and closing times that results in staggered scheduling for a family with children of different age levels. High schools begin at 7:45 a.m., kindergarten to 3rd grade at 8:30 a.m., the 4th to 6th grades at 9 a.m. and the junior highs at 9:30 a.m.

With the white and non-white racial balance in Pasadena at just about 50-50, school officials are having a devilish time trying to hew to court guidelines. Currently, two elementary schools have black majorities—not in line with Real's decree—and in only six of the 27 elementary schools do whites make up 50 percent or more of the enrollments.

Lincoln Elementary is one of those schools now unbalanced racially. Blacks are the dominant group with 44 percent of the enrollment.

To Henry Marcheschi, the one-man minority on the Pasadena school board consistently opposed to busing, white flight is the crucial issue. Marcheschi, who failed two years ago in an effort to oust pro-busing board members in a recall election and failed just last week to expand the board to seven members, deftly uses integrationist arguments against the integrationists.

He points out that Dr. James S. Coleman of Johns Hopkins University, principal author of the massive "Equality of Educational Opportunity" survey in 1966 has pointed to 40 percent as a magic number determining the success or failure of integration.

If a student body is more than 40 percent lower-income students—which in many school districts like Pasadena means non-white students—statistics show that the minority students no longer make academic gains. The reason, Coleman says, is that there are not enough middle-class students to influence the goals and aspirations of the school as a whole. Likewise, Coleman adds, middle class students in a school which is more than 40 percent lower-income may suffer academically.

Marcheschi contends that Pasadena has already reached the point of diminishing educational return from desegregation and busing, since most of its schools are more than 40 percent non-middle-class.

(In Pontiac, Mrs. Irene McCabe, the Joan of Arc of the anti-busing movement who leads N.A.G. (National Action Group) from a storefront across from the Pontiac Motor Division, takes the same stance. "If the trend continues," she said last week in an interview, "Pontiac's going to go all black.")

Pasadena Supt. Hornbeck also acknowledges that white flight is a crucial problem that can be arrested only by convincing people that the school district is delivering quality education with the superior staff it still attracts.

He feels that white flight is nearly under control—although enrollment figures belie such optimism—but, he is also worried that the financial bind of the school district may make it impossible to hold back the floodgates.

In Pontiac, Supt. Whitmer, who must convince voters on April 24 to tax themselves more to support the system-wide busing, takes a grimmer view of white flight. He thinks that only the merging of Pontiac with the largely white communities around it will stem the tide. In Detroit, a federal judge is expected to rule soon on a plan to merge city schools with suburban schools, much in



the same way Richmond, Va., schools have been ordered combined with suburbs, a decision now under appeal.

Pasadena's Hornbeck does not favor merger now with his all-white suburbs, like San Marino, the homeground of the John Birch Society. He is still convinced that persuasion will win out as evidenced by a new Pasadena Chamber of Commerce leaflet being circulated to new residents.

The leaflet cover reads, "Why Your Children Should Attend Pasadena Schools." Inside, it lists some "unique programs," including individual instruction, career education, fewer grade levels and programs for the gifted. One section, headed "All This and More," talks of "sound education in an integrated setting," adding:

"Parents, leave the driving to us. Mothers needn't run a taxi service here. Free transportation is provided for students who live beyond reasonable walking distances."

Pontiac postscript—In the early 1950s, blacks contended in an unsuccessful lawsuit that the Mary McCloud Bethune Elementary School, near the housing projects in the southwest section, was built to contain them on the wrong side of the railroad tracks. Nearly 20 years later, a federal judge agreed that the black community had been right. Bethune School, which had two whites and 379 blacks last year, is now 60 percent white.

The portraits of Ralph Bunche, Booker T. Washington and other black figures that used to hang in the hallways have been put away. The statuette of "Mr. Proud," a symbol last year of black racial consciousness, is now in the white principal's office.

"But this is good," says Mrs. Willie-Mae Harris, a black parent who works as a volunteer at the school. "We didn't want to make the white children feel unwanted."

Pasadena postscript—At Pasadena High School, the largest secondary school in California with 4,000-plus students, some seniors were sitting in a grassy quadrangle last week from which you could see the rugged San Gabriel Mountains since the northeast wind cleared the smog.

"It's apartheid here or peaceful coexistence," said Gary Kohler. "Look at the cafeteria. It's them there and we here. I used to say see that tall guy in the red sweater, but I now say see that black guy. I don't know, maybe it's too late for us. I hope it isn't for the younger kids."

When you walk away, Gary says after you, "Have a happy day."

A few miles away at Willard Elementary School—virtually all white two years ago and now more than 50 percent black and Chicano—Helen Bennett, a 5th grade teacher and 14-year teaching veteran, has written a school song for those younger kids Gary Kohler mentioned. The lyrics are to be sung to the tune of McNamara's Band:

"We come by bus; we come by car; we even walk along  
To Willard School, the very best; the place that we belong.  
Now that we're here, let's give a cheer; it's Willard all the way.  
The school belongs to all of us, so you will hear us say:  
Hip-hip-hooray. Hip-hip-hooray.  
Willard is the school for us; it's Willard all the way."

[From the Government Executive, October, 1971]

#### THE UN-NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL

In New York City, a family struggled for years, clawing its way up out of the Harlem ghetto, finally scratched together enough equity to buy a nice home in Greenwich Village. Then, in compliance with Federal laws on integration, New York educators in charge of such things decided their daughter should be bused to school—back in Harlem.

In Newport News, Va., a black welder at the Newport News shipyard, father of three school children, got a promotion, enabling him to buy a \$30,000 home in a pleasant residential neighborhood. He became a leader in the neighborhood education system, active in the Parent-Teachers Association. Then, in the name of integration, Health, Education & Welfare pressure on local officials resulted, in effect, in his three school-age children being bused 22 miles to the far edge of the city to school. He no longer shows any interest in the local school system.

And, of course, there's the well-publicized case of the Birmingham, Ala., high school girl whose mother had to appeal all the way to the White House before she could get her daughter off a 44-mile round trip busing ride and back into the high school just three miles from home. Mother's point: in order to catch the bus, daughter would have to drop out of the high school band, give up an important part of her musical ambition.

These are just bits and pieces in a mounting pile of evidence that school busing, as defined by the Supreme Court, is at best a gross and often grotesque tool for achieving racial integration. And while people in high places indulge in simplistic, high flown rhetoric over the merits of racial busing, it is children and not adults who are paying the real and quite probably horrendous price of it. And the real sarcasm of it is that in addition to fouling up maturing youth's impressionistic years, the whole exercise seems to be having little effect on how well people of one skin color do or do not like people of another.

We think it is all probably the best example walking around of the thesis, to paraphrase Thomas Jefferson, that Government governs best which governs locally. As Housing and Urban Development Assistant Secretary Floyd H. Hyde contended recently:

"The purpose of Government is to serve and to be responsive to the changing needs of the people. But, let me ask, is our system of Government really responding and functioning as it should? I contend it is not."

In pointing out that "For the past 40 years, there has been an ever-increasing centralization of power in Washington, away from state and local government—and away from the people," he leveled his key indictment:

"Federal legislation and administrative policies have frequently undercut the role and authority of the mayor and locally elected officials and made it almost impossible for them to act effectively."

Though Hyde was emphasizing, when he spoke, the basic problems of urban decay and the merits of no-strings revenue sharing as proposed by President Nixon, he could just as easily, in a human societal sense, have been talking about racial busing and what giant strides it is taking toward creation of the un-neighborhood school.

It doesn't take much of a sociological education to figure out that, where the building blocks of this Nation's greatness were once its rural communities, they are today—or ought to be—that increasingly vast collection of contiguous urban neighborhoods. Thus, a logical game plan says, any government program justified as responsive to the needs of the people (and, basically what other justification is there?) ought first and foremost to impact on the needs of the neighborhood community. To the extent that government officials, especially those high up the bureaucratic ladder, fail to heed that truism, they become, in effect, their own worst enemies; because callous, insensitive government behavior simply provokes the kind of thing government can ill afford: angry public opposition.

C. W. BORKLUND.

#### A SALUTE TO THE STAMFORD COMMISSION ON AGING

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to participate this past Monday in the Stamford Commission on Aging's "Report to the Fourth Congressional District on the 1971 White House Conference on Aging." This was a sell-out affair, indicative of the prominent role the Stamford Commission on Aging plays in the lives of the senior citizens of my district.

It is with great pleasure that I bring to the attention of my colleagues the outstanding work of the Stamford Commission on Aging. Along with cooperating senior citizen clubs, the commission gives purpose and meaning to the lives of Stamford area senior residents.

You name it and Stamford area senior citizens have it: meals-on-wheels, dial-a-ride service, low-cost lunch programs, visiting nurses, sessions to discuss the physical and emotional problems of the elderly. Classes are held at the Quintard Center, Stamford's full-time facility for senior citizens, in almost every possible area of interest ranging from beginning Spanish to bowling, physical fitness, bridge, movies, and dancing. In addition, informative and education talks are provided on topics of interest and concern: consumer protection, medicare, diseases, and current events, to name but a few.

As you can see, Stamford takes care of its older citizens and makes their old age a time of pride and fulfillment, not one of isolation and withdrawal.

I salute the Stamford Commission on Aging, its chairman, Dr. Bernard Friedman; its director, Mrs. Dolores Russell; and the other commission members: Rev. Cyril Peters, Mrs. Freda Brown, Mrs. Effie Massie, Mr. Andrew Robustelli, Dr. Neil Klein, Rev. Paul DuBois and Mrs. Alex McDonald.

I would also like to take this opportunity to commend the other area organizations which help give meaning to the lives of our senior citizens and which assisted in making Monday's meeting such a great success: Members of Quintard Center and its able staff; Friendly Circle, Glenbrook Senior Club, Meals-on-Wheels Volunteers of Stamford-Darien, Older Bolsters, Senior Information and Referral Service, and American Association of Retired Persons.

So that my colleagues may receive an overview of the structure, work and activities of the Stamford Commission on Aging, I hereby submit to the RECORD their first annual report:

THE STAMFORD COMMISSION ON AGING,  
ANNUAL REPORT 1970-71

#### THE BEGINNING

The Stamford Commission on Aging, an official arm of the city government, is a nine-man group of citizens appointed by the mayor to be concerned with the special problems of the city's 10,000 older citizens . . . to meet the needs of active and able retirees who seek meaningful activity in their leisure

... to ease the burdens of those who are ill, lonely, or in need ... and to bring the talents and experience of older persons back into the mainstream of community life.

To cope with these diverse problems, the commission set up an office in February, 1970, staffed with professionals who, with the co-operation of the city's government and social agencies, business, civic, and religious groups, plan for solutions through new community services.

