

dent, I thank the Senator. I also thank the distinguished assistant Republican leader.

I think the record should show that had the Senator from West Virginia not, by inadvertence, failed to contact the Senator from Virginia in conformity with my previous assurance that I would do just that, the Senator from Virginia would have been consulted. Senators would have known the nature of his amendment, and it is quite possible that there would have been no unanimous-consent agreements at all worked out with respect to this bill and other amendments thereto until and unless there could have been a meeting of the minds with respect to the Senator's amendment. So, no harm has been done.

With the cooperation and understanding of all Senators involved here, including the two managers of the bill (Mr. TOWER and Mr. SPARKMAN), the Senator from Virginia will now be able to offer his nongermane amendment. As of this time, there is no time limitation on that amendment. The managers of the bill will get together tomorrow with the Senator from Virginia, the assistant Republican leader, the majority leader, and myself to see if perchance we can still possibly arrive at a time limitation on the Senator's amendment.

So I am very happy and pleased that we have been able to resolve this difficult matter. I appreciate the cooperation of Senators, and I apologize to the Senator from Virginia for the oversight on my part.

Mr. President, so that we may have a clear understanding, what about amendments to the Byrd amendment? I would

assume, and I ask unanimous consent, that the vacating of any time agreement with respect to the amendment by the Senator from Virginia (Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.) also apply to any amendments to that amendment as of now, because otherwise there would be a time limitation on an amendment to his amendment of 30 minutes.

So I think that if the distinguished minority whip is agreeable, I will ask unanimous consent at this time that there be no time limitation on amendment by the Senator from Virginia (Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.).

Here again, on tomorrow, we will meet and see if we can work out something whereby a time agreement can be reached which would be all-encompassing with regard to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, the proposal made by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia is a most appropriate one. It would not seem logical to remove the time limitation on the amendment and then have a time limitation on the amendment to the amendment. So that I think the request of the Senator from West Virginia is most appropriate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the program for tomorrow is as follows:

The Senate will convene at 11:30 a.m. After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, the following Senators will be recognized: Mr. GRIFFIN, for 15 minutes; Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, for 10 minutes.

At 12 o'clock noon, the Senate will resume consideration of the unfinished business, the Par Value Modification Act, S. 929, Calendar No. 82. There is a time limitation on the bill and on amendments thereto. There will be ye-and-nay votes during the afternoon of tomorrow.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11:30 A.M.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 8:01 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 4, 1973, at 11:30 a.m.

#### CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 3, 1973:

##### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

John H. Stender, of Washington, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

(The above nomination was approved subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### KENT FRIZZELL, OF KANSAS, NAMED INTERIOR SOLICITOR

#### HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pride that those of us from Kansas learned of the President's nomination of Kent Frizzell, of Wichita, to be Solicitor of the Department of Interior. Mr. Frizzell has served with distinction as Assistant Attorney General, Land and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice for more than a year.

Kent Frizzell is a good friend; he enjoys the support and admiration of many Kansans who have followed his career of public service. We are confident that he will continue to render distinguished service to our Nation in his new capacity as Solicitor at the Interior Department. We congratulate him and wish him well.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a news release issued by Secretary of Interior Rogers C. B. Morton following the President's nomination of Mr. Frizzell:

### SECRETARY MORTON COMMENDS NOMINATION OF KENT FRIZZELL AS INTERIOR SOLICITOR

President Nixon's nomination of Kent Frizzell to be Solicitor of the Department of the Interior won praise today from Interior Secretary Rogers C. B. Morton.

"Mr. Frizzell's experience in handling land and natural resource problems as well as his broad knowledge of Federal-State relationships especially in the West are excellent qualifications for this important post at Interior," Secretary Morton said. "I look forward to working closely with Mr. Frizzell in solving the many complex legal issues which Interior now faces."

Frizzell, 44, has been Assistant Attorney General, Land and Natural Resources Division, at the Department of Justice in Washington since January 1972. His nomination to the Interior post is subject to Senate confirmation.

The Solicitor is Interior's chief legal officer and is the third ranking official of the Department behind the Secretary and Under Secretary. Frizzell would succeed Mitchell Melich, who has been Solicitor since 1969.

Frizzell has served since March 1972 as Chairman of the Federal Bar Association's Council on Natural Resources, a public service position requiring extensive knowledge of the natural resource field and filled by appointment of the President of the Federal Bar Association.

Frizzell was the Republican nominee for Governor of Kansas in 1970. He was Attorney General of the State of Kansas from

1965 to 1969. Among other public offices he has been Chairman of the Kansas State Accounting Board and President of the Wichita Board of Education.

Born February 11, 1929, in Wichita, Frizzell attended Wichita public schools. He did undergraduate work at Northwestern University, holds a B.A. degree from Friends University, Wichita, and a J. D. degree from Washburn University Law School, Topeka. He was a lecturer in business law at Wichita State University, and practiced law in Kansas from 1955 to 1968.

Frizzell has held a number of civic posts including State Legal Counsel, Kansas Jaycees; Judge Advocate, American Legion Department of Kansas, and Trustee, Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory. He has been an active member of the Kansas Wildlife Federation.

Frizzell and his wife Shirley have five children. Their home is in Falls Church, Virginia.

#### BIG BROTHERS PROGRAM

#### HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, throughout the Nation, Mr. President, the Big Brothers

ers program has for years counseled and given guidance to thousands of fatherless boys. It is beneficial, not only to the American boys it serves, but to their parents, the Big Brothers themselves and to the community as a whole. For the Big Brothers program is more than just an altruistic gesture by a few concerned citizens. It is also a pragmatic method of dealing with some of the potential social and family problems that turn juveniles into juvenile delinquents.

Let us be frank about it. Without the attention these youngsters now receive from their Big Brothers, many of them would end up in detention centers. Unless these young people are given an opportunity to talk over their problems with understanding adults now, the chances are greater that we, the public, will hear from them at a later date, be it in some dark alley, or when we return home some night to find our car stolen or our home burglarized.

But this is a lesson this administration has not yet learned. For although they talk constantly about "law and order," their proposed changes and cutbacks under title IV of the Social Security Act would jeopardize the entire Big Brothers program and all that it stands for.

Mr. President, to demonstrate my concern for the Big Brothers and to further inform my colleagues to the grave hazards of those proposed cutbacks, I insert a sample of correspondence from participants in the Sacramento Big Brothers program in the RECORD:

MARCH 16, 1973.

Congressman JOHN E. MOSS,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOSS: I am writing to you in regards to the proposed changes in regulations for "Service Programs for Families and Children" under Title IV of the Social Security Act. As I understand it, the proposed changes do not provide for "preventative services" (Big Brothers' basic philosophy) and this would jeopardize our present Purchase of Service Contract with the Sacramento County Welfare Department.

As you must know Big Brothers is an International organization of volunteer men who provide mature adult-male friendship and direction to Fatherless Boys on a one-to-one basis (under the supervision of Big Brothers' professional staff). Our main goal is to help Fatherless Boys grow into responsive, respected and contributing citizens of their communities and Country.

During the past year 32,000 FREE hours of service were provided by volunteer Big Brothers to Fatherless Boys in the Sacramento community.

At present our Sacramento Chapter of Big Brothers of America is providing service to approximately 350 Fatherless Boys and their families at a cost of \$250 per boy per year (for interviewing, screening, counseling and supervising a Big Brother-Little Brother "matching"). Considering the cost of a youngster going through the Juvenile Courts and then to a Correction Facility (\$6500 per year) we feel we are making a sound investment and at the same time saving the California Taxpayers money.

Should our Service Contract with the Sacramento County Welfare Department be terminated because of the proposed changes in the Social Security Act, we would have to cut back our service by more than half.

We would only be able to continue operations on a limited basis through private donations.

How do we tell a mother and her son "Sorry, but because of new regulations in the Social Security Act we can no longer help you."

I cannot state too strongly the importance of the Big Brothers Program to the Sacramento community. Our Big Brother volunteers have a 90% success ratio, and what a waste of our community and the families we serve if we must cut back our services.

Will you please do your utmost to modify and/or change these proposed regulations in the Social Security Act to the point that we can continue to service our community. I do not think we are asking too much, considering the number of volunteer hours that are contributed to our program by volunteer Big Brothers.

Thanking you in advance for your consideration of this letter.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE G. BROEHAN  
President.

This letter is written to you on behalf of my son, who is a fatherless boy. My son has had the good fortune of having a Big Brother for two years, in those two years he had graduated from a class for the Educationally Handicapped to regular fourth grade and has overcome many emotional problems. After all these accomplishments have come about I find that these services we have enjoyed will be drastically reduced or terminated. Some boys will lose their Big Brothers and the boys who have been on a waiting list will be dropped.

You can appreciate, I am sure, how it is for some boys who haven't a man in their family picture to help guide them on the right road in a world where the wrong road is often glorified and profitable. I am turning to you for assistance. If there is anything you can do to help keep these funds available for a worthy cause it would be greatly appreciated by Little Brothers, Big Brothers, and mothers of Little Brothers.

Mrs. KATHY ROY.

The Big Brothers Association . . . They are a major source of preventing delinquency in fatherless boys, which are increasing in number every day. The funds your new system will deprive them of will later have to be used in juvenile courts, etc.

To me it would be like immunizing a person after they have a disease.

Mrs. POMIE V. T. LOMAS.

Big Brothers in Sacramento have done a great job in the past and I feel very strongly they will continue to do so in the future, that is of course, if they don't suffer any cutbacks from the Federal Government.

I am a widow and my youngest son, Philip, is eight years old. He lost his Father when he was four years old.

There is already enough problems with our youth in California so please let's try to get the government to help fund this worthwhile program. It is very much needed. . . .

Mrs. BETTY KAZNOWSKI.

I am a mother with a boy 12 who has a Big Brother of Sacramento and it really has and is helping him a great deal. For he has no Father and there is also some boys who will never have a Big Brother with these cuts. Please help.

Mrs. VESTA WELCH.

There are 250 boys on a waiting list here in Sacramento alone who have not yet had a big brother. . . .

Mr. TOM GREEN.

SHARE, INC.

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I want to address myself to the extraordinary work done by SHARE, Inc., a nonprofit service organization headquartered in my district. SHARE, Inc. is an acronym for Share Happily and Reap Endlessly, and is currently celebrating the 20th anniversary of its founding.

The list of accomplishments by this organization is lengthy and impressive.

Since 1953, SHARE, Inc. has raised in excess of \$3 million. These moneys have gone to the Exceptional Children's Foundation for the mentally retarded of all races and creeds. The Foundation is one of the oldest and largest nonprofit community agencies in the country.

SHARE, Inc. supports preschool training and special education classes for mentally retarded youngsters not accepted by the public schools, while maintaining three sheltered workshops for the older retarded. The organization has created special recreational programs, including a summer camp and the Western Special Olympics. SHARE, Inc. has instituted an art center for the gifted retarded and instated a special resident home.

Mr. Speaker, the very special ladies who comprise SHARE, Inc. have established the first Guidance, Diagnostic, and Counseling Center for the mentally retarded and their families, west of the Mississippi. They have also initiated an innovative Infant Development program, so successful that it is now being partially funded by the State of California.

SHARE, Inc., has directed its efforts toward community participation wherever possible, establishing a citizen advocacy program in which a volunteer works on a one-to-one basis, representing the interests of a retarded person. In addition, this participation has provided training opportunities for graduate students from local colleges and universities. SHARE, Inc., has activated research in the development of new methods of delivering services to the retarded and their families.

The State of California has commended SHARE, Inc., for having one of the lowest expenditure ratios of any charity organization. The years of SHARE's involvement in the field of mental retardation have seen this most serious problem come out of the dark, into the light of understanding. The work of SHARE, Inc., has shown that three-fourths of the mentally retarded can become self-supporting individuals, living with dignity.

Mr. Speaker, serving on SHARE's board of directors are: Gloria Franks, chairman; Janet Leigh; Joni Horowitz; Joan Lucas; Virginia Mancini; Jeanne Martin; Miriam Nelson Meyers; Jo Stafford Weston; and Peg Yorkin.

SHARE's current officers include: Peg



Yorkin, president; Jackie Gershwin, first vice president and "Boombtown" chairman; Bette Lou Murray, second vice president; Joan Rush, secretary; and Lynn Beyer, treasurer.

A sampling of the list of more than 60 members includes: Ruth Berle; Joanna Carson; Altovise Davis; Polly Bergen Fields; Laraine Day Grilikhes; Carol Burnett Hamilton; Eydie Gorme; Pat Crowley; Jane Greer Lasker; Nancy Olson Livingston; Martha Lyles; Neile Adams McQueen; Diane Merrick; Dorothy Mitchum; Lucille Ball Morton; Ingrid Orbach; Joan Rivers; Edye Rugolo; Jan Sarnoff; Rosemarie Stack; Anne Jeffreys Sterling; and Pilar Wayne.

# PHILLIPS EXPLAINS ACTIVITIES OF OEO

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post and other liberal newspapers have been having a field day at the expense of Mr. Howard Phillips, Acting Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. If one believed the Post, Mr. Phillips has horns, breathes fire, and carries a pitchfork. However, I know Mr. Phillips well and he is doing an outstanding job in carrying out the mandate of the President—to dismantle OEO.

Mr. Phillips' actions during the past month have been misunderstood. However, in order to clarify what has happened at OEO, I am inserting in the RECORD a recent article by Scripps-Howard staff writer Lee Stillwell. I hope this will serve to explain Mr. Phillips' actions:

## OEO DISMANTLING RIGHT ON SCHEDULE (By Lee Stillwell)

WASHINGTON.—Howard Phillips, under orders from President Nixon to dismantle the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) by the end of June, believes he's on schedule and will complete the job on time, he said in an interview Thursday.

"I'm frankly encouraged and I think we are on course," said Phillips, acting OEO director. "There may be an occasional problem down the road that we may run into . . . That's always possible . . . but I'm confident we are going to carry out the mandate we have been given. By June 30, the transfer of authority will have been achieved."

Phillips believes the administration will win any legal battles that arise from killing OEO and moving many of its programs to other agencies.

"DO VERY WELL"

"I know what we are doing is entirely consistent with the statute and we wouldn't be having any legal problems," he said. "I'm told by our general counsel that they are confident, at least in the long run, that we are going to do very well."

Phillips said OEO has been negotiating very closely with other departments and agencies to which OEO programs are being assigned and believes the new realignment will strengthen their efficiency and effectiveness.

All OEO regional offices will be closed by April 28, he said, with the 200 to 300 OEO employees needed to carry on the phaseout

moved to the general services administration payroll.

Phillips said a task force is now trying to find job opportunities for people who will be out of work.

He's still uncertain about the ultimate fate of an estimated 2,000 OEO employees when the agency closes at the end of June.

## SEEK OTHER JOBS

"I don't know with any certainty . . . so much depends on decisions that haven't been made," Phillips said, adding that some workers probably will follow the programs to other agencies. Others are already seeking other jobs.

Phillips believes Congress will pass legislation for two programs, empowering the Commerce Department to continue certain of OEO's community economic development activities through its office of minority business and create a separate federal legal assistance corporation.

"We seek to enact a bill in this area which will prevent the diversion of legal services funds into political channels and away from the priorities of disadvantaged citizens," Phillips said.

Phillips also said OEO will continue to fund community action agencies (CAA) until the June 30 deadline, permitting many to receive federal help until the end of this year.

## FOLLOW THROUGH

The entire CAA portion of OEO is being eliminated. A total of \$285.3 million was obligated this fiscal year for providing one-third funding for the 907 agencies around the country but local governments must now determine if their programs are worth continuing at their expense.

"Community action agencies have realized that the ball is now in their court and they have to follow through on the message that we have been giving them for the last several years," Phillips said. "That is, prove their case . . . prove their merits, not to some anonymous people in a regional office or Washington but to their neighbors . . . the local officials who are accountable to their neighbors."

Phillips, who argues that the killing of OEO and realignment of its agencies will give other communities more self-determination, believes the administration is winning over the public to its actions.

"In terms of progress, I find that people understand what we are doing," Phillips said, reiterating his stand that transferring OEO programs to other agencies and elimination of federal participation in community action agencies is the proper course to follow.

## NIX WILL NOT SUPPORT RECONSTRUCTION AID UNTIL PRESIDENT WITHDRAWS OPPOSITION TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND OTHER DOMESTIC PROGRAMS

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the President of the United States is preparing to pressure the Congress into appropriating funds for reconstruction aid to North Vietnam, we are faced with his veto of vocational education legislation for our own people.

If there is insufficient money for Government spending in the United States, there is not enough for spending in other countries.

We have already been confronted during this session with an attempt by the White House to administratively cut down payments to veteran amputees, most of whom were Vietnam veterans.

The Congress won that fight for veterans and we will win the battle for vocational education, because of its aid to disadvantaged American youth.

While we are depriving the poor at home with these cuts the administration wants to support not only our friends abroad but our enemies as well.

I do not think that Philadelphia should be a poorer city in order to support the President's dreams of establishing a better world for other nations.

As chairman of the Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee, I have waited until now to challenge the administration's spending plans for North Vietnam. I have waited because I believed that the administration had not expressed all of its reasons for supporting such a project. They will not do so, because we have heard all their reasons. Their case is made, it is a weak case.

They merely wish to place the Government of North Vietnam on a payroll which they can fire them from should they ignore the truce agreement.

I would point out that, by the President's own statements and warnings to North Vietnam, they have already violated the truce. They have shipped massive amounts of munitions into South Vietnam in violation of article 7 of the truce. Large numbers of North Vietnam troops have entered South Vietnam since the truce.

Therefore, we will be buying less peace everyday. In any case there is no reason to believe that North Vietnam would stay bought.

The People's Republic of China, the Soviet Union, and Japan have all promised aid to the Hanoi government.

It is even doubtful that the peacetime potential of North Vietnam was badly damaged based on newstories in the Washington Star-News.

As chairman of the Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee I will find it all but impossible to support reconstruction aid for North Vietnam, and I will not reconsider my position until the President reconsiders his position in opposition to programs for our own people.

## MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, for more than 3 years, I have reminded my colleagues daily of the plight of our prisoners of war. Now, for most of us, the war is over. Yet despite the cease-fire agreement's provisions for the release of all prisoners, fewer than 600 of the more than 1,900 men who were lost while on active duty in Southeast Asia have been identified by the enemy as alive and captive. The remaining 1,220 men are still missing in action.

A child asks: "Where is Daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife wonders: "Is my husband alive or dead?" How long?

Until those men are accounted for, their families will continue to undergo the special suffering reserved for the relatives of those who simply disappear without a trace, the living lost, the dead with graves unmarked. For their families, peace brings no respite from frustration, anxiety, and uncertainty. Some can look forward to a whole lifetime shadowed by grief.

We must make every effort to alleviate their anguish by redoubling our search for the missing servicemen. Of the incalculable debt owed to them and their families, we can at least pay that minimum. Until I am satisfied, therefore, that we are meeting our obligation, I will continue to ask, "How long?"

### THE CASE FOR AID TO SOUTH VIETNAM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, while the attention of the public is being focused on attempts to lavish U.S. aid money to rebuild and strengthen the Communist dictatorship in North Vietnam as "an investment in peace," little consideration is given to the continued suffering of our South Vietnamese allies.

So that the other side of the picture may be presented, I include the following paper by Dr. Nguyen Tien Hung, associate professor of economics at Howard University be inserted. Dr. Hung is most qualified to discuss the Vietnamese situation since he is a refugee from North Vietnam.

The article follows:

#### THE CASE FOR AID TO SOUTH VIETNAM (By Dr. Nguyen Tien Hung)

As Congress moves to consider foreign aid for South Vietnam in the coming fiscal year, it should, for the first time in years, be able to do so without the acrimonious debate that has surrounded the question through the long war.

American troops are gone and the war has—at least officially—ended. The chief sources of contention are gone. Now an adequate program of aid can be one of the keystones for lasting peace in Southeast Asia.

#### AN AMERICAN TRADITION

That it has been a noble tradition of America to help allies devastated by war is a matter of history. Indeed the very program of Foreign Aid to underdeveloped countries today is merely an extension of the Marshall Plan for reconstruction and rehabilitation of Europe after World War II. With over \$3.8 billion in loans and grants for the United Kingdom, \$3.2 billion for France, \$1.7 billion for West Germany, \$1.7 billion for Italy, and others, Western Europe rose out of the ashes of war to become a prosperous and powerful ally of the United States. In the Pacific, with \$3 billion (1950 dollar value) in U.S. aid and loans, South Korea has also rebuilt its economy and recorded a Gross National Product of nearly \$8 billion in 1970, the highest in Southeast Asia.

In a sense, the case for increased American assistance to rebuild South Vietnam is unique when compared with the motivation for support to other war-ravaged countries in the past. That is, in Vietnam and in Vietnam alone, 2.5 million American soldiers fought in a foreign land, but under their own flag, the "Stars and Stripes." In Europe during World War II, American soldiers fought under the banner of the "Allied Forces." During the Korean War, they fought under the flag of the United Nations. On March 8, 1965, with the landing of the first U.S. Marines (3rd Battalion, 9th Marines), America unilaterally came to the support of South Vietnam and initiated a period of direct intervention. A token commitment of other foreign forces (mainly from Korea and Australia) which came in later represented only a symbol of solidarity among the Asian nations for defense of the area. These nations share with South Vietnam and the United States the common goal of protecting their frontiers in the Pacific.

#### STABILITY CRUCIAL IN ASIA

In the years ahead when American foreign policy shifts from the balance-of-power to a pluralistic concept, that is, from political bi-polarity to multi-polarity, the United States will continue to depend heavily on the stability of South Vietnam for its success in building a structure of peace in the Pacific. Even though not everyone believes in the "domino theory," few thoughtful persons can really assume that a unified Communist Vietnam will be content to leave Southeast Asia in tranquility.

But whether South Vietnam can survive as an independent and non-Communist state while groping toward political and economic stability will depend largely on what will or will not be done in the next two or three years.

To the extent that a viable economy and a strong army are essential for stability, increased aid to South Vietnam is basically compatible with America's security interests.

Furthermore, American security interest in Asia may be strengthened by its potential economic interest. The reason is that, as growth rates and market capacities in Europe and the Western Hemisphere slow down, the expansive economic trends in the Pacific countries will become a plus factor in contributing to the strength of the American economy.

#### LONG-RUN PROSPECTS

Provided that assistance will be adequate to help South Vietnam recover from the war and maintain the peace, long-run economic prospects for the country will be bright indeed. The Vietnamese people have the capacity to gain a modest but reasonable livelihood. With financial support during the initial period, the job of reconstruction and self support may be pressed forward with self confidence. For in spite of the destruction and limitations to development imposed by years of hostilities, the war has also exerted favorable influences on potential economic growth.

In the traditional sector, agriculture has been greatly modernized; a high degree of mechanization in agriculture was required to substitute for traditional manpower drawn into the defense sector. This suggests an important degree of structural change in the rural area during the war. Intensive application of chemical fertilizers and better water control have made the introduction of "miracle rice" possible and continue to raise rural productivity.

The war has also changed the nature of the hamlet economy; traditionally subsistence, the hamlet economy had been completely isolated for centuries behind a "bamboo curtain." During the war years, lack of security in the countryside necessitated displacement of nearly 50 percent of the rural population from one village to another

and from the rural area to the cities. The displacement has brought about a high degree of mobility, a favorable factor for development, since excessive attachment to the land has long been viewed as a hindrance to economic growth.

In the modern sector, the impact of war has been most visible. The expansion of infrastructure as a result of American logistic support will save the country a staggering sum in future development plans. The port of Saigon is today one of the best in the Far East, and facilities at Cam Ranh Bay are envied by the rest of Southeast Asia. The presence of American military forces had also induced some transfer of technology, thus generating a profound technical impact on many diverse sectors of the civilian economy. Over 300,000 Vietnamese have acquired some know-how from highly skilled foreign technicians (engineers, electronic specialists, draftsmen). Given a high degree of propensity to borrow and to accept foreign technology, the highly skilled Vietnamese workers will be valuable assets in post-war economic development.

#### SHORT-RUN PROBLEMS

All these favorable economic factors, nevertheless, require financial resources in order to turn them into productive forces. When potentialities fail to be exploited, long-range assets may turn into short-run liabilities. For example, mechanization in the rural sector will continue to require imported inputs, which if not provided, may generate a depression in agriculture. Modern ports and airports will require high-cost maintenance; if production and exports do not increase and tourism expand in order to render them economically lucrative, the ports and airports will actually become a budgetary burden.

Mobility of the rural population during the war years in conjunction with prospects for employment in the urbanized sector has also brought about a high degree of dualism. Fast-growing cities have attracted over one-half million farmers who left the rice fields in favor of high wages in urban employment. Lack of financial resources to help them return to the land will aggravate the unemployment problem and intensify social unrest.

Therefore, while South Vietnam does have great potential to develop its economy to a degree that foreign aid may no longer be required, it does have serious short-run problems in maintaining security, recovering from war, and adjusting to peace.

#### THE COST OF MAINTAINING SECURITY

The January 27, Paris Agreement, by opting for an in-place cease-fire has imposed an enormous cost for maintaining security throughout the country. By permitting over 150,000 of North Vietnam's best soldiers to join the insurgent Viet Cong within South Vietnam, the agreement has left the country with no clearcut physical frontier to defend. The nature of guerrilla warfare is such that it only requires two or three snipers to tie down a whole police force and hold up an entire city's traffic. That was precisely what happened in New Orleans last winter when one or two snipers occupied the Howard Johnson Motel and wreaked havoc in the area for several days.

As the situation now exists, North and South Vietnam will be facing an unfair economic competition. While the North enjoys an absolute security and is able to start reconstruction and development if it so desires, the South still has to devote most of its resources in terms of manpower and money to maintain security throughout the country. The opportunity cost, that is, the actual cost of maintaining a large army plus the cost in terms of foregone development which could take place in the absence of North Vietnamese troops is exceptionally high. Assuming a total Communist force (including North Vietnamese and Viet Cong) of



about 400,000 men, the equivalent of 40 percent of the South Vietnamese forces, the latter will have to devote full time just to keep major roads open and airports protected.

In addition, the spectre of another North Vietnamese invasion is too disquieting to even contemplate. Yet evidence suggests that it may happen, and very soon. The forthcoming offensive, if and when it happens, will make a mockery of the Paris agreement. From the economic viewpoint, not only will it doom South Vietnam's plans for a fast recovery, but will also inflict further, heavy damage to the entire economy, already a casualty of the last offensive.

If security is a prerequisite for economic development, it will then be very difficult for South Vietnam to consider a partial demobilization of its army under the present conditions.

On the other hand, to maintain a million men in the armed forces is a heavy financial burden, for it still requires nearly 70 percent of the budget, leaving little money for social and economic development. The defense burden in recent years has already claimed between 15 and 16 percent of the Gross National Product as compared with a median burden of less than 3 percent for 44 developing countries during 1960-65.

#### THE COST OF ADJUSTMENT TO PEACE

In addition to the cost of maintaining security, adjustment to peace will be no less expensive. Very soon a huge amount of money will be required to resettle over 2 million persons still displaced. In addition to refugees, there are great numbers of war victims who desperately need help in rebuilding their lives. As of February 1970, according to estimates from the American War Victim Directorate in Saigon, there were already 156,000 disabled, 258,000 orphans and 131,000 widows. The number of victims has increased markedly since the 1972 Easter offensive and has greatly burdened the welfare payroll.

The problem of adjustment to peace is extremely serious when viewed in light of the economic effects of American withdrawal. During the latter half of the sixties when over one-half million Americans were in Vietnam, employment was high, income inflated, and an artificial prosperity was visible. Foreign exchange from American spending, estimated at over \$300 million a year, helped to fuel imports and income.

In addition to about 150,000 workers directly employed by the American sector, there is another great, but undetermined, number of people living on services to the U.S. personnel, either on a full- or part-time basis. To these people, the withdrawal means that restaurant tables are empty, dance floors deserted, and laundries shut down. Reorientation, retraining and reemployment of hundreds of thousands of people must take place in order to fill the immense vacuum left behind by the departed Americans.

At present, the budgetary problem has already reached a dangerous level. Sizable annual deficits, which grew by more than seven times during 1966-69 in spite of foreign aid, have been financed mainly by advances from the Central Bank and by drawing down Treasury resources; these deficits, therefore, could not be called upon to finance the additional burden of rehabilitation and resettlement.

#### THE COST OF RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

The argument for American aid to South Vietnam is particularly strong when looked at from the development angle. That is, up until now, most of American aid to South Vietnam has been stabilization aid, or foreign aid provided for import of foodstuffs and consumer goods due to shortages during wartime. Thus, nearly 70 percent of the total American aid in recent years was under the form of the Food for Peace Program and

the Commercial Import Program; foreign aid in its true sense for development purpose is yet to come.

At great cost in men and materials, the Republic of Vietnam has survived thus far as a non-Communist state. War torn and battered, it is now looking toward the future to carry out the task of reconstruction and development no matter what the cost.

In the next year or so, the task of physical reconstruction will have to be completed to lay a foundation for further development. For example, a large sum will have to be allocated for treating over one-half million acres of crop land affected by herbicides before miracle rice cultivation can be widely introduced.

#### CONCLUSION

The overwhelming share of the cost of survival as a free nation will continue to be borne by the Vietnamese people. However, they need substantial and sustained assistance over a short period of time to reach the deeply cherished goal of self support and total independence. An amount of economic assistance, say from \$1 billion to \$1.5 billion a year for the next four or five years before gradual reduction will not only be in the American tradition of helping allies in reconstruction, but will also be compatible with long-run American security and economic interests.

In the 1960's, America undertook grave responsibility in helping South Vietnam to resist Communist aggression. That resistance has been successful, and the political situation in Asia today differs markedly from that in 1960 in favor of freedom. If in the seventies South Vietnam continues to be supported in maintaining that successful resistance while building an independent and viable economy, Asia in the eighties will indeed be even better than Asia today.

GEN. LEWIS WALT, USMC-RETIRED,  
SPEAKS ON NATIONAL SECURITY

#### HON. HAROLD RUNNELS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Speaker, I recently was privileged to attend the 57th annual conference of the Association of Military Colleges and Schools of the United States.

I was guest of a distinguished soldier and West Point graduate, Col. Charles R. Kemble, who is the president of our reputable New Mexico Military Institute at Roswell.

My membership on the House Armed Services Committee gives me a broad insight into the military posture of the world. This committee service also allows me to place in proper perspective the leadership role AMCS graduates lend to both the military and civilian establishments of the Nation. The AMCS is to be commended for its emphasis on disciplined education, quality schools, and productive citizens which graduate in great numbers from its ranks.

Mr. Speaker, I call on you and to each of my fellow Members of Congress, many of whom attended the recent conference, to recognize and renew our support of the AMCS for its persevering efforts to provide America with vitalized, dynamic young men in every walk of life.

The following remarks were presented

at the AMCS conference by Gen. Lewis Walt, an ROTC graduate who became the Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps:

#### NATIONAL SECURITY

There are many words being said today and many more words being written about the "end" of the war. Our people are elated. They are contemplating a long period of peace and prosperity. They are being lulled into the feeling that all is well in our world. Our people are exhausted from war and ravenously hungry for peace—peace in our time, in our children's time and in our grandchildren's time. One can even sense the very dangerous mood among some of our people of "peace at any price". I have been asked on numerous occasions, when speaking to youthful audiences: Wouldn't a mild form of communism be better than what we have today if it would produce a peaceful world? My answer to that question is rather direct: There is no such thing as a "mild" form of communism and the "peace" it would produce would be the Communist form of "peace" where people are "peaceful" because they are subdued slaves of the totalitarian government.

Two hundred years ago, our forefathers paid a terrible price in lives and sacrifices as the first installment on the liberties and freedoms we enjoy today. Since that time millions of patriotic and dedicated Americans have protected these dearest of all treasures at the cost of their lives or their personal well being. Sometimes, I feel that the majority of our citizens take our freedom for granted and idly assume it to be part and parcel of the land we live on. They see no real need for defense forces. They honestly cannot conceive of enemy forces attacking us. Those of us who argue for preparedness and strong defense forces are war mongers who plan wars and ways of getting into wars to justify our existence. They cannot seem to realize that all the niceties, conveniences, material wealth, and comforts we enjoy in our overly affluent society, would be for naught if we lost our freedom. They refuse to accept the fact that our freedom is in any danger today, leave alone the fact that we are approaching the most critically dangerous period since its birth.

Today, we are witnessing a changing world. How can we as common citizens discern right from wrong in international diplomatic relations? Should we or should we not keep our international commitments to our allies of the free world? If not, how then can we survive as a free nation if we are totally enveloped in a hostile atmosphere of communism? How can we survive without friends abroad to sustain us? Due to our affluency we are more dependent on world trade than any nation in the world. Of the critical materials which we need to maintain our industry today, 85% of them have to be imported from abroad. What would happen to our Nation if we lost control of the seas and these critical materials were cut off from us—either at the source or on the high seas? What will happen to our Nation if the majority of our industry is shut down and millions of people are thrown out of work? I doubt if we would have enough police and armed forces in our country to maintain order—especially if dissident groups were successful in carrying out some of their subversive plans.

Our national entity is protected in two ways: internal protection which is accomplished by objectivity in laws and good law enforcement; external protection which must be accomplished through a military establishment.

History shows that weakness—in military power or in "national will/self-discipline" is itself the greatest threat to peace. For this reason, the growing weakness of the U.S. today is the world's greatest threat to peace and this danger is growing because our mili-

tary strength and our "national will to resist" is declining.