#### 1970-71: THE FIRST FULL YEAR

The past year, the first full year of operation for the Commission on Aging, has been one of satisfying achievement, as the hopes and plans of the Commission's early months grew into the first concrete programs specifically aimed to serve the city's older population.

With a minimum budget and staff to work with, the Commission has successfully sought outside aid and cooperation to make possible several major steps forward in meeting the needs of the elderly. These included the establishment of a multipurpose center for older persons, a food delivery service for the homebound, a new transportation service, and a low-cost lunch program operating in Cloonan Junior High School.

#### QUINTARD CENTER

The most significant single development this year was the opening in November of 1970 of Quintard Center, the city's first full time facility planned exclusively for the older citizen. Funded through a \$24,000 grant from the Connecticut Department on Aging and the Federal Administration on Aging under the Older Americans Act, Quintard is providing a free regular program of education, recreation, health and guidance services which have attracted some 400 enrolled members in only seven months of operation. Scores of others have participated in individual activities, with an estimated 1,500 persons having been served by one or more Center programs this year. The Center is located on the main floor of Quintard Manor, a low-income residence for the elderly operated by the Stamford Housing Authority.

Under the capable guidance of Director Hilda Ross, Quintard offers a wide choice of activities specially geared to the interests and abilities of the elderly. There have been classes in painting, sewing, crafts, decoupage, leatherwork, ceramics, handicrafts and stitchery, as well as an exercise and bowling group, and instruction in folk, square, and social dancing. Discussion groups have met to learn about local politics. A Readers Circle was formed to talk about current books and articles. Even more variety will be possible in the Center program when the renovation of a woodworking and a crafts room is completed by the city, allowing for concurrent activities.

Social functions have included parties, films, cards and bingo, an International Day featuring foods and costumes supplied by the Center's foreign-born members of 14 nationalities, bus trips to nearby points of interest, and summer pastimes such as beach outings and weekly fishing trips on the Sound.

#### NEW KINDS OF AID

The vital areas of health and nutrition have received ample attention at Quintard. Brian Langdon of Family & Children's Services has conducted three sessions of group discussions on the emotional problems of aging, which have been well attended and have served as a kind of group therapy for many of the participants. This innovative project will receive national publicity in a forthcoming copy of "Aging", the publication of the Administration on Aging.

Another successful series on health care was titled "Talking It Over With the Doctor". It included talks by local specialists on the

physical changes that come with aging, and on care of teeth, skin, eyes and feet in the later years. Each session was open to questions from the audience.

In addition, a representative from the Visiting Nurse Association was at the Center every second Tuesday for free individual consultation on simple medical problems or questions on home care.

How to cook economically for one or two persons and how to be sure of getting the proper diet necessary for good health were topics covered in a cooking potpourri which ranged from demonstration of how to prepare low-cost nutritious meals to aid in planning menus for diabetics.

A hot lunch program also developed at Quintard on Tuesdays and Thursdays, with members themselves preparing and serving a light luncheon which was sold at cost for 35 cents. Attendance has averaged 35 to 40 for each lunch day.

Other services instituted were Information and referral to direct members to the proper source of aid for their problems, a monthly visit from the Social Security Administration to offer individual aid on questions concerning pensions or Medicare, and counseling by a Center volunteer, a retired lawyer who made himself available by appointment for free advice on wills or other legal matters.

#### SUPPORT FROM OTHER AGENCIES

Many other city agencies have participated in and contributed to the Center program. The Stamford Housing Authority generously allowed the use of its premises without payment for rent or utilities, and has been continuously helpful in Center operations. Four classes were provided by the Department of Continuing Education. Films, talks, and a regular Bookmobile visit were set up by the Ferguson Library. The city Health Department furnished nurses and vaccine to give free flu shots to members.

Private companies have also sponsored special events, such as a home decoration series done by the Harvey Furniture Company, cooking demonstrations conducted by HELCO, a makeup clinic held by Clair, and participation by the medical staff of Olin. Private groups such as the Stamford Garden Club, the Junior Woman's Club and the League of Women Voters have also given their time to hold special programs at the Center.

In addition, Quintard has enjoyed financial support in the donations of a stove by HELCO, crafts equipment by the Courtland Gardens Nursing Home, and cash donations from Pitney-Bowes and the Stamford Home for the Aged. There were other gifts from the Stamford Junior Woman's Club, the National Association of Negro and Professional Women, and four area churches: Bethel A. M. E., Union Baptist, Faith Tabernacle Baptist, and Greater Faith Tabernacle Baptist. Individuals have helped, too, with 69 volunteers, young and old, currently working at the Center as teachers, hostesses, office assistants and program planners.

All of this support has made Quintard Center truly a community project, and has made possible a variety of programs that could never have been achieved otherwise.

#### DIAL-A-RIDE

Perhaps the most meaningful donation of all was the purchase of the "Dial-A-Ride" mini-bus by the Soroptimist Club. With the cost of a driver and gasoline covered through the Quintard grant, and with a year of free service donated by Riverbank Motors, the Commission has been able to furnish free transportation to anyone who wished to attend Quintard Center or the Cloonan School Lunch program for Senior Citizens. The bus also provides a monthly grocery shopping service for tenants at Stamford Manor and the Edward Czeszk Homes, and offers a

limited amount of door-to-door private transportation for medical appointments and other important private needs at a minimal cost of 25 cents each way. The mini-bus is currently averaging 100 passengers weekly.

Quintard Center has formed its own Board of Directors, and, under the continued supervision of the Commission on Aging will work toward becoming an independent body able to raise funds to supplement the city budget after the current grant expires in September, 1973.

#### OTHER PROGRAMS

The Commission has engaged in several other major programs this year, each an example of how the creation of a city office devoted to the elderly has served as a catalyst to coordinate efforts of other groups to make new services possible.

#### MEALS-ON-WHEELS

Meals-On-Wheels, a home food delivery service for incapacitated persons, has served more than 4,000 meals since its beginning last September. With the offer of food preparation for this project by the Courtland Gardens Nursing Home, the Commission was able to obtain a grant of \$3,000 from the Stamford Home for the Aged which made possible the hiring of Mrs. Catherine Munn, a trained dietitian, as a part-time director of Meals-On-Wheels. Then, by contacting every church and synagogue in the area, volunteer drivers were secured to deliver the meals to those who need them. Ten religious groups of all denominations are currently participating, with the American Association of University Women serving as emergency substitutes.

Each recipient receives a hot luncheon and a cold supper brought to his door at noon-time. The original charge was set at \$3, but later in the year when Courtland Gardens found that their costs were running less than had been anticipated, the price was lowered to \$2.25. The Nursing Home also very generously donated \$1,000 to be used as a Friendship Fund to aid those who could not otherwise afford this service.

Many welfare cases are also benefiting from Meals-On-Wheels, with the State Welfare Department covering their costs.

This important community service has enabled many to come home from the hospital earlier than would have been possible otherwise, freeing needed hospital beds.

The relief of the burden of food preparation has also enabled many to continue to live independently in their own homes through a temporary illness rather than being forced to the expense of a nursing home. And certainly not least, it is a significant indication of interest and concern by the community for an ill elderly person. For many who are sick and lonely, the smile and friendly words of the Meals-On-Wheels volunteer may be just as important as the food she brings.

Meals-On-Wheels has already set up its own Board of Directors and a medical advisory Board. By the end of the coming year it should be functioning as a totally independent body, operating with no more than moral support from the Commission.

#### CLOONAN LUNCH PROGRAM

Another example of coordination between organizations was the establishment of a hot lunch program for the elderly at Cloonan Junior High School. At the request of the Commission on Aging, the Board of Education agreed to a trial of this new idea, priced at 55 cents, the same fee paid by students. Attendance at Cloonan varied from 25 down to 5 or 6, depending greatly on the weather. Cloonan's location is not within easy walking distance for many elderly persons, and participation fell sharply during the cold months. Though the Dial-A-Ride bus was available, the number who called this serv-



ice just to eat a meal and return home was small. If the Board of Education agrees to continue this program next year, the Commission will attempt to add some more social aspect to make the meals more appealing than the fast and somewhat impersonal cafeteria lunch offered this year.

#### MAYOR'S CONFERENCE ON AGING

Upon the suggestion of Mayor Julius Wilensky, the Commission organized and conducted Mayor's Conference on Aging which drew more than 300 people, young and old. It was held at the First Presbyterian Church on May 5, 1971 and was an all-day program where they learned much about the local problems of the elderly and had the opportunity to express themselves on the issues which will be discussed at the White House Conference on Aging next November. This Conference produced a list of recommendations for local action which will become the focus of the Commission's activity in the near future.

#### HELP WITH BEACH STICKERS, TAX EXEMPTIONS, BUS DISCOUNTS

Once again this year the Commission has worked with the Park Department to distribute free beach stickers to residents over age 65. This activity was moved from the Commission office to Quintard, where parking is easily available and there are no steps to climb. This proved a most fortunate choice as it also introduced the Center to many new people and resulted in a number of new members.

Help was also given in the Commission office to older persons wishing to fill out forms for bus discounts or real estate tax exemptions. Both forms were on hand, and assistance was readily available for those who did not fully understand the related regulations.

#### PUBLIC INFORMATION

A prime aim of the Commission on Aging is to inform the public of the problems confronting its elderly neighbors, and to make the city aware of the new services now available through the Commission.

To accomplish this, a newsletter was sent out regularly to a mailing list of 1,000 persons, including a calendar of Quintard Center activities. Special literature was also mailed to all area physicians and churches to enlist their aid in spreading the word to older persons about Quintard, Dial-A-Ride, Meals-On-Wheels and Cloonan lunches.

A steady stream of radio and newspaper publicity has come from the Commission office, and personal talks have been given to all Senior groups as well as to other community organizations.

Special talks were given to student nurse groups on the needs of the older patients who will be in their care.

#### AID TO OTHER COMMUNITIES

It has been most gratifying to our relatively new Commission to find ourselves being called upon by other communities as a model of successful operation. Representatives from Norwalk and from Princeton, New Jersey, have asked to tour our various facilities, and we have been contacted by a number of state bodies, including CDAP, for advice on financing and organization of a mini-bus service and a school lunch program. The Commission proposal for the Quintard Center grant will be used by the State Department on Aging as a sample for other communities applying for financial aid.

#### MUCH ACCOMPLISHED—MUCH TO BE DONE

Though the Mayor's Conference recommendations show that much remains to be done in the coming year, the achievements of the past year point to an auspicious future for the Commission on Aging as a permanent and valuable arm of the city, representing the interests of its growing older population. The providing of services for the elderly

have made Stamford a better place to live for the Senior Citizens today . . . and for those who will be the elderly of tomorrow.

## ABORTION AND THE UNWANTED CHILD

### HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I insert the second article in a series written on abortion by Mary Kay Williams for the N.C. News Service.

The article, "Abortion and the Unwanted Child," states,

One cannot permit abortion in order to solve another pressing problem that is less than the demand for someone's life.

That statement, to me, is the foundation of the anti-abortion struggle—that a woman's convenience should not rule over the child's right to live.

The article follows:

#### II. ABORTION AND THE UNWANTED CHILD (By Mary Kay Williams)

It's a universal experience. Every one of us at some time in our life has felt unwanted, unloved by someone. It's a lonely feeling even for adults who may have a healthy ego and a resilient spirit. And so when one hears of unwanted children, somehow that situation seems worse still.

No one wants to see a child suffer either physically or emotionally. Because of this natural sympathy to protect children, sincere people may be misled by the pro-abortion argument: "Wouldn't it be better if the child was never born?" This question is likely to take on a humanitarian posture which conveniently serves as a smokescreen to the real issue.

Who is the unwanted child? Is he the unplanned child? Is she the defective child—the one who will be born handicapped? Let's consider all these children.

Abortion promoters say that an unplanned child will be an unwanted child, and an unwanted child will be a battered child. Their logic is depressingly faulty.

Although it's difficult to define "unwanted," many social scientists have been studying the pregnant mother and her attitudes towards her unborn child. They overwhelmingly agree that one cannot predict the mother's attitudes after birth. What can be predicted, however, is the experience of some depression at some point during a pregnancy. This is considered very normal—not a sign of pregnancy rejection, nor a sign of mental illness.

A widely used textbook on obstetrics describes this phenomenon: "It is not unusual for women who will become good mothers . . . to react initially to the diagnosis of pregnancy with resentment, frustration, and depression, only to express strong, genuine, positive feelings of acceptance as the pregnancy advances and fetal movements appear."

This is all the more reason for women to receive good medical counseling to help them understand these normal feelings that they may have during pregnancy. They should be helped to understand that whether or not the child is planned or unplanned, there will probably be some depression and anxiety during pregnancy.

In the case of the unmarried pregnant mother, her stress may be even greater—especially when her pregnancy is strongly rejected by the father of the child, her family and friends, and societal attitudes. What is

needed in this situation are more service programs such as Birthright, now in 60 American cities, offering multiple supports in the form of counseling, adoption referrals, financial aid, employment, medical care, day care, and friendship.

The second point that the pro-abortion group makes is that the unwanted child will be a battered child. Again, latest scientific evidence does not support their argument.

After analyzing 13,000 child-beating cases in all 50 states, the most extensive research ever conducted on child abuse in the United States reached some very surprising conclusions. Dr. David G. Gil of Brandeis University found that child abuse could be traced to the widespread acceptance in America of the use of physical force in child-rearing and discipline. In many instances, their own parents used corporal punishment on them, and this is what they remember.

It is not that the parents are mentally disturbed, or that the child is unwanted or unloved. It is much more a question of what society considers acceptable discipline, and the measure of self-control that one has over one's violent tendencies.

The remedy for child abuse has nothing to do with abortion. What is demanded is a radical change in the underlying value system that permits abusive striking of children, as well as laws against corporal punishment in homes, schools, juvenile courts, and child-care facilities.

This brings us to our last consideration—the handicapped child. The pro-abortion argument says that life is tough enough without being born crippled or mentally retarded. They argue that if a woman knows in advance that there is a good possibility her child will be born defective, then she should be allowed an abortion.

Some significant research on the handicapped person has recently been made public. A team of psychologists headed by Dr. Paul Cameron, University of Louisville, and Dr. D. Van Hoeck, Wayne State University, reported that there was no difference between malformed and normal persons in their life satisfaction or vulnerability to frustrations. The handicapped were found to be as happy as others. Life may be more difficult for them, but these difficulties did not make life less tolerable.

However, one must acknowledge the strain on families who care for their handicapped children. In some cases, the handicapped child will be a financial and emotional burden. While this is a legitimate argument for immediate and sustained public and private support to these families, it should not take precedence over the right to be born. One cannot permit abortion in order to solve another pressing problem that is less than the demand for someone's life.

For Christian parents of handicapped or retarded children, the mystery of the resurrection of the body should have great meaning and encouragement. Enlightened by faith, these parents can rejoice in the expectations of the glory which their sons or daughters—regardless of their physical or mental limitations now—will carry in their bodies through all eternity. The child with the greatest deformity—the lowest I.Q.—can be, because of the promise of the resurrection, perfect in his humanity in mind and body forever.

## THE STRUGGLE TO SURVIVE

### HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Jerome L. Johnson of rural Eagle Lake,

Minn., is extremely concerned by the effort of Ralph Nader and assorted others who presume to speak for consumers to roll back the Federal support price of milk. She has provided me with a copy of a recent letter she sent to Mr. Nader in which she provides a vivid, detailed account of her family's struggle to survive, a struggle shared by the overwhelming majority of hard-working farmers today.

I believe there is merit in including her letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in the hope that it will be read by those who have no direct farm experience. It is an honest eye opener. I include Mrs. Johnson's letter at this point in my remarks:

EAGLE LAKE, MINN.

DEAR MR. NADER: I read with great interest the article in the January 25, 1972 edition of the *Mankato Free Press* (Mankato, Minn.), telling about a consumer coalition led by you to overturn an increase in the government's support price of milk, because the Congressmen and Nixon administration yielded to political pressure when they approved the milk support rise from \$4.66 to \$4.93 per hundredweight.

First of all, why single out the dairy farmer? What about all the other interests and organizations, such as labor unions, that lobby with far more pressure and with far greater amounts of money.

All our costs keep rising. Why shouldn't we have a raise? We have to become four per cent more efficient just to break even, say nothing of having more money to invest in our business or to have something left over to have a better life for our families. You talk about poverty and poor housing in the big cities; there are many farmchildren who do not have decent food or clothing and who have a cold house to sleep in. Poverty in rural America is a very real thing.

In this letter I'd like to give you an explanation of some of the problems we farmers face and a picture of what life on a farm is really like. I would like you to understand that any raise on the price of milk or a raise on any farm product is much needed or the nation may find itself with a diminishing food supply and then prices will rise because of dire necessity. The USDA reports a drop of two per cent or 45,000 less farms for the past year. The present number of farms in the Northwest States is the same as 60 to 100 years ago. For the U.S. as a whole, farm numbers have now dropped to approximately where they were in 1872, a century ago, when many western states were just being settled, and the Homestead Law was hardly ten years old. But, what has happened to the population of the United States?

We live in South Central Minnesota and are what you might call diversified farmers, raising corn, soybeans, oats, and hay. Most of these crops are harvested to feed our herd of about 40 milk cows, our replacement heifers, some calves, some feeder steers, and some fat cattle.

Do you realize what a farmer has invested? We consider ourselves small farmers, paying for 140 acres of land valued at about \$450 an acre. Why don't you figure \$63,000 at 8% interest? We are fortunate and don't pay that much, but there are farmers who do and some who pay even more. Then we rent about 50 acres more. Rent runs from \$30 to \$40 an acre in this area. We also buy hay by the bale if necessary. It doesn't take a cow long to eat a bale of hay which usually costs about 50 cents.

Then of course, we must have buildings and equipment. We have a barn with thirty stalls, calf pens, milkhouse, silo, and an attached shed for young stock. With the equipment which includes an ornery barn cleaner, a bulk tank, a vacuum pump, a broken silo

unloader, wash tank, water heater, and drinking cups, I estimate we have \$40,000 invested. Many farmers have much more than that invested. We have no pipeline or transfer system. My husband and I carry, on the average, over a thousand pounds of milk a day from the barn to the milkhouse. Many farmers have expensive milking parlors and wash systems to save themselves time and labor. My uncles in Wisconsin recently installed a pipeline system which cost around \$4,500. Some have elaborate and expensive automatic feeding systems and loafing barns to save themselves that time and labor so that they can have a greater volume in order to show a profit.

We also must have machinery to plant, take care of, and harvest the food for our cattle. We have invested, with my father, in tractors, combine, two broken down balers, two broken down field choppers, a worn-out silo blower, wagons, bale racks, corn planter, grain drill, manure loader, haybine, hay rake, digger, drag, cultivators, sprayer, grinder-mixer, manure spreaders, and numerous other pieces. I would say the value of this small farmer's line of machinery is \$50,000. A farmer could easily invest \$200 thousand. Tractors and combines are selling now for 25 to 30 thousand dollars. And we have to keep replacing and repairing our machinery or we don't stay in business. Don't forget the investment in our cattle—a good milk cow costs at least \$400.

A big investment of a farm is a well. Cattle do drink lots of water you know and we use a lot of it for washing milkers and bulk tank. We had some well trouble recently and asked the repairman how much a new well would cost. We know we are taxing our present water system with so many cattle. He estimated the cost to be between two and three thousand dollars. And of course there are several repair calls each year. Then there is the electric bill for pumping all that water. So the farmers get their water free, don't they?

A farmer has a little more than a dinner pail invested. There is a saying, "The farmer is the only man who is in debt all his life and still leaves an estate." And I might add—his son might inherit that estate, make some improvements and some investments and be in debt for the rest of his life too.

Also, I believe a farmer is entitled to a higher wage because of all the hard work and long hours that he, his wife, and their children put in. It takes, on the average, four hours a day for one of us just to do the milking. That is not including feeding, cleaning, bedding, or taking any time for problems that might arise. For example, the other morning when it was 30 degrees below zero, my husband, at six in the morning, discovered a cow that had gotten herself hung up in the stall. He woke up our neighbor, got some equipment from the veterinarian and it took them three hours to get her out, and she's still not coming along very well. There's always pipes to thaw, equipment, machinery, and buildings to repair, say nothing of field work from dawn to after dark during the field season.

Have you ever loosened a barn cleaner or manure spreader or spread manure when it's been 20 to 30 below zero? My husband's face and hands have been frostbitten many times and that metal likes to break when it gets that cold. Just the opposite—There's been many an early summer evening when I've milked when it's 80 to 90 degrees and the sweat runs down my face.

It's winter now so my husband doesn't get up until nearly six to milk. I get our boy on the school bus about 7:30 and then I go out to help with the feeding of the cows and calves and do the washing up. Sometimes I help with the barn cleaning and it's after ten when I get in. Then at four, when our boy gets home from school, he helps us with the evening chores. We usually don't eat supper until 7, but then we are done for the

evening, except for my husband who shuts off the drinking cups at 10:30. You'd shut them off too if you've ever cleaned a gutter with 300 gallons of water in it. That is our winter schedule.