You may ask the logical question: If strength is so essential to peace—why do so many Americans oppose our being strong or more specifically, oppose expenditures for our military forces? These reasons are used to substantiate their arguments:

- (1) U.S. is already awesome in power!
- (2) Tensions with Soviets and Chinese seem to be lessening.
- (3) We no longer can afford to be the world police force.
- (4) Squander needs on home front.
- (5) Squandering and inefficiency in the Pentagon.
- (6) Real threat to our country is the industrial/military complex which threatens to destroy our social programs.

I must admit that there is enough real or imagined information to support each of these contentions so that when only that side is presented—it is convincing to an ill-informed, peace-loving, war-weary people. The blame for this must be shared by many including our political leaders and the news media. Let us examine the first of these arguments.

Is our power awesome? Is it adequate? How much is enough and how much is too much?

What is our national strategy today? I believe our national strategy is poorly defined and even more poorly understood. After World War II, the world became sharply divided into two major camps—the free world and the Soviet or communist-controlled world. The free world led by the U.S., believing the war to be over, brought their military forces home, disbanded them and prepared for an era of peace. The Soviet-led world took a different tact. To them, war was a continuing effort. They did not demobilize, they did not withdraw their forces from the lands they had occupied, they started aggressive moves against other free nations. To stop this aggression, the free world, again led by the U.S., originated a world-wide strategy of collective security—a banding together of free nations in mutual security agreements to stop communist aggression. This strategy backed by the military and economic power of our country proved highly successful but even so the communists have been able to subvert seventeen free nations since the end of World War II.

The free world forces have halted this aggression through physical force in Greece, Berlin, Lebanon, Korea, Taiwan, and Southeast Asia. Our country is still a signator on over forty treaties or agreements in one form or another. Does our national policy still commit us to honoring these agreements and to what extent? What is our national strategy today in carrying out these commitments? Do we maintain forces to give nuclear weapons protection to our allies or do we withdraw to our borders and use nuclear weapons only if we are attacked directly by the USSR?

During the 1950's we had a national strategy of massive retaliation by nuclear weapons. This strategy was sound—we had a monopoly on these weapons and we had demonstrated their effectiveness. However, that strategy lost its validity and much of its value as a deterrent because when the Communists attacked South Korea we did not use our nuclear weapons.

As a result of Korea and because other nations now had nuclear weapons, we ceased our full reliance on nuclear weapons and began once more to build up our conventional war capabilities. Although we still enjoyed nuclear superiority, our national strategy was changed in the 1960's from one of massive retaliation to one of flexible response. We declared our intention and ability to fight either type war—nuclear or conventional.

This opened the gate for the Communists

into Vietnam and we found ourselves involved and immediately bogged down in a different and unfamiliar type of conventional warfare. A war where the elusive guerrilla was the number one enemy and the hearts and minds of people were the number one target. It was a war where psychological and political weapons were as deadly as the bombs and the guns and where the United States itself was as much a part of the battlefield as South Vietnam.

By 1970 the Soviet had pulled ahead of us in thermonuclear capability and also in several other areas of strategic importance such as ICBMs, modern naval surface ships, submarines both nuclear and conventional powered and in overall air power. Our national strategy then took on a defensive tone and was called "credible, reliable, or realistic deterrent."

Just how credible, how reliable or how realistic is our military force capability today? To be credible, our military forces should be powerful enough to deter any potential aggressor from initiating either an all out strategic exchange or a more limited tactical conflict. In my humble, but I believe well-founded, opinion we do not today have the military power to deter either type of conflict!

The adequacy of our deterrence depends not upon what we consider to be adequate but rather upon what our potential enemy considers to be inhibitive. Our strategic deterrent, for example, must be of such strength to provide unacceptable punishment to an enemy after having absorbed a surprise attack by that enemy and after having countered the defenses of that enemy. If our strategic deterrent does not fulfill this requirement and our deterrent force cannot in fact deliver unacceptable punishment on the enemy, we may then be placing an enemy in a critically dangerous position. A position of being able to win if he initiates the conflict, and only if he initiates the conflict!

Compared to the Soviets, we do not provide for ourselves anywhere near the deterrent capability that the Soviets have considered necessary for themselves. For example: the Soviets have 3100 home defense interceptor aircraft—we have 400. They have 10,000 surface-to-air missile launchers for home defense—we have 600. They have operational ballistic missile defenses, anti-ship missiles and a fractional orbit bombardment system; none of which we have.

The USSR is decisively surpassing the U.S. in virtually all aspects of military strength. Four years ago, Russia had 550 ICBMs—today they have over 1600 including over 300 monstrous SS-9s, with 25 million ton TNT equivalent warhead explosive capability. Four years ago, the U.S. had 1054 ICBMs—today we have 1054, the largest having less than 1/10th the SS-9 power.

Four years ago the Soviets had 5 advanced strategic missile submarines—today they have 42 with permission in the SALT I agreement to build 20 more. Four years ago, we had 41—today we have 42. The SALT I agreement prohibits us from building anymore. As to overall submarine strength—the Soviets have over 400 compared to our 141. They are building submarines at a rate five times that of the U.S. The Soviets have tested their fractional orbit bombardment system (FOBS)—an intercontinent space weapon which carries a payload equivalent to 50 tons T.N.T. We have no defense against it! The payload of the USSR strategic ballistic missile force, under the relationship essentially frozen by SALT I agreement, is approximately four times that of our own.

If the trends continue in which the USSR military power continues to grow and the U.S. military power continues to decline, as has been the case for the past five years, it is a matter of fact that USSR will have the capability of controlling the sea lanes, and the capability of making a deadly first

strike against both our land based and sea based ICBMs by the year 1975.

We have gone as far as we dare go in proving our willingness to make peace. We have placed ourselves in an inferior position to the Soviet Union in terms of strategic armaments. We are number two in military power today—they are number one. We have opened relations with Communist China at a terrible cost to our friends in Taiwan and to our prestige and truthworthiness among our other free world allies. We have undermined the confidence of the Asian free world peoples governments in our united defense commitment in Asia. We have given in to Soviet demands for a European Security conference which can benefit only the USSR.

By subscribing to the ABM treaty, both the U.S. and the USSR have "agreed" to remain vulnerable to retaliatory attack thereby "assuming" that even small deterrent forces will be adequate to deter.

This is not logical reasoning or thinking. It fails to take into account the massive Soviet air defense system. It ignores the basic principle of strategic deterrence: The certain survivability of one retaliatory force. With Soviet superior first-strike capability today—we do not have a survivable retaliatory force. It is quite plausible and evident that the Soviet's intense interest in ABM treaty was to stop the U.S. from its much more advanced ABM deployment.

The unsupported notion that the USSR has accepted the doctrine of minimum deterrence—seems to be wishful thinking on the part of our own arms control specialists. Some scientists have voiced the opinion and presented the argument that a handful of nuclear weapons targeted on a handful of Soviet cities constitutes strategic nuclear sufficiency.

SALT talks conferred 50% advantage of ICBM and SLBMs on USSR!

Soviets have enough missile power to destroy our retaliatory force and still retain enough to wipe out our major American cities if we tried to retaliate. Furthermore, a minimum deterrence for the U.S. would mean no deterrence for our free world allies.

Since WW II the Communists have taken over seventeen free nations. It has subjugated nearly 50% of the world's population. With the Communists growing military power and political influence, we are given only one alternative if we are to resist communism as an accepted way of life. We must fight. There is no substitute for the "will to fight" and the "courage to suffer" for our cause of freedom. There is no other way we as a people and as a Nation can protect our freedom.

Today our "will to resist" and our "ability to resist" is at a very low ebb. Our Congress, who must bear the responsibility laid on it by our Constitution for the defense of our country, in my opinion, is not fulfilling that responsibility. We are number two military power today and each day we are falling farther behind the Soviet Union in the vital area.

Not only are we behind in missiles, airplanes, ships, submarines, armor, etc., but we are behind in the caliber of "trained" military men and the discipline of our military forces. Permissiveness has softened the substance of our fighting forces. Pleasure, laxity, and comfort have replaced discipline, tough training and pride of achievement. The so-called fighting man of today, who is supposed to be prepared to go on the battlefield tomorrow, is not prepared either physically or mentally to carry out such a mission. It would be unmitigated murder to commit him to battle against a well-trained enemy on a modern battlefield. This is not his fault. The fault lies with the attitude of our society today.

The average American wants and believes that we have a generation of peace ahead. The fault lies with our civilian and military leaders who are not insisting that our Armed



Forces be in a state of true readiness. Our Nation or our Armed Forces are not prepared today to defend our freedom. Apathy, wishful thinking, and downright carelessness have put our Nation in the most precarious position of its existence. There is no enemy who will attack us if we are strong—none will fail to attack us if we are not. Our future is not bright.

#### FOOD SUPPLEMENTS

### HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, recently I was pleased to join Congressman Hosmer in cosponsoring a bill, H.R. 6044, which I believe will do much to clear the controversy regarding Federal regulation of food supplements. As we are aware, this has been an active issue since the Food and Drug Administration's attempt to revise the food supplement regulations in 1962. The proposed regulations were objected to as interfering with the freedom of choice of consumers, as unfairly damaging the health food industry, and as unsound scientifically. Due to heavy opposition to the regulations—over 54,000 unfavorable responses were received by the FDA—the regulations were never promulgated.

Revised regulations were then proposed in 1966 and again numerous objections were raised. Many felt that the Food and Drug Administration was overstepping its authority by involving itself in the economic aspects of the food industry and that the extent of its involvement should be limited to the question of safety. As was the case with the 1962 regulations, the 1966 regulations were never made final.

The Food and Drug Administration has once again proposed regulations for food supplements. Among regulations proposed are upper and lower limits for each individual vitamin and mineral which may be present in the specified daily quantities of dietary supplements of vitamins and minerals. I understand that certain evidence indicates that excessive amounts of some vitamins may have toxic effects. However, the FDA has no authority to limit the amounts of those vitamins which do not constitute a hazard to health—this is an economic issue not a safety issue.

The bill I am cosponsoring, H.R. 6044, will clearly prohibit any abuse of authority or imagined authority in regard to regulation of food supplements. It would prohibit the limitation of potency, number, combination, amount, or variety of any synthetic or natural vitamin, mineral, substance, or ingredient of any food supplement unless such article is intrinsically injurious to health in the recommended dosage. In addition, a definition of food supplement would be added to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. At present, no such definition exists in the law; only in the regulations promulgated in accordance with the law.

I urge immediate and favorable action on H.R. 6044.

#### THIEU'S POLICIES

### HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, a short while ago, several Members expressed their dismay that this administration continues to support the corrupt regime in Saigon, even wining and dining its dictatorial President.

In the past few months the press, too, has expressed increasing alarm, as more and more hard news comes in to confirm our worst fears of existing conditions for all who oppose Thieu's policies. I would like to submit the following editorials from the New York Times, the Nation, and the War Resisters League, all among the first to expose the real situation:

#### THE OTHER PRISONERS

(By Tom Wicker)

Two young French school teachers, André Menras and Jean Pierre Debris, left New York last week to speak in cities across the United States about a matter that stands in sad counterpoint to the return of American prisoners of war from North Vietnam.

In 1968, they went to South Vietnam as exchange teachers in a French Government program. In July, 1970, outraged by what they regarded as the corruption and tyranny of the Thieu regime, they mounted a monument in downtown Saigon, unfurled a Liberation Front flag, and started handing out peace leaflets.

This was unwise, if bold; they were immediately jailed by South Vietnamese military police. After a trial in which they were not allowed to speak, they remained in Chi-Hoa prison in Saigon for more than two years, until they were suddenly released and deported last Dec. 29. Now they have a grim story to tell about the inhumane treatment, starving, beating and torturing of political prisoners in South Vietnam, of whom they maintain there are at least 200,000 (other estimates range from 35,000 to 300,000, a lot in any case).

There is nothing particularly new about the accounts by the Messrs. Debris and Menras (aside from their impressive earnestness) of their harrowing experiences and of the terrible suffering in the South Vietnamese prisons. The existence of the infamous "tiger cages" in Con Son prison has been well-publicized here and as far back as May, 1969, the story of one prisoner, He Khan Hieu, was detailed in this space—how, for instance, he had spent a month in solitary in a "tiger cage." As the two Frenchmen tell it convincingly, things have only gotten worse since then, particularly with the great influx of political prisoners arrested during last spring's Communist offensive.

But somehow, American public opinion has never been aroused by these activities of the nation's ally in Saigon, even though it has been documented—for example in Don Luce's authoritative study, "Hostages of War"—that American funds and companies helped build the "tiger cages" and American personnel sometimes helped in the political roundups.

Predictably enough, Messrs. Menras and Debris did not get much response to their appearances in New York (including a news

conference at the U.N.), in a week when C.B.S. meekly bowed to the fears of its affiliates and refused to show a drama about a Vietnam veteran who did not get the red-carpet treatment now being accorded returning bomber pilots.

Nevertheless, there was one element of the Menras-Debris account that needs repetition, if only because it could bode trouble for the cease-fire agreements now uneasily in force. They contend, with a wealth of eyewitness detail, that the Thieu Government is systematically forging records and callously shifting bodies about from prison to prison, so that thousands of its political captives can be reported as common criminals and kept in jail, cease-fire or no cease-fire. The reason is obvious; once released, most of these political prisoners are not likely to support President Thieu in the political struggle for power.

(The two French teachers believe they were released in December so they could no longer witness this process, which was being stepped up as the cease-fire approached.)

Aside from questions of compassion and justice, this effort by the Thieu regime to hold on to its civilian political prisoners (its exchange of prisoners of war with Hanoi and the Vietcong is a separate matter) is a direct violation of the Paris accords. They define "civilian internees" as anyone arrested for "having in any way contributed to the political and armed struggle" in South Vietnam, and provide that such persons shall be released by agreement between Saigon and the Vietcong, who are supposed "to do their utmost" to accomplish this within ninety days.

The Menras-Debris charges of a violation of this provision are probably the most direct and convincing, but the same charges have been heard from others; moreover, the Thieu regime may also have violated or circumvented other provisions of the accords on Feb. 6, when it suddenly released 10,000 prisoners on the Saigon streets. These were said to be former Vietcong, but no one can be sure, and if they were, they should have been returned to the so-called Provisional Revolutionary Government.

It may be of little interest to some Americans that, aside from its general sponsorship of President Thieu's regime, the United States has aided and abetted his political repressions; but it ought to concern all Americans that, by violating the accords on the release of political prisoners, he could endanger the cease-fire, not to mention the peaceful political development of South Vietnam.

In the preamble, after all, the accords state that the signing parties "undertake to respect and to implement them." That means all of the accords and protocols, not just those that serve President Thieu's political interests; and it means the United States has an obligation to see to it that his political prisoners are released just as it has an obligation to see to it that its own P.O.W.'s are returned.

[From the Nation, Dec. 18, 1972]

#### SAIGON'S PRISONERS

"Each day the war continues, South Vietnamese patriots now in prison face execution and torture." In mid-October, Nguyen Thanh Kiem, chief of the legation in Hanoi of the Provisional Revolutionary Government (NLF), was discussing with us, four lawyers invited by the Hanoi Bar Association, the fate of political prisoners in South Vietnam. Kiem said further that the PRG, whose cadres have infiltrated all levels of the Saigon government, had come into possession of the text of a "liquidation" program issued by Saigon to prison officials. One passage was ominous: "to avoid difficulties in case of an eventual forced release of prisoners, in regard to those whom they do not succeed in re-

dressings and gaining over, appropriate and easy measures are recommended." He paused. "You know what that means—shooting, secret disposal, massacre, poisoning." (Klem spoke Vietnamese which was then translated into English.)

A few days later, we met in Paris with Mme. Nguyen Thi Binh, Foreign Minister of the PRG and its chief delegate at the Paris talks. Mme. Binh expressed her deepest anxiety over the fate of the political prisoners, and appealed to us to alert the American people to the ominous situation.

There are signs that the killing may already have begun. On October 30, *The New York Times* quoted Mme. Binh as saying, "Thieu is now embarked on an extermination policy with regard to the prisoners. Women and children are being tortured and killed in the Saigon jails. The United States is equally responsible, for Thieu is not capable of carrying out such a policy alone." In corroboration of Mme. Binh's assertion, the *Times* on August 13 had published reports that five political prisoners had already died from torture in prison. A subsequent report in that paper (November 2) quoted "Vietnamese Catholic sources in Paris" as saying that Le Cong Giau, a student leader, was on the point of death following torture in Saigon's Chi Hoa Jail.

Mme. Binh had given us a folio of documents bearing on conditions in South Vietnamese prisons. One was the text of a letter (undated) addressed to U.N. Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim by Vo Nhu Lan, president of the Association of Students of Van Hanh University, calling attention to widespread imprisonment of students and requesting a commission of inquiry of the Saigon administration, described as "*rangé parmi des régimes militaires dictatoriaux les plus barbares du monde entier*." A footnote records that Vo Nhu Lan was himself arrested on May 5 and detained at the Han Hiep prison.

Estimates of the number of political prisoners in South Vietnam vary widely. Craig Whitney, a *Times* correspondent in Saigon, wrote recently (November 12) that "some estimates" in Saigon put the number at 40,000 to 60,000, while "the Communists claim they number 300,000." Klem and Mme. Binh mentioned that there were more than 200,000.

The release date of political prisoners, as proposed in the current Paris negotiations, is not altogether clear. Hanoi's newspaper *Nhan Dan* asserted recently that the settlement must provide for the release of all civilian prisoners held in South Vietnam at the same time that military prisoners, including American POWs, are freed. That ran counter to statements by Dr. Kissinger that military prisoners were to be released first, the exchange of Vietnamese civilians held by both the Saigon regime and the PRG being negotiated afterward by the Vietnamese themselves.

Article 3, as broadcast by the North Vietnamese in a summary which Kissinger stated to be correct, is understood by the North Vietnamese to cover the release of all civilian and military prisoners held by the South, including political prisoners, as well as the release of U.S. and other foreign POWs held in both North and South Vietnam. While Article 3 calls for the release of all prisoners of "the parties" during the period when U.S. troops withdraw, North Vietnam's Deputy Minister Nguyen Minh Vy said in the October 30th *New York Times* that the military prisoners must be released within the sixty-day troop withdrawal period but political prisoners apparently only within a ninety-day period. These are North Vietnam's expectations.

On October 27, two days after our meetings

with Mme. Binh and Mr. Vy, Cornell University Prof. George Kahin clarified the North Vietnamese position at a press conference immediately following his detailed discussions with Mr. Vy and Mme. Binh. He said, in fact:

They [the PRG] are also upset to find what they had understood to be a release of all prisoners on both sides is now being interpreted by Mr. Kissinger as not covering the many thousands of political prisoners, NLF as well as third force, held in the prisons of Saigon. As Mme. Binh observed this afternoon in Paris with some evident bitterness, the United States has a responsibility to see to it that civilians, including political prisoners arrested during the war, are released along with American POWs. To set a double standard to the rules of prisoner release is fairly certain to hold up that process and is hardly consistent with the Presidential pledge to work for the earliest possible release of American POWs.

Each day that the signing of the settlement is deferred imperils the fate of the political prisoners. Mr. Nixon was ever wont to forecast a blood bath if the NFL's seven-point program were accepted. Why has he remained silent about Thieu's "liquidation" program?

#### POLITICAL PRISONERS

One of the most urgent problems following the cease fire is that of the political prisoners held by Saigon. *Newsweek* (February 5, 1973) conservatively estimates the number of civilian prisoners at 150,000. Most sources agree the number is at least 200,000 and the PRG suggests it may be as high as 300,000. It is known that Thieu has been arresting tens of thousands of persons in recent months in preparation for a ceasefire. Thieu himself at one point admitted to holding only 10,000 prisoners—an ominous figure, since it may mean he is preparing to liquidate the rest before international inspection can take place. Some murders have already occurred and prompted Amnesty International, not a radical group, to issue a special call for world pressure to keep these prisoners alive.

Who are these prisoners? For the most part it is believed they are not cadre of the PRG for the simple reason that most PRG civilian cadre were executed on capture. It is known the prisoners include women and children as well as men, and include Catholics, Buddhist priests and nuns, non-Communist political opponents, and a number of persons totally innocent of any political involvement but arrested on the basis of rumor.

Thieu is reluctant to release so vast a number of persons because, while many have been broken by the prison experience, all who are released will stand as living witness to the cruelty and torture of Thieu's prisons (built and financed by the U.S. government). Just as it was once noted that virtually every Russian family had a relative in Stalin's prisons, so virtually every Vietnamese family today has a relative in prison in South Vietnam. The prisoners live under barbaric conditions, eating rotted rice, decomposing fish, crowded into tiny cells, denied medical attention, and subjected to direct torture. (The list of tortures is nauseous: water forced up vaginas, electric shock applied to genitals, repeated beatings, etc.)

The Paris Agreements make it clear—in principle—that all prisoners are to be released. But agreement in principle is one thing and compliance in fact is another. Some of the prisoners have already been murdered. Others are being charged with criminal acts so they will not show up on the lists of political prisoners. The lives of all are in danger. The War Resisters League is

making an immediate and major effort to focus attention on these prisoners and this must take precedence even over amnesty for prisoners held in our own prisons for war resistance. It would be dangerously easy for Americans, once our own military prisoners are home (only about 500 of them) to ignore the fate of the 200,000 or 300,000 civilian prisoners held by Thieu.

#### VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION: A DESERVING PROGRAM SUFFERS AN UNDESERVED SETBACK

#### HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I learned of the failure of the Senate to override the President's veto of S. 7, the proposed Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1973. It was a good bill, one worthy of enactment.

Vocational rehabilitation is not a New Frontier or Great Society program which has been proven ineffective. Indeed, the first Vocational Rehabilitation Act was passed by Congress long before the Fair Deal of Harry Truman, or even the New Deal of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Since 1920, Congress has considered the rehabilitation of our Nation's handicapped as deserving of the highest priority.

And what has been the record of this program? The vocational rehabilitation system is widely acclaimed as one of the great successes in Federal-State partnership. Last year, for example, more than 300,000 men and women were rehabilitated into employment. Their total earnings in 1972 amounted to \$1 billion—400 percent higher than they had earned before entering the program. Out of that increased income they paid about \$58 million in taxes to all levels of government—revenues that would not have been generated otherwise.

In addition, the removal of many of them from public assistance rolls saved Federal and State governments another \$33 million. These savings will continue over the years.

Mr. Speaker, more than 3 million handicapped Americans have been returned to meaningful and productive lives because of assistance from this program.

I will not recount the legislative history of S. 7 and its predecessor. The two vetoes, ostensibly on grounds of economy, have done serious, perhaps irreparable, damage to the 12 million Americans for whose direct benefit this legislation was designed. Their chance to live in dignity as contributing members of our society has been thwarted by false economy. As a consequence our Nation as a whole has suffered a setback.

I urge the House Education and Labor Committee to try again to design a workable program which can muster the necessary two-thirds majority support from Congress to override another Presiden-



tial veto. I pledge my best efforts to assist in this task in any way possible.

THE LATE PRESIDENT JOHNSON  
AND TEXAS WATER

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the activities the late President Lyndon B. Johnson fostered for the benefit of people during his years in the White House are well known to us all.

They are built on a foundation of people-concerned programs he fostered throughout his public life, some of which are not so well known.

One area which received much of his careful attention was water—a crucial issue in many parts of his home State of Texas.

The executive director of the Texas Water Development Board, Mr. Harry Burliegh, paid tribute recently to President Johnson's efforts in the field of water throughout his public career.

I should like at this time to reprint Mr. Burliegh's statement in the RECORD as follows:

THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

(By Harry P. Burliegh)

The Texas water fraternity lost one of its best friends with the death of former President Lyndon B. Johnson on January 22 of this year.

The former President loved his State. He loved its people. More importantly, he exercised his leadership in a manner that left a stamp on our State of a nature that will endure in perpetuity and may in the long run be one of the more significant memorials to him and his career. This occurs in the many water projects and water programs he fostered and furthered in the interest of Texas. As a national leader he understood better than any other the catalytic relationship between orderly water programs and economic growth and he expressed this knowledge in purposeful programs. His interest in water matters endured throughout his entire political career from the time he was elected to the House in 1937, to the Senate in 1948, as Senate Majority Leader, and later as Vice President and subsequently as President.

Mr. Johnson took many actions that related to Texas water affairs. Some of the more significant include:

A directive in 1949 to the federal water agencies to determine how their technical resources could more effectively assist Texas in development of its water resources.

Publication in 1953 of Senate Document 57, 83rd Congress: "An Appraisal of the Texas Water Problem." The document was preliminary in nature—often the subject of controversy—but for the first time it sharply directed attention to the intricate relationship between unused water of Texas to the State and national economies in a time of rapid economic growth.

Creation, through the Congress, in 1958 of the United States Study Commission. Directives to the Commission were based upon a full awareness of the basic sovereignty of Texas over its own water, and for the first time integrated into a single group

the collective capabilities and skills of a number of federal water agencies and the skills and leadership of the various Texas river authorities to common goals. The report of the Study Commission later provided a solid base for the water plan for Texas published by this Board in 1968. Importantly, it represented integrated views of several levels of government.

Throughout the entire decade of the 50's and later, solid support for appropriations to federal agencies concerned with water matters in Texas.

Late in the 50's, directives to the Corps of Engineers and the Department of Interior to fully cooperate with the then Texas Board of Water Engineers on formulation of the first statewide water plan.

In 1962, a directive to the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers to make a reasonable apportionment of their efforts in Texas as between them. This was done.

Strong support for many individual Texas projects now serving the Texas economy. Among them the Canadian River project, the first totally municipal water supply project to be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation; Falcon; Amistad; and a host of others.

The preceding are examples. Others could be set forth. In their aggregate implementation Mr. Johnson left a stamp on his beloved Texas that may be in the final analysis his most enduring eulogy.

In the years ahead, Mr. Johnson will be favorably judged for many accomplishments: progress in civil rights, progress in education, progress in social welfare, and other areas. The water fraternity will respect his memory because of his profound knowledge of what intelligent use and control of water meant to the public weal and for the capability to translate that knowledge into practical programs and projects.

He will be missed.

WOMEN AS ECONOMIC EQUALS  
CONFERENCE

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, on March 21 in Washington, D.C., Ladies' Home Journal, National BankAmericard Inc., and six Maryland and Virginia banking institutions sponsored a unique conference concerning "Women as Economic Equals." The symposium provided a valuable forum for exchange of views among varied, and sometimes dissenting, segments concerned with women's rights. Hopefully this will further the unity needed in breaking down the bastions of opposition and complacency to equality for women that continue to exist.

The 500 female delegates to the conference discussed barriers to women in financial transactions and employment and possible solutions to inequalities.

Jayne Baker Spain, vice chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission; Liz Carpenter, former press secretary to Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson; and Dr. Bernice Sandler, counselor to Women's Equity Action League; were among those setting forth problems and opportunities for women in business and government careers.

I was privileged to review the status of Federal and State laws and proposed bills of vital concern to women. The delegates discussed measures women can take to obtain credit until nondiscriminatory legislation is passed.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Caspar Weinberger endorsed the equal rights amendment. Herbert Klein assured those of us participating in the conference that President Nixon would continue to support this amendment.

It was encouraging to hear the executive vice president of National BankAmericard Inc., John A. Dillon, say that his organization's new directive to member banks includes a recommended practices section, which states that ability and willingness to repay, not sex or marital status, should be the determining factors in all decisions relating to the extension of credit.

Mr. Speaker, this is an area with which I have long been concerned, and feel we need much more of this type of positive action.

DAY CARE HELPS MOTHERS SHAKE  
WELFARE YOKE

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on February 15, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare issued proposed new regulations for the funding and administration of social service programs. The effect of these new regulations is to cut back many urgently needed domestic programs for the blind, aged, and poor families with dependent children.

Despite the Nixon administration's emphasis upon the "work ethic," one of the most disgraceful aspects of these regulations is the fact that they will literally force many hard-working, self-supporting mothers to quit their jobs and return to the welfare rolls. These working mothers and their children will become ineligible for federally assisted day care programs if the mothers' incomes are above the poverty level. Therefore, the mothers will be given the choice between paying the high cost of child care out of their monthly incomes or giving up their jobs in order to stay home and care for their children. In nearly all cases, it would be more profitable for these women to quit their jobs and receive welfare benefits than to work.

The following is an editorial which appeared in the March 27 edition of the Detroit Free Press which presents quite clearly the plight of these working mothers:

DAY CARE HELPS MOTHERS SHAKE WELFARE  
YOKE

There is a strange irony in President Nixon's philosophy of getting people off relief and into the work force while at the same

time cutting back social service funds that permit them to do it.

The cutbacks scheduled to go into effect April 1 on day care programs for children of low-income working mothers are going to make it more profitable for them to go to Aid To Dependent Children than to work, and in many cases will force them to go on welfare.

The head of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Caspar Weinberger, says his people are reviewing the situation and may ease the new regulations. The time to do this and insure the continuation of existing programs is going by fast.

There are other ways to run day care programs for the children of the working poor, mostly mothers, besides demanding the federal government take up the responsibility. But the government is the major source of help at the moment, and precious little time has been offered to develop substitutes. Mr. Nixon offered none.

The average cost of day care in Wayne County is \$25 per week per family in day care centers and \$15 in licensed day care homes. About 2,000 children in the county will be cut off the federal program under the new regulations.

The new federal program will cut families from day care programs if their income is a third more than they would receive on welfare. Since the cost of child care in the lower income brackets will amount to a third of the family income, welfare will become more attractive.

There are many families using day care centers, in fact, who will be penalized if they work hard and study hard to improve their incomes even a small amount, because it will put them over the income edge and disqualify them from free day care. Some incentive.

There are alternatives to public day care subsidization. A number of businesses and industries, including Michigan's Whirlpool Corp., provide day care facilities for their employees. Some unions have day care centers, and there is a variety of day care service provided by churches and other community centers.

But these programs do not begin to dent an increasing problem. The number of working mothers has increased eight-fold since 1940, with 12.7 million mothers of children under 18 either working or seeking work as of a year ago. About one out of three mothers had children under six. By 1985, it is estimated, about 6.6 million women with children under five will be in the labor force.

The most recent survey indicates only about five percent of the children have been cared for in group centers, although it is probably larger by now. The rest are cared for by relatives, in the homes of neighbors or by older children. But the fragmentation of families makes it increasingly difficult for mothers to rely on having a kindly elderly relative around to look after the kids. The federal program is the only alternative, and it has not been offered on a large scale.

The day care cutbacks are going to make thousands of struggling mothers completely dependent. They would prefer to amount to something, and they could with a little help.

#### A WAY TO REMEMBER

**HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is not enough to honor our veterans with parades, and cheers and words. They need and want jobs.

In this light, I want to applaud the efforts of Bankers Trust Co. in New York, which currently employs approximately 1,500 veterans. It will take similar outstanding and progressive efforts on the part of employers and companies across the country to give our veterans what they truly deserve.

I submit a recent editorial from the New York Daily News on the efforts of Bankers Trust to employ veterans:

A Way To Remember—these fine young men that will give them a lift in body as well as spirit. As President Richard M. Nixon said on Saturday, employers should give top priority to recruiting and hiring veterans.

The President praised (though not by name) the efforts of Bankers Trust here in New York, which employs 1,500 ex-service-men, including many with severe handicaps.

More can be done, and should be done, by American business. Let's show these men by actions as well as words our profound gratitude for their sacrifices.

#### UNION BRIDGE WELCOMES EDDIE DRABIC HOME

**HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, not only the POW's but also their families and friends have suffered years of anguish during the period of their captivity. Now is a time of rejoicing as we share in the joy of the release of husbands, sons, and brothers.

Last week, Eddie Drabic, recently released from North Vietnam, returned to his hometown of Union Bridge, Md. I would like to share the account of his happy return from the Frederick Post:

UNION BRIDGE WELCOMES FORMER POW—EDDIE DRABIC COMES HOME

(By Martha Raver)

Eddie Drabic came home Friday to an old fashioned hero's welcome in Union Bridge.

High school buddies, town officials, VFW Post 8806, and a crowd of friends and neighbors greeted Sgt. Drabic as he drove into town from Valley Forge Military Hospital in Pennsylvania.

A color guard of 4 Vietnam veterans and a parade of cars led the returning prisoners of war up Main Street past flags, signs and hundreds of people.

"Oh, it's so good to be home again," Drabic said over and over as he picked familiar faces out of the crowd. In the center of town, people swarmed over Drabic's car halting the procession with shouts of "Welcome home," and "God bless you, Eddie."

The parade swung down the hill past the Lehigh Portland Cement plant to Eddie Drabic's house on Lighter Street.

Stepping into the crowd, Drabic paused as he searched each face and then remembered a name, good times, four years ago.

Grown men had tears in their eyes as Eddie gave them each a bear hug. "My old buddy," he cried, holding a school friend close.

"I never forgot any of you. Honest I didn't," Drabic told another man.

Nothing seemed to have changed in the little town since Drabic went into the Army four years ago, "except the children," one woman said.

The news boy, the little girl next door, a good friend's kid brother are now inches

taller. "Boy, you've grown," Drabic said to many.

Drabic slipped out of the crowd for a few minutes and walked with his sister Nancy Blacksten up the back yard to see his dog Snoopy. The aging beagle was the only Union Bridge resident Friday who wasn't quite sure who Eddie Drabic is.