For the planting, growing, and harvesting season, my husband rises at 5 a.m., I go out to help at 6, then we hurry to eat breakfast so we can get to the field. On days when I work in the field, I come home at 5 to do the milking and feed the kids some supper. I never know when the rest eat, so usually have something going in the oven. There are many nights that it is ten p.m. before my husband and the neighbors quit unloading bales in the barn. We have that extra hour of daylight so that the hay doesn't dry till later in the day and then we can work later at night. If you want to protest something, Mr. Nader, why don't you protest daylight saving time? There's many a time when my neighbor lady has jokingly complained that my husband's feed grinding keeps her awake at night.

Most farmers and especially dairy farmers have little time off. We are on the job seven days a week. The longest time we are ever away from home is overnight and we only do this once or twice a year. And we wouldn't do this at all if my husband's folks didn't live in Iowa and if my sister and her husband wouldn't do our milking. We've never taken our children more than 160 miles from home—to their grandparents in Iowa, or to my relatives in Eau Claire, Wisconsin. My grandmother is in a rest home in Fall Creek, Wisconsin and I haven't seen her for a year and a half. That is called "keeping your nose to the grindstone". Our biggest event in a long time was our annual dinner and meeting of Associated Milk Producers Inc. last Friday. We were gone from home from 11:30 a.m. to 4 p.m. The meeting was poorly attended; it was such a cold day and I suppose many of the farmers just couldn't get their work done.

Mr. Nader, if you're helping the consumer, just who do you think the consumer is? As I understand it, the farmer is the biggest consumer of steel in his machinery, cars, trucks, and machine repairs. We are great consumers of clothing. My husband, son, and I wear out stacks of jeans, gloves, coveralls, boots, rubbers, and jackets each year. We buy groceries like we were running a small hotel. If you load 700 bales of hay in an afternoon, you need more than a hot dog for lunch. I fix the men three and four big meals a day, because if they are going to work, they've got to eat. We buy concentrate for feed, fertilizer, liquid nitrogen, gas, oil and other petroleum products, lumber, paint, shingles and other building supplies, machine repairs, veterinarian supplies, soaps, cleaning aids, etc. The list is endless.

A few years ago I had a restaurant operator tell me that she could always tell on her volume of business when the farmers had too much rain or it was too dry. I remarked that Mankato was a college town and that I thought her business came from the students. "Oh, no", she replied, "We need the farmers."

So, I feel, Mr. Nader, that when you picked on the dairy farmer or any farmer for that matter, you've picked on the wrong guy. You may think the farmer isn't important—He only produces your food (a human's first need) and he also buys your products.

Who pays the taxes? What are real estate taxes? They are taxes on the land a farmer must pay for the privilege of breaking his back producing food. Then there's the sales tax. How much is the 4% tax on a small, \$12,000 combine? Farmers pay more than their share of taxes because they are the owners of the land and because they are big consumers also.

I feel that if the farmer's prices do not rise in accordance with his expenses that many will be forced off the land and you'll go without food—a steak and a cold glass



of milk still tastes better than a pill. If large corporate farms result, you'll pay much more for food because those managers and workers won't tolerate such hard work, long hours, and low pay. Their wives and children won't be working either. The owners too are going to want a fair return on their investment. Many experts still feel the family farm is the most efficient. But *Hoard's Dairyman* reports in its January 25 issue that "Though milk prices continue to set records, prices paid by farmers go up faster. Real estate taxes are up 8 per cent; all production costs 5 per cent. Milk parity was down to 77 in September, but is up to 79 now. It is still 4 points under a year ago."

I thank you for your time Mr. Nader and hope this has helped you to understand more fully what farming is really all about. Unless you've held that fork in your hand and worked every day with it, it is hard to realize the plight of the farmer. I would like to suggest, Mr. Nader, that before going ahead with this suit, that you invite many farmers to talk with you and better yet, visit many different kinds of farms all over the United States so that you can step right in and help a few farmers clean those barns and throw those hay bales. See for yourself what this business of farming is.

I would appreciate a reply to signify that you received this letter. Thank you again. Sincerely,

Mrs. JEROME L. JOHNSON.

#### POSTAL EXPERTISE COUNTING AGAIN AS SIGNALS SWITCH

**HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was interested to read an item in Joseph Young's "Federal Spotlight" column telling of a switch in direction by the U.S. Postal Service.

I want to congratulate Postmaster General Klassen for taking a fresh look at the practicalities of postal service in the United States.

Mr. Klassen and the Postal Service are reaping the self-imposed woes that result from his predecessor's conscientious effort to eliminate experienced and knowledgeable postal people from the organization. They were forced to take early retirement, with the only sop being an expensive bonus.

I am not criticizing the dedicated former employees who accepted the lone option they were given. The great loss was to the Postal Service in losing top-level postal expertise that was gained through practical experience in an operation that is like no other business anywhere.

In the light of the mounting postal service problems and in the face of widespread complaints, the switch of direction by Mr. Klassen is very much in order.

The tragedy of the situation is the loss of continuity and momentum which resulted from the wholesale shakeup—and shakeout—of the very people who have some practical understanding of how to move the mails.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I include the text of the item from the

March 7, 1972 "Federal Spotlight" column by Joseph Young in the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star:

#### SECOND THOUGHTS

The U.S. Postal Service has quietly set up a special group to study the postal system to find out what's wrong with it and what should be done.

What makes this especially newsworthy is that some of the group's members are former postal career officials who were pressured into retirement last year when the new regime took over.

The Postal Service is finding out that expertise and experience do count, and that just because a man was successful in the private sector doesn't necessarily mean he will be a whiz-bang in the Postal Service.

#### THE BEST KIND OF INSURANCE

**HON. PHILIP M. CRANE**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, recently, W. Clement Stone, chairman and chief executive officer of Combined Insurance Co. of America and the president of several other important insurance companies, saw a film of the Russian Navy in training which fell into the hands of the U.S. Navy.

He noted in an article in *Success Unlimited* of which he is editor and publisher:

The film was amazing—it was startling and—it developed a deep reaction of concern in me and those who were fortunate enough to view it.

Expressing the view that all Americans should have the opportunity to see this film and to understand the method by which the Soviet Union is rapidly becoming the most powerful nation on earth, Mr. Stone pointed out that:

If what America sought was a generation of peace, then the best way to achieve this was not through weakness.

He wrote:

If we seek to avert a war in this generation we must keep our military strength so strong that the Soviet Union or any other potential adversary would be discouraged to start a war with us.

He noted that:

History has taught us that it's imperative that we must now negotiate from strength to clear away the difficulties and shut out the possibility that the undesirable could happen.

Mr. Stone stated:

Peace has never been achieved through appeasement and vacillation. The best kind of insurance for the American people is "prevention." Remaining stronger than any potential aggressor provides that necessary prevention.

He concludes by stating that:

Remember: it's cheaper to prevent a war than fight a war and win.

I wish to share Mr. Stone's article with my colleagues, and insert it into the *RECORD* at this time:

#### THE BEST KIND OF INSURANCE—JUST TRY

IT . . . YOU'LL LIKE IT

(By W. Clement Stone)

I'm a salesman. And I'm going to try to sell you something you need even though you may not now want it. But if you will just try it . . . you'll like it.

On a Monday morning a short time ago, I as Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Combined Insurance Company of America and its subsidiaries held an enthusiastic sales meeting with a select group of our star Texas sales representatives at Dallas.

One of the top salesmen had sold 200 new policies, the previous week . . . an outstanding sales record. In relating his experiences, he said, "There were persons who refused to buy our Little Giant Accident Policy. But . . . many of them changed their noses to 'All right . . . go ahead' when I finally said 'Just try it . . . you'll like it.'"

The following Wednesday morning I was attending a meeting in New York City at which time Capt. Robert Delaney of the U.S. Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island, showed an official confidential naval training film of the Russians which fell into the hands of the U.S. Navy. It was amazing . . . it was startling and . . . it developed a deep reaction of concern in me and those who were fortunate enough to view it.

Every American boy, girl, man or woman would also be fortunate to see this film. It's possible that you and your associates could have this privilege should you write to Capt. Delaney; however . . . the following thought flashed into my mind as I viewed the film: "America, keep your eyes closed. But if you do . . . your grandchildren may go to everlasting sleep." I have an aversion to using the words "died" or "death" and have never before used them in my writings. Instead I have used the softer terms "went to everlasting sleep" or "passed away" in referring to one who was deceased.

I try to operate by formula; specifically: determine the principles that bring success and failure . . . reduce each to formulas and then . . . apply the one and eliminate the other. And that's how I developed a sales system for my companies whereby it's impossible for a salesman or sales manager in my organization to fail if . . . he learns and applies the success formulas in their entirety. The same procedure is used by me regarding achieving success or avoiding failure to achieve desirable goals in every human activity regardless of the individual or organization.

While flying from New York to Chicago late that Wednesday afternoon, I thought about the film and meditated on the possible solutions to the problems that brought concern to me. One thought lead to another. A solution became crystal clear as to The Best Kind of Insurance for you, me and those whom we wish to help including all of us in the organization that binds us together . . . America for whom too infrequently many of us fall through lack of action to express our love and loyalty.

#### THE BEST KIND OF INSURANCE

*The Best Kind of Insurance* for you, me and every other American can be expressed in one word . . . *Prevention*.

This type of insurance, unlike a commercial insurance policy that reimburses for financial loss, can avert and ward off potential personal unhappiness, physical and mental illness, accidents, failures, poverty, catastrophes and that which you do not want to happen to yourself or others.

And that's why *Success Unlimited* magazine, in its efforts to try to make the world a better world for this and future generations, endeavors to motivate you and all of our readers to motivate themselves to: recognize,

relate, assimilate and use desirable universal principles . . . develop PMA (a Positive Mental Attitude) and eliminate NMA (a Negative Mental Attitude) . . . learn to motivate one's self at will and to motivate others to desirable goals . . . avoid physical and mental illness . . . develop character . . . become effective good parents and leaders . . . acquire wealth and . . . find the true riches of life. For you to motivate yourself to achieve any one of these, it's necessary to engage in study, thinking and planning time with regularity and then follow through with . . . action.

Now *The Best Kind of Insurance* . . . Prevention is also applicable to our nation in each of its activities wherein our leaders strive to reach all desirable national goals on a priority basis.

We want a generation of peace. And *The Best Kind of Insurance* is to avert, ward off and prevent the likelihood of a war in this generation and perhaps in the future with a nation which is said to have built the greatest modern military machine in the world (one of many examples is the building of the second largest navy in the world in a short period of 15 years and one that is expanding rapidly) is to keep our military strength so strong that she or any other nation would be discouraged to start a war with us. History has taught us that it's imperative that we must now negotiate from strength to clear away the difficulties and shut out the possibility that the undesirable could happen.

Principles learned from history are universal. We have learned that war is almost a certainty when ambitious and warlike leaders of good people become intoxicated with power and have the military strength to conquer weaker nations. Their statements and actions have proved that conquest was their objective be they barbarians . . . madmen like Adolph Hitler . . . intelligent, scheming rulers like King Philip of Macedon who prepared his nation for war and motivated his son Alexander the Great to strive to conquer the world or . . . any of the great deceivers of modern times who have enslaved their own people and those of other nations.

George Washington and each of the framers of the Constitution tried to originate the best kind of insurance . . . prevention. They endeavored to anticipate law to avoid internal and foreign conflicts.

Our senators, congressmen and national leaders will listen to the voice of the people if they speak up. Priorities are all important. At the moment the American public must become so *Prevention conscious* that all of us use the power we have as citizens to urge members of congress and national leaders to give priority to the preventive measures that will safeguard the nation and the lives of our posterity in the future. It's time to speak up!

We should buy *The Best Kind of Insurance* . . . *Prevention*. In the long run, it's the cheapest and most effective. Remember: it's cheaper to prevent a war than fight a war and win. Also: in your personal life, in helping others and protecting your posterity, buy *The Best Kind of Insurance* . . . *Prevention!* Just try it . . . you'll like it.

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS HONORED  
BY ITALY

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the Honorable WAYNE L. HAYS, was recently honored by the Republic of

Italy. His work as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, his contributions as the chairman of the House of Representatives delegations to the North Atlantic Assembly, the parliamentary arm of NATO, and his role as the president of that conference in particular, have earned him a citation as a friend of Italy.

In a ceremony at the Italian Embassy, Italy's Ambassador Egidio Ortona presented Congressman Hays with the decoration of Commander in the Order of Merit of the Republic of Italy. As a recipient myself of this award, I am proud to be joined by the company of my colleague.

It is not unusual that individual achievement is recognized first by those outside the home community. I especially wish, therefore, to bring this achievement to the attention of the Congress and to express to WAYNE my warm personal commendation and congratulations.

The promotion of cooperation and understanding in the international arena has become a vital part of our Nation's business. WAYNE's dedicated work and contributions in this area deserve much credit. I am pleased that they have been recognized by the Republic of Italy in this manner for the receipt of this award is both an individual honor and a positive reflection on the United States.

THAT THE TRUTH MAY PREVAIL  
ABOUT GEORGE WASHINGTON

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, one of the surest ways to destroy patriotism and love of country is to destroy the credibility of the Nation's heroes in the malleable minds and tender hearts of the children.

During the past two decades, the United Nations Educational, Social, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), educational materials have been forced upon America's schoolchildren with the purpose of breaking down the walls of nationalism and promoting one-world government.

In booklet 5 of a nine-volume series entitled "Toward World Understanding," the teachers are told:

Before the child enters school, his mind has already been profoundly marked . . . by earlier influences. The earlier years may be indispensable to the education of children for world citizenship. The kindergarten and infant school . . . can prepare the child for membership in a world society. . . . As long as the child breathes the poisoned air of nationalism, education in world mindedness can produce only precarious results.

Assisting the UNESCO effort to destroy the eminent stature and outstanding reputation of the greatest of our national heroes, George Washington, is a book entitled "George Washington's Expense Account" by Marvin Kitman. I mention the title and author so that our col-

leagues may know of this book which through distortions and falsehoods attempts to degrade President Washington and so that educators may be forewarned against its use. I have received reports that American children are already being brainwashed with the false contents of the book.

I insert in the RECORD at this point an excellent article which points out many of the book's errors. The article was written by Brig. Gen. William H. Wilbur—U.S. Army, retired—well known as a soldier, educator, historian, diplomat, author, and world traveler. The article, entitled "That the Truth May Prevail" and written expressly for the SAR magazine of the National Society, Sons of the American Revolution, 2412 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20008, follows:

THAT THE TRUTH MAY PREVAIL

(By William H. Wilbur)

For almost two hundred years, George Washington's glorious example of total integrity has inspired Americans to be more courageous, more honest, more patriotic and more industrious. Yet individuals have appeared who have tried to destroy the Washington image. We have derived some consolation from the fact that, in every case, thorough examination has proven that the charges had no basis whatever, in honest fact.

Now, a new attack has appeared: a book which is both an assault on George Washington's character and an affront to all our honored standards of honesty and rectitude.

The author of this travesty achieves the appearance of veracity by printing in the first part of the book a facsimile of Washington's expenditures during the Revolution. Many pages later, he has concocted a supposed detailed analysis of the account. In doing this, the author has brazenly changed most of Washington's entries to others which are as much as eight times as large as the figures which Washington submitted.

Although it seems unbelievable, many readers have been misled into thinking that Washington padded his expense account. This is perhaps natural, for the average reader does not suspect inaccuracy, so does not check the correctness of the author's figure on any given page against Washington's figure sixty pages earlier. When we make such a check, we find that the author has made a host of unsupportable statements, and that Washington made none.

When the reputation of a person of great integrity is attacked by an unknown author, our first reaction is to decide to ignore the attack. We say we will not dignify such totally incorrect statements and insinuations. We tell each other that if we preserve a disdainful silence, the book will achieve its own destruction. Wishfully, we hope that the book will attain the oblivion which it so completely merits. Unfortunately, this kind of wishful thinking does not neutralize the misleading impression which the book continues to spread.

No, the book must be answered. Faithful, honest, true-blue Americans must not be left to wonder if there is perhaps some truth in the accusations. If those who know the truth remain silent, such doubts grow to beliefs.

The perceptive reader of the book will find a large number of errors. He will also find cleverly contrived inferences and innuendos as well as attempts to prove guilt by association through recounting the dishonest or dishonorable actions of others who may have had no more contact with Washington than the fact that they lived during the early period of our history.



On the first page of the book, we find Washington's statement that he would serve without pay, would only ask that the government reimburse him for his expenses. The record is clear that by this refusal Washington gave up a salary of \$500 a month. For the eight years of the war, this would have reached a total of \$48,000.

It is worth while to determine just how much of a sacrifice, if any, Washington made. This can be done by selecting out from Washington's expenditures the items which can be properly charged as personal. If we do this, we find that they reach a total of less than \$15,000. Thus, the author's statement that Washington made money by refusing a salary of \$48,000 for eight years is seen to be completely false. The truth is the government made a very advantageous deal; its profit was something over \$33,000.

The most bizarre fabrication in the book is the statement which reads: "For the eight years of the war General Washington turned in an expense account of \$449,261.51."

The correct figure, clearly stated by Washington at the end of his accounting, was 16,311 Pennsylvania Pounds. Expressed in dollars, this amounted to \$54,370.00, a far cry from the erroneous figure given in the book.

Many reviewers, we regret to say, have accepted the book's figures and have printed favorable reviews. One such review was headed "A Cool Half Million". Thus it seems clear that the most damaging misstatement in the book is the monumental exaggeration, the brazen substitution of nearly a half a million dollars for the actual, correct figure of less than 55 thousand dollars.

"But," someone will promptly, and correctly, say, "55 thousand dollars is a lot of money for a personal expense account!" We would agree, but in the same breath invite attention to the fact that the expenditures included in the accounting which Washington submitted covered much more than his personal expenses. They embraced:

1. All the disbursements for the very successful secret intelligence system which Washington maintained for eight years. As a result, Washington was always ahead of the British, never fell into any of the many traps they set for him.

2. Expenses incident to official travel by officers of his staff.

3. The necessary expenses involved in sending out groups to reconnoiter the enemy or the terrain.

4. The expenses incurred in feeding visitors at headquarters, including members of Congress, representatives of foreign governments, and a constant stream of American commanders visiting headquarters.

5. The account even includes other very proper expenditures which Washington made, such as those to win the help, or sometimes the neutrality, of Indians.

If we turn to the individual items on which the author bases his completely incorrect total of nearly a half a million dollars, we find that each one has been blown up to a figure far beyond the amount stated in Washington's accounting. This becomes very evident when we look at some of the specific items.

In the original accounting, we find, entered in George Washington's own handwriting, a record of the expenditure, on June 22, 1775, of 55 Pennsylvania Pounds for the purchase of "a light phaeton bought of Dr. Renaudet". (We would call it a light carriage.)

This same item is included in the author's analysis. But there we find it entered as, "To a light phaeton bought of Dr. Renaudet, \$1,430.00."

Under his formula for changing pounds to dollars, the author has multiplied the pounds by 26. The correct conversion figure should have been based on the fact that one pound equalled three and one-third dollars. Based

on such a correct ratio, we find that 55 pounds equalled \$183.15.

Thus we see that the padding cannot be charged to Washington.

The author's analysis goes on through some 170 repetitive pages. It takes up, in succession, each one of the two hundred and ninety-one entries which Washington submitted. In every case, the figure has been changed from that submitted by Washington.

The author was not content to exaggerate merely the figures that Washington submitted. For example, he has the unbelievable effrontery to tell the reader, "In terms of today's dollars, the Renaudet phaeton is the equivalent of roughly twelve Cadillac broughams." The truth is just the reverse, for one second-hand Cadillac costs twice as much as twelve phaetons would have cost. The author may have thought that this ridiculous exaggeration was a devastatingly funny remark, but most of us will not be able to find the humor.

The book also contains many deliberate attempts to twist Washington's motives, and to belittle him. For example, very early in the account, we find items of expense for secret intelligence. Thus, on July 15, 1775, we find a charge of "333-1/3 dollars given to . . . to induce him to go into the town of Boston to establish a secret correspondence for the purpose of conveying intelligence of the enemy's movements and designs." (This item, the author has calmly blown up from 333-1/3 dollars to \$2,600.)

Washington was careful to add a footnote which explained the reason why the name of the spy was omitted. It reads: "The names of persons who are employed (in spying) within the enemy lines and who may fall within their power cannot be inserted."

Washington's effort to protect the identity of the spy would seem to have been an intelligent and proper thing to do; for, once discovered, such informers were classed as spies and executed.

The author uses the nameless entry as an excuse to find fault with Washington. His soggy humor consists of scolding Washington for selfishly refusing to identify the spies, thus depriving these courageous patriots of the credit which is rightly due them.

Another measure of the book's Americanism may be found in the fact that, on several occasions, it refers to Washington's valiant soldiers as "Hippies".

Lastly, let us look at the book's major deception. In it, the author has first engaged in a lengthy, complicated discussion of the conversion of depreciated currencies to hard coin, or as he states, into "terms of today's dollars". This discussion of currencies is very successful in concealing the fact that he has multiplied Washington's paper currency figures by some figure (frequently 26) instead of dividing as he, of course, should have done. The result in each case is an enormous and totally incorrect figure which has no basis in fact or logic.