"You've got to get your fishing rods out, Eddie. We'll go fishing in Liberty just like always," an old friend said.

"Coming back to Mithell?" another asked. Drabic worked for the Union Bridge trucking company before he was drafted and his job is still open, Bob Myers said yesterday.

Almost every house and store in the little town was decorated Friday with flags and homemade signs of "Welcome home, Eddie Drabic."

A child's crayon drawing, original poems and cartoon characters repeated the message again and again.

"God loves you. And so do we," a sign read. "Rejoice with the Drabics, Eddie's home," said another. "Welcome home Eddie. From all the bad boys in the cement row," said a sign from J.W. and R.W.

#### THE IRISH AND ST. PATRICK

**HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I wish to include the excellent and eloquent address of Judge Joseph M. F. Ryan, Jr., Associate Judge to the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, to the members and ladies' auxiliary of the local Ancient Order of Hibernians assembled at the annual St. Patrick's Day banquet at the Sheraton Hotel in Silver Spring, Md., last March 17.

In his speech Judge Ryan emphasized that the basic teaching of St. Patrick was the urgent need, for a well ordered life, of each individual to develop self-discipline in accord with divine laws, which is a lesson and an admonishment that merits the most serious attention of all God-fearing people everywhere, especially during this very turbulent period of national and international history.

Judge Ryan's address follows:

JUDGE RYAN'S ADDRESS

The opportunity to address persons of Irish ancestry, and particularly a gathering of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, on this special day is truly an Irishman's dream. One would have but a slight reservation in such a situation—what shall I say that has not already been said and probably with greater eloquence? Today, March 17th; the Saint, Bishop Patrick; the land, Ireland; the people, the Irish, and those who spring from Irish heritage, require no panegyric reminding or extravagant extolling. On numerous occasions they have all come in for an abundance of praise and honor.

Although the day we celebrate is the Feast of St. Patrick, the thoughts conjured up include the land, the Saint, and the people. What can be said of the land? Its greatness lay not in its size, nor in its singular solitary exposure to the ravages of North Atlantic Seas. It certainly is no tropic isle, nor even the Florida Keys. From the Middle East site of the Garden of Eden it could scarcely be more remote. But to those who have been privileged to be there, or who have their roots in the Emerald Isle, there is no prettier



place on this planet, no more peaceful place to be.

But, for all the beauty it possesses, it is still a demanding land. It knows all seasons intimately and tempers not a one. As a sole source of sustenance it grudgingly reserves its produce for only those who earn it.

By the force of historical events it has permitted to dwell there only those who fought to hold each square inch of its sod. Even Rome's mighty legions were brought up short and unable to conquer it. But the land taught a lesson. Its people were the pupils. They learned the value of that for which they had to fight, and they were more grateful for a sustenance they had to wrest from a stubborn terrain. What they thus gained and harvested they treasured all the more. No easy life was offered them. To survive they were forced to work and fight. Yet, a peculiar kinship between man and land developed as a result of this daily confrontation with the forces of nature.

No surprise should it be then that through the catalytic effect of a man named Patrick they were brought to a recognition of their real relationship to nature and nature's God. There have been critics and debunkers who are quick to point out that Patrick was not born in Ireland, he came from some other place. But no matter what is said, he came to Ireland. It was his chosen land and whether Patrick was Irish or the Irish were Patrick is of little moment. The amalgamation of the two produced a dynamic force and a people from that land whose influence today has permeated and penetrated the periphery of civilization.

Although he came to them as a man of God, a God whom he convinced them to be true, he would never have achieved acceptance had he not first satisfied them he was himself a man. He taught them a new, strange and demanding doctrine, requiring first a discipline of oneself. He exemplified his very teachings. His lesson was a live one. He was a man the Irish could follow and in whom they placed their trust.

But then what of the Irish, the people? From whence did they spring or originate? Jokingly, some of our friends say they are the lost tribe of Israel. It is, of course, not inconceivable. Ireland does lie to the Northwest of Israel and the Irish today still tend to the Northwest. But from wherever they came, they drew one common characterization from all of history's commentators: our predecessors were fierce. But fierce is the term enemies use for the same quality for which your friends give you praise as fearless. The people who inhabited the Emerald Isle prior to the coming of Patrick were unquestionably fierce and fearless. Patrick, however, taught them fear—but a proper fear, a fear of the Lord, a fear of their Creator.

To all the peoples and creatures they remained fierce and fearless. But they unashamedly professed and reserved a fear of their Creator. To what places they have ventured and to what heights they have risen, history is a far better chronicle. Their names, fame and accomplishments have spread far and wide. But the one identifiable strain which follows all Irishmen to the ends of the earth is the threat of religion sown by Bishop Patrick. The binding tie he left each Irishman is a recognition of his relationship to his God and his dependence upon that Supreme Being.

So Patrick taught them fear, but it was a fierce fear that became a burning fire—a fire which in a short time has engulfed the earth. It is unnecessary to remind this group of the heroism of the Irish through the ages. The wild geese, the countless Irish brigades of many nations, the contingent of Irish on whom our first president, Washington, relied most heavily at Valley Forge. In both World Wars Irish soldiers distinguished them-

selves. In the Second World War British authorities admitted that the number of Irish volunteers exceeded the number who could have been obtained through a draft. Moreover, of the ten leading aces in the Royal Air Force, four were Irish volunteers.

But lest emphasis be misleading, their prowess lay not alone in arms, for by the sixth century the land was known as the Isle of Saints and Scholars. Indeed, in many respects, during some of the church's darkest days they were the firm bastion of Christianity.

But when we say Irishmen we of course include the Irish ladies. Without such ladies there would be no Irishmen. What can we say of the Irish ladies? Call me prejudiced if you will, but I picked one for my mother and one for my wife. As girls you'll find none prettier, as companions there are none wittier. As wives there are none better and as mothers they are unequalled. And the courage of an Irish lad derives not always from his dad.

But the Irish colleen took her duties seriously whether it be as sweetheart, wife, or mother. Her home was her interest—her husband, family and no other. No greater tribute can be paid than to say that behind every successful Irishman there was a courageous wife and mother. No race of women in history have weathered more adversity as they clung to their men and homes reserving all the while the values of family, love, morality and a devotion to almighty God.

What then shall we say of these people—the Irish, these Irish men and their ladies?

Look for those who love nature and a closeness to the land.

Never bored, they're self-sufficient, they come from Ireland.

Mark the man who with pride of family reaps the joy of simple life.

Finding peace amidst suffering, displaying courage amid strife,

With a heritage of honor and royal blood within his veins,

He has fought in countless battles and in many different reigns.

Yet he also built our railroads, dug canals and tilled the plains,

And in varied statesman offices he made substantial gains. These were Irishmen!

It is good from time to time to recount our blessings and to reminisce on thoughts such as these. For one cannot then help being thankful for the land, the Saint, and the people. Let me conclude by saying on such a fitting occasion, let us give voice to such thanks:

#### LAND

I give you a land which tells man his real worth with a climate as testing as any on earth.

I give you a land that is true emerald green, With mountains and lakes that are best ever seen.

#### PEOPLE

I give you a people whose message is mirth, Whose music and laughter enriches the earth. I give you a people called fierce at one time, Whose learning and wit now help make life sublime.

I give you a people whose secret of living is a

Fear of the Lord and a real thrill of giving.

#### ST. PATRICK

I give you a man who brought God to that land,

Who kindled a fire of burning desire Which united that people to such an extent It identified them wherever they went.

I give you St. Patrick, Erin's primate, Who gave form to that substance we now celebrate.

On this eve in March with a shout from afar All praise to St. Patrick and Erin go Bragh!

#### WELFARE SCANDAL—VII

### HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the clumsy bureaucracy which administers our antiquated and ineffective welfare programs has contributed to the failure of these programs to fulfill their intended humanitarian purpose.

Today I am inserting in the RECORD the seventh installment of a series run recently in the Milwaukee Sentinel exposing the mismanagement of an estimated \$28 million in welfare funds last year by the Milwaukee County Welfare Department.

The easy access to welfare funds even for those not qualified for assistance is compounded, say reporters Gene Cunningham and Stuart Wilk, by the administrative inefficiencies which continue payments or make double payments to those who should no longer be receiving assistance.

It is time to call a halt to this seemingly endless chain of abuses and establish some order and efficiency in our efforts to aid the needy.

AID PAID IN ERROR—OR TWICE

(By Gene Cunningham and Stuart Wilk)

"Gentlemen, I am amazed that you are not aware that Mrs. — is off the (welfare) rolls. I wonder how many thousands (of dollars) you mailed out this month won't come back?"

That note was sent to the Milwaukee County Welfare Department by a person who had been paid for the bill of a woman who was no longer on welfare. He returned the check with the note.

Another person also sent a check back to the department—the second payment he had received in one month for the room and board of a welfare recipient.

"I got what Willie paid for rent and board. Here your check back," the man wrote to the department. "If you think I got one to many let me no I send it back."

The department once paid the foster care for a child for almost three years after the child had been removed from the foster home.

In August of 1967, the child was removed from the home and placed in the State School for Boys at Wales. The welfare department continued paying the foster mother until April of 1970.

"Notice was not received by the accounting department of the removal of the child . . ." a department supervisor reported when the error was finally discovered.

The removal of the child did show up early in 1970 but "was overlooked by the accounting department," another employee reported.

An agreement later was worked out with the foster mother, arranging repayment of the money she had erroneously received.

Under the agreement, she was to repay \$110.50 a month to the department until the entire \$3,759 she had received through error was repaid.

A year later, the business office of the department reported that the woman had only made five payments—one for \$15 and four for \$50 each.

An auditor assigned to the welfare department by the county auditor's office said she has "run across a lot of double payments."

Once something gets on the computer for payment, it isn't stopped, so double payments result, she said.

It has been said, "It's easier to get on welfare than it is to get off."

"The solution is not to look for double payments but to correct the system so it will prevent double payments," said Carl A. Seydewitz, county audit director.

Arthur Silverman, director of the welfare department, said there are "very few double payments."

Double payments, in the sense that two checks were sent paying for the same thing, "should be a rare situation," Silverman said.

The Sheriff's Department Fraud Squad told of one month in which a quantity of welfare recipients received double checks.

The department was transferring a number of recipients from general relief payments to payments under specific categories of aid, a deputy on the squad said.

The switch was made and the checks went out under the new categories, he said. But then someone discovered the general relief checks for the same recipients hadn't been stopped. Everyone involved received two welfare checks that month, he said.

"How can you charge the client with fraud in a case like that?" the deputy asked.

A former accountant in the welfare department said there were a lot of double payments in 1971 when the computer that is used to issue welfare checks was not programmed correctly.

The computer, he said, was allowing general relief checks to go out at the same time that checks under another aid category were going to the same people.

Much of the problem relating to double checks, the accountant said, is caused by caseworkers who don't close the cases, so payments continue in one category after they have already been started in another.

If the old payment isn't stopped when the new one is started, double checks result, he said.

Double payments also result from the system of replacing "lost" checks.

Some of the checks actually are lost by the recipients. Some are not, although they are reported as lost.

When a recipient reports that his check was lost, the department often issues a replacement check only to find later that the "lost" check already had been cashed, according to an official in the county treasurer's office.

If a person receives and cashes both the original and a replacement check, he is referred to the welfare department for fraud investigation, said Edwin W. Kornblum, administrative assistant in the county treasurer's office.

"The county, in effect, has made a double payment," Kornblum said.

Some recipients, he said, say that the endorsement on the "lost" check is not theirs, in which case they are asked to come to the treasurer's office and sign a forgery statement to that effect.

If they don't show up at the treasurer's office, then the assumption is that they did receive and cash both checks, he said.

The money the welfare department wastes in double and duplicate payments is all county tax money.

The federal government and the state do not share the cost of duplicate and erroneous payments, officials of the State Department of Health and Social Services said.

Welfare funds are 56% federal money, 26 1/2% state and 17 1/2% county.

Pay the same person or the same bill twice and it's 100% county tax money.

## THERE MUST BE AN ANSWER

### HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, one of the big problems in countryside America is the shortage of medical doctors. There is hardly a community in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District that does not need at least one medical doctor. Some communities have hospitals and clinics but no medical doctors to staff them.

In the 92d Congress, I introduced legislation designed to provide more medical school graduates and in particular general practitioners for the countryside.

Gordon Duenow, editor of the St. Cloud Daily Times, in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District, recently wrote an editorial on this matter which, I believe, should be read by every Member of Congress so that they may increase their concern over our medical doctor shortage.

Congress does have the tools to alleviate this shortage. An expanded medical school program would pay more dividends than some of the Federal programs on which we are lavishing Federal funds.

When, as Editor Duenow says, 735 Minnesotans applied for admittance to our Minnesota medical schools who had places for only 40, there is something drastically wrong with our planning.

I would like to insert Mr. Duenow's editorial in the RECORD and highly commend its reading to my colleagues:

## THERE MUST BE AN ANSWER

It is possible that we just don't understand what the problems involved are but it does seem strange to us that while so many students aspire to become doctors some way can't be found to make the dreams of those qualified become a reality. Certainly there is no over-supply of doctors in the United States.

We were reminded of this when it was reported that 735 Minnesotans applied for the 40 places in this coming fall's entering freshman class of the new Mayo Medical School. Only 36 Minnesotans were selected with the other four from outside the state. More than 1,700 applicants competed for the four positions granted to students from outside the state.

Thus it can readily be seen that there are hundreds of qualified young people who want to become doctors but there just isn't any place where they can get a medical education.

While there is a desperate shortage of doctors in all fields, colleges and universities continue to graduate students every year in fields which are far overcrowded. In many instances, there just aren't any jobs in the areas for which the students have been educated. It is possible that some of these graduates also had ambitions to become doctors but were forced into other fields because they just couldn't gain admission to a medical school.

We know there are more than enough teachers and there is an over-supply of qualified graduates in almost any field. We have a drawer full of applications from highly qualified young people seeking employment in the newspaper field. There just aren't enough newspaper jobs to go around.

Just why it isn't possible to provide educational opportunities in the medical field is difficult for many of us to understand.

We know operation of medical colleges is expensive. But it also takes a lot of money to educate young people for jobs which can't be found in today's job market.

We desperately need more doctors. Young men and women are eagerly seeking an opportunity for a medical education. Somehow a means surely can be found to fulfill the demand for doctors which exists and at the same time fulfill the ambitions of thousands of qualified youngsters. G.E.D.

## CORRESPONDENCE ON VETERANS BENEFITS

### HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from one of my strong willed and outspoken constituents who is also a disabled veteran. In that letter, Mr. O. S. Bramlett of Tiptonville, Tenn., states his views on programs providing veterans benefits. With the permission of Mr. Bramlett, who is a quadriplegic, I include his letter in the RECORD at this point:

TIPTONVILLE, TENN.,  
March 4, 1973.

HON. ED JONES,

House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ED: I have seen you guys up there all week pertaining to the raw deal all of us vets are getting. I've written W. J. Bryan Dorn, Olin Teague, Talmadge & others of the Vets Affairs Committee. I've heard from Dorn already.

I saved you till this time for a reason. As you know I'm totally paralyzed from the neck down & unable to speak. I type with one finger & in order to do this my aid has to put my arm up in an overhead sling so I can slowly peck out a letter with one finger of my right hand.

I am a non service-connected quadriplegic. My degree of injury can well be classed as one thousand percent, yet due to a SS raise I got a cut in my VA pension. I get a big ole one hundred & ninety five bucks. Me and all other quads are definitely entitled to a flat thousand a month & the proper legislation to insure no cuts for nothing. Furthermore we should receive any & all medical treatment needed & all prosthetics & rehab. equipment needed. I'm speaking of non service-connected quadriplegics. Reckon you could get along without your legs, arms, voice and a number of other things we fellows are forced to do without?

You fellows are setting the stage for the greatest mass march on Washington by all veterans from all wars in the history of the world & you make sure you inform the rest of the House & Senate those words.

The very idea of a Senate & House letting the President try his budget cutting on disabled veterans so he can have a hundred & sixty million.

If there's any cutting to do, cut out the assinine talk of aid to Hanoi. I'll put it plain, brother I wouldn't give one American life for all of Vietnam.

I respect this great country, I respect the U.S. flag, I respect the Office of the President, but this cut I took and the cut the President has tried to hand Vietnam vets has made me sick in the gut. Every fighting man in our services ought to stop right where he is. It's the height of all cruelty for any disabled vet to suffer any kind of cut for any reason.

I see in last nite's news where Ralph Nader stepped in. That's good, somebody better straighten this out and you can com-



mence by getting to your colleagues in the House, Olin and Dorn and raise us non service-connected totally paralyzed quads up where we can at least live decent.

My next letter goes to Gov. George Wallace who knows what it is not to be able to walk. I'm going to ask him to speak out for the non service connected veteran and you all know how Gov. Wallace can drive his speeches home. Although he is just paraplegic where I'm quadriplegic and even unable to speak. You have a voice, speak out for us fellows.

The President has no right to impound monies appropriated by Congress. Doesn't Congress have any guts any more. Why is all the power flowing to the White House? Stop it . . . What happened to the checks and balances? We're paying you fellows over forty grand a year a piece for nothing if you are going to let one man run the show.

Then my next letters will be directed to the news media. The whole country needs to know the plight of the non-service connected quad.

I'd like to remind you that the Bible says, "He who fails to take care of his own is worse than an infidel."

I'm a quadriplegic of the U.S.A., a navy veteran, and we need some help from our U.S. Congress and we need it now. And we don't need sympathy, that don't pay the inflated bill.

Sincerely,

O. S. "SHORTY" BRAMLETT.

P.S.—Us non-service boys are just as paralyzed as the service-connected.

If a quad is so severely paralyzed as to require full time aid, he needs to be rated service-connected.

#### ARCTIC WINTER GAMES BILL

### HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced a bill to authorize the appropriation of \$150,000 to assist in financing the Arctic winter games which will be held in the State of Alaska in 1974.

As you may know, a similar measure which sought a \$250,000 appropriation, passed the Senate last May 10 without objection. However, the press of business prevented it from being considered by the House last spring. A lesser appropriation is in order at this time, I believe, because the Armed Forces in Alaska have since agreed to provide food for the contestants at a nominal fee, and private donations have surpassed the original expectations of the organizing committee.

Still, an appropriation in the amount of \$150,000 is needed if the games are to be held next March in Anchorage, Alaska.

The first Arctic winter games were held in Yellowknife, Northwest Territories, Canada, in 1970 under the joint sponsorship of the State of Alaska and Canada's Yukon and Northwest Territories. The games were organized to strengthen the common bond that exists between nations and territories whose lands lie above the 60th parallel.

In the past, approximately two-thirds of the funding for the games has come from the Canadian Government. In support of the 1970 Yellowknife games and

the 1972 contests which were held in Whitehorse, Yukon Territory, the Canadian Government contributed almost \$500,000. The State of Alaska appropriated \$30,000 toward the first pair of games.

During this time, the U.S. Government has made no contribution toward the games. It is estimated that \$150,000 is the minimum amount needed from the Federal Government in order to bring the games to Alaska next year; this is the reason for introducing this bill today.

Since their inception, the Arctic winter games have grown substantially. Thousands of American and Canadian spectators have watched young people from both nations compete. Greenland, Iceland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Finland are counted as possible future competitors.

Greenland even now is exploring the possibilities of sending a team of competitors to Alaska for the 1974 games.

I urge Congress to assist in funding this worthy event. For as these games progress and grow, they will expand to provide a forum for international peace and understanding between the young people of all northern nations and territories.

#### VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1973

### HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, now that the Senate has upheld President Nixon's veto of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1973, the House should promptly turn its attention to approving a bill that will continue this meaningful program and that will be signed by the President.

I believe that such a bill is already available to us, Mr. Speaker. I refer to legislation drafted by our colleagues, Mr. Esch of Michigan and Mr. Erlenborn of Illinois, which authorizes total funding for fiscal 1974 of \$799.5 million as compared to \$1.69 billion in the vetoed measure.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the issue of vocational rehabilitation has become entangled in the conflict of congressional and Presidential power that is presently underway on Capitol Hill.

Far more important, in my judgment, than setting authorization levels that cannot possibly be met and only inviting more impoundment of funds, is the serious need to provide funding consistent with the need and with the budget.

The Esch bill, which I have cosponsored, does not establish new programs for any particular group. It, instead, allows for flexibility in carrying out present programs.

Title I of the measure establishes basic Federal-State grants for upgrading and expansion of State services to the handicapped. It calls for State plans and sets up regional offices to advise and assist States and other groups involved in programs to aid the handicapped.

Title II of the vetoed bill is replaced with a section authorizing the Secretary of HEW to conduct experimental programs for, and study the needs of the severely and minimally retrainable handicapped who are not presently eligible for services provided under the act.

Title II of the Esch bill establishes special Federal responsibilities in construction, vocational training, and other special projects and demonstrations.

Title III provides grant for research and training. Title IV provides for administration and project evaluation, and title V establishes an Office of the Handicapped to advise, provide information, and complete research data.

Mr. Speaker, there is still time for this House to act on vocational rehabilitation and to give agencies back in the States and counties the assurance that the Congress and the administration strongly support continuation and improvement of this very important and worthy program.

I would like to urge my colleagues to join in support of this new measure so that this assistance can be provided without further delay.

#### JAMES J. KILPATRICK SPEAKS OUT ON THE CORRUPTION ISSUE

### HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the shady economic and political dealings of this "law and order" administration have become too blatant and too excessive even for the White House's natural allies in the press to tolerate.

The lack of any effort on the part of the White House to cleanse itself from some of the worst corruption in the Nation's history has prompted conservative columnist James J. Kilpatrick to ask, "What in the world is wrong with Richard Nixon?"

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the March 30, 1973, Washington Evening Star article in which Mr. Kilpatrick expresses his disgust with the White House gang.

The article follows:

#### SQUARELY CONFRONTING CORRUPTION ISSUE (By James J. Kilpatrick)

It is time for those of us on the political right, drawn by instinct toward the Nixon administration and the Republican party, to face up squarely to the long-simmering issue that now threatens to boil over. The issue is corruption.

For understandable reasons—reasons rooted in human nature and in the partisan spirit—many of us have tended to avoid the issue. Since the first ITT case blew up a year ago, conservatives have been fighting defensive battles. These have been months of embarrassment, discomfort, bewilderment and shame. We have apologized, minimized and justified. Both in public and in private life, Republicans have shown surpassing loyalty. But loyalty has its limits, and mine, at least, have been reached.

One thing has followed upon the heels of another. There was the settlement of ITT's antitrust case. There was the milk deal, the wheat deal, the carpet deal. June brought Watergate. Now we learn of the Vesco deal. A rich woman has bought herself a pretty title: She is Mrs. Ambassador now. ITT, it develops, once seriously proposed to buy from the CIA \$1 million worth of subversion.

This has been a year of charge and accusation, of innuendo and suspicion, of images that linger in the mind: Dita Beard in a buffet line, would-be burglars in a darkened office, money—big money, cash money—hand-delivered in packets of \$100 bills. The tragic tale has been played on a shadowed stage. Characters come and go, their roles unclear, their lines obscured, their presence clearly felt if still unseen.

Those of us in the audience, mystified and anxious, have prayed for some burst of cleansing light, some blazing sunshine that would burn the noxious mist away. We have prayed in vain. Denials firm have been followed by denials not quite so firm. Events that should have been explained have gone unexplained. The White House record, by and large, has been a record of evasion, dissembling, expostulation and silence.

The anguished heart will not be stilled: What in the world is wrong with Richard Nixon? One might have supposed, looking back 20 years to the time of the "Nixon fund" and the Checkers speech, that he above all men would be keenly sensitive, acutely sensitive, to the slightest appearance of impropriety. Clean as a hound's tooth! That was the standard Dwight Eisenhower fixed, and to that standard Nixon once willingly repaired.

No such telling phrase has come from Nixon's lips these past 12 months. An ugly charge was voiced a year ago: The International Telephone & Telegraph Corporation, caught in a crucial antitrust prosecution, had wangled a favorable settlement out of court; in return, or so it was implied, ITT had made a generous offer toward a Republican convention in San Diego.

In the face of such a charge—a charge of corruption—it was not too much to expect an angry and explosive reaction from the President himself. We should have had instant documentation of the facts, full exposure of the truth, complete access to every person and every record, and if there were indeed malfeasance, we should have heard the sound of rolling heads. Nothing of the sort occurred.

By the end of June, 10 days after the news of the Watergate bugging burst upon Washington, it was clear to every schoolboy that this was no "caper." The astounding, dismaying truth began to emerge that men in high places had known, or should have known, of this squalid, disgraceful and inexcusable affair. Yet that truth emerged in bits and pieces, not with the eager help of an outraged President, but against a wall of hostility, indifference and resistance.

Recent revelations of the "Vesco deal" are for me the last straw. It is incredible, simply incredible, that the President's advisers could have accepted one penny, or made one telephone call, or opened one door, at the suggestion of a man in serious trouble with the SEC. The first breath of this \$200,000 campaign contribution must have reeked of impropriety. But the blind monkeys on whom the President relied could see no evil and hear no evil, and plainly they could smell no evil either.

It is late, but not too late, for Nixon to exert his personal leadership in clearing the air. If he fails to grasp the seriousness of

the situation, and to respond effectively to it, he will yet forfeit much of the respect he has fought so long to earn.

**STRONGER ANTICRIME MEASURES  
SPONSORED BY CONGRESSMAN  
JOHN D. DINGELL**

**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the United States must enact and enforce stronger anticrime laws and I am introducing legislation today to make it a Federal crime to murder or assault a fireman or law enforcement officer engaged in official duties of protecting law and order.

I feel there are few issues that concern our residents as much as acts of crime and violence.

I want to see a law on the books that states whoever murders a law enforcement officer or fireman engaged in the performance of his duties shall suffer death. That is exactly what my bill requires.

The legislation further requires that "whoever assaults a law enforcement officer or fireman would be imprisoned for up to 10 years, or fined as much as \$10,000, or both."

The Federal penalties under my bill would also pertain to any person traveling in interstate commerce or using any facility of interstate commerce who commits such a crime against a law officer or fireman.

Mr. Speaker, despite what the White House and the FBI report as being a decline of 3 percent in 1972 in the crime rate affecting burglary, larceny, and auto theft; according to the administration's announcement March 29, there must be a tougher system of sentencing convicted criminals in the United States if we are to stop acts of outrageous violence which increased in 1972.

The FBI statistics show that murder, rape, robbery, and assault increased by 1 percent for the past year. While the administration touts that as being a far lower rate for crimes of violence than any in the past, it nonetheless is an increase and our citizens remain ravaged with fear of criminal activities.

The police and the courts have got to tell the criminal that we mean business and enforce the laws on the books while the Government provides the tools and the Congress provides the laws to fight crime.

I also have sponsored legislation to stiffen the penalty against those persons who use a firearm to commit any crime.

This second anticrime measure was introduced January 30. It is H.R. 3257 and it would strengthen the penalty provisions of the Gun Control Act of 1968. It would require sentencing of a person who is convicted of a felony, and who used a gun in the commission of the crime, to a term of imprisonment for not less than 1 year or more than 10 years.

Additionally, in the case of subsequent convictions of the same person for a crime involving the use of a firearm; that person would be sentenced to a longer term of not less than 25 years, no suspended sentence, no parole, and the term of sentence could not run concurrently with the term of imprisonment imposed for the commission of the felony.

Mr. Speaker, I urge early action and swift enactment of these crime control measures, and include the text of these two bills at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

H.R. 6505

A bill to make it a Federal crime to murder or assault a fireman or law enforcement officer engaged in the performance of official duties by any person traveling in interstate commerce or using any facility of interstate commerce for such purpose. *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end of chapter 51 the following new section:*

"§ 1116. Murder or assault; law enforcement officers and firemen.

"(a) Whoever murders a law enforcement officer or fireman engaged in the performance of official duties shall suffer death.

"(b) Whoever assaults a law enforcement officer or fireman engaged in the performance of official duties shall be imprisoned for not more than ten years, or fined not more than \$10,000, or both.

"(c) This section shall not be construed to evidence an intent on the part of the Congress to prevent the exercise by any State of jurisdiction over any offense with respect to which such State would have had jurisdiction if this section had not been enacted by the Congress.

"(d) For purposes of this section:

"(1) The term 'fireman' means any member of a fire department of any State or political subdivision of a State or any volunteer fire department organized or administered under the laws of any State or political subdivision of a State.

"(2) The term 'law enforcement officer' means any officer or employee of the United States, any State, or any political subdivision of a State responsible for the enforcement of any of the criminal laws of the United States, a State, or any political subdivision of a State, or the prosecution or conduct of any trial or appeal arising thereunder, or the enforcement of any sentence or decree imposed therefrom.

"(3) The term 'assault' means any assault which is punishable under the law of the State where the assault occurred by imprisonment for one or more years."

(b) The table of sections of chapter 51 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"1116. Murder or assault; law enforcement officers and firemen."

H.R. 3257

A bill to strengthen the penalty provisions of the Gun Control Act of 1968

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (c) of section 924 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:*

"(a) Whoever—

"(1) uses a firearm to commit any felony which may be prosecuted in a court of the United States, or



"(2) carries a firearm unlawfully during the commission of any felony which may be prosecuted in a court of the United States, shall, in addition to the punishment provided for the commission of such felony, be sentenced to a term of imprisonment for not less than one year nor more than ten years. In the case of his second or subsequent conviction under this subsection, such person shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment for not less than twenty-five years and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the court shall not suspend the sentence of such person or give him a probationary sentence nor shall the term of imprisonment imposed under this subsection run concurrently with any term of imprisonment imposed for the commission of such felony."

# OPPOSITION TO INTEREST RATE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 204

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, regretfully I must announce to the House that I am disassociating myself from H.R. 6168 introduced by the chairman and several members of the Committee on Banking and Currency on March 27, 1973. I cosponsored the measure with serious reservations about section 204 as it pertains to interest rates. I had hoped that this section would be amended in such a way as to insure a favorable economic impact from the bill. Since that does not appear to be the case, I can no longer support the bill.

I am providing for the RECORD my testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee in which I explain my opposition to the interest rate provisions of section 204.

The testimony follows:

STATEMENT BY RICHARD T. HANNA

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, I thank the Chairman for allowing me to appear before my colleagues in the role of witness. I devoutly hope that the subject matter of my remarks will justify your courtesy and attention.

I am keenly concerned over the proposal to freeze interest rates as set forth in the bill before us. As a co-author, it is one of two aspects for which I entertain strong reservations. I will attempt to outline as clearly as I am able the magnitude of my concern.

First, I am greatly distressed with the approach to the problem of interest rates under Phase I, II and III, and the results this approach produced. The wrong-headedness of efforts used to suppress the "prime rate" is so evident as to make the need of an alternative compulsive. One course definitely more disastrous would be a freeze, which would set these past mistakes in cement. Let me be specific.

The "prime rate" is the interest return banks require from their biggest and best borrowers. These are the giants of the corporate world, companies like I.B.M., G.M., I.T.T., etc., etc. All have substantial lines of credit in as many as twelve to fifteen of the large and medium size banks of the country. By artificially depressing the rate charged these customers to a figure below the actual

market price for money in other capital centers, we guarantee the maximum use of all their credit lines. Since bank loans will be the cheapest source in the total capital game, these large corporations sop up much of the available lendable funds, and bump down the borrowing bench—

- (A) The small businessman
- (B) The consumer, and
- (C) The home buyer.

The availability of capital to these three is substantially diminished and, ironically, these are the very people we as public servants hope to help.

May I remind you that the big borrower has ready access to every other source of capital in the diverse money markets; to wit—the commercial paper market; the corporate bond market; the stock market, and the Euro-dollar market. How can our legislation control the interest paid in these markets? I speak here of interest in the broad context of being the cost of the use of money, for the "discount" pays the cost in the commercial market; the coupon clipping pays the cost in the corporate bond market; the dividend pays the cost in the stock market; and the interest plus arbitrage pays for the Euro-dollar market. Each of these competes against the other and all with the banks—"for the big borrower." The little man has no such alternatives. Why, then, should we set in legislation a guaranteed advantage for the large capital seeker?

Reflect on the already existing advantages that protect preference for the large borrower—

- (1) Large corporations can provide good size "compensating balances," which leverage bank earnings.
- (2) These corporations or large borrowers can provide attractive certificate of deposits for the lending bank.
- (3) Larger loans are less costly per loan, thus assure better profitability.
- (4) I hesitate to add—a newly discovered advantage for the largest of borrowers. That is, the U.S. Government as residual guarantor—examples are the Penn Central case and the Lockheed case.

With all this going for them why should we freeze an interest rate structure which has disproportionately benefited the strongest businesses, and has assisted all too little the three segments of the country which need our help—i.e., the small businessman, the consumer, and the home buyer.

Is there an alternative?

The Chairman of the Federal Reserve System, Dr. Burns, coyly suggested last week a two tier interest system. Spelling out what this would require—a thing Dr. Burns has been cautiously avoiding—

I submit the following:

One: Let the Federal Reserve get out from under their detailed concern for prime rates, and concentrate instead upon encouraging capital for the elements of our economy that have little or no alternative for credit borrowing than the banks and savings and loans.

Two: Provide incentives to roll back loans to this class of borrower, because the big boys can take care of themselves. They will play off their alternatives, one against the others, and get the best market.

Three: One incentive is to gear the borrowing window at the Fed to the paper generated from just these kinds of loans.