This explains how the author was, for example, able to achieve the hocus-pocus of changing Washington's figure of 333-1/3 dollars for intelligence services to \$2,600.00.

Similarly, as we have seen, the modest item of 55 Pennsylvania Pounds (which Washington recorded as the amount paid to Dr. Renaudet for his phaeton) has been blown up to the ridiculous figure of \$1,430.00.

When the author added up all the grossly enlarged single items, he obtained the incredible total of \$449,261.51. This, as we have seen, is the amount which the author then claimed that Washington had received from the U.S. Treasury at the end of the War for Independence. The truth is that the total is just as inaccurate as all its single components are.

Rather than accusing Washington of improper accounting, the author could have better spent his time in a factual statement

of the very considerable financial contribution which General Washington made to the patriot cause. This included:

1. The \$33,000 already mentioned as the profit which accrued to the government as a result of his generous conduct in serving without pay.

2. A very considerable sum which Washington spent to purchase U.S. Loan Office Certificates (The Liberty Loan Bonds of the day) during 1778, '79, '80, perhaps the darkest days of the war. The value of these certificates depreciated tremendously. This depreciation was so great that Washington suffered a loss of well over \$50,000.

3. During the war, Washington's farms operated in the red, year after year. A conservative estimate of the loss in this category would be \$40,000.

A. Loss of pay-----	\$33,000
B. Depreciation of U.S. Loan Certificates-----	50,000
C. Losses on farm-----	40,000

Total----- 123,000

The total of these three items is impressive:

As John C. Fitzgerald so correctly states, "if any other American backed the forlorn hope of independence with heart, mind, hand and purse, as did George Washington, he is yet to be discovered."

But to get back to the distressing book which is the subject of this effort, may we add one more comment:

The intelligent reader will find it even more bizarre than any of the author's sleight of hand performances, to learn that not a single one of the reviewers of this regrettable book reported any of the many examples of flagrant deception.

The disturbing consequence of the publication of this book is the fact that many readers, especially the young, may acquire, and forever retain, an incorrect picture of the Father of our Country. Let us therefore make it certain that the truth shall prevail; let us spread the correct facts far and wide so that Americans of today, and Americans of the future, can always stand up proudly, and say with complete conviction, "No, you are wrong! George Washington never padded his expense account—not one single penny!"

#### THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA

#### HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 1972

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, sometimes the truly good and therefore highly praised endeavors of our country have been so often written about, and commended, that additional praise that sounds fresh and reflects genuine feelings of pride is hard to come by.

Girl Scouts of America is a truly good and highly praised organization. And yet, can too much be said about the accomplishments and potential of this organization that unites our young women as sisters and instills in them a love of each other, of country, and of God. Can we speak too often of the challenges which Girl Scouts asks its members to rise to that are character-building preparation for the challenges they must face as young adults?

I admire this organization and its leaders deeply, and as a reflection of that

admiration I am delighted to join my colleagues in commemorating the 60th anniversary of the Girl Scouts of America.

#### FULBRIGHT RECALLS MUGGERIDGE THEORY

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I addressed the House emphasizing the unfortunate and totally negative attitude of the junior Senator from Arkansas toward Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

A very effective commentary on this subject was carried in the Aurora, Ill. Beacon News, of February 29 in a column by the highly esteemed international correspondent of the Copley Press, Dumitru Danielopol, which I insert in the RECORD:

FULBRIGHT RECALLS MUGGERIDGE THEORY  
(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—Senator J. William Fulbright's stubborn determination to dismantle Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty brings to mind Malcolm Muggeridge's theory of "the great liberal death wish."

The well-known British newsman, writer, TV and radio commentator sees the Free World threatened not so much by communism, but by the "death wish" of the left wing enunciated by liberal politicians, commentators and authors who find "our enemies are always right and our friends are always wrong."

Much of the comment on that people's paradise called Red China follows this line.

Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, two organizations created in the early 50s to beam true information into eastern Europe and the Soviet Union are obvious targets. They are American, therefore, they must be bad, or at least ineffectual.

Never mind the fact that their existence and American backing has been a great inspiration to people behind the Iron Curtain. Never mind that they are a daily proof that the people of America have not forgotten those snared into a Communist net. And never mind that they help dispel erroneous information about the United States from Communist propaganda machines.

Fulbright says that they are useless and must go. The financing of the two stations for years was handled mostly by CIA. Now is it to be public. The House is in favor of continuing the operations. In the Senate the decision rests with the Foreign Relations Committee, chaired by Sen. Fulbright, D-Ark.

He is adamant. The stations are an "anachronism" he says. "They are cold war relics." They will continue only over his "dead body." The cold war is over and we just aren't smart enough to know it.

I have often been a critic of RFE operations. I say now that on every count Fulbright is wrong. The cold war is not over. It goes on more furiously than ever.

If the cold war was over, why do the Soviets make every kind of propaganda to disband NATO, to promote a phony European Security conference, to bring about the dismemberment of Yugoslavia? Use every means to push the United States from Europe, the Mediterranean and North Africa? Why do they support every kind of subversive, anti-capitalist group in the Free World?

Moscow and other Communist capitals in Eastern Europe have been ranting for years

against RFE and Radio Liberty. They even threatened not to send teams to the Olympic Games in Munich in 1972 unless the stations there were silenced.

Now the blow comes from Washington. The silencing of these two voices would—in the opinion of this correspondent—be the greatest cold war victory that the Communists ever won. It would tell their subjugated people that Soviet rule was inevitable—endless.

The prestige of our country behind the Iron Curtain and among exiles and refugees in Western Europe would sink from sight.

It is ironic to find that Fulbright wants to strike such a blow at a moment when Red China is bidding for the support of the captive peoples and the ethnics abroad to form a common front against Russia.

The Senator may say his own "mea culpa," but he has no right to chant them for people who want to live.

#### CHICAGO TODAY SURVEY ON AMNESTY

### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently, Chicago Today ran a survey concerning amnesty for draft evaders. Their survey brought a response of 68 percent readers against amnesty, or more than two out of every three.

Because this subject is very controversial and generating a lot of interest, I include in the RECORD today an editorial written by Mr. Peter Reich of Chicago Today concerning their survey and his views on this matter:

A NEWSMAN SOUNDS OFF—HE WOULD BAN AMNESTY FOR "CRAVEN BUMS"

(By Peter Reich)

It restores my faith in mankind to see that two of every three Chicago Today readers responding to a poll on amnesty for draft evaders and deserters voted "No!"

To me, it is the height of effrontery for some craven, selfish bum who flees the country and lets someone else do the bleeding and dying for him to come back whining for "amnesty."

As I see it, these cowardly misfits have forfeited forever the right to be called Americans.

So the little darlings questioned the wisdom of our fight in Southeast Asia, did they? So did many of the 45,000 American men who laid down their lives there.

But we must have compassion for the idealistic youth who left their country because they didn't want to kill, you say?

Tell it to the young Chicagoan in Hines Hospital who was too compassionate to carry a gun. He became a medic, to devote himself to saving lives—and was paralyzed for the rest of his life by a Viet Cong hand grenade hurled at him while he was binding up a buddy's wounds.

But we had no business getting into the Viet Nam conflict, some people argue. The Communists "aren't really bad, like the Nazis were."

That may be so. Yet I remember what a 28-year-old Navy pilot, Lt. Dieter Dengler, who managed to escape from his Communist captors after being shot down, told me at Loyola University:

"First, they beat me until I lost consciousness. When I woke up, I was hanging by my heels from a tree, my head barely touching the ground.

"Then the Communists smeared honey on my face and pushed it into an anthill. There were thousands of ants. I must have screamed for about a minute before I passed out."

Don't we have business opposing that kind of evil? I think we do.

As a matter of fact, I think the Viet Nam war may be one of the worst unselfish wars any country ever has fought. We've paid a terrible price, in blood and wealth, knowing all along we had nothing to gain for ourselves. All we've ever sought to accomplish is to keep the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong from taking over South Viet Nam.

And as President Nixon's latest offer should make clear to any but the most misguided, the United States has bent over backwards to end the conflict.

In sum, the crocodile-tear pleas of the draft-dodgers and deserters that they ought to be allowed to return scot-free to "the country we love" turn me off.

#### PLASTICS RESIDUES FOUND IN BLOODSTREAMS

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of January 18, 1972, carried an article under the heading "Plastics Residues Found in Bloodstreams" which again points out the need for strong legislation to control the introduction of such substances into commerce. I include the text of the article at this point in the RECORD:

PLASTICS RESIDUES FOUND IN BLOODSTREAMS  
(By Victor Cohn)

Humans are just a little plastic now.

A National Heart and Lung Institute chemist has found chemicals from plastics in the bloodstreams of 86 out of 100 laboratory workers and patients. In his opinion, this is "a fairly typical population group."

He knows of no immediate danger. But like many other scientists and government environmental officials, he is seriously worried about what they call "the completely unknown long-range health effects" of some of the chemicals in the millions of tons of plastics all around us—and by now inside us.

"I know this is going to be a significant future issue," said Warren Muir of the White House's Council on Environmental Quality. "It's potentially our next bad one."

In a broadcast sponsored by the American Chemical Society last month, narrator Norman Metzger, cited "hard evidence" that plasticizers, the softening agents in many plastics and plastic films, "have indeed become a considerable environmental contaminant that enters the body."

The current lack of testing of these chemicals for long-range effects is one reason why Council and Environmental Protection Agency officials are pushing for passage of a Toxic Substances Control Act that got bogged down last year in Congress.

It is one reason why Senate environmentalists, led on this issue by Sen. William B. Spong Jr. (D-Va.) are proposing an even tougher version that calls for federal approval of every new chemical in any product.

The chemicals found in the 86 human bloodstreams by Dr. George W. A. Milne at the National Heart Institute at Bethesda are plasticizers known as phthalate esters.

They are mainly used in polyvinyl chloride, a common plastic often 30 to 60 percent



plasticizer. Polyvinyl chloride is used to make water bottles, car seat upholstery, floor coverings and hospital and blood bank blood-storage bags and tubing.

The same plasticizers are used in lesser amounts in some other plastics, including some food wraps. They are used in some insect repellants and pesticides.

The plasticizers in such products are apparently dissolved out by materials like blood, milk and fats. They also escape into the air.

Much of the sticky film found on the inside of auto windshields is plasticizer that has escaped from vinyl car upholstery. Some film comes from cigarette smoke, some from air pollution.) The same plasticizers are inhaled by anyone in the car.

"The darned things are everywhere!" says Dr. Richard Schoettger, director of the U.S. Fish Pesticides Laboratory at Columbia, Mo.

The amounts found by Dr. Milne in his subjects' bloodstreams are from 10 to 30 parts per million of blood serum. That may not sound like much to the ordinary person, but it is far from a tiny number to a biochemist. It is far larger than the five or so parts of DDT per million that are now part of human beings, to scientists' discomfort.

In recent months, moreover:

Phthalate plasticizers have been found in the heart muscle of cattle, dogs, rabbits and rats by Dr. Darius Nazir and colleagues at Sinal Hospital, Baltimore. With Barbara Bierl and Dr. Morton Beroza of the Agriculture Department Research Station at Beltsville, they found phthalates in association with mitochondria, the parts of every cell that supply it with energy. This raises the possibility that the plastic contaminants could interfere with cells.

Phthalates have killed embryonic chicken heart cells in culture in tests by Dr. Robert L. DeHaan of the Carnegie Institution in collaboration with Dr. Robert J. Rubin at the Johns Hopkins School of Public Health. Rubin earlier found that such plasticizers were not only extracted by blood from hospital containers but were also slowly metabolized in the liver.

The same chemicals have been found in "significant" amounts—up to 5.5 parts per million—in Mississippi, Alabama and other southern commercial catfish ponds. There is no evidence of harm to the fish or their consumers, but the Columbia, Mo., fish pesticide lab has exposed tiny lake creatures—microcrustaceans called *Daphnia magna*—to phthalate concentrations as low as three parts per billion. Even these inhibited the creatures' growth and reproduction by 60 percent.

The same creatures, it was also learned, can concentrate phthalate traces in lake water by up to 13,000 times—and tiny fish commonly feed on such creatures.

In other Missouri tests, food containing high phthalate levels produced abortions in guinea pigs and caused "large mortalities" in zebra fish. The zebra offspring usually died in a crescent shape, indicating disturbed calcium metabolism.

High levels of phthalate also produced dead fetuses and birth deformities in rats in tests by Dr. John Autian, director of the University of Tennessee's material science toxicology laboratory and one of the nation's leading authorities on plasticizer pollution.

"I'm not worried about pregnant women being exposed to plasticizers," Autian said last week.

"I am concerned that if these things are seeping into our bodies, it may have some effect over long periods on our cellular constituents. If we're breathing these things in or getting them through food wrappings or other sources, in 10 or 20 or 30 years will there be a biological effect?"

"Phthalates are very oily solutions. Our cell membranes are very oil-like. Consequently phthalates could get into the membranes and maybe in some way alter them. They

might put the cell under added stress, or make its components adhesive so they might not pass through the capillary beds of the lung. This may be a lead to a condition called 'shock lung' (a sometimes fatal lung disease).

"All I am saying is that perhaps these substances are indeed innocuous, as everyone has believed. But there is not enough research on them. And financial support in this area is practically zero."

Both chemical firms and the Food and Drug Administration agree that no toxic effects have been demonstrated in human beings.

The FDA does have some coordinators and special groups assigned to watch the problem. The FDA and other agencies have increased their research somewhat, and more is under discussion, though Autian said: "Every now and then I get a call from FDA or NIH about doing more research. Then I hear nothing."

Plastics makers are seeking ways of chemically bonding other chemicals to plasticizers, so the latter could not possibly migrate. But this goal has not been achieved even in the laboratory for the polyvinyl chloride or PVC plastics, the largest plasticizer-users.

The basic problem, says Dr. Milne, is that up to now most chemicals have been considered innocent unless proved harmful.

Now, he said, "I think one should worry about anything that is absorbed from the outside, because that is by definition a pollutant. It may be that some are quite harmless, but I would assume that none is harmless unless proved otherwise."

## ROVING UNDERSEA THRUST—WITH LOS ANGELES IN ITS SIGHTS

### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the continued expansion of the Soviet Navy, and particularly its submarine fleet, is a matter of critical concern in the maintenance of our Nation's defenses. I read with special interest the following article in the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner by staff writer, Al Stump, concerning the Navy's antisubmarine warfare activities and commend this article to my colleagues' careful review:

[From Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, Feb. 13, 1972]

## ROVING UNDERSEA THRUST—WITH LOS ANGELES IN ITS SIGHTS

(By Al Stump)

PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII.—Airborne electronic "eyes" flashed word here from northwest of Honolulu last April that a near 400-foot-long Russian submarine had surfaced amidst one of the most highly-guarded ocean areas on earth.

Swooping over, Navy tracker planes identified her as a Yankee-class ship carrying 16 ballistic missiles—the equal of our Polaris nuclear subs.

"We were sort of taken aback," says Deputy Commander, Capt. Edward E. Williams of Anti-Submarine Warfare Forces, Pacific. "We knew of a heavy Russian subsea presence in the eastern Pacific. But this was the first confirmation of a 'Y' class big boy so far from home base."

Modified Soviet prowlers of this type are believed capable of lofting nuclear missiles from Hawaii to California, and beyond—some 3000 miles.

Pressure of an undeclared global under-

sea war is pushing subs of the USSR Pacific Fleet closer and closer to California waters.

The move is regarded here as critical.

"They're within range of Los Angeles City Hall," say strategists under Vice Admiral Evan P. Aurand, the top submarine boss in these parts. "And close enough to hit Vandenberg Missile Base, ICBM sites at Chico and elsewhere and military bases at San Diego, Riverside and elsewhere."

Aurand and U.S. First Fleet Commander Vice Adm. Raymond E. Peet liken it to "having a many-chambered gun pointed at your head in your own back yard."

Invasion of sea space which the Navy cannot afford to yield is a relatively new move by the Soviets.

And it's been a quiet, methodical, growing one.

An unknown number of Russia's estimated 92 nuclear-powered subs of both the cruise-missile and attack type now move in regularly from home bases at Vladivostok and the Kamchatka Peninsula to study eastern Pacific approaches and—reportedly—sow it with factfinding electronic "bugs."

While most attention has been on the Mediterranean, the Atlantic and Cuba, a buildup threatening to West Coast cities and installations has developed. "Every inch of California coast, and more, is vulnerable," say Hawaiian experts.

Nowadays the Russians are estimated to have 20 times more undersea boats in their Pacific detachment than Hitler had at the outset of World War II.

Word at Ford Island is that one USSR submarine yard, alone—Sverdovsk on the White Sea—has a greater building capacity than all U.S. sub yards combined.

"Kremlin cigars" are a big part of the fastest naval boom in history. Last January, President Nixon advised the Defense Department to prepare a \$15 billion sub and anti-sub system as a key deterrent against nuclear attack through the 1980s. The total USSR submarine strength is 355, compared to 142 for the United States.

Outmatched in numbers, we also lack guided (cruise) missile submarines, of which Russia has a reported 65. These vessels can stand off 300 to 400 miles and hit surface ships beyond their range of retaliation.

Big, \$1-billion-each carriers such as the Eisenhower, Nimitz and Kennedy continue to roll down our shipways, but the sub program lags.

This discomfited commanders here and adds to the difficulty of their job—that of setting up defenses.

Visitors here quickly learn how intently the threat to the Pacific Coast is being met.

More than 12,000 men and the most advanced of electronic inventions are employed between the First Fleet out of San Diego, Long Beach and Hawaii and the Seventh Fleet, based at Yokosuka, Japan. Hawaii is a strategic point as the Russ show more and more curiosity about our off-continent defenses.

The first thing one notices at Pearl Harbor is a captured, two-man Japanese sub—a "human torpedo"—which was used to attack Pearl in the raid of December 1941. The attacking force sneaked at least a dozen of these into the harbor as a prelude to the aerial bombardment.

The displayed, 54-foot-long object is there as a reminder that in any future, electrified war, submarines will play the vital role.

Basic to everything going on today in the Pacific is ASW—the core of which is the ability to peer into the practically opaque, sound-crammed ocean and detect the presence of an invading ship. "Detection is everything," points out Adm. Aurand. "You may produce the best ASW weapon in the world, but until we find the enemy sub it's useless."

When our undersea patrols leave here or San Diego, they carry a fantastic device called the magnetic anomaly detector. This

device spies out obstructions or anomalies in the earth's magnetic field precisely enough to say whether it's a whale, a mass of plankton—or a nuclear or conventional submarine. "It can even tell us by comparing a signal against a known sub's magnetic profile what class of sub it is," says the ASW command. "It can go further—predict the next contact of the ship, its course and speed."

The U.S. now is fitting the advanced, 3000-mile-range Poseidon nuclear missile into 31 of our 41 ballistic subs. Protecting the West Coast from Mexico to Canada are 23 "Flotilla One" subs—10 of them nuclear-powered attack vessels. They can stay underwater indefinitely, using rotating "Blue" and "Gold" crews. Their target accuracy is 99 percent.

Included in off-California service is the \$85 million USS Dolphin, the world's deepest-diving sub and unique in the Navy. Last Jan. 8 the keel was laid for the USS Los Angeles, which is designed to be the quietest-running nuclear sub the world has known. She'll be in duty by early 1973.

"Poseidon missiles will be our important new deterrent weapon," explains Capt. Ed Williams. "They'll be outfitted with multiple warheads, each of which can be separately targeted." This is the "ultimate weapon"—MIRV (Multiple Independently Targetable Reentry Vehicles). Once fired, MIRV splits off into a number of missiles—each with an objective and flying too fast to be shot down."

"Assuming the Russians have MIRV capability, too," ASW chiefs remind you, "it's our job to be able to destroy any undersea attack before it can be triggered."

Unspoken but a terrible fact is that a multi-megaton missile launched underwater from a submarine is next to impossible to stop. Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles must travel many miles. From a sub, it's only a pop-shot to land.

Only five months ago, a Soviet convoy of seven warships insolently steamed into off-limits Hawaiian waters, passing between Maui and the Big Island of Hawaii. Included were two subs of the attack type. In refueling 20 miles off Diamond Head, the prowlers discharged oil into the sea.

"We had a big hue and cry about pollution," says Adm. Feet's office. "As far as we were concerned, this wasn't the point. The point was that subs, destroyers and supply ships of their Navy could function this far from base and even loiter for several days on the local scene. They showed us great range."

How effective is our detection? "We knew all about them five weeks before they got here," goes on the report. "We'd tracked them closely from off the Siberian coast and never lost contact."

On the other hand, the admirals claim that Soviet antisubmarine forces have never yet detected an American missile sub on patrol.

Operating from California bases and Hawaii is another system of locating invaders far from the West Coast. Soviet subs enter the Pacific from the Indian Ocean through the Strait of Malacca between the Malay Peninsula and Sumatra and through the Japanese Strait between Korea and Japan—which is rated deadly. These are the subhunter tracker-killer aircraft, chiefly the Grumman S-2 Tracker and the Lockheed P-3C Orion.

"For example, let's say that in wartime an enemy sub is operating in the upper eastern Pacific," says Capt. Williams. "How do we pin him down and wipe him out?"