Four: Consider requirements of a certain percentage of bank loans to include a minimum portfolio of these borrowings. Setting favorable discount rates to assure a reasonable return to the banks.

The Federal Reserve specialists should be able to suggest other specifics to make this program feasible, and acceptable. Our basic challenge is, I believe, to get the public to

understand that the prime rate holds no magic for the bulk of our citizens. Our problem is that the newspapers and economists have been "brainwashed" with the phrase "prime rate." There is a pervasive and misleading folk wisdom to the effect that if you know a things name, it follows it is understood and friendly. Nothing could be further from the truth.

This Committee should not rest until it has exhausted every alternative to both unacceptable propositions—A) the status quo and B) a freezing of this status quo.

Mr. Chairman, may I make this final observation. Much of what has been told us by a variety of witnesses comes down in agreement with the sentiments of Professor Bassie, who told us on Tuesday:

"I believe effective stabilization measures will be increasingly necessary over the indefinite future on an across the board basis . . . I do not favor a simple one year extension, because I feel that would be entirely inadequate."

This imperative fact is equally painful to the strong conservative and the enthusiastic liberal, but for separate and disparate reasons. To the conservative, it commands a departure from beliefs he thought were absolute and he knew were comforting. To the liberal, it dictates a departure from the thrilling rhetoric and heady freedom of an abstract concept.

For everyone and especially for this Committee it commands our grappling with the realities of an economy which has evolved in spite of our beliefs and outside the comforting confinements of out-moded phrases and ineffective programs. I warn my colleagues, to kennel a frisky dog is one kind of challenge, to kennel a canny fox is quite another. In a manner of speaking, we are setting out with a very poor appreciation of just what kind of critter we are seeking to corral by this legislation. My hope is that we will take some of our time to cultivate this much needed appreciation. I hope you will agree with me that the matter of interest rates is far more complex than our simplistic journalistic advisors have thus far demonstrated for our benefit and edification.

# HON. BILL NICHOLS ADDRESSES THE ANNUAL STATE FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE CONFERENCE

HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, my distinguished colleague from the Third Congressional District of Alabama, the Honorable BILL NICHOLS, addressed the annual State Fraternal Order of Police Conference in Montgomery, Ala.

In his remarks, Congressman NICHOLS discussed the various problem facing law enforcement officers today and legislation pending before this Congress to alleviate some of these problems.

Mr. Speaker, the job of the police officer is becoming more difficult every day; the job is more dangerous and it is more demanding. Congressman NICHOLS points these facts out in his speech and I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for study by my colleagues:

## FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE CONFERENCE

Thank you for your very kind remarks. It is a real pleasure for me to be here at the annual conference of Fraternal Order of Police.

From the beginning of civilization society has found it necessary to designate certain individuals to be responsible for enforcing the laws of that society and protecting human life and property. In ancient Rome, that responsibility rested with the centurion who was faced with the task of making it possible for civilization to survive against the onslaught of lawlessness.

Today, you gentlemen are the new centurions. You are the only buffer that stands between those forces of evil, crime and terror and our society. If left unchecked, these forces would bring our civilization to its knees. Whereas the Roman centurion had to have some qualities of leadership, his effectiveness was often judged by his size and physical ability. The new centurion, however, is somewhat different. While size is an asset, today's law enforcement officer must be intelligent as well. He must be a psychologist, a lawyer, a preacher, a doctor, and a sociologist. He must be able to make a decision in a split second, remembering all the time that he might be violating someone's constitutional rights—he must be aware of the fact that his split second decision might mean life or death—he must hold his personal emotions in check when he arrests a suspected cop killer, a child molester or some other thug who has committed a particularly horrible crime.

Today's law enforcement officer is a professional. Our society no longer gives a man a gun and a badge and says, "go enforce the law". Our state has now started an excellent educational program which will insure that all law enforcement officers are qualified and are professionals.

Our new policy in Alabama requires 240 hours in one of the four law enforcement academies set up in Alabama for all new police officers and those who have been in law enforcement for less than three years. This, plus on the job training these new officers receive while working with veteran officers such as yourself, will prove invaluable to them and to the society they protect. The law enforcement school at Jacksonville State University, Auburn University, the University of Alabama, South Alabama, Troy State and U-A-B are working well and many officers are now working toward a college degree in the field. These officers should be commended for attending school during their off-hours to make better officers. It is interesting to note that one recent graduate of Jax State is now the police chief in Roanoke: It is believed that chief Billy White, age 24, may be the youngest police chief in Alabama.

To further encourage our law enforcement officers to improve themselves through higher education, I have co-sponsored legislation with Congressman Bill Chappell of Florida which would amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. In essence, our proposed legislation is designed to compensate officers for courses taken at institutions of higher learning in law enforcement. Since we in Alabama have six institutions of higher learning offering degrees in law enforcement, I believe this will be very beneficial to our State. This bill is now pending before the Judiciary Committee.

All the formal schooling in the world, however, is useless without practical experience and this is where you members of the F-O-P come in. Most of you have been in law enforcement for at least several years now and I am sure you are aware of how much it has changed since you first joined the force. So

be patient with the new officer and remember that while you are teaching him, you are also learning so both of you benefit—as does society.

I believe the citizens of the United States are now taking a different attitude toward the police officer. A few years ago, your image was tarnished and it seemed that every arrested suspect was crying "police brutality" and his cry was often heard. Those charges are still being made although the number is diminishing, but the public is paying less attention. Instead, they are paying attention to the newspaper articles that say, "Two Deputy Sheriffs Shot to Death in San Antonio," "Two Delaware State Troopers Die in Gunfight," or "Sniper Slays Three New Orleans Police Officers." Last year, 112 law enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty including officer Israel Gonzales of the Arlington County, Virginia Police Department who died while attempting to stop a bank robbery in a suburb of Washington, D.C. His death prompted a member of the Capitol Hill police force to write this poem in his memory:

The rains come down, the skies are gray  
Another "cop" is buried today  
His young wife mourns, her grief we share  
A final tribute to show we care  
He died with honor, he met the test  
This man in blue, the Nation's best  
We ask ourselves, "why must this be"  
And who is next, maybe you or me  
For the flowers wilt and lose their beauty  
And a young man died in the line of duty  
Still the rains come down, the skies are gray  
Another "cop" is dead today  
But the sun must shine, the rains must cease  
So we say farewell, may he rest in peace.

While this poem was written in honor of Officer Gonzales, it stands as a memorial to all 112, including the three killed in Alabama, who died in the line of duty during 1972.

I am very concerned about the future of the families of those 112 men who gave their lives while protecting society during 1972. I am sure that many of these officers did not have adequate insurance to provide for all the needs of their families. In order to assure that the survivors of police officers killed in the line of duty do not face economic hardships in the future, I have introduced H.R. 874, the public safety officers benefits act. This bill would provide \$50,000 to the family of police officers and firemen killed in the line of duty. This legislation is similar to a bill I introduced, while in the State senate. This legislation, which was passed in 1965, provided \$10,000 to survivors of police officers and firemen killed in the line of duty. I believe this was one of the most worthwhile measures passed while I was in the State legislature. Ironically, the first to benefit from this law was the family of an Anniston fireman.

While this legislation might have been sufficient in 1965, it is no longer adequate to meet the economic needs of these families. The average income of a police officer in Alabama today is only \$5,800, hardly enough to provide long range economic security for his family in the event of his death. Since this legislation affects all policemen and firemen in the country, the national F-O-P has undertaken a massive letter writing campaign to members of the judiciary committee, where this proposal is now pending.

You know, gentlemen, I don't envy your position today. While your stature has come up in the eyes of the average citizen, there is no doubt that it is open season on law enforcement officers. In 1971, there were 126 police officers killed and over 75,000 assaults—the number of officers slain during 1972 decreased but assaults continued to

mount. In New York, there are approximately 300 assaults every month and the story is the same in much of the nation. The urgency created by this growing epidemic of attacks and killings with respect to police officers calls for the most stringent measures to protect our society, our government and our citizens.

I have introduced legislation which, I feel includes the stringent measures to protect our police officers from these attacks. This bill, H.R. 2372, has also been endorsed by the national F.O.P. First, this legislation makes the assault or killing of a police officer a Federal crime; secondly, it provides for imprisonment and/or a fine for those convicted of assaulting a policeman; thirdly, this bill provides for a mandatory death sentence for anyone who kills, with premeditation and malice aforethought, a police officer acting in the line of duty. It is my opinion that this provision complies with the supreme court on capital punishment since the jury has no discretion in the sentence; and finally, this legislation authorizes the attorney general to pay up to \$50,000 for information leading to the arrest and conviction of anyone who violates this law.

Last summer, the Supreme Court made one of its most ridiculous rulings in history when it—in essence—struck down the death penalty. The decision, five to four, was extremely confusing with each Justice writing a separate opinion. Only two felt the death penalty was cruel and unusual punishment. What seemed to disturb the other three members of the majority was the fact that juries had the discretion of deciding life or death. A number of States have already passed new laws which will allow the imposition of the death penalty under certain conditions. These States believe that the new laws will comply with Supreme Court ruling. I very definitely believe that capital punishment is a deterrent to crime and I think the statistics will bear me out. In 1960, the United States had a murder rate per 100,000 population of 5.0; that year, there were 56 executions. In 1966, the murder rate was 5.6 and there was one execution. By 1971, the murder rate had skyrocketed to 8.5. There were no executions in 1971—in fact, there has not been a single death sentence carried out in this country since 1967.

A number of members in the 93rd Congress—and I am one of them—are concerned about the Supreme Court ruling. We have introduced a bill, in the form of a constitutional amendment, which would give the States the right to impose the death penalty for first degree murder and treason. I am sick and tired of our lawbreakers being coddled with society receiving the blame for whatever crimes they committed. The man who guns down a law abiding citizen, assaults and murders a child or kills a public safety officer has forfeited his right to live yet under today's laws, he cannot be executed. The Supreme Court ruling of last June spared the lives of over 600 persons including some convicted of particularly brutal crimes.

Several weeks ago in a Washington suburb, a group of men forced their way into a warehouse during an attempted robbery. They held a number of hostages, several of whom were shot, and then exchanged gunfire with police for about an hour. During the gun-battle, one of the robbers told a hostage, "We might as well kill you—after all, there's no death penalty." This statement underscores the need for capital punishment.

Gentlemen, I commend each of you. You have one of the most thankless jobs in our Nation. You are the target of more abuse



than any other group of men in our Nation. But I am happy to see the situation changing. You are returning to a position of honor and respect. I am sure there are many reasons for this change—fear by the law abiding citizens for his personal safety—a tiring by these citizens of the lawlessness which continues in our country—and, of course, the 112 colleagues of yours who laid down their life during 1972 to protect society.

I would also like to pay honor to your wives. The life of a police officer's wife is not an easy one. There is always a certain amount of uncertainty—there is always the overcooked dinners—the holidays when your husband is working.

I often wonder why a man wants to be a police officer. The pay is not good, the hours are often long and the work is dangerous. I am sure your reasons are much more complex but I think it can be summed up easily—it's a desire to help your fellow man in a job that has to be done. I thank you for making police work your profession. Society owes you a debt—a debt that cannot be repaid. But hopefully, during the 93rd Congress we will be taking steps to begin repaying this debt. I hope this session of Congress will pass this legislation which is badly needed and which will make your job just a little easier.

I thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today and I want to issue each of you a personal invitation to stop by my office when you are in Washington. We look forward to seeing you and repaying the kind hospitality you have shown to me today.

#### THE FICTION OF FOREIGN AID

**HON. H. R. GROSS**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the February 1973 issue of Washington Monthly has published an article by William and Elizabeth Paddock which ought to be read by the Members of Congress since they will be called upon in the weeks ahead to vote on still another edition of the annual multibillion-dollar foreign aid program.

The article is adapted from the Paddock's book, "We Don't Know How," soon to be published by the Iowa State University Press. It describes the waste and utter futility of certain projects in the foreign aid programs through which billions of dollars have been squandered since the inception of the Marshall plan.

But let the Paddocks, through Washington Monthly, tell you of their experience in Central America in the following article:

THE CULTURE OF BUREAUCRACY: SO HARD TO REMEMBER, SO EASY TO FORGET

(By William and Elizabeth Paddock)

In the 1940s the American people began a long journey that was to take them to the hungry nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It became an emotional crusade involving the government, national foundations, church groups, universities, and scientists. Other "developed" countries one by one joined us in this crusade. The United Nations took up the cause, declaring the 1960s to be the "Decade of Development." The total cost

to the American people to the beginning of 1971 was 100 billion tax dollars plus the money and energies of the many nongovernment organizations.

This enormous expenditure has been justified for many reasons, but the dominating motive has been the conviction that we "cannot live as an island of affluence in a sea of poverty," that if the world is to have peace it must be stable, and for the poor nations to achieve stability they must be "developed."

In the last few years enthusiasm for the crusade has flagged as the development of the poor nations seems, somehow, always to recede, no matter how much money is spent, no matter how many new ideas are put into operation. In fact, by now, the only people who remain enthusiastic seem to be those of the receiving countries (provided they get to spend the money, themselves, without strings), and the staffs of the massive (and firmly entrenched) development bureaucracies inside and outside the government. As for the stability of the world, seldom has it seemed more elusive. Fighting for it with the sword of development has come to seem rather futile and out of date.

The authors, firm believers in the doctrines of development and long involved in the struggle, believed now was the right time for a report about foreign aid which would be not only optimistic but useful as a guide showing how a variety of development projects had indeed succeeded. We were thinking of more than a glorification of all those thousands of people who have given up the amenities of their homes and gone out to strike development sparks in the suffering areas of the world's hungry nations. We wanted to give an account of a dozen or more effective development programs in the hope that the lessons learned from them could be applied elsewhere.

With nothing more definite than this in mind we set out to find the most promising region (not a single country) in the world to study. We began by talking to government officials, businessmen, diplomats, foundation officers, directors of international agencies, missionary groups, and the like. We asked, "What area in the whole world of development can we visit in order to see the most optimistic case for foreign assistance, an optimistic case based on valid accomplishments already achieved, not on blueprints or further hopes?"

The almost universal consensus, at the end of 1967, was that we should go to Mexico and Central America. This was the area with the most promising growth statistics, the experts said, and the cause for this was largely aid from a number of different development organizations.

We asked key officials with both private and government development organizations to recommend their most effective programs in Mexico and Central America. We asked that they name programs that were at least three years old so we could see progress already accomplished, rather than progress hoped for. We wanted to visit and examine those specific programs which the administrators of development organizations themselves assured us were especially effective. It was important that the praise for the projects come from the men responsible for the planning and financing of them, rather than from the press or the people carrying out the work in the field.

We organized a list of "effective development projects" and traveled some 25,000 miles to inspect them. We not only held more than 200 prearranged interviews but talked with everybody in sight—government officials, scientists, merchants, peasants, laborers, doctors, and lawyers. Upon arrival at a project, our usual procedure was to be

briefed by the officials in charge, who then would arrange our tour and go with us or send an aide to answer our questions in the field. Whenever possible, we returned alone to the project, so we could study it without official guidance. We wanted our study to be a genuinely independent audit.

The oddest thing came out of this research.

When we examined these projects in the field, we found they were not at all as described by the high officials back home (Peace Corps, AID, Inter-American Development Bank, and the rest). The projects were not necessarily ineffective; they were just different, sometimes unrecognizably so.

We do not question the sincerity of the officials who gave the recommendations, but certainly we now question the accuracy of the information fed back to them from the field. Always it is biased in favor of their programs. Always the reports are favorable. Journalists somehow never seem to write critical records of specific projects; perhaps it is because their studies are so often made on grants from the organizations being studied—or else they are hoping for grants for future studies. For the record, we financed this research trip ourselves, and thus were beholden to no organization.

#### CHOCOLA TREAT

An agricultural experiment station operated by the Guatemalan government is located at a town on the Pacific Coast called Chocoma. This station was once the focus of a major U.S. effort to assist agriculture throughout this coastal area of Central America, and a lot of U.S. money went into it.

I had last visited Chocoma in 1958 with Louis Franke, then head of the U.S. program for agriculture in Guatemala. He was about to be transferred to Argentina and was anxious to show me what he had accomplished before leaving Guatemala. "This is my major contribution," Franke said. He was rightly proud, for it was a beautiful experiment station.

Unlike most foreign aid administrators, Franke had brought to his job a good technical background and a lively interest in tropical farming. He knew that Guatemala's future depends on agriculture and he was able to convert this knowledge into action by getting the United States to put money into this station at Chocoma and another at Barcenas.

At Chocoma, a laboratory was built, followed by classrooms, dormitories, offices, a cafeteria, and so on—all with U.S. funds. Guest houses were constructed, and the station soon became a favorite spot for U.S. government personnel to visit.

Chocoma was designed to become a major agricultural research center, concentrating on the problems of principal tropical commercial crops like coffee. It was also to be a training center offering short, practical courses to farmers and agricultural extension agents from all of Central America, so they could carry home with them updated knowledge of improved farming practices.

This preface will help explain why I was so pleased when Covey Oliver, assistant secretary for Inter-American Affairs in the Department of State, told me that one of the projects I should visit was an experiment station established with AID support at Los Brillantes, located near Chocoma. I was doubly pleased because back in 1956 I had had a small hand in selecting Los Brillantes, from several possible sites, for a substation to augment the work at Chocoma. Thus by visiting Los Brillantes, a project which Oliver indicated already shows "evidence of success or which [is] sufficiently well established so that

a significant effect on development can be confidently predicted," I could also stop by and see Chocola.

Now, on this revisit to Guatemala's south coast, I could see at once a definite increase in cattle production. This seemed to jibe with a current policy in economic planning—namely, encouraging the developing countries to diversify their agriculture in order to alleviate dependence on a single crop—in the case of Guatemala, coffee. The planners say that such dependence makes a nation highly vulnerable to the vagaries of the international market and most governments have long tried to encourage the production of more kinds of crops.

But how to effect the diversification? That was the specific task assigned to Los Brillantes—a difficult one because theory and practice unfortunately are at odds.

#### CASHEWS AND ORANGES

Assistant Secretary Oliver had urged me to visit the experiment station at Los Brillantes precisely because it was effectively solving this difficult, complex problem; that is, it was finding crops into which Guatemalan farmers could diversify and still make money. With half of Guatemala's export earnings coming from one crop, he said, AID is keenly interested in helping Guatemala break the shackles of coffee dependency.

Oliver told me a great deal of progress had been made at Los Brillantes through the introduction of rubber and citrus as new crops. The station was supplying seedlings and advice on how to plant them, and AID was providing the loans needed to support this diversification. In addition, he said, research was moving ahead on other crops, such as black pepper, vanilla, cashews, allspice, mangos, tea and achote.

At Los Brillantes, the first person I met was Raymond Stadelman, a man whose writings I have admired for so long I thought he must be dead. His *Maize Cultivation in Northwestern Guatemala* remains the classic background study on the agriculture of the highland Indians of Guatemala. Stadelman was now working here on rubber, and AID, according to Oliver, was greatly pleased with his progress.

Earlier, I knew, Los Brillantes had been kept busy for at least five years supplying rubber seedlings to Guatemalan farmers who had planted some 27,000 acres of rubber. Now, to my amazement, the place seemed dead. The reason, Stadelman explained, was that Guatemalan farmers were interested in planting rubber only as long as AID provided money on easy terms (such as a seven-year grace period before repayment begins).

When the loan money was used up (some loans were sizable: one farmer received \$884,000) the station, once a beehive of projects, fell into the doldrums. With prices as low as they were, neither rubber nor citrus was sufficiently attractive to the farmer without the easy loan money.

Now Stadelman was working alone. Support from AID to the research station had been reduced solely to providing his salary. No one could have been less optimistic about the future of rubber cultivation in Guatemala than Stadelman himself. He was even less optimistic about the possibility of receiving the additional support needed to change the direction of this work or to revive it. I commiserated with him and left as he was preparing for a visit by Congressman Clarence Long of Maryland and Nathaniel Davis, the new U.S. Ambassador to Guatemala. They would be arriving the next day for the same reason I had come—American officialdom had told them it considered this to be a good and thriving development project.

Why were the embassy and Washington continuing to send such visitors to see the "successful" AID program at Los Brillantes? Was it that they had not yet heard that the program had dried up?

#### BACK TO THE GRAVEYARD

From Los Brillantes I drove, for old times' sake, 30 minutes down the road to the station at Chocola. Superficially, it looked much as it had in 1958, except that the beautiful buildings were empty.

A second glance showed it to be a disaster area. Its staff consisted of a single agronomist, a Guatemalan, Efraim Humberto Reyna, who had the equivalent of a high school education in agriculture. With the help of only two field hands, he was trying desperately to manage this huge station. Never have I seen a harder working, more dedicated, or more lost soul. Poor fellow, he had literally nothing with which to work—no equipment, no help, and obviously, only hand-to-mouth money. He was puppy-dog happy to see me, as if I were the first visitor in 10 years. The whole station is presently funded, all from the Guatemalan government, the equivalent of \$3,500 per year. Occasionally, Reyna is able to scrounge a little fertilizer from manufacturers. And that is his support.

And yet at the time of my visit, this was the one and only coffee research station in operation in all of Guatemala, a nation that still relies on coffee to pay for 36 per cent of all its imports. The total effort of government research to find more economical ways to produce this crop, to combat diseases and pests, to solve harvest and processing problems rested on the shoulders of this one man.

The dormitories, which U.S. tax money had built, had last been used six months earlier when they housed eight students for six days. The last course prior to that had been held nine years ago.

It is painful to go on. The Chocola station is today a graveyard where the forgotten bones of this carefully planned major aid program have been left to rot. The chairs, typewriters, desks, furniture—even the microscopes and pH meters—are still there, stenciled with the letters S.C.I.D.A., the long-forgotten alphabet soup designation for the cooperative program that operated for a few years as a joint venture of AID's predecessor, the U.S. International Cooperation Administration (ICA), and the Guatemalan Ministry of Agriculture.

Incredibly, I found there was no cooperation, nor had there been for years, between Chocola and Los Brillantes a few miles away. These two agricultural stations were separated as if by the Great Wall of China. The reason for this, I learned, was that there had been some jurisdictional scuffling between the Guatemalan Ministry of Agriculture and AID. The result: neither worked with the other.

Chocola is an illustration of one tragic aspect of our development work: *AID has no memory.*

AID programs are constantly scrapped, abandoned, or started anew—or forgotten. Budgets are cut and then, an alibi, Washington simply says it is time for the local government to "take over." The local government, however, usually has neither the money nor the talent (nor, sometimes, the interest) to take over. Thus another orphan program joins the graveyard.

New foreign aid directors arrive in the capital, sweep the decks clean, and begin anew. Back home a President is elected and his new foreign aid administrator also sweeps clean. No one takes the time to learn. What preceded? Did it fail? Did it succeed? Why?

A long-time AID friend says, "Every morn-

ing we wake up and laboriously reinvent the wheel."

#### COWS AND BUNNY RABBITS

Wherever the United States has a foreign aid program it has a staff that supervises the spending of its money, plans its use, and cajoles the local government into actions intended to make the money effective. The staff is called a "mission" and the man in charge is the "mission director."

Deane Hinton, U.S. AID mission director in Guatemala, was fresh from the National War College and recently decorated with a Superior Honor Award. Undoubtedly Hinton, whom I found to be a likeable man, was highly regarded as an administrator at AID's Washington headquarters.

Like AID mission directors around the globe, Hinton was filling an important post within the embassy structure. The AID director is generally the principal economic counselor to the ambassador. Although this was Hinton's first assignment in Latin America, he had served at several embassies in Europe and elsewhere, mainly as a political affairs officer. As is true of nearly all other AID mission directors, he had had no experience as a technician. Thus I was not surprised to learn that he knew little about agriculture even though this is the major economic business in Guatemala. But I was startled by the way he expressed it, although it was refreshingly honest.

"I don't know a cow from a bunny rabbit," he told me. "I'm a political economist."

I asked Hinton about how AID was performing in Guatemala. The answers he gave could have come from any of several other highly-regarded AID mission directors whom I have known.

Paddock: What is the most effective AID program in Guatemala?

HINTON: The agricultural school at Barcenas. We were able to convince the minister of agriculture that this agricultural school is important.

Paddock: The director said he was having a problem placing some of the graduates. Of the 26 new graduates in forestry, not one of them has a job in sight.

HINTON: I don't know about that.

Paddock: I understand Barcenas includes the forestry school the U. S. government helped establish 10 years ago and later helped merge with the agricultural school there.

HINTON: I don't know anything about that. You must remember that I have only been here 15 months. There is a lot about previous programs I don't know.

Paddock: Is any money going into the experiment station at Barcenas?

HINTON: What experiment station? There is no experiment station there in the sense any of us would think of one. It's a work farm for the Barcenas students. The farm is terribly run down, stupidly managed, and the United States has never helped it with funds.

Paddock: I don't mean the school's farm. I mean the experiment station. When I worked here in the 1950s this and the station at Chocola formed a major U.S. government effort. . . .

HINTON: I know nothing about it. I'm still learning. I have my hands full trying to keep track of what is going on today. I don't have the time to go through all the past records.

Paddock: What U.S.-supported project are Guatemala's officials most enthusiastic about?

HINTON: None. There is probably no one in the Guatemalan government who would be sorry about our leaving or even notice if



we left tomorrow. I'm talking about projects. Loans are another matter. Everybody wants loans.

PADDOCK: I'm interested to know why you chose the Los Brillantes coastal experiment station and the nearby agricultural school at Barcenas as projects for the new ambassador to see on his first trip into the country last week, and also why you considered them worthy of inspection by Congressman Clarence Long, who went with him.

HINTON: The trip was planned for the Congressman and he didn't want any briefings. He wanted to get out into the country and these fit his two-day itinerary nicely.

PADDOCK: What is the most important thing AID can do in Guatemala?

HINTON: Be smart enough to operate as a catalyst for change. We should emphasize the training of people and the need for changes in their fundamental attitudes. In addition to giving them new technical skills, we should expose them to new ideas.

PADDOCK: How would you do this?

HINTON: We are doing it in a training program in social sciences at the local university.

PADDOCK: How did you happen to choose social sciences?

HINTON: We had a study made of the university, and the study showed this was the area of greatest need.

PADDOCK: Who made the study?

HINTON: Gene Martin.

PADDOCK: What is his specialty?

HINTON: He is a social scientist.

This is an old story. In 1963 AID hired the Center of International Studies at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to find an answer to the agricultural dilemma of the world's hungry nations. The center assembled a group of experts who set about interviewing agriculturalists and scientists from such other fields as anthropology, sociology, and psychology. The \$100,000 study, published in book form, showed that each specialist finds solutions in terms of his own discipline. If you hire a social scientist to study the university, you end up with a solution that involves social science.

I myself am no different. Being a former corn breeder, I lose few opportunities to emphasize that corn is of major importance in Central America and Mexico. That I know this about myself makes me wary of the same bias in others.

PADDOCK: What do you consider Guatemala's most serious problem?

HINTON (after a discussion of some political dilemmas): Agriculture. And for the first time we are going to take a serious look at the Guatemalan farm picture.

He went on to explain that through his efforts, a contract had been arranged with Iowa State University to send a team of agricultural economists to Guatemala to make an analysis of the role of agriculture in the development of the Guatemalan economy.

PADDOCK: Why are you using Iowa State University?

HINTON: Because it's a good agricultural school.

PADDOCK: Are you familiar with the Iowa State-Guatemala Tropical Research Center, operated here by Iowa State from 1945 to 1955? That was the program which brought me to Guatemala originally.

HINTON: I've never heard of it.

PADDOCK: That program emphasized agriculture. It was then taken over by the International Cooperation Administration which, as you know, was the predecessor agency of your own AID. At one time the annual U.S. budget for Guatemalan agriculture was nearly \$1 million. That certainly represented a major interest in those days.

HINTON: I've been here too short a time to

know the details of previous programs. However, I know Iowa State is a good university and they have good men.

Of the four authors of the study for which Hinton had contracted Iowa State, only one was then in Guatemala. He was a young graduate student named Eric Graber, and I sensed he was doing most of the field work for the study. Our conversation went like this:

PADDOCK: Are you familiar with an earlier Iowa State agricultural program in Guatemala?

GRABER: I have heard there was some kind of program but that's all I know about it.

PADDOCK: I am interested in what you think has been the most effective U.S. effort in Guatemala.

GRABER: The Peace Corps. Of course I'm prejudiced because I was once with the Peace Corps.

PADDOCK: What do you consider to be the most effective AID program in Guatemala?

GRABER: I haven't found one.

PADDOCK: What will your current study indicate?

GRABER: We would like to determine the priorities for investment in agriculture.

PADDOCK: Do you know what use will be made of the report for which you are collecting data?

GRABER: I really have no idea.

#### EVEN IOWA FORGETS

In April, 1969, Iowa State University published the report, a full two inches thick, titled: *Agricultural Development and Policy in Guatemala*. When I read that its purpose was to review the extent "to which the agricultural sector has changed since 1950," I realized it covered part of the 1945-55 period when Iowa State had operated its own agricultural experiment station in Guatemala. Writing Graber, I asked if his group had consulted any of the reports published during the course of that earlier program. He replied: "I don't remember those specific reports." Thus, like AID, Iowa State, too, has no memory.

I wrote to Hinton some nine months after the report had been released, asking two questions: How has the report been used? Which of its recommendations have been acted upon? He replied that the report had been circulated widely but had "encountered a fairly general lack of interest."

Not surprising! The report begins with these deadly naive and patronizing sentences about a nation which, it would seem, no one at Iowa State had ever heard of before (in fact, they might have been written in 1852 by John L. Stephens, the first U.S. envoy to Guatemala):

"Guatemala lies just south of the Yucatan peninsula in Central America. It is bounded on the north and west by Mexico, on the east by Belize, to the south and east by Honduras and El Salvador, and on the southwest by the Pacific Coast. Although Guatemala contains only 108,889 square kilometers, approximately the size of the state of Louisiana, it has a very wide geographical diversity."

This study, remember, was intended primarily for Guatemalan officials and Americans stationed there. I wonder how many bothered to read through this two-inch rehash of all the appallingly familiar data which had been kicking around the back offices for years. Fifty officials? Twenty? Five? No one?

In his letter, Hinton commented that it was "still too early" to say which of the Iowa State recommendations would actually be put into practice, but "I am happy to tell you . . . the Government of Guatemala seems to have accepted . . . one of the recommendations, the idea of placing more emphasis on basic grain cereals, particularly corn."

phases on basic grain cereals, particularly corn."

Hinton's letter was postmarked Santiago, Chile. He had been transferred there to head up another program where, in the deeply entrenched tradition of AID, he doubtless was again starting from scratch.

When I wrote to the new U.S. mission director in Guatemala, his assistant answered. "I can assure you that the report has had a major impact . . ." The result: another U.S. loan to Guatemala, this time for \$23 million.

I did not have the heart to write to Hinton that the corn seed stock from the old Iowa State College-Guatemala Tropical Research Center is sitting in a storeroom at the experiment station at Barcenas. It was put in storage 10 years ago when ICA stopped funding the program. A faithful Guatemalan there is keeping the seed collection in what he believes is good order, just in case someday someone wants to use it.

How could this have happened? Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, from his years of experience, pointed at the answer when, after a highly optimistic White House briefing about Vietnam by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, he said President Johnson had been "led down a garden path. . . ." Actually, Acheson is more exactly reported to have said, "With all due respect, Mr. President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff don't know what they're talking about." He claimed that field reports written near the scene of combat in Vietnam were rewritten as they passed through each higher echelon. With each re-writing the reports reflected less and less the pessimism at the front and more and more the optimism that prevailed in the Pentagon.

The same reporting situation occurs with development projects in the "third world," and with the same result. Gunnar Myrdal, writing about South Asia, said, "Optimism, and therefore approaches that make optimism seem more realistic, is itself a natural urge for intellectuals. . . . All (economic) planning . . . tends to err on the side of optimism. . . ." This can similarly be found in Latin America and, I am sure, in Africa as well. (In virtually every interview for this book which involved an unfavorable view of a development project, I was told, "Don't quote me." But no one ever said that when their remarks were favorable. Thus the syndrome feeds upon itself.)

The most easily understood examples of this are the numerous congressional fact-finding missions where congressmen travel abroad to evaluate foreign aid projects. The congressman arrives at the foreign capital; he is met by the ambassador and the AID mission director. Off they all go to see the mission's best project, and at its best appearance. You remember, like Sunday dinner for the preacher or parents' day at school. Who shows the failures? Who would be so naive as to suggest showing them? Who even wants to see them?

#### WELFARE: EVERYBODY'S WHIPPING BOY

#### HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the welfare "mess" has been a major political issue for the past several years, but there has been more rumor than fact in

the public debate. Our welfare system definitely needs reform and needs it badly. At the same time, however, there are millions of poor people in this country and we cannot simply terminate all welfare payments. What we need instead is a rational debate based upon the true facts of the situation—and this is exactly what we have not been hearing from politicians and public officials.

The AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education has recently performed a great public service by publishing the real facts about welfare, and *Parade* magazine on April 1, 1973, summarized these facts. People wind up on welfare, because they are poor—not because they are chiselers. Most poor people are not even on welfare. More than half of the people on welfare are young children. Less than 1 percent of the welfare recipients are able-bodied males.

No one is getting rich on welfare. Cheating and fraud are minimal. Welfare mothers are not churning out illegitimate children. Almost half of the people receiving welfare payments are white. And there is no evidence that welfare is necessarily habit-forming.