The current answer is a combination of speedy little S-2's equipped with sonobuoy launchers and a flying data-processor plane which carries more electronic gear than any aircraft in the world. These, along with helicopters.

Initially, the trackers send sound buoys plunging deep into the sea, weaving a wide pattern from which a sub, no matter how

evasive, cannot escape. Computers absorb the findings of the sonobuoys, indicating the point of attack.

Comes next either the 400-knot PC-3, equipped with another 52 launchers for sonobuoys, a MAD (magnetic anomaly detector) system digital target computers and a variety of weapons—air-to-surface missiles, depth bombs, torpedoes, rockets and mines.

"The PC-3 is the most highly computerized submarine killer in the air today," states Adm. Bernard Cleary, commander-in-chief Pacific Fleet. Her internal systems can handle four million bits of data per minute.

Helicopters, too, are being widely used off the decks of warships. They carry homing devices on torpedoes which are drawn directly to the hull of a ship.

Just last week a new S-3A jet tracker was test-flown out of Burbank airport. Attached to the Pacific Fleet's Naval Air Force squadrons at North Island, this new craft has the range to sweep the waters from Los Angeles to Hawaii.

Pearl and San Diego are proof that the Navy continues to believe strongly in the giant, nuclear-powered aircraft carrier—despite the fact that the Soviet Union has yet to build its first nuclear surface warship. The USSR has no major operational aircraft carriers. But operating from Hawaii and California are units of the 15 carriers of our fleet.

Under a new concept the big CV carriers haul a mixture of fixed-wing, strike planes and rotary-wing and vertical-lift aircraft—the whole bag of defensive-offensive air warfare.

Another aspect of ASW, which the Navy keeps under tight wraps, is the matter of oceanographic espionage.

This is the highly-secret "spies in the sea" game which the USSR and U.S.A. are playing in the Pacific, as elsewhere.

At Pearl Harbor, officials will say only that fixed undersea listening devices are used—including areas off Los Angeles and San Francisco. How broadly the Continental Shelf off Southern California is "bugged" against invaders isn't known. But it has been revealed that two networks of sonar cables called Caesar and Sossus are operational.

Evidence that the Soviets are building subs with power plants producing very little noise is said to be behind the "bugging" program.

For Californians, sitting atop a huge military complex, what is happening in ASW is of growing importance. The periscopes are growing closer.

But the countermeasures—seen from here—appear to be as highly effective as men and science and money can make them.

## THE SCOUTING PROGRAM IN CONNECTICUT

### HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 8, 1972

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the phrase "America's Manpower Begins With Boypower" has been coined by the Boy Scouts of America to emphasize its ambitious and commendable goal to involve one-third of all Scout-age boys in Scouting by 1976, the 200th anniversary of our Nation. In implementing this goal the Boy Scouts of America has developed several innovative programs, such as Project SOAR—Save Our American Resources, Operation Reach—a nationwide fight against drug abuse, and providing

for the admission of young women into the exploring program. These timely changes have acted to enhance the success of Scouting in Connecticut and throughout the country. I commend the Boy Scouts of America on these innovations and Boypower 1976.

At this time I include the following correspondence from Alden Barber, chief Scout executive, concerning the Scouting program in Connecticut:

FEBRUARY 3, 1972.

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN,  
Congressman from Connecticut.

DEAR MR. MONAGAN: At the National Governors' Conference in Puerto Rico last fall, Gov. Daniel Evans of Washington made a formal presentation on behalf of the Boy Scouts of America. Coinciding with Governor Evans' statement, separate reports were prepared for each Governor describing the progress of Scouting in his State. At this time of our anniversary celebration, we are pleased to share with you the report for your State.

You will no doubt be interested in knowing that we are proceeding with deliberate speed with our long-range plan BOYPOWER '76, whose goal is to deeply involve in Scouting a representative one-third of all Scout-age boys by the 200th anniversary of the Nation.

Scouting is proud of its accomplishments. But even now with Operation Reach, our nationwide fight against drug abuse, and Project SOAR (Save Our American Resources), our national Conservation Good Turn which is extending into its second year, it is clear that the complete record has yet to be written.

Sincerely,

ALDEN G. BARBER.

## CONNECTICUT AND SCOUTING

The State of Connecticut and the Boy Scouts of America have long worked together on matters of mutual interest and concern such as camping, problems of pollution, and problems of drug abuse. Connecticut and Scouting each give to the other, making contributions in many ways. The State gives to Scouting through its people, cooperation, and locale. Scouting in turn gives to the State through a program of benefit to all the State residents, in particular the young.

## PEOPLE

A number of men from Connecticut serve the Boy Scouts of America in major positions of leadership. Donald M. Kendall of Greenwich, chairman and chief executive officer of PepsiCo, Inc., has been a member of the BSA Executive Board since 1968. Regional vice-chairmen of Region 1 included Donald N. Clark and Atwood C. Ely. Mr. Clark from Orange is an executive of the Asgrow Seed Co. Mr. Ely from Mystic is the senior vice-president of the Hartford National Bank and Trust Co.

Last year Harold S. Barrett of Manchester was presented with one of Scouting's highest awards, the Silver Antelope, for his distinguished service to boyhood in the region.

## PLACES

The first National Camping School in Region 1 in 15 years was held last year at the Lake of Isles Camp in Connecticut. The camp school was visited by members of the regional executive committee. The school included a police academy and an aquatic camp.

The police academy included discussion of personal protection, emergency equipment, public safety, and law enforcement. The aquatic camp included such activities as swimming, boating, canoeing, a trip to Mystic seaport, and camping on an island.

Certainly the State of Connecticut has made through its people and its resources many contributions to the Boy Scouts of America.



## PROJECT SOAR

Project SOAR is Scouting's contribution in the fight to preserve our environment. The program is a good example of the benefits Scouting can provide to the State. Project SOAR—a program to Save Our American Resources—is a year-round ecological effort. But citing the results of a single day's effort can show the overall success of Project SOAR. In Connecticut, on Scouting Keep America Beautiful Day—June 5 of this year—1,800 adult volunteer Scouters and 8,000 Scouts and Explorers, in cooperation with Government agencies, cleaned up more than 1,000 miles of State highways, rivers, and coastline and collected approximately 700 tons of trash and litter and spruced up more than 1,800 acres of empty lots and parkland. These June 5 activities are a small portion of the entire Project SOAR program that, incidentally, has been so successful that the BSA Executive Board has renewed it for at least 1 more year.

## OPERATION REACH

Drug abuse is another problem area in which Scouting is attempting to have as

much impact as it has had in Project SOAR. Our new approach to this major problem area is called Operation Reach. The Boy Scouts of America pioneered this program in a few special pilot projects in the past year and is now extending it throughout Connecticut and the rest of the country.

## CAMPING

Camping is an activity important both to the Boy Scouts of America and to Connecticut. There are 17 Scout camps operated by the 14 Scout councils in Connecticut. Last year more than 12,000 Scouts and Explorers stayed in these camps with their 605 troops and posts for long-term camping. In addition, 276 disadvantaged boys, who were not then Scouts, spent a week or more camping in these camps as the guests of Scouting.

From all parts of the country, Scouts are also invited to use 19 camping facilities in Connecticut that are part of the BSA National Campways tour program.

## CONNECTICUT SCOUTING FACTS

Connecticut's 14 Scout councils serve a total boy membership of around 77,000. Included in this figure, as of the first of this year, are 3,000 young adults in 236 Explorer posts, 32,000 Scouts in 955 troops, and 42,000 Cub Scouts in 865 packs. Working with these youth on a volunteer basis are 26,000 adults. A professional staff of 67 aids these 102,000 citizens of Connecticut who are actively engaged in Scouting.

But all is not statistics with Connecticut Scouting. The 1970 Spencer Award for program excellence was given to three Connecticut Scout councils. They are the Central Connecticut Council, headquartered in Meriden; the Nathan Hale Council, headquartered in New Britain; and the Eastern Connecticut Council, headquartered in Norwich.

All in all, Connecticut has proved to be an important contributor to the Scout movement; just as Scouting has proved to be an important contributor to the State of Connecticut.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 9, 1972

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Lead me, O Lord, in Thy righteousness: Make Thy way straight before my face.—Psalm 5: 8.*

O Lord, our God, who art the source of light and life, and the fountain of flowing love, may Thy spirit arise within us as we wait upon Thee in this moment of meditation. Open our hearts to receive the good news of Thy word and let Thy spirit guide us in the paths of truth and love.

Grant that our leaders and all those to whom our people have given authority may be filled with Thy spirit, the spirit of wisdom, understanding, and good will. May Thy presence abide in the heart of our free institutions that our country may remain forever the fortress of freedom and our people enjoy the life of liberty in the land of liberty.

We pray that peace may come to our world and with peace the fruits of righteousness and good will. Be with us this day and all days and keep us walking in the ways of the Master. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on March 6, 1972, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2828. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rose Scanio;

H.R. 3093. An act for the relief of Mrs. Crescencia Lyra Serna and her minor children, Maria Minde Fe Serna, Sally Garoza

Serna, Gonzalo Garoza Serna, and James Garoza Serna;

H.R. 4319. An act for the relief of Josephine Dumpit;

H.R. 5179. An act for the relief of Soo Yong Kwak;

H.R. 6506. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hind Nicholas Chaber, Georgette Hanna Chaber, Jeanette Hanna Chaber, and Violette Hanna Chaber;

H.R. 6912. An act for the relief of William Lucas (also known as Vasilios Loukatis); and

H.R. 8540. An act for the relief of Eleonora G. Mpolakis.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10834. An act authorizing the State of Alaska to operate passenger vessel of foreign registry between ports in Alaska, and between ports in Alaska and ports in the State of Washington, for a limited period of time.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10390. An act to extend the life of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 602) entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of judgments, when appropriated, recovered by the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont., in paragraphs 7 and 10, docket No. 50233, U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 671) entitled "An act to provide for division and for the disposition of the funds ap-

propriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Blackfeet Tribe of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont., and the Gros Ventre Tribe of the Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont., in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 279-A, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 860. An act relating to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; and

S. 996. An act relating to the transportation of mail by the U.S. Postal Service.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to section 123 (a) of Public Law 91-605, appointed Mr. STAFFORD as a member of the Commission on Highway Beautification in lieu of Mr. WEICKER, excused.

## URGENT SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, 1972

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1097) making certain urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1972, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-909), which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire, in the absence of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow), whether he is aware of the filing of this report?

Mr. MAHON. Yes. The joint resolution was reported unanimously from the Committee on Appropriations today.

Mr. DU PONT reserved all points of order on the joint resolution.

## NEW LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS: A MAJOR BUDGET CONTINGENCY

(Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the Presi-