It is facts like these, and the documentation behind them, that should be heard in public debate. COPE deserves our commendation for its candor and its report deserves the attention of every Member.

Therefore, I would like to insert both the AFL-CIO study and the *Parade* magazine summary in the *Record* at this time:

#### WELFARE: EVERYBODY'S WHIPPING BOY

(Welfare . . . it's as unloved as athlete's foot. Office-holders know they're guaranteed prime press space by attacking it. Conservative groups and leaders make careers inveighing against it. In a government administering thousands of programs, welfare is probably the least popular and most misunderstood. It's everybody's whipping-boy.)

(The Greeks created no more myths about their gods than we have about welfare. Time and again we are told of the welfare client who arrives in a fancy car to pick up the check that comes from taxpayers' money, and goes home to his color television and vintage champagne. He is strong, able-bodied and employable, we are told . . . but he just doesn't want to work. He's a loafer.)

If the welfare client is female, we are drawn a horror picture of repeated illegitimate births for the sole purpose of increasing her welfare benefits. She's a loafer, too.

We are advised that welfare provides such opulent living its clients would be crazy to give it all up and go to work. We hear repeatedly that welfare clients are cheats and welfare programs are rampant with fraud.

We even are asked to believe that hordes of poor people scrutinize statistics that come out of federal and state agencies, locate states and communities where the highest welfare benefits are paid, and choose their spots accordingly.

We believe, too, that the majority of welfare recipients are blacks.

Perhaps the attitude of a great many Americans toward welfare was reflected in a campaign statement by President Nixon: "We are faced with the choice between the 'work ethic' that built this nation's character, and the new 'welfare ethic' that could cause that American character to weaken."

The statement seems to encompass and reinforce most of the myths about welfare.

As the new Congress swings into action and may confront again, as it did last year, the welfare issue, it's a good time to look more closely at the facts, not the myths. Following are 10 key facts about welfare.

Fact No. 1—People wind up on welfare not because they are cheats, loafers or malingers, but because they are poor. They are not just poor in money, but in everything. They've had poor education, poor health care, poor chances at decent employment, and poor prospects for anything better.

Fact No. 2—But even most of the poor are not on welfare. Some 15 million Americans receive some form of welfare benefits. There are more than 25 million officially below the poverty level of \$4,000 a year for a family of four. Another 30-50 million are just barely above it. And \$4,000 a year, as everyone knows, does not afford extravagance.

Fact No. 3—Of the 15 million receiving welfare, about eight million are children under 16 years of age. Anyone for "work-fare" for children more than half a century after child labor laws were enacted?

Fact No. 4—Less than one percent—about 150,000—of welfare recipients are able-bodied employable males. Many of these are in their late-middle years. Most are uneducated. All are required by law to sign up for work or work training. A government study shows more than 80 percent want to work, rather than draw welfare, and among the fathers in this group one in three is enrolled in work training.

Fact No. 5—Apart from children and the relative handful of potential employables, on welfare are more than two million aged, more than one million totally and permanently disabled or blind, three million mothers. All of these are in programs roughly supported 50-50 by state and federal funds. Another group of less than one million is aided by state and local non-federally supported programs. These are single adults and childless couples, most of whom work full time but are paid less than they would be on welfare. These are the working poor.

Fact No. 6—No one is getting rich on welfare. It allows, at best, bare-bone living. In no state does the average welfare payment bring a family up to poverty level. Maximum payments for a family of four range from the \$700 a year in Mississippi to \$3600-plus in New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts and Connecticut. Thirty-nine states pay less than their own established standard of need.

So instead of the high living often portrayed among welfare recipients, the facts boil down to an average nationally of \$1.68 per recipient per day with a range in the states from 48 cents to \$2.58 per person per day. Out of this comes food, clothing, housing and other essential cost items. A survey of welfare mothers showed that if they received higher benefits, half would spend it mostly on food, 28 percent on clothing and shoes, most of the others on rent or a combination of essentials.

(Figures are based on the major federal-state matching program called Aid to Families With Dependent Children, which covers the largest percentage of welfare recipients.)

Fact No. 7—Cheating and fraud in welfare are minimal. There is, of course, some cheating and dishonesty among welfare clients. Try to imagine any program involving 15 million persons that is entirely free of fraud. But the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates there is cheating among fewer than one percent of welfare

cases. Add to this another 2-3 percent on the rolls due to misunderstanding or technical-bureaucratic error, and there is an upper range of 4-5 percent receiving benefits who are either completely or partially ineligible. It is likely that this range of cheating, plus error, exists in income tax payments of citizens and in many other areas of activity.

No one argues that any cheating should be permitted when discovered, but the public idea of massive fraud in welfare is wrong.

As for invading hordes of welfare clients moving from state to state to achieve higher benefits, facts don't support this myth. In New York, which pays the highest benefits, less than two percent of new recipients have lived in the state less than two years; more than 85 percent of all recipients have lived there more than five years. The facts show that poor people, like the rest of us, move around mainly to find better job opportunities.

Fact No. 8—Welfare mothers are not churning out illegitimate children. Nearly 70 percent of all children in welfare families are legitimate, according to the Social and Rehabilitation Service of HEW. Thirty percent of welfare families with any children have only one child; 25 percent have two; 18 percent have three. The remainder have four or more.

Economically, anyway, the myth is nonsense, since the average payment per additional child nationally is only \$35 a month, hardly an incentive toward mass production.

Fact No. 9—More than 48 percent of welfare families are white; about 43 percent are black. Most of the remaining are American Indians, Orientals and other racial minorities. The reasons for the high percentage of blacks are self-evident: More than 34 percent of the black population in the U.S. have incomes below the poverty level, compared to 13 percent of the white population.

Fact No. 10—There is no evidence to sustain the belief that welfare is necessarily habit-forming, that is that "once on welfare, always on welfare." Half the families on welfare have been on the rolls 20 months or less; two-thirds have been on the rolls less than three years. Fewer than one in five have received welfare for five years or more. One in 16 has been on 10 years or more. About 65 percent of welfare cases at any given time are on for the first time; about one-third are repeaters.

These, then, are some of the major facts about welfare. Sad to relate, there is no fresh revelation among them. They have been printed in many places, many times. Yet, the myths about welfare, and the objections to it, persist.

A major objection, raised both by those who want to reduce it and even many of those who want to improve it, is its cost. It is true, welfare costs money—about \$12 billion a year in the major programs jointly financed on about a 50-50 basis by the states and federal government. Another \$100 million a year is borne by states and communities in general assistance programs not aided by Washington.

The federal share of the cost represents about 2½ percent of an over-all budget of \$270 billion that President Nixon is shooting for next year.

So welfare really costs less than 2½ cents of every dollar paid into federal taxes. Indeed, closing just a few major tax loopholes for corporations and wealthy individuals alone could bring in enough additional federal revenue to cover present welfare outlays.

Buried in the emotions surrounding, and misunderstandings of, welfare are some other important matters that should not be ignored.



AFDC, the major welfare program, was conceived to provide help for dependent children. As Bert Seidman, director of the AFL-CIO Social Security Department noted in a recent speech, "Our whole approach to welfare reform ought to be, therefore: What is best for these millions of disadvantaged and under-privileged children?" He called "disadvantaged" and "underprivileged" fancy words "to describe kids who are hungry and ill-clothed and living in rat-infested tenements surrounded by filth, despair, degradation and often disease."

Instead, Seidman said, "their plight is ignored and all the attention is placed on the alleged sins of the adults . . . but whatever may or may not be the sins of their parents, the guiltless children share heavily in the punishment."

It is too simple to say, as some do, "send the mothers to work." In the first place, surveys show many would like to work. But where are the jobs, and if there were jobs what do you do with the children? Who will be there when they get home from school? If they are pre-school, where are the day care centers to look after them properly? The President vetoed day care legislation a couple of years back.

If there were sufficient jobs and adequate day care facilities, what are the ethical implications of a must-work program for welfare mothers? Some welfare opponents have split personalities. In one breath they oppose day care legislation on the grounds it would weaken the family structure; in the next breath they extol "work-fare" and the "work-ethic." You can't have it both ways.

Experience with non-federal must-work programs for welfare clients in several states has been a jolt, with one of the key roadblocks to any success being "the documented reluctance of employers" to hire welfare recipients, according to a congressional study.

Welfare probably will be a matter of heated controversy for years to come, and it is likely to remain massively misunderstood. The shape of any true reform was described by Seidman this way:

"In summary, any genuine welfare reform must, first and foremost, emphasize the children's welfare. It should rely primarily on non-welfare programs to develop and assure suitable jobs at decent wages supplemented by improved social insurance, health security and other programs aimed at eliminating poverty.

"With this multi-faceted approach, welfare, whatever it is called, could become a residual program providing a decent level of living to people who can't work at all or ought not to be required to work if they wish to devote themselves to their children's care. Under these circumstances, welfare would be far less costly and the 'work ethic' would be irrelevant to welfare. The nation might even turn once again to helping instead of punishing the poor.

#### THE TRUTH ABOUT WELFARE

In a recent "Memo From COPE," a publication of the Committee on Political Education of the AFL-CIO, 10 key facts were printed to dispel the myths which have grown up in this country concerning welfare.

Herewith from COPE the fact sheet on "Welfare: Everybody's Whipping Boy":

Fact No. 1—People wind up on welfare not because they are cheats, loafers or malingerers, but because they are poor. They are not just poor in money, but in everything. They've had poor education, poor health care, poor chances at decent employment and poor prospects for anything better.

Fact No. 2—But even most of the poor are not on welfare. Some 15 million Americans receive some form of welfare benefits. There

are more than 25 million officially below the poverty level of \$4000 a year for a family of four. Another 30-50 million are just barely above it. And \$4000 a year, as everyone knows, does not afford extravagance.

Fact No. 3—Of the 15 million receiving welfare, about eight million are children under 16 years of age.

Fact No. 4—Less than one percent—about 150,000—of the welfare recipients are able-bodied employable males. Many of these are in their late-middle years. Most are uneducated. All are required by law to sign up for work or work training. A government study shows more than 80 percent want to work, rather than draw welfare, and among the fathers in this group one in three is enrolled in work training.

Fact No. 5—Apart from children and the relative handful of potential employables, on welfare are more than two million aged, more than one million totally and permanently disabled or blind, three million mothers. All of these are in programs roughly supported 50-50 by state and federal funds. Another group of less than one million is aided by state and local non-federally supported programs. These are single adults and childless couples, most of whom work full time but are paid less than they would be on welfare. These are the working poor.

Fact No. 6—No one is getting rich on welfare. It allows, at best, barebone living. In no state does the average welfare payment bring a family up to poverty level. Maximum payments for a family of four range from \$700 a year in Mississippi to \$3600+ in New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts and Connecticut. Thirty-nine states pay less than their own established standard of need. . . .

Fact No. 7—Cheating and fraud in welfare are minimal. There is, of course, some cheating and dishonesty among welfare clients. Try to imagine any program involving 15 million persons that is entirely free of fraud. But the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare estimates there is cheating among fewer than one percent of welfare cases. Add to this another two to three percent on the rolls due to misunderstanding or technical-bureaucratic error, and there is an upper range of four to five percent receiving benefits who are either completely or partially ineligible. It is likely that this range of cheating, plus error, exists in income tax payments of citizens and in many other areas of activity. . . .

Fact No. 8—Welfare mothers are not churning out illegitimate children. Nearly 70 percent of all children in welfare families are legitimate, according to the Social and Rehabilitation Service of HEW. Thirty percent of welfare families with any children have only one child; 25 percent have two; 18 percent have three. The remainder have four or more. . . .

Fact No. 9—More than 48 percent of welfare families are white; about 43 percent are black. Most of the remaining are American Indians, Orientals and other racial minorities. The reasons for the high percentage of blacks are self-evident; more than 34 percent of the blacks in the U.S. have incomes below the poverty level, compared to 13 percent of the white population.

Fact No. 10—There is no evidence to sustain the belief that welfare is necessarily habit-forming, that is that "once on welfare, always on welfare." Half the families on welfare have been on the rolls 20 months or less; two-thirds have been on the rolls less than three years. Fewer than one in five has received welfare for five years or more. About 65 percent of welfare cases at any given time are on for the first time; about one-third are repeaters.

#### PARTING TODAY'S RED SEA

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, it is as simple for a nation to take the easy way out as it is for an individual. Periodically, every society is confronted with a choice between short-term physical gain at expense of principle, or preference for the more difficult alternative dictated by adherence to standards on which that nation was founded and upon which it is supposed to stand.

Such a decision is going to confront our Nation, Government, and Congress in the next few months.

Today, there are 3½ million Jews in Russia. That is nothing new by itself. There have been Jews in Russia from the very earliest times of recorded history. Nor has their situation changed much over the centuries.

For as long as there have been Jews in Russia, there has been active anti-Semitism. It is a national phenomenon there. To be a Jew was to be born under the sign of persecution. Forms of oppression varied and evolved, but never the motivating forces behind them; hatred for the Jew because he was different, determined to practice his religious faith, and impossible to eliminate by mere discrimination.

Regime after regime tried as hard as it could. Czar after czar fomented pogrom after pogrom. And the Jews died. Horribly. Beaten to death. Sabered by the thousands by Cossacks. Burned out of their homes by czarist-inspired mobs. Driven from entire provinces by ukase from Moscow. Tortured to death for being religious. Slaughtered by enraged mobs because of false charges of ritual murder.

Unable to attend universities. Unable to own land. Unable to work in certain areas.

Forbidden to travel into specified sections of the nation. Forbidden to stay on sidewalks when non-Jews trod them. Forbidden to speak to non-Jews with a hat on their heads. Forbidden to build houses of worship. Forbidden to manufacture religious articles. Forbidden, it seems, to do everything but die and pay taxes. Their only solace was in each other and in their God.

Butchered by one people or another, until their history became one quavering, drawnout wail of supreme agony. Crowded into tiny villages of the Pale, where they were forced to live by decree, these masses of belabored humanity somehow survived. All they could do was pray to the Almighty that He would somehow see them through that stygian darkness of torment to a brighter time.

We all know what happened. The czars were replaced by the Bolsheviks, who have tenaciously clung to the goal of stamping out all recognized religion. So their agony took different forms. Synagogues were closed. Religious life was

frowned upon in any form. Every organized power of the state was mobilized to focus upon these stubborn "people of the book" who resisted oppression in the time-honored manner of their tribe: fervent devotion to their God and silent suffering under the tyrant's heel.

Since that time, these people have endured more than any other in the world's recorded history. Hitler has come and gone. Yet still the Jewish people live. And in Russia, no matter how hard the dictators of that land tried to snuff it out, their faith stayed alive. Huddled about countless Sabbath candles, they persisted in reaffirming their adherence to the ancient covenant. And at last, the new day came, as Israel rose like a phoenix from the ashes of 6 million of their slaughtered brothers and sisters.

Today they seek to shake the dust of Russia from their feet and emigrate to a place that is their own, at long last. To do so is to exchange one set of foes for another, but it does not matter to them. For there burns in their hearts a yearning to be free that veritably embodies much of the spirit of their ageless faith.

The Soviets have placed every physical obstacle in their path that they can think and conceive of.

News of Israel and the movement for freedom for Russian Jews has been vigorously repressed by the full force of the Soviet state. Yet as if by some magic, Jews across Russia thrill to the knowledge that they are not alone, and that across the world their brethren are moving heaven and earth to break age-old chains of bondage which still bind them. And it spreads across the face of Russia, to the rage and despair of police authorities.

From Moscow to Smolensk; from Leningrad to Kiev; from Odessa to Magnitogorsk; from Volgograd to Minsk; from Riga to Dnepropetrovsk; from Gorko to Archangel.

Nothing can stop it. For it flies with the wind, drifts with the snow and seems to fall with the very rain. No gun can kill it. No fence can hold it in.

And these Russian Jews risk and lose all by applying for permission to leave. As soon as they take such a momentous step, the full force of the Soviet state is loosed on them in a fury. Jobs are lost. Spies appear. Phones are tapped. Children are suspended from school. Physical violence accompanies all other forms of intimidation. Yet still they persist, willing to die on their feet rather than continue to live on their knees.

Frantic, the regime has imprisoned many on trumped-up charges, for numbers of these desperate people are both brilliant and accomplished.

Finally, as a last resort, the cynical Kremlin leadership imposed an infamous exit tax based on no formal education attained by prospective emigrants. In effect, it seeks to make it financially impossible for any educated Jew to leave the Soviet Union. No other group is harmed in this manner by the tax save the Jews.

In spite of all obstacles Russian life

places in their path, these people have attained many educational goals. Russia seeks to pick their minds without allowing them personal religious freedom. If they leave, Russia, starved for foreign currencies, seek to demand and collect a true highwayman's ransom for their persons.

From the very start of the campaign on behalf of the Jews of Russia, I have been intimately involved, and this spans the last 3½ years. All the names of those brave souls, either now in the West or still rotting in Soviet prisons, have come across my desk, and I, among many others, have done what was in my own poor power to aid them in their struggle to be free of persecution.

In recent weeks, the Soviets have made a great show of nonenforcement of the exit tax, without, it should be carefully noted, wiping that odious legislation from their statute books. Let it also be noted that just prior to our own last election, a similar move was made by them, and a number of educated Jews were allowed to leave without payment of the tax. Shortly after the election, as we all remember, the tax was reimposed.

Now, we are told, the Congress must ease its hitherto firm stand on the Vanik and Jackson amendments. In the name of selling them grain and turning profitable deals on the fruits of American technology, which Russia wants and needs, we are told to "ease up."

I am all for profits and expanded East-West trade. I applaud any relaxation of old tensions. Laudable and worthy of pursuit and realization. Yet how worthy is any goal if it is gained by stepping over the bodies, lives, hopes, and ideals of an ancient, helpless and innocent people? Has America ever done this? When have we ever gone to war in modern times for land? When have we coldbloodedly sold out a vulnerable group of human beings whose only crime is sharing a common religious faith? Are we that eager for Russian money? Do we thirst that much for some slight improvement in the balance of trade?

Our solution is simple and obvious. No weakening of congressional resolve is necessary. All we need do is pass the Vanik and Jackson amendments, and put them on the shelf, like worthy tools which for the present shall remain unused. Just like the Russian exit tax, which remains on their statute books but is now, according to their claims, unused. If they ever come to reinstitute it, then all we need do is reach for the shelf, grasp our own equalizer, and nullify their move. Simple, effective, and quite non-controversial.

Then most-favored-nation status can be extended to the Russians, and everyone is happy. The Soviets gain American business. Our business people gain lucrative Russian trade. And the Jews are able to shake the dust of Mother Russia and leave in peace.

Therefore, I shall continue to offer my enthusiastic sponsorship and support for the Freedom of Emigration Act. Some pharaohs, I believe, need a reminder from time to time.

## AID TO NORTH VIETNAM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the aid to North Vietnam syndrome persists as the administration escalates its maneuvering to condition the people to accept secretly made deals.

Time was when Americans felt that government was a servant of the people and that Congress was their forum to make sure that government was responsive to the wants and the needs of the people. The people's elected representatives in government have never approved of aid to North Vietnam or for that matter aid to North Korea, or to Communist Cuba. No one can truthfully suggest that it is the will of the American people to rebuild North Vietnam or give financial assistance to the Communist aggressors who mistreated our POW's, killed 46,000 American men, and wounded thousands of others.

Yet the Presidential mouthpieces continue to tell the American people that the President has pledged aid to Hanoi so American dollars must go to Hanoi—the people and this Congress be damned. THE PRICE OF "PEACE WITH HONOR" MUST BE PAID

As for me, hell would have to freeze over before I would vote 1 penny for North Vietnam, and if hell froze over, I still would not.

I am still waiting to hear any ripples that our new found allies, the Russians and the Red Chinese, feel obligated to give any aid to South Vietnam, or for that matter, aid to North Vietnam—unless it is more Mig's, SAM missiles, and military hardware.

If the American people sit by and watch this international rape of national integrity, we all deserve the reputation we are rapidly achieving around the world, that is, the most gullible fools on earth.

I insert a related news clipping:

[From the Washington Post, April 1, 1973]  
U.S. AID PLEDGED TO HANOI—PRESIDENT FIRM  
DESPITE BRUTAL POW HANDLING  
(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

SAN CLEMENTE, March 31.—The Nixon administration has no intention of abandoning its commitment to aid to North Vietnamese recovery despite indignation over Hanoi's treatment of prisoners of war.

That was one official comment of spokesmen here today as President Nixon prepared for his first meeting with South Vietnam's President Nguyen Van Thieu since July, 1969.

Thieu is to arrive in Los Angeles Sunday for the meeting at the Western White House here Monday and Tuesday. Demonstrations against and in support of Thieu are being planned both here and in Los Angeles, but officials indicated they do not expect any trouble.

In President Nixon's speech to the nation Thursday, he made no mention of the promise he had made earlier to give post-war reconstruction aid to North Vietnam.

The tough warnings to Hanoi in the speech, plus stories of mistreatment of American prisoners and the vigorous opposi-



tion in Congress to aid to North Vietnam, led some observers to conclude that the assistance effort might be dead.

An authorized spokesman as well as officials speaking privately said today, however, that the President has not changed his position and intends to live up to the commitment in the cease-fire agreement. The agreement said that the United States will contribute to "healing the wounds of war and to postwar reconstruction of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and throughout Indochina."

In addition to the Paris commitment to aid Hanoi, the United States agreed during Henry A. Kissinger's February visit to North Vietnam to establish a U.S.-North Vietnam Joint Economic Commission to develop economic relations between the two countries. That commission is now meeting in Paris.

An official emphasized here that Mr. Nixon, while disturbed not only by the treatment of American POWs but also by Hanoi's military movements, nevertheless is convinced that the most important objective is to have all sides abide by the cease-fire agreement.

The President is expected to tell Thieu that the way to achieve peace in Indochina is through "positive acts" and that "a dynamic approach to peace" is required despite all the previous bitterness and violence.

White House press secretary Ronald L. Ziegler said yesterday that the two presidents will confer in "postwar economic, political and military relationships between the two countries."

The military relationships may interest Thieu as much as the economic, and he is bringing with him the chief and assistant chief of the joint general staff.

But he also is bringing, in addition to his foreign minister, both the minister of economy and the minister of finance. In addition to their talks here, they will meet with American economic experts in Washington and with World Bank President Robert S. McNamara.

Pham Duong Hien, director general of overseas information, said in Washington this week that Thieu will seek assurances from Mr. Nixon of guaranteed military support if North Vietnam resumes large-scale war.

"In case the Communists break the agreement with a large-scale and blatant invasion, we want some kind of guarantee that the U.S. will not permit North Vietnam to do so," the South Vietnamese spokesman said.

"Much depends in the firm attitude of president Nixon. If they realize he would react militarily to a blatant violation of the agreement, then they may resort only to small-scale guerrilla activity."

That request could be the most difficult for Mr. Nixon to answer clearly, and it may in part explain the tough attitude he took in his Thursday speech. Not only did he speak emphatically in the need for "keeping the strength" of America, but he heaped scorn on what he called the "weak, soft and self-indulgent" who advocated "peace at any price" in Vietnam.

Obviously, the President is continuing to use both the carrot and the stick with North Vietnam, yet he must know that Congress will oppose his offering of the carrot and scream wildly if he should again use the stick.

As Thieu departed today from Saigon for the flight to Honolulu, where he held his first conference with an American President seven years ago, he said his journey would "mark a new era" in U.S.-Vietnam relations. That, indeed, is what the conference here Monday and Tuesday is all about.

Thieu expressed optimism that the meeting will lay a "foundation suitable to the new situation that is postwar and peace era."

"My trip will mark a new era in which the United States and South Vietnam will share difficulties as well as glories," the South Viet-

namese president said. "That is why I have baptized my plane 'Cooperation in Peace.'"

Thieu will have an opportunity not only to express to the President his concerns about the cease-fire and Hanoi's intentions, but to hear from the President his plans to "normalize" U.S. relations with Hanoi and Peking.

The working out of a new United States relationship with Asia's Communist leaders directly concerns Thieu, and he wants to hear from Mr. Nixon how the new directions in American policy will affect him economically, militarily and politically.

The nature and dimensions of the Saigon-Washington relationship will inevitably change at the very time that Thieu is facing new and difficult problems domestically.

After his meetings here, the South Vietnamese leader, who has never been to the United States mainland, will fly to Washington and later to the LBJ Ranch in Texas to pay his respects to Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, widow of the President who sent more than a half-million American troops to fight in South Vietnam.

It is significant that when he leaves this country he will visit not only London and Rome but his chief friends in Asia, South Korea and Taiwan.

For Thieu, who has wanted to visit America ever since he became president, his trip is of enormous significance, and it may be no less so to Mr. Nixon as he attempts to bring about a new era in America's relations with the Asian and Pacific nations.

#### NOT WORTH A CONTINENTAL

### HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, Harry L. Hamilton, editor and publisher of the Tri-County News, Seymour, Tenn., is one of Tennessee's outstanding editors. He is a man of great ability, wide perspective, and a real credit to his profession.

He writes a column, "From the Editor's Desk," which has gained widespread readership. The following column is from a recent issue of his weekly newspaper:

#### NOT WORTH A CONTINENTAL

The battle for independence by the American colonies began about break of day at the battle of Lexington, April 19, 1775. It ended with the surrender of Lord Cornwallis at Yorktown, October 19, 1781. A treaty of peace with England, granting independence to the colonies was not signed until September, 1783. During this period of war and uncertain peace, large amounts of something to use for money was needed. The Continental Congress had no power to tax, loans from abroad were almost impossible to arrange. So the Continental Congress did what all nations do under similar circumstances, printed millions and millions of dollars of paper money, called Continentals, without any gold or silver to back it up. The more they printed the more worthless it became. It was a simple case of a man writing checks without any money in the bank.

During the war Franklin, Washington, Lafayette, Robert Morris and Haym Solomon gave some money to the cause, and by the end of the war Congress had been able to borrow about ten million dollars from France, Holland and Spain, all enemies of England.

But the Second Continental Congress had issued almost 250 million dollars worth of continental currency! In 1780 about half of

this amount was redeemed at two cents on the dollar. By this time a hundred dollar bill would not buy a pound of potatoes. For the most part, the balance went unredeemed. In this wise, the saying, "not worth a continental" came to mean something entirely worthless.

Chosen unanimously by the electors of the thirteen colonies, on April 30, 1789, George Washington mounted the steps of Federal Hall, Wall Street, in New York City, and took the oath of office as President of the struggling young Republic. Money was still the most pressing problem. He wanted Robert Morris for Secretary of the Treasury, but Morris refused. He settled on Alexander Hamilton, who had been his secretary and adjutant during the war. Washington already knew Hamilton had unusual ability and was honest.

Hamilton set about to fund the already large debt over a period of time, set up tariffs and urged Congress to enact what taxes the people could pay. In addition, he asked for a United States Bank as a central depository for what funds he had. His system was sound. He paid the nation's debts on or before they were due, and in less than fifty years the young nation's money and credit were sound, the American dollar selling on par with the leading nations of the world. During the administration of President Andrew Jackson, the last dollar of national debts was liquidated, and ours became one of the few nations of the world to be able to make such a boast.

A few years later large quantities of gold and silver were discovered on our West Coast. Now every American dollar could be backed by a dollar in gold or silver, and was the most highly prized money in the world! But gold and silver are heavy metals and the people tired of their transportation. Why not leave them in the vault and issue paper certificates against them, redeemable on demand? It was arranged and gold and silver certificates were issued, "redeemable in gold or silver" on demand.

By 1930 the nation was again heavily in debt and faced with a deep depression. When the printing presses were turned on there were more paper dollars than there was gold to cover them, so the gold standard was given up. The printing presses continued to spin. In 1963 the Silver certificates were declared null and void and again our money has no backing and the boys in Washington continue to write checks without having any money in the bank.

In just two more years it will be two hundred years since Congress started printing the Continentals. Is history to repeat itself in that short period of time?

(Submitted by B. W. Piper.)

#### HERE'S WHAT HAPPENED

What is it that nice, sensible guy you elected to Congress seems to go off the deep end shortly after he gets to Babylon on the Potomac? He often takes on an aura of royalty, tells you how to run your affairs and proposes with blithe unconcern new ways to spend tens of billions of your tax dollars.

It is reported that when new members of the House of Representatives go to Washington they find that suddenly they are "... wrapped in a veritable cocoon of privileges and prerequisites—at taxpayer expense. ..." To make sure a fledgling Congressman does not overlook anything, there is a new 204-page "Congressional Handbook" outlining all of the goodies provided for his creature comforts and working convenience. In the first place, he has a \$157,092 a year allowance to hire a 16-member staff to help him run his office in Washington and in his home district. An employment service to find these people is provided free of charge. Provisions are made for every kind of personal service, from legal help to shoe shining, at no cost. Complete facilities and expert assistance are available within instant reach to

help with communications to the folks back home—radio scripts, movies, slides, speeches—anything at all. The Congressman's salary, not to be sneezed at, is \$42,500 a year and to assure that he stays around to a ripe old age, 31 different health plans are available as well as the complete medical services of Walter Reed Army Hospital and Bethesda Naval Hospital.

It's little wonder that that nice fellow from down the block that you sent to Congress fought so hard and valiantly to get the job of representing you and changed so much after he went to Washington. It takes a lot to support a Congressman in the manner to which he becomes accustomed, and it's hard to believe that most of the time we get our moneys' worth.

#### WORDS FROM HISTORY

"The rung of a ladder was never meant to rest upon, but only to hold a man's foot long enough to enable him to put the other somewhat higher."—Thomas Henry Huxley.

#### COMMENDATION TO A GROUP OF COURAGEOUS FRENCHMEN

##### HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, despite international tensions, there is often harmony among nations and cooperation between peoples. This is brought to mind by a constituent of mine, Stephen Weiss. Mr. Weiss recently vacationed in France and was able to locate two members of a group of Frenchmen who saved his life in an incident during World War II. It is fitting that we pay tribute here to these men whose courage and intelligence were exemplary in a time of war, exhibiting a spirit which transcends national boundaries.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly recount the story behind that incident.

During the summer of 1944, in the fight for Southern France, the 36th Texas Division met retreating elements of the 19th German Army.

This meeting produced a battle which lasted the better part of the evening of August 24. The American forces sustained a sizable loss in men and materiel. Eight soldiers of C Company, 143d Infantry, 36th Division emerged to find that the remaining U.S. forces had advanced without them.

The eight sought refuge at the farm of M. and Mme. Gaston Reynaud. Despite the proximity of the Germans, M. Reynaud promised he would aid the American infantrymen. His commitment exposed his family to great risk in the event of a search by German patrols.

Reynaud held a conference with members of the local resistance—Police Commissioner Gerard, Marcel Volle, M. Guillon, Agent Salmon, M. Crespy, Captain Ferdinand, Lieutenant Maurice—regarding the Americans in his custody. The means of escape to be followed called for the Americans to don French police uniforms and reach safety in a police car.

The Germans were engaged in a farm-to-farm search for the infantrymen when the police car arrived to the Reynaud's home. Communication between the two allies was difficult, but the imperatives

of the situation produced the greatest sort of cooperation, transcending the bounds of culture and language.

Through the entire course of the operation, the eight Americans were neither stopped nor questioned. On three separate occasions, however, members of the Reynaud family were queried as to the whereabouts of the American soldiers. Throughout, the incident was kept in confidence.

As the Germans widened their search to the outskirts south of Valence, the eight members of the 36th were rowing across the Rhone River, with the assistance of Robert Debreuil and Augustin Bouvier, the mayor of St. Perey.

In late September of 1944, after aiding an OSS Special Forces Company, the infantrymen rejoined the 36th far to the north. The attempt had been entirely successful.

Its success can be traced, in part, to the bond of friendship between the United States and France. The willingness to cooperate, evidenced on both sides, should serve as an example to us all.

#### A GOOD SAMARITAN

##### HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are those in this Chamber who oppose or at least, question the abandonment of the national draft.

Certainly, the issue is many sided and the pros and cons are legion. A debate, however, on the central issue will come another day.

Today, I would like to comment briefly on one small side effect, one of no great import on a national scale but one of relevance to the people of Stamford, Conn.

Twice a month for the past 22 years, Mrs. Samuel Plotnick has wished Stamford draftees well as they departed their hometown from the city's railroad station. In that span of time, every young man drafted from Stamford has seen Mrs. Plotnick's smile, has been the recipient of her well wishes and has been given a small gift by this most genial of hostesses.

Here is a case, Mr. Speaker, of a woman who cared enough to spend cold, rainy, snowy and dark mornings representing the townspeople and offering a few kind words to a long list of young men who at the time were probably experiencing the loneliest moment of their lives.

Recently, several hundred people turned out to honor Mrs. Plotnick at a testimonial dinner at Stamford's Italian Community Center. Under the able direction of the mayor's patriotic and special events commission chairman, Alphonse Pia, the affair was an enormous success and a fitting tribute to this dedicated, personable and unselfish woman. However, no tribute will ever be enough. Hopefully, we will never need Mrs. Plotnick's services again but at the same time, Mr. Speaker, we will miss them very much.

#### J. B. COLE IS SCIOTO COUNTY'S "MR. REPUBLICAN"

##### HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to share with my colleagues at this time an article upon Mr. William Jennings Bryan Cole which appeared in the Portsmouth—Ohio—Times for March 6, 1973.

Having experienced party politics from the grassroots on up to the national scene, "JB" Cole's opinion is often sought on many important issues.

Friend of the powerful, servant of the poor, the successful career of Jennings B. Cole attests to his vast knowledge and great ability. As with the "Great Commoner" himself, Cole's popularity truly transcends party affiliation.

The article follows:

J. B. COLE IS SCIOTO COUNTY'S "MR. REPUBLICAN"

(By Everette E. Parker)

What is Scioto County's Mr. Republican doing with a name such as William Jennings Bryan Cole?

That's the full name of Jennings B. Cole, Scioto County director of elections, and perhaps the county's most widely known Republican.

How did the versatile Republican come by that particular Democratic name?

It's simple. His father, the late John Wesley Cole, was an ardent Democrat, and all fall before the birth of his son John Wesley Cole had waged a strong campaign for the election of William Jennings Bryan as President of the United States.

The impressive name didn't influence the son, and for all practical purposes the name has been Jennings B. Cole, often shortened to "JB" by his close friends.

Cole, a native of South Webster, has won acclaim for his Republican party support from virtually every level of activity—from the village of South Webster through township, county, and state to the national scene.

Cole, who served 8 years as mayor of South Webster, never has sought another public elective office, although he has been successful in serving as central committeeman for his party for more than 40 years.

He's also been head of the Scioto County Board of Elections 32 years, coming here from a position with the Department of Taxation.

An active Republican all his life, despite his father's political leanings, Cole has been personal friends with Ohio's Republican governors back to and including Gov. Myers Y. Cooper.

He's also been active in GOP presidential campaigns ever since he worked for the election of President Herbert C. Hoover.

In more recent years he was aboard the presidential campaign trains for President Eisenhower and President Nixon, and he has a huge collection of letters, photographs, and autographs to prove his close friendships with these and many other nationally known Republicans.

Among his prized possessions are pictures he's taken himself, along with pictures others have taken of him and GOP dignitaries through the years.

He has several letters from President Nixon, dating back to the early '60s, including several since the 1968 election.

Dozens and dozens of his photographs are autographed, or with whom he was photographed.



His picture-taking possibilities almost have been unlimited, especially since he has been a delegate to three national conventions.

Actually, Republican politics has been a way of life for Cole. He knows so many prominent Republicans that he's almost in constant contact with a leading GOP figure from one state or another all the time.

But party politics hasn't filled the vast expanses of his life. He's still active in civic, church and community activities, and takes a firm stand for progress, believing in getting things done for the good of all, regardless of the level of government.

Cole has spanned the party gaps in his role as director of elections. He is popular all over the state with elections officials, and as early as 1955 was elected president of the Ohio Association of Election Officials, an organization of both Democrats and Republicans. For the last 13 years he has been treasurer of that group, and now also is chairman of its Legislative Committee and Retirement Committee.

His gap-spanning ability also was evident when he was South Webster mayor during the WPA days of the Roosevelt administration.

Cole managed to get such cooperation that he got a village building, sidewalks and the first rural fire department in the county. He clearly remembers the old Model A truck on which the units equipment was mounted.

In addition to combining his photographic interests with politics, he has done the same with his interest in sports.

He has a huge collection of pictures he's taken of America's foremost athletes, including such figures as Jack Dempsey, Honus Wagner, Dizzy Dean, Babe Ruth and others. He's particularly proud of the pictures he has of many of the old Portsmouth Spartans football players.

Eyen today Cole is an ardent sports fan, and he'll take off any evening he can spare to witness anything from a high school basketball game to a professional football or baseball game.

He's still taking pictures, adding to his collection which dates back to early days of Scioto County. He owns five still cameras and a movie camera, but to his embarrassment, recently found that the particular camera he was using was inoperative and he had to borrow one to get his desired pictures.

Proud of his record in all his work, Cole is specially proud of the many citations his office has won for excellence in handling the elections during the last 32 years.

"At my age, with my 76th birthday anniversary coming up April 26, I'm beginning to give some thought to retirement, but I haven't made any firm decision yet," Cole says. He's quick to state that he has plenty to keep him busy in case he should decide to retire.

His interests then could turn more to community and party activities, as well as to his work in South Webster's Christ United Methodist Church where he serves as a member of the administrative board.

Both his father, and his mother, the late Emma Potts Cole, were pioneer residents of South Webster.

He and his wife, the former Margaret Hughes of Oak Hill, still live in the village. They have a son, Ronald, of Cole Lincoln-Mercury and a daughter, Mrs. Howard (Rosemary) Williamson of Houston, Tex.

Anything about Cole would be incomplete without mention of his widely known ability in writing a fine Spencerian script. He's sought by many to embellish certificates, awards and other items for presentation.

In considering his accomplishments and the possibility of retirement, he has one major regret. He would have enjoyed the privilege of seeing Scioto County move to voting machines. It hasn't been done.

# PRESIDENT'S PEACE WITH HONOR

## HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, let the record show that on April 1, 1973, the last known U.S. prisoner of war was released in Vietnam and that 3 days prior to that, on March 29, 1973, all U.S. military forces were withdrawn from South Vietnam.

President Nixon accomplished both within 71 days of taking the oath of office for his second term. He did so without begging the enemy, but rather he ended our involvement there in such a manner as to bring our men home with honor and with assurances of a lasting peace.

I make this distinction about the time and the manner of the settlement as a reminder of the promises made by Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN in his campaign for the presidency. It was on July 14, 1972, as he accepted his party's nomination, that he promised:

Within 90 days of my inauguration every American soldier and every American prisoner will be out of the jungle and out of their cells.

President Nixon beat that deadline by nearly 3 weeks.

It was on June 30, 1972, that Senator MCGOVERN told a South Carolina meeting:

Begging is better than bombing. I would go to Hanoi and beg if I thought that would release the boys one day earlier.

This admission on the part of a presidential candidate that he was willing to "beg" the enemy to end the conflict was played over and over again to our prisoners of war in attempt to destroy their morale and their faith in their country.

President Nixon did not have to beg for a settlement. He negotiated from a position of strength so that the cease-fire would not just signal the end of our involvement but would be part of a lasting peace for all of Southeast Asia.

It is a peace that has been long in coming. Our President insisted on settling only on terms that could produce a lasting peace in Vietnam. Those who charge that this war could have been concluded 4 years ago, or even last fall, are plain wrong. They are missing not one but several essential points.

It was not until October 1972, when it became apparent that President Nixon would win reelection, that the North Vietnamese gave up their demand that a political victory be handed them as a precondition for even a discussion of military questions. To that time, the North Vietnamese had insisted on establishment of a coalition government that would have paved the way for a total Communist takeover of the politics of South Vietnam. Our President could not accept those terms.

He could have bought peace earlier, too, on the terms favored by a strident minority who advocated immediate unconditional withdrawal of American troops. Such would have meant peace for us alone. The Vietnamese people would not have shared in it. Instead, the

President insisted on an internationally supervised cease-fire that is designed to bring peace to all of Vietnam as well.

And if peace had come on the terms of Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, we would not be here so secure in the knowledge that the prisoners of war—all of them—have been released.

Whatever judgment history may render on the war in Vietnam and our involvement in it, we must be thankful that President Nixon led us out of a war he inherited into a peace with honor.

The credit for peace belongs also to the silent majority in Congress and in the country, who stood with the President for an honorable peace. Had the President's opponents prevailed, I am convinced Americans would today be witnessing a bloodbath in Southeast Asia. The difference between what the President has achieved and what his opponents wanted is the difference between peace with honor and the false peace of an American surrender.

# MEAT EXPORT LIMIT

## HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, several local suburban supermarkets reported meat sales down 25 percent yesterday—the first day of a nationwide meat boycott.

American consumers are not satisfied with the President's meat price controls, as evidenced by the widespread support of the boycott.

As the effects of unrestricted foreign bidding on domestic meat purchases, while domestic prices are held down by price controls become evident, Americans will become even more disgruntled.

If we do not institute meat export controls to complement meat price controls, there will be shortages of meat and extensive black market meat deals.

The supply of meat available to Americans must be insured.

Economists have long known that the demand for food is relatively insensitive to its price.

People must still eat, even if the prices of food are outrageously high.

Even with the demand for food remaining relatively stable, the supply is not an even one.

Very simply, when the supply of meat goes down, the price goes up.

Even small changes in meat supply have disproportionately large effects on price.

The only logical course of action is to keep the American supply of meat from leaving the country. The exportation of American meat merely decreases the domestic supply and increases the price.

Legislation which I am introducing today would provide that whenever the annual rate of increase in the average price equals or exceeds 3.6 percent in any consecutive 3-month period beginning January 1, 1973, the President is required to ban the export of these meat products and of the intermediate meat

products used in their manufacture or preparation.

It also provides that this export ban shall remain in force unless and until the annual rate of increase in this average price remains below 3.6 percent for a period of 6 consecutive months or the expiration of the act, whichever comes first.

The export ban cannot be lifted earlier than 6 months after removal of the President's price controls on meat.

If a foreign emergency in which human suffering could be relieved by the export of meat, this bill would allow the President to waive for 30 days part of the export ban for the exclusive purpose of meeting such emergency.

Mr. Speaker, the meat price crisis in our Nation has not been solved by meat price controls alone. We must institute export controls to complement the price controls already in effect.

#### VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

### HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I have cosponsored legislation to insure the continuation of ongoing vocational-rehabilitation programs at responsible levels of funding.

The President's veto of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1972, on the judgment that it exceeds responsible levels of funding, has been respected by a majority in Congress.

As a supporter of the original House version of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1972, I urge my colleagues to now turn their support to the legislation being introduced today.

The substance of the controversial title II of the vetoed bill would be changed, eliminating the duplication which would have resulted had the original vocational-rehabilitation bill become law. Title II was designed to extend the benefits of vocational-rehabilitation services to the handicapped who are not employable. Previously, such services did not exist under this act, but have been provided for through medicare, medic-aid, and the Developmental Disabilities Act. Effective January 1, 1974, title 16 of the social security amendments will provide Federal reimbursement to State agencies aiding all eligible blind and disabled individuals under age 65.

In addition, the compromise bill directs the National Advisory Council on Rehabilitation for the Handicapped, created by both bills, to study the question of aid to the unemployable and report to Congress.

This bill would place special emphasis on spinal cord injuries and low-achieving deaf individuals in special projects and demonstration grant programs.

The Rehabilitation Services Administration would be created by statute as part of the Special Rehabilitation Service.

State advisory councils would be permitted by the compromise bill, with the

States given the responsibility to include the council under a State plan and fund it from a State grant.

Also provided for would be the architectural and transportation barrier compliance board to consolidate and enforce existing statutes and regulations designed to accommodate the handicapped in building design and transportation systems.

This proposal presents a viable legislative alternative to the vetoed Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1972, a responsible level of funding, and a deep concern for the continuation of services to the handicapped.

#### TO FIGHT INFLATION?

### HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the March 31, 1973, Indianapolis, Ind., Star makes some interesting points:

#### TO FIGHT INFLATION?

The New York State Communist Party is calling for a mass program to fight inflation. The way the Communists propose to accomplish this task is interesting.

The first point of the program is this:

"Freeze prices, not wages."

Freezing prices while not controlling wages would very probably result in reduction of employment. One of the sure things concerning inflation is that every time an employer must give in to wage demands that exceed productivity increases he is forced to raise prices or go out of business. The collapse of American industry is one goal of international Communism, including its United States strain.

"Halt government handouts to big business."

We'll pass that, except to observe that what the C.P. has in mind apparently is the making of loans or grants to corporations in financial trouble, and the covering of cost increases on defense contracts. The latter item does need better control, which would indeed help to fight inflation.

"Tax big business. Repeal all sales taxes."

Taxes on business, big or little, wind up in the prices for the goods and services sold by business. But prices are frozen under this program, aren't they? So what happens? "Big business" is squeezed out of business and socialism takes over. We aren't peachy keen on sales taxes either. But they have been instituted in many cases as the direct result of following the philosophy of the next Communist proposal to combat inflation.

"Stop cutbacks on social programs. More money for people, not less."

In other words extend the welfare state. Make more and more people dependent on government. And when government goes broke because of trying to provide for the people all the Communists say they would like to have, why, then the Communists can take over.

The final point in the Communist "inflation" program is most fascinating:

"Abolish military spending at home and abroad."

The major Communist nations of the world make no bones about spending large portions of their budgets for military hardware. The Soviet Union for years has been augmenting and modernizing its navy until it today is ranked as one of the most powerful, if not the most powerful, in the world.

Abolishing all military spending on the part of the U.S. while the Communist nations proceed to strengthen themselves would of course so weaken the U.S. that it would be easy prey for the conquest that Communists dream of.

Fight inflation? No. Fight the U.S. Exactly.

#### BUNYAN'S BUNION

### HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the high cost of food is far from the only form of price inflation attacking pocketbooks all over the country. In the past few months, the cost of wood fiber products has soared much higher and faster than food. No single reason accounts for the high price tags on logs and lumber, and no simple solution can alleviate it, but the following comments and suggestions may be of interest to my colleagues. Mr. Speaker, I will insert the full text of an article which appeared in my most recent newsletter in abbreviated form at this point:

#### BUNYAN'S BUNION

In singling out food prices alone as the target of his anti-inflation rhetoric, AFL-CIO President George Meany may be barking up the wrong tree. He has declared that he cannot support Phase III wage guidelines while retail food prices continue to climb; but if anything has warped the framework of the President's program of "voluntary compliance," it is the skyrocketing price of lumber.

"Lumber prices," the Wall Street Journal said recently, "are going through the ceiling. And the roof, too." This verdict from a newspaper hardly noted for hysterical hyperbole only confirms what home buyers and home builders have known for some time, that inflation in the cost of wood fiber products far exceeds the rate of increase for any other. Since the beginning of the year, prices on key lumber and plywood items have shot up between 20% and 30%. According to the National Association of Home Builders, the construction cost of the average new one-family house has jumped \$1,200 in the last six months solely because of price hikes in wood products.

The basic problem is a high, sustained and still rising demand for these products from domestic and foreign customers. Fueled by a record number of housing starts in both the United States and Japan (about 2.4 million in each country) demand has outraced usable supplies of lumber for eighteen months. Japan, which is able to grow very little timber of its own, relies on imports and is willing to pay almost any price for logs from the Pacific Northwest. Last year they consumed 85% of the three billion board feet which the United States exported. The Japanese would buy more if they could, and their eagerness has driven up prices beyond the wildest dreams of America's timber titans. In one month, industry sources say, the price on Douglas fir for export to Japan more than doubled to \$300 per thousand board feet from \$135. The appetite of this populous nation, poor in most natural resources but rich in manufacturing technology and foreign exchange, is apparently insatiable for raw materials of all kinds.

Other factors contributing to the insufficient supplies of lumber include pressure from environmental groups and the perennial boxcar shortage, which has slowed down the movement of logs to sawmills as it has



other agricultural products to their destinations. However, the environmental lobby has impeded the growth of lumber supplies far more effectively than the dearth of freight cars. Not that all members of the Sierra Club are opposed to harvesting the forests—any more than all the executives of Boise Cascade are enemies of ecology. The major differences between these opposing factions center on how many trees should be cut, what methods should be used and how the forests should be managed to best satisfy the public interest.

Yet there are fundamental discrepancies in their approach to the problem. The timber industry sees trees primarily as an economic resource, a vital raw material for houses, furniture, cartons, paper. From this vantage point, a tree which dies of old age or disease is a waste. Conservationists judge the value of forests from an entirely different perspective. To them trees are objects of beauty and important contributors to the complex ecological balance of the forest. And a "tree farm," they maintain, is not a forest. It cannot nurture the variety of life or halt erosion in the same way that a diverse woodland can.

In an effort to reconcile these competing and sometimes conflicting interests, Congress passed two broad measures aiming to satisfy both somewhat: the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act (1960) and the Wilderness Act (1964). According to the terms of the first, the Forest Service must manage forests on public lands so that there will always be a new crop growing at the same rate mature trees are felled. The public forests must also, however, serve six distinct purposes: recreation; watershed management; wildlife preservation; timber production; mining; and grazing. Because multiple use is neither possible nor desirable on each and every acre, the Wilderness Act set aside some nine million acres as untouchable. The fate of an additional 34 million acres awaits the results of a lengthy, comprehensive Forest Service study mandated by law some years ago but not yet completed. (Ironically, the conservationists' success against further inroads by the timber industry may ultimately harm the environment more than heavier timber cutting, for synthetic wood substitutes require an enormous expenditure of energy to produce.) The new environment-inspired reluctance of the Forest Service to develop public lands further is exacerbated by the Office of Management and Budget's stingy stipend to the Service, this year as well as next. Like many another worthy agriculture program, it has fallen under the administration's axe and has suffered severe cutbacks.

The convergence of all these factors has obliged the timber industry to seek new ways to increase lumber supplies. Spurred by intense shortages (and high profits) private woodlands planted for commercial harvest are now being utilized to a fuller extent. "We use everything," said one timber man, "but the sign of the pine." (The same efficiency, it should be noted, is not operative on public lands probably because their custodians lack the requisite economic incentive.) Timber companies are also seeking new, more stable sources of supply, especially in Canada. The forests of British Columbia now furnish 20% of our logs. In effect, we import more than we export of this commodity.

Nevertheless, exports are the first order of concern for most domestic consumers of lumber. They argue that, when supplies are scarce, preference should be given to American needs first. I have therefore introduced a bill prohibiting the exportation of logs for a twelve-month period. As of this writing, the administration is still reluctant to impose an embargo on log exports, preferring to negotiate a voluntary limit with the Japanese. In the meantime, Cost of Living Council Director John Dunlop has unveiled a plan to place lumber under wage and price

controls, while Agriculture Secretary Earl Butz will insure that 11.8 billion board feet of logs will be sold from national forests this year (compared with 10 billion last year.)

To meet the long-term demand, more far-reaching measures than these will be necessary. With better management, the Forest Service could make tree-cutting on public lands a more efficient source of lumber for the timber industry and revenue for the government. Some compromise will also have to be reached between the environmentalists and the lumber producers on how best to balance the competing claims of commerce and conservation. There is encouraging evidence, however, that both sides recognize the inevitability of cooperation.

#### DAILY CHRONICLE EDITORIAL ON MILITARY SERVANTS

#### HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the attached editorial from the Daily Chronicle of March 26, 1973, published by the students at the University of Utah, echoes my own strong feeling about the military abuse of using enlisted men as personal servants for general officers. I think other Members may be interested in reading it:

#### HEY BOY! UNCLE SAM NEEDS YOU

It was another one of those news items which somehow escaped proper detailing in the pages of our local newspapers. The networks failed to allot time for it. But in a Senate subcommittee hearing Sen. William Proxmire of Wisconsin discovered that the U.S. Army maintains a special school at Fort Lee, Virginia, where it trains enlisted men to be servants for the generals.

According to the General Accounting Office the cost of equipping these 1,722 men per year with their special military skills comes to \$13 million per year. Some of the classes taught are bar-tending, gourmet cooking, ice-carving, dog walking, ashtray-emptying, and bathroom cleaning.

The graduates are assigned to 970 generals and admirals. One defect in the program is that brigadier generals and rear admirals must struggle along with only one "enlisted aide." Members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, on the other hand, have six to eight servants. The Pentagon explained to Proxmire that the servants are necessary to induce admirals and generals, who may earn nearly \$43,000 per year, to remain on active duty. The aides "relieve officers of minor tasks and details which, if performed by the officer himself, would be at the expense of his primary and official duties." Which presumably means we would need more generals to get the job done. It is, the Pentagon said, "A good deal for the taxpayers."

And to prove that the Pentagon is an equal opportunity employer, why it turns out that 98 percent of the Navy's military servants are Filipinos and 65 percent of the Marine Corp's servants are Black. Hey, boy . . . Uncle Sam needs you!

Several weeks ago while cutting social and educational programs all to hell, the White House mentioned that there were many beneficial programs emanating from the intact new budget (which favors business and the military). We guess this school for servants must be one of them; why as soon as you are done shining shoes in the military you can move right into private enterprise. Shining shoes.

#### PRESIDENTIAL WAR POWERS

#### HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in view of the continuing debate in both Houses of the Congress over appropriate legislation to define the powers of the President to engage in military hostilities abroad without a congressional declaration of war, Members and other readers of the RECORD may be interested in the testimony of Prof. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., before the House Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments. That testimony, presented on March 14, 1973, follows:

#### WAR POWERS LEGISLATION

(By Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.)

As one much concerned with these questions both as a former government official and as a student of American history, I welcome the opportunity to set forth certain views on the range of questions embraced by the war powers resolutions before this Committee. These resolutions address themselves to a question of wide import and deep significance: the question of the democratic control of that most vital of national decisions, the decision to go to war. I am glad that this Committee is conducting so careful an inquiry into the alternative modes of action open to Congress and the country.

Of the various proposals before the Committee, I shall refer first to the War Powers bill as passed so emphatically by the Senate last year—S. 440.

Let me begin by emphasizing that I heartily endorse the purposes of this bill.

Nor do I have any question about its constitutionality. I am aware that objection has been made that, in seeking to define the powers of the President, the bill is in derogation of his authority as Commander in Chief and is therefore unconstitutional. This objection seems to me without force. The notion of the office of Commander in Chief as a source of independent and inherent peacetime authority is relatively novel in our constitutional history. The Founding Fathers would surely have regarded it as a latter-day heresy.

For the men who drafted the Constitution made clear their very narrow interpretation of the office of Commander in Chief. "It would amount," Hamilton carefully explained in the 69th Federalist, "to nothing more than the supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces"—and he went on to distinguish this limited authority from the much broader authority of the British King. The President's power as Commander in Chief, in short, was simply the power to issue orders to the armed forces within a framework established by Congress; it was, in particular, the power to conduct war once Congress had authorized war. As Commander in Chief the President would have no more power than the first general of the Army or the first admiral of the Navy would have as professional military men.

This view prevailed through the early republic. In 1850, the Supreme Court, in reviewing "the power conferred upon the President by the declaration of war" in the case of *Fleming v. Page*, said bluntly that, when he assumed the role of Commander in Chief, "His duty and his power are purely military." The theory that the Commander in Chief had larger powers first appeared during the Civil War, but this was justified, as Lincoln repeatedly said, by the emergency, noted in the Constitution in connection with the suspension of *habeas corpus*, of rebellion and

invasion. Lincoln's successors did not claim that their role as Commander in Chief conferred on them any special peacetime authority. In his 83 press conferences in 1941 up to Pearl Harbor, during the anxious time when our nation entered into an undeclared naval war with Germany in the North Atlantic, Roosevelt never once claimed that he had any special powers to bypass Congress by virtue of his office as Commander in Chief.

The Second World War gave Presidents the theory that this office was a residuum of inherent and independent authority, and in peace as well as in war. As early as 1948 Justice Jackson in the case of *Woods v. Miller* called the Commander in Chief clause "the most dangerous one to free government in the whole catalogue of powers." Subsequent developments, it seems to me, abundantly justify Justice Jackson's warning. In any case, the idea that S. 440 is unconstitutional because it interferes with the President's authority as Commander in Chief is based on a conception of that office unknown to the men who wrote the Constitution—unknown, indeed, to most Presidents of the United States until very recently in our history.

S. 440 contains three separable elements: (1) a definition of the circumstances in which the President can send armed force into battle without a declaration of war by Congress; (2) a provision requiring the President to report periodically to Congress on the status of hostilities; (3) a provision enabling Congress to terminate hostilities by statute or joint resolution.

My difficulties with this bill arise from the first of these elements: Section 3 of the bill attempts to define the possible contingencies in which the President would be authorized to commit armed force on his own initiative. History is exceedingly unpredictable; and the attempt to specify in advance all the circumstances that might justify unilateral presidential action seems to me hazardous in the extreme. "The circumstances that endanger the safety of nations are infinite," Hamilton wrote in the 23rd Federalist. Able and perspicacious as the sponsors of this legislation are, one wonders whether they can see so much more clearly into the future than the men who designed the Constitution.

In attempting to specify these contingencies, Section 3 has the peculiar character, or so it seems to me, of being at once too limiting and too expansive. While on the one hand it seeks to pin down the particularity of circumstance that would legitimize unilateral presidential action, on the other hand it gives its blessing to the theory that has justified the most extravagant instances of such action—that is, the theory of defensive war. I call your attention to the relevant phrases—the power proposed in paragraph (1) to send armed forces into battle "to forestall the direct and imminent threat" of attack on the United States; the power proposed in paragraph (2) to send armed forces into battle "to forestall the direct and imminent threat" of attack against the armed forces located outside the United States and its possessions; the power proposed in paragraph (3) to send armed forces into battle in any country where American citizens are "subjected to a direct and imminent threat to their lives." Since no provision is made as to who shall make the judgment about the directness and imminence of such threat, it is to be assumed that the judgment is left to the President.

I hardly need recall to this Committee the warning issued by a member of the House of Representatives exactly one hundred and twenty-five years and one month ago, "Allow the President to invade a neighboring nation, whenever he shall deem it necessary to repel an invasion," said Congressman Lincoln of Illinois, "... and you allow him to make war at pleasure. Study to see if you can fix any limit to his power in this respect. ...

If, to-day, he should choose to say he thinks it necessary to invade Canada, to prevent the British from invading us, how could you stop him? You may say to him, 'I see no probability of the British invading us' but he will say to you 'be silent; I see it, if you don't.' " Though this proposition did not apply to the Mexican War, where Congress had formally recognized the existence of a state of war, it does apply with great precision to S. 440.

There is nothing more elastic than the theory of defensive war once that theory is extended beyond actual attack to alleged threat of attack. Presidents of a certain temperament may easily see direct and imminent threats on every hand; and, if members of Congress fail to see such threats, be silent; I see them, if you don't. When one has seen this highly expansive concept of defensive war invoked to justify American attacks on neutral countries, one recalls Joseph A. Schumpeter's description of the foreign policy of the Roman Empire. "Here," he wrote, "is the classic example of that kind of insincerity in both foreign and domestic affairs which permeates not only avowed motives but also probably the conscious motives of the actors themselves... of that policy which pretends to aspire to peace but unerringly generates war, the policy of continual preparation for war, the policy of meddlesome interventionism. There was no corner of the known world where some interest was not alleged to be in danger or under actual attack. If the interests were not Roman, they were those of Rome's allies; and if Rome had no allies, then allies would be invented. When it was utterly impossible to contrive such an interest—why, then it was the national honor that had been insulted. The fight was always invested with an aura of legality. Rome was always being attacked by evil-minded neighbors, always fighting for a breathing space. The whole world was pervaded by a host of enemies, and it was manifestly Rome's duty to guard against their indubitably hostile designs."

Nothing seems to me more perilous in S. 440 than the congressional sanction thus bestowed on the expansive theory of defensive war. The President has always had the power to repel sudden attacks on his own responsibility. But this bill would give him blanket congressional authorization to send armed force into battle whenever he sees within the first three categories what he pronounces, by his own personal, independent, unilateral and unchecked judgment, as "direct and imminent threat" of attack. As Senator Javits has frankly said, the bill "gives the President more authority to do what is necessary and proper in an emergency than he now possesses" and provides "ample play to the need of the Commander in Chief to have 'discretionary' as well as 'emergency' authority" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 117, pt. 9, p. 11462).

The President must of course have the power to respond to emergency. But it would seem to me far better that he exercise this power on his own and not with the color of congressional authorization. I see no advantage in Congress thus giving away its independence and compromising its position in advance. On this issue I agree with Senator Fulbright that a President "would remain accountable to Congress for his action to a greater extent [if he acted on his own responsibility] than he would if he had specific authorizing language to fall back upon. Congress, for its part, would retain its uncompromised right to pass judgment upon any military initiative undertaken without its advance approval." (Additional Views of Senator Fulbright, Senate Report No. 92-606, "War Powers," 92 Cong., 1 Sess., February 9, 1972).

I have equal difficulty with the provision in Section 5 of S. 440 requiring congressional authorization for the prosecution of hostilities after a period of thirty days. This raises

first of all a problem that is more tricky than it may seem: how to ascertain the date on which hostilities began? Nor does the bill make this conundrum any easier of solution by mentioning, in an additional endorsement of the expansive theory of defensive war, situations "where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances." What in the world does this mean? At what point does the commitment of armed force in response to actual attack or to speculative threats of attack trigger the 30-day authorization period? Had S. 440 been on the statute books in 1960, at what point would the 30-day deadline have applied to the American involvement in Vietnam? These are not frivolous questions. They go to the heart of the proposed legislation.

The 30-day deadline seems to me to be filled with booby-traps. Most wars are popular in their first 30 days. These are the 30 days when the President who ordered the action overwhelms Congress and the press with his own rendition of the facts and his own interpretation of the crisis. It generally takes a good deal more than 30 days for other facts to emerge and other interpretations to win a hearing. With the President's immense advantages in his control of information, in his ability to define the emergency, in his capacity to rouse the nation, it would take a very stout-hearted Congress indeed to veto his request for the authorization of continued hostilities—except in those infrequent cases where differences have already crystallized in advance of the commitment of force. This bill, I greatly fear, would be more likely to become a means of inducing formal congressional approval of warlike presidential acts than of preventing such acts.

Moreover, the principle on which the bill is based—that the President must carry out the policy directives of Congress in the initiation and prosecution of military hostilities—is founded on the unstated assumption that Congress can be relied upon to be more peace-minded than the executive. This assumption finds little sustenance in the historical record. In two of our five declared wars in American history—the War of 1812 and the Spanish-American War—Congress imposed war on a diffident executive. One need go back no further than the Cuban missile crisis to recall, as Robert Kennedy has told us, that the congressional leaders, when informed by President Kennedy of the quarantine policy, "felt that the President should take more forceful action, a military attack or invasion, and that the blockade was far too weak a response." A bill constructed on the supposition that the President is always a force for war and Congress always a force for restraint may have unexpected consequence when, as has been so often the case in our history, it is the Congress which is seeking war and the President restraint.

As an historian, I feel that a legislative proposal of this consequence must be subjected to the historical test, by which I mean that we must carefully consider what its effect would have been had it been on the statute books in times of crisis in our past. I will not enter here into the question whether S. 440 would have prevented the action undertaken by President Truman in Korea and by President Kennedy in the Cuban missile crisis. Both conceivably could have slipped through under the capacious theory of defensive war sanctioned in the bill, and neither probably would have been hampered by the 30-day deadline. I will concentrate rather on two other situations of equal significance: the undeclared naval war with Germany in the North Atlantic in 1941, and the war in Vietnam.

In 1941 Britain, fighting alone in the west against Hitler, depended on American aid for survival. The Roosevelt administration felt that British collapse and Nazi victory would jeopardize the security of the United



States. Accordingly, Roosevelt announced a "shoot-on-sight" policy in order to protect the British lifeline. It is not at all clear that this action falls within the categories of initiative permitted to Presidents by S. 440. In any case, it is fairly certain that Congress would not have sustained the shoot-on-sight policy after 30 days. For this was one of those cases where policy differences had been well crystallized before the commitment of force. One has only to recall the fact that in August 1941 the House of Representatives came very close to disbanding the American Army when it extended the draft by but a single vote. It is hardly conceivable that this same Congress would have authorized Roosevelt to pursue an undeclared war in the North Atlantic.

As for the Vietnam war, President Johnson could unquestionably have got all the congressional blessing he wanted at any point up to 1968 and probably even then. If S. 440 had been on the books, it would not have arrested American participation in the war; it would only have locked Congress deeper into the escalation policy. In short, the War Powers bill would have prevented President Roosevelt from protecting the British lifeline against Nazi submarines; and it would not have prevented President Johnson from intensifying the war in Vietnam nor President Nixon from carrying that war into Cambodia and Laos. If all this is so, then the bill will serve neither the purpose for which it was drafted nor the national interest of the United States.

All these considerations constrain me to believe that Sections 3 and 5 of S. 440, however constitutional they may be, are ill-considered, unwise and filled with danger for public policy. Nor, indeed, do these sections seem to me essential to attain the declared purposes of the bill. For these purposes can be effectively attained, in my judgment, by the provisions in S. 440 providing for the reporting and the recall of hostilities. For this reason, Congressman Bingham's proposal, H.R. 317, seems to me to represent a greatly preferable approach to this complex problem.

H.R. 317 omits the impossible attempt to foresee all future contingencies; it omits the placing of the congressional imprimatur on expansive theories of defensive war; it avoids the perplexities and dangers created by the 30-day deadline. H.R. 317 retains, however, the usable and useful provisions of S. 440.

Section 3 of H.R. 317 provides for periodic presidential reports to Congress on the status of hostilities. My only comment on this section is to wonder whether the requirement that the President must report to Congress at least once every six months is sufficient. It would seem to me safer to require such reports no less often than every three months.

Sections 4 and 5 provide for the termination of hostilities upon the adoption by either House of a resolution disapproving continuance of the action taken. I am in agreement with the congressional priority provision in Section 5. As for the mode of termination prescribed in Section 4, this is based on the precedent of the Executive Reorganization Act; and the reasoning behind it in this case is evident—that, since one House of Congress could defeat a declaration or authorization of war, one house of Congress should be able to prevent the continuation of undeclared or unauthorized war. From some viewpoints, a joint resolution passed by both Houses of Congress would seem a more appropriate form of action. I am not sure, for example, whether Section 4, if on the statute books in 1941, might not have resulted in the termination of American protection of the British lifeline, though, since it would have required positive action by one or the other House, such termination could not have been achieved without a most intense national debate. On the other hand,

with the presidential power to veto joint resolutions, the war-making power would rest in the hands of one-third of each House, and this surely was not the intention of the Constitution. So, on balance, I am inclined to feel that the mode prescribed in Section 4 is a feasible solution. With this perplexity noted, I would urge on this Committee the consideration of H.R. 317, which will, I believe, fulfill the purposes of S. 440 without saddling the country with that curious mélange of rigidity and permissiveness I find in S. 440.

As for H.J. Res. 2, this proposal seems to me to suffer from two defeats. It would appear to endorse the expansive theory of defensive war on presidential initiative by authorizing the President to commit forces when "the necessity to respond" to situations endangering the United States constitutes in the presidential judgment "extraordinary and emergency circumstances as do not permit advance Congressional authorization." While Presidents may be compelled by emergency to take action without congressional sanction, it does not seem to me, as I have noted before, essential that Congress should encourage them to do so by providing an appearance of sanction. The reporting provisions in Section 5 seem to me admirable and might well be incorporated in H.R. 317. The provision for congressional action in Section 6 seems to me vague and less satisfactory than the more specific provisions in H.R. 317.

In the interests of time, I will not comment in this statement on the other resolutions before the Committee, though I will be glad to do so to the best of my ability in the course of the hearing.

Before closing, I would beg the indulgence of the Committee to suggest two other aspects of this general problem for your consideration.

One means by which Congress could get a grip on the problem of war powers is through the exertion of its control over the deployment of armed force outside the United States. I recognize that the constitutional authority of Congress to determine the commitment of forces outside the country has been in dispute. Nevertheless I would recall to you the statement made on the floor of the Senate in 1912 by the eminent lawyer Elihu Root, who had served as Secretary of War under McKinley and Secretary of State under Theodore Roosevelt. While expressing the hope that it would never do so, Root conceded that "Congress could by law forbid the troops' being sent out of the country." The more venerable among us can remember the "great debate" of 1951 when President Truman proposed to send four additional divisions to Europe. That debate ended inconclusively with the passage of a "sense of the Senate" resolution in which the Senate approved the sending of the divisions but added, over administration opposition, that no additional ground troops should be sent to Western Europe "without further congressional approval." Among those voting against inherent presidential authority and for the principle of congressional control of troop deployment was Senator Nixon of California.

I would call this Committee's attention to the statement by the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development in February 1972 entitled "Military Manpower and National Security." This statement argues persuasively for a procedure by which Congress could regularly authorize and control the overseas deployment of military manpower. The report recommends that Congress should annually and explicitly authorize by major overseas areas the number of troops that may be deployed outside the United States. This need not limit the President's power to act in an emergency, for Congress can require of the President an after-the-fact accounting for emergency action; but it would give Congress a continuing

voice in peacetime overseas deployments. This would go far, in my judgment, in restoring the proper balance between Congress and the Presidency.

My second point has to do with the vital question of information. Nothing has been more effective in obstructing the democratic control of foreign policy and in perpetuating monopolistic control by the national security bureaucracy than the myth of inside information—the "if you only knew what we knew" attitude. There is absolutely no reason why Congress should not have before it all the facts essential to sound and informed judgment on the large decisions of foreign affairs. This would require a marked change of attitude on the part of the executive. It would require the substitution of genuine consultation for unilateral briefing. It would require the end of the abuse of executive privilege. It would require the transmission of all executive agreements to the foreign affairs committees of both Houses, with appropriate provisions for secrecy when secrecy is really necessary. It would require, it seems to me, the establishment of a Joint Committee on Intelligence on the model of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. It might well require, as Benjamin V. Cohen has proposed, the establishment by Congress of a commission with representatives from both Houses and from the executive branch empowered to exchange information and views on the most delicate and critical questions of foreign affairs. It will require above all more systematic and aggressive efforts by Congress to avail itself of the vast resources of knowledge in the public domain; for, in my experience, the great bulk of information necessary for intelligent political judgment is available to any citizen who will take the trouble to seek it out.

If Congress will arm itself with knowledge, with the control of overseas troop deployment and with some means of terminating hostilities undertaken on unilateral presidential initiative, it will make long strides toward bringing the war-making power under responsible democratic control.

#### A FRIEND IN NEED

### HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent statement, President Nixon called on employers to give top priority to hiring returning servicemen.

One businessman who did not have to wait for this invitation is a constituent of mine—Dick Chase, of Chula Vista, Calif. As president of Chula Vista Sanitary Service, Mr. Chase has long had hiring guidelines which he explains quite simply in the following words:

Disabled veterans get the first crack at employment opportunities. Veterans, particularly Vietnam veterans, are considered next. That Mr. Chase practices what he preaches is borne out by the statistics that follow: Of 135 persons employed by his company over the past 3 years, 89 have been veterans and 11 disabled veterans—an excellent batting average for any firm.

Dick Chase seeks no credit for his policies. In fact, he says, they bring him cash as much as credit. He also says,

I hire a man for his ability, not his disability.

And he finds that veterans, disabled or not, make excellent workers. Equally important, they have a team spirit and loyalty instilled in them by their military service.

Mr. Chase agrees with the president's statement that,

These men ask no special privileges or favors.

They do expect and deserve a chance, however, and Dick Chase is seeing to it that they get the best chance he can give them. Hardheaded businessmen might well note the growth of Mr. Chase's company and ponder this demonstration of the fact that hiring veterans is an exercise not only of patriotism but of sound business judgment as well.

#### THE NATIONAL ARTS AND HUMANITIES FOUNDATION

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, during the last few weeks, the House Select Subcommittee on Education has been holding hearings to urge an extension and increase the budget of the National Arts and Humanities Foundation.

Because I so strongly believe in the need to continue this invaluable program and because I am so pleased with the progress and achievements the Endowment has made over these past few years, I would like to share the words of my testimony with you at this time:

#### TESTIMONY BY PETER RODINO

Mr. Chairman, I have been said that given nothing but its music, the archeologist of the future could do a fair job of restructuring American civilization in the decades of the 60s and 70s. The mixtures of musical forms and styles, the straining for new sounds and new tonal and rhythmic relationships, the persistence of musical idioms of the past, the protest songs of American youth, soul music, even the singing commercial—will not all these factors together constitute a true mirror of our times? I am not speaking so much of the separate words, of the specific sounds, of the individual drum beats. I am speaking, rather, of the representation of particular ideas. And, if this individual expression is the very reflection of life for us today, should we not recognize that our music, our art, is the medium through which our ideas, our beliefs, our dreams, are given concrete form and substance? Aristotle quite succinctly stated, "the aim of art is to represent, not the outward appearance of things, but their inward significance, for this, and not the external mannerism and detail, is true reality."

It is therefore extremely important for me, and for all of us in this Congress, to extend every effort to assist and encourage the development and expansion of the artistic efforts so vital to the life and growth and legacy of our nation. The more I study the existing economic difficulties experienced in practically every creative endeavor, however, the more I realize the need for Federal assistance to our arts becomes ever more acute.

Of all the performing arts, grand opera takes its place as the most spectacular, the most artistic, and also, the most expensive of presentations. With its full cast of singers,

complete orchestra and ballet, with its elaborate scenery, costuming and lighting, the opera production embodies all the economic burdens that beset every other art form. Its cast, from four leads, 10 supporting singers, 75-100 chorus members, 20-40 ballet dancers, and 80-100 orchestra members can run between 200 and 300 individuals. And, noting that often different operas with different casts may perform each evening, rehearsal costs are far higher than those of a theatrical production with a moderately long run.

The first recorded opera performance on American soil was in 1735. The Metropolitan Opera was founded in 1883. Despite this long tradition, however, professional opera in the United States is extremely scarce. Only four major opera companies exist—the Met, the New York City Opera, the Chicago-Lyric Opera and the San Francisco Opera. And, approximately 40 professional opera groups are scattered throughout the country. Opera singers, therefore, must usually travel from place to place, singing in an ensemble framework that is largely improvised. Artists with young talent have no place to go. They often train outside the United States and request, "Please find us a place in a European opera house. We don't want to go home because we can't find an opportunity to work and earn a living in our own field."

If, therefore, for approximately 340 days a year no professional opera exists in such major cities as Boston, Dallas, Hartford, Houston, Kansas City, New Orleans, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh and Washington, D.C., how is it possible to develop a continuing opera program in this country? If such few performances are given, one understands a director's reluctance to experiment with fresh styles. Standard works are basically used, mostly for economic reasons. With so little opportunity to enjoy opera, an audience wants to see, those few days a year, the works she knows well and understands. Yet, how can opera fulfill its role in America if its predominant interest is focused on the 18th and 19th Centuries? Exclusive preoccupation with past glory contributes little to the vitality of opera as a living art form.

You have already heard the excellent testimonies of the Honorable Emanuel Celler and of Schuyler G. Chapman, Acting General Manager of the Met on the financial "desperation gap" in which the Met is now caught. Between inflation costs and slowing rising income, added to the fact that the box office pays 80% of the Met's expenditures, leaves this grant opera company with a high temptation to raise its prices. Yet, its directors shy away from this alternative, preferring instead to broaden the availability of public opportunity to enjoy and share in this art. Even as it stands now, a large segment of our communities, simply because of high prices and the dearth of existing facilities is denied the opportunity to appreciate opera. For how can our citizens learn to enjoy the living arts if so few performances are available to them? And, what child should not be given the opportunity to know and to feel comfortable with this art form, especially while his tastes are still developing and his behavior patterns are being socialized.

It is not as though the men and women of this nation have demonstrated a lack of interest and support for the arts. To the contrary, a growing awareness exists, and a wealth of American operatic talent wants only to be given a chance. We all recall, for example the overwhelming response to Leonard Bernstein's performance of the Mass. Tickets were sold out so quickly, I know of many who were turned away and denied the opportunity of viewing this production.

If we look upon our roles in this Congress as voicing the needs and desires of America's citizens, as serving to increase public awareness of the significance of encour-

agement and support of the arts, we must act now. The arts are public goods and the wishes and interests of the public should be followed in the allocation of this most valuable national resource. Government funding in this area is certainly justified. We must demonstrate our responsibility to the stability, continuity and growth of American art.

When one realizes, for example, that European governments pay 40-90% of opera house costs, one cannot dispute the fact that there exists no system of American sponsorship corresponding to the European government subsidy. And, one cannot help but recognize that the present American system of financial sponsorship is certainly not secure enough at this point to guarantee any substantial artistic future for this nation.

We have not faced head on the financial plight of our artistic endeavors, but rather have approached the problem in a limited fashion, from offering tax incentives to private contributors, to supporting specific projects. None of these funds, however, are sufficient to guarantee the stability and freedom needed for our arts to flourish properly. Ronald Berman, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, in his recent testimony before this committee, stressed the importance of encouraging new approaches, new research, in discovering new ways, new time frames, for the acquisition of even conventional knowledge. The mind, given the opportunity, has an unlimited wealth of ideas and expressions. "The object of art," stated Francois Delarte, "is to crystallize emotion into thought and then fix it in form". Let us not, by our inaction, stifle this process for America. The development of mature cultural activity, of exacting standards of performance and of an understanding audience can't be provided overnight. Funds must be provided today if the arts are to be kept alive tomorrow.

As one of the original sponsors of P.L. 89-209, to establish the National Endowment of Arts and Humanities, I am extremely pleased to note the success and progress of the Foundation since 1965. Since its inception, the Endowment has sought to understand the needs, concerns, and dreams of our citizens, and to respond to these needs on a national as well as a local level. It has set up councils and committees, composed of individuals from a multitude of backgrounds and experiences, within each state to tap into the state's existing human resources, to reflect the particular nature of each state and to answer its specific desires and concerns.

The exhibition of "Impressionist and Post-Impressionist Painting from the USSR", opening this Saturday at the National Gallery, the first exhibition of Western Art to be lent to the United States by the Soviet Union, was largely sponsored under a \$100,000 grant from the Endowment. I am extremely excited about this cultural exchange and very much look forward, as I'm sure many Americans do, to the museum opening.

The Goldovsky Opera Institute, through Endowment Assistance, toured last year in my home state of New Jersey and this year, New Jersey's own Opera Theatre is being aided by a matching grant from the Arts' Endowment. Just last year 45 grants for the opera were made, including one to the National Opera Institute whose function is to encourage the growth and development of opera in the United States. Through this Institute, financial encouragement has been provided to outstanding young singers and grants in aid have been offered for the commissioning and production of new performances of rarely performed operas. Assistance to date has made possible the world premiere of 10 new operas.

Since I am most familiar with the Endowment's projects in New Jersey, I would like to share with you a few of the programs



which stand out in my mind as special to my constituents, but important to the country as a whole.

The Creative Leadership Arts-In-Schools program, a cooperative project with the U.S. Office of Education, began in 1970 with a small grant for a post working in our local school system. Since that time, the program has grown in 3 years to include poets, dancers, visual artists, musicians and filmmakers—all working throughout the elementary and secondary schools of the state. Debra Stein, leading the poetry component of this project, under the direction of Bryan R. Kelly, director of the New Jersey Council on the arts, writes, "Our goals were to bring the living art of poetry into the classroom, stimulating the natural creative ability of the student and encouraging an appreciation of both contemporary and classic forms". The following poems were written through this program, the first from a 3rd grader and the second from a high school student.

An open door  
Says come in.  
A shut door  
Says who are you?

#### APARTMENT HOUSE

A filing cabinet of human lives  
Where people swarm like bees in tunnelled  
lives.

Each to his own cell in the towered comb  
Identical and cramped, we call it home.

The Newark Community Arts Center, in another matching grant program, received support for its 1972 classes in music, drama and dance—a grant which served nearly 1000 inner-city youngsters. The importance of these opportunities, experiences and encouragements to these children during so special a developing period in their lives cannot be overstated.

The New Jersey Symphony, located in Newark, received assistance during the past fiscal year to continue its youth concert programs and to expand to new locations and new audiences in several counties throughout the state. And, the Newark Museum has received matching funds to catalogue its collection of American paintings and sculpture covering the 18th, 19th and 20th Centuries with an additional collection of American folk art.

Thus, the National Arts and Humanities Foundation has given life and vitality to the art of the United States. It has encouraged, in its short years of existence, creativity of tremendous value. It has exposed our young to new and beautiful experiences and to exciting new avenues of expression. And, it has continually sought to respond to the hopes and desires of our citizens. With our support and with the successful passage of this legislation to assist this Foundation in its invaluable work, all this has only just begun.

REV. JAMES A. RUSSELL CELEBRATES 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS ORDINATION

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 13, Rev. James A. Russell celebrated the 25th anniversary of his ordination. He is presently pastor of Our Lady of the Mount Roman Catholic Church in Warren Township, N.J., and his parish is having a celebration of this event on April 8, 1973.

Father Russell is an exceptional per-

CXIX—688—Part 9

son as a spiritual director, citizen, and is both loved and deeply appreciated by the members of his parish as well as the other parishes that he has served during his priesthood.

I would like to add my congratulations to those that soon will be expressed.

A GROUP OF 34 LENINGRAD JEWS COURAGEOUSLY SPEAK OUT ON THE EMIGRATION POLICY OF THE SOVIET UNION

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, many of us have joined in sponsoring legislation to halt the persecution and harassment of Soviet citizens of Jewish heritage, calling for the exercise of the citizen's right to emigrate to the country of his choice. This past week I received a very desperate appeal from Rabbi Harvey J. Fields of the Anshe Emeth Memorial Temple of New Brunswick, N.J., and Mr. Samuel Landis, president of the Jewish Federation of Raritan Valley, N.J., urging increased sponsorship and congressional action in securing passage of all relief measures possible to put an end to the oppression of Jews and bring about the right of Jews and others to leave the Soviet Union.

Their message to me included a letter signed by 34 Leningrad Jews calling upon the Congress of the United States to remember the tragic plight of the Soviet Jews in any discussions relating to foreign aid and cooperative programs with the Soviet Union and continue to seek the "free exit from the Soviet Union for all Jews who wish it, with no concessions or compromises."

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will be interested in the communication from these representatives of the Soviet Jewish citizenry and their description of the alarming conditions with which they are faced in their efforts to reaffirm their right to leave the Soviet Union and live their remaining years in the State of Israel. I insert their letter at this point in the RECORD for your information and guidance:

A GROUP OF LENINGRAD JEWS ADDRESSES THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

We are not able to fulfill our wish—to leave the Soviet Union and to settle forever in the State of Israel. We are conscious of the fact that this, our wish, is an elementary right of contemporary civilized men—nevertheless, we are deprived of it. The Soviet authorities do not allow us to arrange our own fate and the lives of our children.

We do not lead an easy life, but one that is full of assorted material and spiritual difficulties. We are not writing about them because they will never be fully understood in the West—no matter how much is written or said about them. We live a life which kills the spirit, moreover, we bear our present time only so that it might pass quickly; but after all the present life is that only life we have. We want the future to arrive as quickly as possible, our indefinite future.

We are striving for fairness from the Soviet authorities. In our argument what can we say to them?

The only stand we can take is to show our lack of fear of their monstrous power; to show our agreement to make sacrifices; and by our being prepared to go to prison. This latter is a preparedness which the authorities unfortunately use all too often. It is turned out that after the camps and crematoriums of the War—there still remains Jews for whom it is necessary to go to prison in order to reaffirm their right to leave the Soviet Union forever and live a natural life in their homeland in the State of Israel.

The official laws which regulate the issuance of exit permits for the State of Israel are unknown to us. Jews to whom exit visas are refused do not know when they will be able to receive a visa; they do not know on what the reasons for refusal are based; they do not know in particular which organizations or officials are blocking the issuance of the visa; they do not know in which instances it is necessary to appeal the refusal; and above all, they do not know if they will ever receive permission to depart. The only thing that they know is that a year after the refusal they once again may submit all of the documents together with their request for an exit visa. And it is possible once again to receive a refusal. And again in another year to submit documents . . . and this can go on without end.

But life goes on, children go on growing. Specialists are disqualified. In order to live such a life and not lose heart or despair an unlimited belief in success is necessary.

We complain about the absence of laws but when they appear the situation by no means gets any better. The notorious education tax has only the appearance of legality; indeed it emphasizes still more the lack of rights of those who wish to leave. The unprecedented sums of the tax which were called for in the beginning have so affected public opinion that, when they were slightly reduced (albeit remaining excessively large), it was possible to point out that the situation had improved. But no, it had not improved. The education tax continues to remain a monstrous absurdity and a mockery of common sense. The evil of the education tax lies not only in itself but also in the fact that it diverts public opinion in the West from more important issues to do battle against it. Progressive people in the West may think that if the tax is either surmounted, lowered or completely rescinded, then the main obstacle on the path for Jews going to Israel will have been eliminated. No, no, no! This just isn't so! The main obstacle on the path for Jews going to Israel is not the education tax but the absence of free exit for all who wish it.

The Jews and non-Jews of the Western world have rendered us invaluable aid. The support of public opinion and of various organizations in the West helps us to exist, to endure and surmount our lives. It may be said straight-forwardly that without your support we would never have been able to stand ground.

Therefore we are turning to you: remember us!

We are living people just as you are; we know the same joys and the same pain that you do. We do so love our children and fear for them as do you for yours; and we too want to make them happy.

Help us in this! Remember about this during the negotiations with the Soviet government over political and economic questions.

Do not agree to compromises and half measures.

Do not trade the bodies and souls of Soviet Jews for tons of grain or fertilizer.

Don't delude yourselves about the apparent legality of the tax on education and similar measures.

We beg you to strive for one thing alone: Free exit from the Soviet Union for all Jews who wish it.

No concessions or compromises! Only free exit for all who wish this—this is the position we are expecting from you; and it is for this that we have hope.

Mr. Speaker, although we have been aware of the difficulties, this letter, I am sure, will bore deeper into the hearts of all freedom-loving people throughout the world and add strength and determination to our efforts here in the United States to secure a worldwide commitment of goodwill and understanding among all peoples of the world, and particularly the U.S.S.R. in hastening to make amends and abolish the evils of archaic, tyrannical principles that do not belong in the doctrine of human values today. For no matter how we equate or measure our values—by whatever standard applied—it is axiomatic that human values are paramount to the purpose of the mutual endeavors and responsibilities of all of mankind.

**C. DIXON BILLINGSLEA AN  
AMERICAN HERO**

**HON. DON FUQUA**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, Arlington National Cemetery is the final resting place for thousands of American heroes. Here two Presidents, privates and generals rest side by side in honored glory.

A small dignified cross marks the final resting place of General Pershing, beside those he led.

On a hill overlooking thousands of crosses of his fellow heroes is a new cross. It too marks the final resting place of an American hero who has answered his Nation's last call to duty.

Col. C. Dixon Billingslea was decorated by his country more than 140 times. He had a record of 379 hours in combat in 250 missions.

He was to make his last flight on February 10, 1973, when the small private plane in which he was a passenger crashed 8 miles from his base, with Colonel Billingslea and two friends losing their lives.

Flying was his life. He was a brilliant aviator. Why such a bright star should be plucked from our midst is not for us to know.

Suffice it to say that in his short life, Colonel Billingslea experienced more than man has a right to expect. He knew combat, he had a reverence for duty, he was blessed with a loving family, his career was astonishing in its accomplishments and he left so many friends that their number is countless.

It because of men like Dixon Billingslea that this Nation remains strong. He gave his all.

His family has made an equal sacrifice. I can only hope that in their grief, they can be comforted in the knowledge that he lived such a rich, full life.

One day soon, his son, Arthur, will be

graduated from the Air Force Academy. A great tradition has only been temporarily stifled. It will live on.

From his beginning in the service as a senatorial appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy to participation in some of the early astronaut programs to heroism in battle, the colonel's background was one of distinction.

Colonel Billingslea entered the Naval Academy in 1947 and was graduated in 1951 with a degree in engineering. While there he also qualified as a translator-interpreter in Spanish with the State and Defense Departments.

After graduation he entered pilot training at Spence AFB, Ariz. in 1952. After another school at Nellis AFB, Nev. he traveled to Korea where he racked up 87 combat missions for 139 combat hours in the F-86 Super Sabre.

Returning to the United States in 1953, Colonel Billingslea served in a variety of positions while flying the F-86, the F9 F-8 and the F-100.

In 1960 the colonel left TAC while a F-100 weapons instructor pilot and began work toward his master of business administration degree at the University of Chicago. He specialized in engineering management of research and development and was graduated in 1961.

From 1961 to 1963 Colonel Billingslea was assigned to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, where he played a major role in the development of the C-141 Starlifter. His primary specialties with the aircraft were the new jet engines and cockpit design. It was also at Wright-Patterson that he participated in various "Zero G" weightless experiments in the air and under water for the early astronaut programs.

For the next 3 years, he served on an F-105 with the 36th Tactical Fighter Wing at Bitburg Airbase, Germany. In 1966 he was reassigned to the 39th Tactical Fighter Squadron at Danang Airbase, Vietnam.

While with the 39th, he flew 152 combat missions, and 240 combat hours in the F-4C. For one of his combat missions over North Vietnam, Colonel Billingslea was awarded the Silver Star.

When he returned to the United States in 1967, the colonel served a stint with Headquarters, USAF, at the Pentagon as an operations staff officer before going into the Army War College at Carlisle Barracks, Pa. He received his diploma from the War College in 1970.

An assignment to Misawa Airbase, Japan as deputy commander for operations with the 474th TFW and the job with the 3d TFW at Kunsan followed his graduation.

He began his final assignment when he went to Holloman Air Force Base in New Mexico in July 1972. He reportedly had arrived there with the most impressive set of credentials ever seen at the base.

He was serving as the commander of the 49th Civil Engineering Squadron at the Base at the time of his death.

His military decorations include the Silver Star, the Distinguished Flying Cross with three Oak Leaf Clusters, the Bronze Star, the Air Medal with 13 Oak

Leaf Clusters, the Meritorious Service Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Republic of Vietnam Gallantry Cross with Bronze Star, and 184 other awards.

Colonel Billingslea attended Marianna High School and graduated from Marion Military Institute, Marion, Ala.

He is survived by his wife, the former Miss Molly Ley Austin of Tallahassee, one son, Arthur, a cadet at the Air Force Academy, one daughter, Karen, a student at Texas Christian University, and his parents, Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Billingslea of Marianna.

His hometown newspaper, the Jackson County Floridian of Marianna, Fla., carried an editorial entitled "Jackson Loses a Son."

We share in the loss of a distinguished son of Jackson County, a man whose service to his country exemplified the true strength of America.

**POW'S ACCOUNTS OF TORTURE  
PRESENT THE TRUE FACE OF  
COMMUNIST BRUTALITY**

**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, now that the American POW's have been returned to American soil, the truth about their brutal treatment at the hands of their North Vietnamese captors is finally being told to the American public. The fear that the Communists would take reprisals against those remaining in captivity forced the early returnees from making the truth of their ordeal known earlier.

The accounts of the shameful torture inflicted on American prisoners by the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong present a shocking horror story for the public. But the accounts should be given widespread attention so Americans can see the true face of the Communist enemy in Southeast Asia.

As it may have been anticipated, the antiwar and Red apologists who supplied propaganda support for North Vietnam during the war years, have now turned their attention to discrediting the accounts of brutality by the Communists. This new line of antiwar diatribe has been picked up and mouthed by many members of the "surrender at any price" crowd.

One outspoken antiwar guitar picker recently was quoted as saying:

You have to bear in mind the sources from which these reports come. They (the POW's) have been carefully screened and studied before being allowed to talk.

The stories of starvation, beatings, and torture are too spontaneous and have been confirmed by too many of the returning men to be merely passed off as being controlled by Government press agents.

A better example of carefully manipulated press-agentry was the job the North Vietnamese did on the antiwar crowd when they visited Hanoi. They



"carefully screened" what they wanted their American comrades to see, and it was accepted as truth with no questions asked.

The obvious reason for the attempted repudiation of the prisoners' accounts is to soften the American public's strongly held opposition to aid to North Vietnam. But the dodge will not work. The representatives in Congress of the American people, if their votes reflect the feelings of the country, will not allow \$2.5 billion of tax dollars to be given to the brutal, subhuman Government of North Vietnam.

I insert the following two related newsclippings at this point:

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 2, 1973]  
BAEZ SURPRISED

Singer Joan Baez said in Paris that she was surprised at the reaction to reports by returning American prisoners of war of torture while captives in North Vietnam.

"I am a little surprised at the outrage over the POWs since there are still 200,000 prisoners in South Vietnam who are not being treated well," the antiwar folksinger said yesterday.

"Of primary importance is that civilization must demand that any and all torture must cease. It does not matter if it is by our side or their side."

"Nobody seemed to care about boys on drugs committing suicide, but with the POWs they are taking special care. You have to bear in mind the source from which these reports come. They have been carefully screened and studied before being allowed to talk," she said.

#### THE TRUTH COMES OUT

Now that all the American prisoners the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong admit to having held have been repatriated, the truth concerning the conditions under which the POWs existed is beginning to leak out. It is a chilling story of organized brutality for political purposes that will surprise only those who have always maintained that their country's enemies are but a little lower than the angels.

At best, the lot of a prisoner is never a happy one. For those held by societies which do not place a high premium on human life or suffering, imprisonment can be a searing experience. But when a natural brutality is complemented, as was the case in Indochina, by a structured form of terror designed to extract political advantage from the plight of helpless men, one's heart goes out to those who have been its victims.

Americans captured by the Viet Cong and the higher-ranking fliers imprisoned in Hanoi during the years 1965-67 appear to have fared the worst. After 1967, the uproar in the American press and pressure from the White House seems to have resulted in slightly better treatment.

The tales of beatings, starvation and other forms of torture unquestionably will become more heartbreaking as more and more former prisoners tell their stories. Under the circumstances, the wonder is not that some prisoners signed anti-war statements but that more did not do so. Those who stood up under such vile treatment deserve the highest possible praise for their courage, resolution and faith.

A soldier, be he officer or enlisted man, owes it to his country, his comrades and his service to resist interrogation when information which he has would endanger others if revealed. But beyond that, there can be no absolutes. No man can say how much he would endure when in the hands of skilled and pitiless interrogators. Some, like Marine Major Donald G. Cook, died

rather than tell his interrogators the time of day. But not every man is capable of such heroism.

In any case, the shame of torture rests not on its victims but upon those who inflict it. Which will not make it any easier to get through Congress that \$2.5 billion for rebuilding North Vietnam as an "investment in peace."

#### OUR FLOUNDERING WELFARE SYSTEM

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 27, 1973

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 27, 1973, Representative MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS provided the assembled body with an enlightened and informative analysis of the status of our Nation's welfare system. I commend Mrs. GRIFFITHS' excellent study and her attempt to tie together some of the loose ends of our floundering welfare programs.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that Mrs. GRIFFITHS has made a significant step in welfare reform by focusing attention on the shortcoming of welfare programs, which, as she so aptly indicated, are disordered, overlapping, and generally unsatisfactory.

No one denies that there is a need to provide for our truly needy, for our aged, our disabled, for our handicapped—for all those who desperately need Federal assistance.

But there is something drastically wrong when our Nation's hard earned tax dollars are utilized in providing assistance in a welfare system which contradicts the best of our American traditions. Something is wrong when welfare assistance negates the work incentive and something is radically wrong when the Federal Government and the States provide an individual with all of the essentials of life without generating any impetus for that person to create a living for himself.

We are all cognizant of the abuses in our present haphazard methods of dispensing funds to poverty stricken individuals. And Congress may have encouraged some of these abuses by indiscriminately pouring funds into programs whenever a need is expressed. Congress, seeing the needs of the American people, has responded in a truly humanitarian spirit.

But, by that very response, have we missed the point? Just as important as providing moneys and services to stricken individuals, should we not also foster the desire to work, to achieve, to seek the ability to be self-sustaining and self-reliant?

The temper of these existing programs is not in tune with our American traditions. In his inaugural address, President Nixon called upon every American to assume responsibility for himself, by taking the initiative to make his own way among the masses. To do this, we in Congress must take stock of where we are heading, where we have been, and how effectively

we are looking ahead to provide for underprivileged Americans.

The gentlewoman from Michigan has pointed out 11 existing programs comprising our present system of welfare services. Surely with these 11 programs, working independently of one another, there is bound to be overlapping and irregularities. Mrs. GRIFFITHS' study has suggested consolidating these programs. That is certainly an alternative which bears further investigation by the Congress.

Thanks to Mrs. GRIFFITHS, we finally have an accurate assessment of our current welfare system. It is now up to Congress to pursue meaningful reform, making certain that our Nation's welfare program truly fulfills our intentions of providing the incentives for self-reliance, thereby seeking a termination to the endless welfare cycle.

#### COMMENDATION FOR A COURAGEOUS LADY

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, we in Birmingham and Alabama, are fortunate to have working with the handicapped a lady who herself overcome a serious handicap to continue providing greatly needed assistance to others. This year, Dr. Gwenth R. Vaughn, chief of audiology and speech pathology service at the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Birmingham has received the VA Administrator's commendation and is a finalist for the Outstanding Handicapped Federal Employee of the Year Award which will be presented later this week.

Dr. Vaughn has my sincere gratitude for her many years of outstanding service and for the courage she has shown. She is an inspiration to the handicapped in her personal life and a shining light for all those whom she touches in her professional life.

During World War II, Gwenth Vaughn moved to Mexico City where she helped establish the University of the Americas. She served as principal of the American High School which was the largest private English-speaking high school outside the United States. During this period she became the sole support of her small daughter.

In 1950, at the age of 34, Dr. Vaughn developed polio. She was told that she would never walk again and she had great difficulty in swallowing. Many Mexican friends, nurses and the local polio committee rallied about her because of her determination to live. She slowly recovered the ability to speak, swallow and move her extremities. She also faced her struggle for financial independence.

Dr. Vaughn was so severely paralyzed that she had to be carried from place to place by cab drivers and strapped to her chair to remain upright while she was teaching. Dr. Vaughn not only continued working and supporting her daughter but also provided the first edu-

cational opportunities for the physically handicapped and the first private school for the mentally deficient in Mexico. Often she supported the school from her own salary, and shared her home with 18 multiple handicapped students.

After being told she had no chance of ever walking she developed her own devices to help her walk. Her first attempts were with the support of a grocery cart. She now uses an umbrella cane she developed to disguise her need for support. The umbrella is easily interchangeable and she has sets in various colored materials that she attaches to match her clothing.

Dr. Vaughn and her staff have the responsibility for assessment and treatment of those with hearing and speech impairments among the veterans in three VA hospitals at Birmingham, Tuscaloosa, and Montgomery. She is also on the teaching staff of the University of Alabama in Birmingham and director of the joint VA-University "Project Tele-Therapy," an innovative approach to supplementary and followup services to veterans needing help with speech and language. For her outstanding work she received one of VA's highest awards, the VA Administrator's Commendation in February 1973.

A 1959 Ph. D. graduate of the University of Denver, Dr. Vaughn is a leader in her professional field, the author of several books, and a contributor of chapters to several books in medicine and dentistry. She is a fellow in both the American Speech and Hearing Association and the American Association on Mental Deficiency.

Despite the fact that Dr. Vaughn routinely must use either a walker or personal assistance, she asks for no special consideration in her job, said Clyde G. Cox, director of the VA hospital, adding:

Through her deep understanding, professional competence, and desire to help others, she is most effective in aiding the sick and disabled in their life struggle.

#### PHYSICAL FITNESS

### HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, the national physical fitness effort was given another fine boost this past weekend with the running of the 11th Annual J. F. K. 50-Mile Hike along the Appalachian Trail and C. & O. Canal towpath. I know you join with me in extending special thanks and appreciation to those colleagues among us who added encouragement and enthusiasm to this significant activity with their participation. Congress was active along the course with the likes of Idaho's ORVAL HANSEN and Washington's JOEL PRITCHARD. But special recognition is justly due to our grimly determined colleague from California, LIONEL VAN DEERLIN, who endured the steady rain and fog for 14 hours to become one of this year's 675 finishers. My hat is off to him and our pride in his achievement abounds.

#### MENTAL HEALTH FUNDS CUT

### HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to place in the RECORD at this time an article which appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle which vividly outlines the disastrous effects of President Nixon's budget cuts on programs designed to meet real and pressing human needs.

Community mental health programs have met with major success and are of unquestioned worth. In San Francisco alone, three community health centers will lose grants if funds are not restored. If you multiply this by the communities across the Nation which have been similarly affected, you have what comes close to a national disaster in the field of mental health.

The article follows:

THREE CENTERS LOSE GRANTS; SAN FRANCISCO MENTAL FUNDS CUT  
(By David Perlman)

Three community mental health centers in San Francisco have lost more than \$2 million in federal grants for new programs as a result of administration budget cuts in Washington. The Chronicle learned yesterday.

The programs had been developed over several years with broad local community participation and federal encouragement. They had been officially approved by mental health experts at local, state and federal levels.

But now the applications have all been returned to San Francisco officials, with the flat statement that there is no money for the programs in President Nixon's budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1.

The grants would have covered the first of eight years of operations, so the city stands to lose a total of \$18 million unless the cuts are restored by congressional or administrative action.

According to Dr. Barry Decker, San Francisco's mental health services chief, the largest lost grant was for \$1,739,879 a year.

This would have paid for three-quarters of the staff costs in launching badly needed new mental health programs throughout the Sunset, the Richmond, and the Oceanview-Merced-Ingleside districts.

Another grant was for \$300,000. It would have developed new psycho-social services for hundreds of isolated, lonely and needy elderly people living in seven senior citizens' housing projects and 20 board and care homes throughout the area covered by the Westside Community Mental Health Center.

The third grant, for \$241,040, was to have gone through the Bayview-Hunters Point Community Mental Health Center to the John Hale Health Foundation. It would have trained a corps of mothers to serve as specialized mental health workers for children.

Dr. William Goldman, director of the Westside Center, is also president of the National Council of Community Mental Health Centers. He has been virtually commuting to Washington for weeks now, leading a battle to stave off the budget cuts.

#### CUTS

According to Goldman officials at the National Institute of Mental Health have declared that federal approval for nearly \$9 million in federal grants for programs at 11 California centers are being rescinded because of the budget reversal.

Nationally, about 140 separate mental

health center programs had won approval at some official level, and 100 more official level, and 100 more were in advanced planning stages when they were notified there would be no money, according to Goldman.

The San Francisco psychiatrist, who is heading for Washington again this week, said yesterday that Congressmen William F. Mailliard and Philip Burton have both been strong supporters of community mental health center legislation in the past and that they have proved "most receptive" to Goldman's urgent pleas for help now.

But he said he has found it "extremely difficult" to gain access to Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Caspar W. Weinberg's top staff advisers to present his case.

President Nixon has argued that the federal cuts in mental health center program financing are now possible because money is available from states, local governments and private insurance funds.

State and local tax money is increasingly tight, however, and almost no private health insurance policies cover any expenses for mental illness, Goldman replied.

"But with sufficient public outcry and support at all levels, there are indications this program might be restored." Dr. Goldman said, "because even the White House admits that community mental health centers have been a major success."

#### SUPPORT

Eventually, he said, federal financing "could well give way to local support, but we won't be able to pick up the federal burden for another three or four years."

The biggest fund loss in San Francisco is scheduled in the Richmond-Sunset areas, where citizen and community groups have been planning new health services for three years.

The mental health efforts there would be strongly focused on families seeking them, according to Decker. They would include individual services to children and parents, "walk-in" clinics, day care centers for disturbed youngsters, home visiting programs, and inpatient services to acutely ill mental patients at Langley Porter Institute.

"With so much trouble in our schools, with our juvenile justice system overloaded, and with difficulties arising in so many families, we believe the new services could make a dramatic change in the mental health picture of the communities involved," Decker said.

#### ABOLISH CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

### HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House two editorials broadcast recently over WEEI in Boston, supporting the abolition of the death penalty. My office has received many letters and comments in support of my bill (H.R. 5592) to abolish the death penalty. The editorials which follow are a further example of the sentiment expressed by many of the citizens, including the religious leaders, of this country.

#### THE DEATH PENALTY, PART I

Many people thought that capital punishment had walked its last mile when the Supreme Court ruled the death penalty unconstitutional after finding it a cruel and unusual punishment.

But capital punishment is back from the grave and is again being discussed at the



highest levels of government. President Nixon is calling for reinstatement, saying: "I am convinced that the death penalty can be an effective deterrent against specific crimes."

You probably heard the President's comments on capital punishment, but perhaps you missed another voice. WEEI thinks the words of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Nashville Joseph Durick are worth repeating.

Bishop Durick says the death penalty is "un-Christian and un-Godly." And he quotes the late criminal lawyer, Clarence Darrow, who said 30 years ago that the walk to the death chamber has been from the "beginning a procession of the poor, the weak, the unfit."

The Nashville Catholic Bishop cites many other arguments against capital punishment including noted psychiatrist Dr. Karl Menninger's contention that the death penalty is not a crime deterrent. Yes, WEEI thinks Bishop Durick's arguments are worth repeating; we'll discuss more of them in tomorrow's editorial.

And we wish more church leaders would take stands on the social and moral issues of the times. For it seems that the only time we hear from them is when they make dogmatic statements on such sexually-oriented issues as birth control and abortion. We feel that issues like war and capital punishment far transcend issues of private sexual morality.

In yesterday's editorial we quoted Catholic Bishop Joseph Durick of Nashville who contends that capital punishment is "un-Christian and un-Godly." Today WEEI would like to tell you more about the Bishop's reasoning.

The Bishop does cite several Old Testament passages that are often used to give Biblical support to the death penalty. These are from Genesis where it is written: "Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed," and from Numbers: "If a man strikes another with an iron instrument and causes his death, he is a murderer and should be put to death."

Bishop Durick points out, however, that "there are no New Testament passages sanctioning the death penalty." And he quotes a statement made by the Roman Catholic Bishops of Canada who said they consider it "an illegitimate use of the Bible" to use Old Testament passages to argue for the death penalty.

The Canadian Bishops said that these texts "must be weighed against any passages in the New Testament where Jesus constantly rejects the normal human tendency to redress injury by injury and calls instead for generosity." And Bishop Durick says the Jewish theologian, Rabbi Israel Kazis, thinks that these Old Testament passages don't reveal the true position of Judaism toward the death penalty.

The Bishop of Nashville says in summary: "The theological arguments in behalf (of the death penalty) are weak. Let us treasure life, not gamble with it." WEEI is in full agreement with Bishop Durick's thinking on this important social and moral issue. And as we said in yesterday's editorial, we find it refreshing to hear a church leader take a stand on an issue like this.

#### NFL PLAYERS VISITS TO SOUTH-EAST ASIA

**HON. JACK F. KEMP**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, amidst the gratitude for the return of our prisoners of war and the shock over the tortures

inflicted upon them, it is easy to forget the efforts of many Americans who have devoted much time and energy to improving the lives and conditions of those U.S. fighting men who have served their country in lonely and distant lands over the past several years.

One of the few clear and incontrovertible accomplishments of the Vietnam war has been the mobilization of a great number of non-governmental volunteer groups of Americans devoted to humanitarian pursuits in Southeast Asia. Many Americans have touched, in a personal way, the lives of those who have made it possible for the United States to leave Vietnam with honor. With the end of American involvement in Vietnam, it is my fervent hope that much of the good which came from those who sought to ease the ravages of war will not be lost. As grateful Americans, let us acknowledge the service, the sacrifice, and the patriotism of those who helped lighten the burden which many of our military men have borne in Southeast Asia.

I particularly wish to express my thanks to the National Football League for their 8 years of effort in bringing players in the NFL to Vietnam and the Far East. Their spirit and hope helped make the lives of our fighting men a little brighter.

I enclose the following list of players who have participated in tours:

#### PLAYERS WHO HAVE PARTICIPATED IN TOURS

1966

John Unitas, Willie Davis, Sam Huff.

1967

Don Meredith, Dick Bass, Larry Wilson.

1968

Bobby Bell, Bill Brown, John David Crow, Jack Kemp, Andy Russell, Lance Alworth, Ernie Green, Wayne Walker, Bart Starr.

1969

Al Atkinson, Irv Cross, Marv Fleming, Joe Namath, Tommy Nobis, Jim Otto, Dan Reeves, Dick Schafrath, Billy Ray Smith, Dick Westmoreland, Steve Wright.

1970

Tucker Frederickson, Floyd Little, Paul McGuire, Jack Snow, Chuck Walker, Dave Whitsett, Dick Butkus, George Webster, Jim Marshall, Dan Conners, Gary Garrison, Jim Nance, Norm Snead, Len Rohde, Chris Hanburger.

1971

Lem Barney, Greg Landry, Clint Jones, Bob Lilly, Tom Woodeshick, Jerry Smith, George Kunz, Joe Scibelli, Tom Dempsey, Fred Hoaglin, John Brown, Tom Matte, Jon Morris, George Byrd, Larry Csonka.

1972

Donny Anderson, Ken Houston, Danny Abramowicz, Gene Upshaw, Otis Taylor, Bill Curry, Marlin McKeever, Mike Garrett, Manny Fernandez, Jack Gregory, Marlin Briscoe, Roger Wehrli, John Elliott, John Fuqua, Grady Alderman.

1973

George Atkinson, Mike McCoy, Archie Manning, Joe Morrison, John Zook, Cliff Harris, Ken Iman, Karl Kassulke, Marty Domres, Bill Kilmer, Jim Marsalis.

The NFL, in conjunction with the USO, has undertaken goodwill tours which have been invaluable, not only to the men they were organized to assist, but also to those of us who have had the privilege to participate. NFL Com-

missioner Pete Rozelle issued a white paper in 1970 which talked about the NFL-USO project and what it has tried to accomplish:

#### THE "HANDSHAKE" TOURS

Each year the National Football League, in cooperation with the USO and the Department of Defense, sends groups of players on a post-season tour of military installations and hospitals in Vietnam, Thailand, Okinawa, Guam, Japan, and Hawaii.

In Vietnam, as two groups did last winter, they travel from the tiny island of Con Son off the shore of the Mekong Delta to the fringes of the Military Demarcation zone (DMZ), from the sands lapped by the South China Sea to the borders of Laos and Cambodia.

They talk about the length of miniskirts with the six men and one dog that make up a Marine patrol a few miles out of mortar-scarred Da Nang and they chat about the width of lapels with the crew of a freshly-painted aircraft carrier in the Gulf of Tonkin.

They show the Super Bowl film on a sheet draped over a truck in the "doonies."

And they know what Jack Snow has said—that for a few minutes they have taken young minds off the horror of war.

And the learn what Schafrath has said—that those few minutes are as important to the players as to the servicemen.

The response to these non-political missions to the Far East has been the most rewarding aspect for the sponsoring partners. General Creighton Abrams Jr., the American commander in Vietnam, has personally requested that the tours continue. The NFL intends to do so, for as long as we are wanted.

I'm told that the usual response to the NFL visits stems from the fact that the pro football players come as people rather than performers. They are not bound by a performance schedule that limits their movements. Because of that, there is a maximum of face-to-face contact with the servicemen.

Their very nature—the NFL stars travel light, dressed in fatigues, and carry a minimum amount of equipment—allows for the group to find even the remotest areas accessible for chats with the servicemen stationed throughout that part of the world. For that reason, the visits have been labeled "handshake" tours, and they are exactly what the label connotes—pro football players shaking hands with thousands of servicemen while talking, talking, talking—including football—as a relief from the rigors of service life.

The tours are both physically and mentally demanding. One early visitor likened his routine day to the rigors of training camp. And for good reason. On an ordinary day, the players hop the map on a dozen stops from a starting point at dawn to an era in the boondocks at midnight. But they always insist on working on scheduled days off.

Visits are made to all branches of the service and there are no priorities, except the unwritten law that no hospital can be bypassed. Transportation is by whatever means is available—helicopter, truck, even sampan.

The program began in 1966 when the NFL became the first sports organization to send a group of athletes to Vietnam. The first group was made up of Johnny Unitas, quarterback of the Baltimore Colts, Sam Huff, middle linebacker of the Washington Redskins, Willie Davis, defensive end of the Green Bay Packers, and CBS sportscaster Frank Gifford, former all-NFL running back for the New York Giants.

Whenever I mention it, I recall Unitas' classic line. He was intently reading a book when the Vietnam-bound plane set down in Guam in a violent rainstorm.

After the plane had landed and was taxiing to a refueling area, Unitas looked out

at the driving rain, shrugged and said: "Every time I come to Guam it's raining." And calmly went back to reading his book.

In subsequent years the tours have grown in demand and numbers participating. Last January, 15 players, broken into three groups, toured the South Pacific for as long as 17 days, carrying with them Super Bowl films, team decals, polaroid cameras, and lots of small talk.

The cameras proved extremely popular. Pictures of the players and servicemen were taken, developed, autographed and presented as keepsakes on the spot.

Despite the accoutrements brought along, however, the most significant part of the tour seems to be the talk sessions with the emphasis on the three F's—football, fashions and females.

What does it mean to the players?

Norm Snead, quarterback of the Philadelphia Eagles, said afterward, "I wouldn't trade the experience for anything else I've ever done."

Said Floyd Little, Denver running back: "It was very gratifying. We went everywhere, mountain country, jungle, we were right up there with the 'Dirty Boots,' the kids who are really in it. They were so tickled, so happy to see somebody."

Said Paul Maguire, the Buffalo punter: "On the way over I wondered if they'd look on us as a bunch of hot dogs, you know, pro football players out on a vacation, but the best part of the trip was the reaction we got everywhere we went. They were really glad to see us. Anybody with any chance to go should do it because it means so much that somebody is interested enough to visit them."

Said Dick Westmoreland, Miami cornerback recently traded to Minnesota: "It makes you proud. It makes you feel what you're doing is a drop in the bucket compared to what they're doing. These people are doing a tremendous job and paying a terrific price."

After he returned from a hospital tour, Bart Starr wrote me:

"May I take this opportunity to thank you and all of those responsible for arranging our tour to the Far East. This was one of the most memorable trips of my life and although some of the wounded cases we witnessed were tragic, the exemplary courage of these young men made me very proud to be an American."

Once back in the States, many players have made one of their first projects a series of long distance telephone calls—at their expense—to the parents of injured servicemen they met on their tour.

Dick Schafrath recorded his daily doings for the Cleveland Plain Dealer and in his series urged people to write to servicemen in the area. He offered to coordinate the mailing and delivery. Within the next few weeks, he received nearly 20,000 letters.

Forty-two players have made the tours thus far, along with one member of my staff, Bill Granholm, who has coordinated the last three visits.

And as I said, we will continue these visits for as long as the need exists and as long as we're wanted.

PETE ROZELLE, Commissioner.

I was fortunate enough to be a part of the project in 1968 traveling to South Vietnam and Thailand and can say without hesitation that it was one of the most rewarding experiences of my life. While the program has affected different players in different ways, there can be no doubt about the sense of gratitude we felt for being able to, even briefly, bring some happy memories of home and pro football into the lives of those great guys.

Mr. Speaker, much credit for NFL support of humanitarian and patriotic en-

terprises must go to Commissioner Pete Rozelle. His effort and that of Bill Granholm, special assistant to the commissioner, in coordinating the program for 5 of the past 8 years, have made the project an accomplishment of which the NFL should be proud.

The kind of effort this has represented and which I hope will continue in the years ahead is tribute to the coming of age of an industry which brings great enjoyment into the lives of millions of Americans. The National Football League clearly recognizes its capacity for contributing to the lives of those who do not have the opportunity to be spectators of professional football. Many lives have been brightened by the energies of those in professional football who manifest the same devotion for their country and their countrymen, as they do for excellence on the football field.

I pay tribute to those who have been involved in the NFL program. It can and should mark only the first step in making much of the world of sports, entertainment, and for that matter, other elements of private industry, cognizant of their infinite capabilities to meet the needs of our Nation, at home and abroad.

Bob Roesler of the New Orleans Times-Picayune recently spoke of the effect of the trip on Archie Manning. It is worth reading.

The article follows:

#### BEHIND THE SPORTS SCENE

(By Bob Roesler)

#### MANNING ON THE WAR

Archie Manning has always been a serious young man. Life is more than football for him. He has had a keen interest in things like government, international politics and people.

He has just returned from the Far East, touching down at places like the Philippines, South Vietnam and Thailand while taking part in the National Football League's annual pilgrimage to military installations "over there."

He arrived in Thailand after the cease fire, but it obviously had not "ceased." He and his group were at an outpost known simply as NKP located on a river across from Laos. From there he could see flares dropping and feel bombs exploding.

"You know you can read about the war in the newspapers and never really know what it is like over there," Archie said seriously. "But after seeing what I did and talking to the men who have been doing the fighting you know, I feel I know a lot more now."

"I came home with a great pride in our servicemen, our equipment and this country. At several bases we visited we would go out on the flight line and watch the fighter-bombers take off loaded and return empty."

"It was a strange feeling to know that pilots we were talking with the previous night might not be coming back in the morning. But the morale is high. Golly, it's good."

"Oh, there are the usual gripes about bad food, or maybe one GI would have a beef about his commanding officer. You know, like some football players might grumble about a coach."

"But there is great esprit de corps. The F105 squadrons think they are better than the F111 people. And for a long time the B52 crews were the buff of jokes because they had easy missions."

"Then in December, when the B52s took heavy losses, those guys would hold their heads high. They all just have fantastic pride in their own planes."

"The rivalry extends to bases, too. We'd stop at one place and the guys would boast that they had the best gym facilities in Thailand. Another base might counter by saying that maybe so, but they had the best track, or the best club."

#### NIXON AND ANTIWAR FEELINGS

I asked Manning how rank and file dog-faces and officers, too, felt about President Nixon, his effort to end the war and the anti-war movement back home.

"Almost everyone had good things to say about President Nixon and what he was doing. They used the expression 'commander in chief' a lot—and with pride. Actually I found very few of what you would call anti-war comments."

"The tour was pretty informal. Sometimes we would talk with 75 people, other times it would be 300 and 400. I remember one airman asked me how I like Thailand. I told him it was okay. So what does he say? He told me, 'Well, if you like it so much, how about you staying here and letting me go home in your place?' But it was all in fun because they all seem to agree that if you've got to pull duty over there, the best spot is Thailand."

#### A ROCK GROUP?

Manning's group included Joe Morrison of the Giants, Mike McCoy of the Packers, John Zook of the Falcons, Cliff Harris of the Cowboys and George Atkinson of the Raiders. All looked like mod-squad members with their long hair.

"When we first got there people thought we were a rock group," Archie grinned. "We got a lot of ribbing about our long hair, but the guys were real nice to us."

"Our shows were not much more than a rap session. What really amazed us was how knowledgeable they were about football. We didn't get many stupid questions."

"Oh, there was a lot of ribbing. Like one GI asked Harris what happened to the Cowboys. Cliff told him that the players had made so much money the year before by winning the NFC championship and Super Bowl that they had to dump the season for tax purposes."

"They got on to me pretty good because the Saints had a bad season. But they asked serious questions on how hard the college-to-pro transition was and my thoughts on a running quarterback."

"Funny thing, our group wanted to ask questions, too. We were interested in their thoughts of the war, their outfits, how the civilians treated them and things like that. But we were snowed under with questions about the National Football League."

"We did learn that they got NFL games three weeks late and they were shown over television. Every base there had their own TV studios."

"We brought along the Super Bowl film and another funny film about things like quarterbacks getting sacked. They liked them a lot. Believe me, they were an appreciative audience."

There is more to the Archie Manning story. But let's save it for Sunday. You'll find out the impression 300-pound Mike McCoy made on the small Thailanders; how Manning bartered Saint decals for a taxi ride; and his gang's visit to a fly-infested Marine outpost somewhere in the boondocks.

Too, Archie will talk a bit about the spirit of our fighting men. Or fashioned patriotism—maybe you could call it World War II vintage—is not dead.

Many reporters filing stories out of Vietnam the past years have painted some bleak word pictures of our GIs. Manning and his pals found things a little different.

Those hard-nosed, often far-left newsmen either deliberately overlooked patriotism or were too damn blind to see it. Manning came home with a feeling of pride for our men in uniform. His words are refreshing.



There isn't a darn thing wrong about the American idea of mother, flag and apple pie. It is still there for those who care to log for it.

Those American newspapers whose stories and editorials seem to come direct from the Hanoi Herald would do well to listen to people like Archie Manning. But I have a hunch those kind of opinion-shapers wouldn't want to hear anything that would prove that their hogwash about low-rating everything from the U.S. and extending crying towels to the enemy is just that—hogwash.

Manning is my kind of guy. As for the Hanoi Herald-types, they can erect a statue to Ho Chi Minh in their men's room.

#### A SIX PACK

For priority and VIP purposes Archie Manning and the National Football Players who toured the Far East were given temporary ranks of colonel.

The title and privileges were sources of embarrassment when the troupe landed in the Philippines and at Saigon. With their "horse-power" they would be first off the planes.

"We really felt funny being given the VIP treatment while an Army veteran of 16 years had to wait for us to deplane and things like that," Manning grinned sheepishly.

"There were no hard feelings, but as soon as we got to Thailand we got into more casual clothes. Some of us wore fatigue pants or just cutoff shorts and golf shirts."

Manning, Joe Morrison, Mike McCoy, John Zook, Cliff Harris and George Atkinson visited many Thai bases, large and small. Some were landing fields for giant B52s, others were reachable only by helicopter.

"There was a Marine base called Nam Phong, at least that's the way I believe it is spelled," Manning began. "It was carved out in a primitive, remote part of the jungle. It turned out to be nothing but miserable."

"We were told it was to have been a temporary place and would be used for three months, so no permanent buildings were erected. But the Marines stayed on and were living in tents until just recently."

"You know, when we'd reach a base one of the top brass would meet us at the plane for a formal welcoming. That was nice. But our best welcome was from this Marine captain at Nam Phong."

"As we climbed off the helicopter he handed us each a six-pack of beer. Since the temperature seldom dipped below 100 you can imagine how good it tasted."

"The camp was really something. You had to eat fast or the flies would get more than you would. But you know the Marines, they enjoy roughing it."

"Matter of fact, one of the Marine officers told me that if Hilton built a hotel there, the Marines would still prefer their present style of living."

"They didn't like our long hair and I believe that was the only place we visited that I honestly felt one of those guys would grab us and give a haircut."

#### BANGKOK: NEVER THE SAME

Before beginning the tour of Thailand, Manning and his pals had a few days in Bangkok. It proved interesting, profitable and funny.

"The Thais are rather small people, you know, and were utterly amazed by Mike McCoy's size," Manning grinned. "He says he's 270, but if he isn't 300 pounds my name isn't Archie Manning."

"Everywhere we went people would stop and gawk at Mike. There is a vehicle over there that is powered by a bicycle and has a seat in the back that carries two people. I wish you could see the legs on those little Thai pedal pushers."

Manning related how his gang used decals of NFL teams—they went over with thousands—as barter. "We'd put them all over their vehicles and on their clothes," he said.

"The taxis are something else. One might see a Mercedes, another a pick-up truck with benches in the back. They were something else."

"Clothes over there were real cheap. You could get a tailor-made knit suit for \$30. And you could sit down there and design the suit and watch as the tailor made it."

"You had to bargain for everything. One tailor wanted to charge me \$60 for a suit I finally paid \$30 for. Mike McCoy had trouble, though. They took one look at his size and doubled the price. Believe me Bangkok will never forget Mike McCoy."

#### PRICELESS EXPERIENCE

The Saint quarterback considered the trip over there as an experience he will never forget. "It was something to see how people live in another part of the world, examine their culture, religion and government," the redhead said, sounding more like a political science student than a professional football player.

"It was also a valuable education in military affairs and war. It was something to listen to those pilots and what they have been through. I came home with a deep respect for the American servicemen. They are courageous people who love their country."

"As for the equipment they fly and use, well, after talking to them I am convinced it is the best. I am confident that we have the people, knowhow and equipment to meet any emergency."

"The guys we met there were just great. It made you feel good to be an American. There is a high degree of patriotism over there. They have a love for their country, and as I have said before, much respect for their Commander in Chief."

With the war winding down there was little need to visit base hospitals, but Archie and his pals did drop in on some. "Those in there were being treated for non-combat things. Like colds and bad backs," Archie related.

"We did talk to two patients who had turned themselves in to take the drug cure. The drug situation is one thing the military is keenly interested in and watching."

"With the fighting ending there will be less for the GI's to do and boredom could set in. Boredom could bring on a drug problem, but the brass hats are on the alert."

Once the tour was over, Manning's group plus the one Bill Kilmer took to Korea headed east. There were a few days of relaxing in Hawaii on the itinerary but Archie skipped that stop.

"I was eager to get home," he admitted. "You know even when I take a vacation I am anxious to get back home. This trip was no different. But I would like to go back again."

"Being with our servicemen over there was a rewarding experience. I'll never forget it. You know, we were supposed to go over there to help the GI's. It was more the other way around. They made me feel proud of them and our country."

Right on, Archie.

#### THIEU'S POLITICAL PRISONERS

#### HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 2, 1973

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, a most unusual and frightening document has come to my attention. It is the true story of two young Frenchmen who served time in South Vietnamese prisons for antigovernment activity. I

cannot judge their guilt or innocence. But their description of prison life strikes me as totally sincere. I am truly concerned that these prisons are largely supported by American subsidy. The two young men, Jean-Pierre Debris and Andre Menras, witnessed torture and atrocity as a way of life. The incidents that they recall are often stomach turning. At this time, when America is so grateful for the safe and healthy return of our POW's, it seems especially relevant that we investigate the way in which the South Vietnamese are treating political prisoners.

With this in mind, I urge that my colleagues find time to study this very enlightening document:

#### THIEU'S POLITICAL PRISONERS

(By Jean-Pierre Debris and Andre Menras)

#### INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

More than four years ago, in 1968, two young Frenchmen, Jean-Pierre Debris and Andre Menras, both teachers, went to South Vietnam on a governmental educational exchange program called in French "La Co-operation". Jean-Pierre, aged 27, teaches mathematics, and his friend Andre, who is 24, is an "instituteur", or primary school teacher.

Although they had gone there with no political preconceptions, after two years, during which they worked in Danang, then in Saigon, they became so indignant at the amount of corruption and tyranny they encountered on every side, that on July 25, 1970, they decided to break the strict silence they had maintained thus far. Throwing all caution to the winds, they climbed on a monument just outside the National Assembly in Saigon, unfurled a Liberation Front flag, and at the same time, started scattering leaflets in Vietnamese, which urged immediate peace.

The reaction was not long in coming; they were quickly surrounded and overpowered by ARVN MP's, assisted by numerous plain-clothed police, who hustled them to the CHI HOA prison in Saigon, where they remained until they were freed without warning, and immediately expelled, on December 29, 1972. They arrived in Paris on New Year's eve, and on Tuesday, January 2, held their first press conference at the headquarters of the Paris SECOURS POPULAIRE which, as they tell, played an essential role in their release.

The following text is a translation of the taped statement they made during a meeting that took place at the Paris Mutualite, before an audience of some 5,000 persons, on January 20, 1973. This meeting was organized by three important Vietnamese groups in Paris.

The two teachers will be touring the United States between March 5 and 23 whereupon they will begin a 7-day tour of Canada. It is hoped that this statement and their subsequent dialogue and statements before U.S. and Canadian audiences and news media will receive the widest possible dissemination.

Their testimony is, to date, the most authentic non-Vietnamese statement that has been received concerning the fate of the more than 200,000 political prisoners in Thieu's jails, and whose very lives are in the balance during the weeks that lie just ahead.

We would urge you to give your full attention to the attached statements and to seek out more information relating to the treatment of political prisoners held in the jails and prisons of South Vietnam.

Further documentation available upon request from: The International Committee to Free South Vietnamese Political Prisoners from Detention, Torture, and Death, 122 W. Franklin Ave., Minneapolis, Minn. 55404.

JEAN-PIERRE DEBRIS

First of all I want to tell you about our arrest. During the first week we spent in jail, we were surrounded by ordinary prisoners, who are used by the Saigon administration to guard and beat up the political prisoners. Still, even in that first week, while we were lying in our cell, I was thrown a little bottle of oil which the Vietnamese use for relieving pain after you've been beaten up. Around this little bottle was a note written in very good French. It said "Thank you, on behalf of the Vietnamese people," and was signed, "your comrades in arms." We learned a long while afterwards that this came from a cell where the so-called "rebels" were kept, those who refused to salute the Saigon regime's flag. They were beaten and tortured for it.

We met them eight months later, during the first TET celebration we spent in prison, in February 1971. After months of complete isolation, we were able to go down into the yard where the latrines were. It wasn't a favor on the part of the prison guards; it was just carelessness: they were too busy celebrating TET. So we went into the yard and there we met the brothers who had sent us the lotion. They lived in awful conditions and now, for TET, their families had been able to visit them and had brought them all kinds of good things to eat. They insisted on giving us everything, and we celebrated together. We sang the song of Unity and Solidarity.

Then the brothers from the isolation ward also came down. These were political prisoners who had been brought back from the tiger-cages in Poulo Condor. Normally, they were never allowed to go out into the sunlight; but were kept in solitary confinement, in cells without windows or light. But that day, the first day of TET, they could come down into the prison yard. So we saw, the whole jail saw, for the first time, these hundred prisoners from the tiger-cages. And in what condition! They had to crawl down, because they couldn't walk anymore; their knees had been broken. They dragged themselves along the ground with little wooden benches of their own make. In the sun they had to close their eyes completely because they'd been blinded from so many years of darkness. Their faces were haggard and lined, their bodies gaunt and emaciated. They were wearing tattered prison uniforms, the standard black pyjamas. No one made a sound when they arrived. Even the trustees who guarded them were astonished. A regular prisoner threw them a box of candy. The trustees didn't move. They let him do it. Other regulars threw delicacies they had been brought: oranges, fruit, even a few ducks. We watched all the prisoners throw everything they had to these people, who had come back from the death camps. We even saw an American, an American GI, who was in the isolation ward. He had nothing to give, no money, he received no visits. All he had was his clothes. He started to undress and piece by piece, he threw all his clothes to these prisoners from Poulo Condor.

This policy of "re-education", as the Saigon government calls it, is aimed solely at breaking patriotic Vietnamese; sapping their strength; breaking them not only physically, but especially morally. There are many ways to kill a man. At Fu Quoc, an island prison, for seven years, until 1971, prisoners were shot at with machine-guns. When the prisoners demanded better food, jeeps with machine-guns mounted on them were driven into the prison and they would fire on the prisoners, forcing the prisoners further and further down. And each time there were dozens of dead and wounded. At our prison of Chi Hoa, and elsewhere there are other ways of killing people; by giving them nothing to eat, by rationing their water by

beating them, by torturing them, by leaving them in tiger-cages.

In our last months at CHI HOA, we saw something which was still more tragic. On the 15th of November (1972) Colonel Nguyen — came back. He had been exposed in '69 and '70 as the "father of the tiger-cages" at Poulo Condor. These tiger-cages were denounced in '69 by all the international press, by American papers and by French papers. I even remember seeing a picture of this colonel in a Paris magazine that labeled him the father of the tiger-cages. (Actually it was the French colonialists who were the first to build them.) In '67 this colonel was director of the concentration camps at Poulo Condor. After the scandal of the tiger-cages he disappeared, only to re-appear in the "Phoenix" campaign, which was aimed at destroying the ranks of the National Liberation Front by assassination.

Despite the exposure of the tiger-cages, they're still there, and what's more, they've been rebuilt. We saw prisoners in RC sector, in particular, in cell OG3, at CHI HOA, who had come back from the tiger-cage to be "nursed". There is an infirmary at the CHI HOA prison. When they arrived at this infirmary, they were told that there was no medicine. The American supplies weren't being sent any more. There were no dollars for medicine for political prisoners, but there were 400,000 dollars to build new tiger-cages in camps numbers 7 and 8, at Poulo Condor. There is an American company in Saigon which is building tiger-cages at the present time: new, improved models.

The cages are too low for the prisoners to stand up. Also they put three to five prisoners in each one, so there's not enough room for them to sleep. They have to take turns lying down while the others crouch. The cages are kept in completely dark rooms without ventilation; most of those who manage to live through the experience are completely blind afterwards. Friends of ours who've lived in the cages have told us how they were forced in desperation to wash themselves with their own urine, even to drink their own urine. The food rations decrease each year. In August 1972 it was still a pound and a quarter of cooked rice a day; now it's less than a pound, and the rice is soaked in sea water and mixed with sand to make it go further. The only thing they get with the rice is a pinch of salt—not enough—no vegetables, no meat, of course, no fish. They used to get a bit of pickling brine, but now they don't even get that.

If anyone so much as asks for an extra bowl of rice, there is ferocious repression. Beside each tiger-cage is a container of quick lime which the guards throw onto the prisoners, and which burns their skin. They also use grenades of nausea gas and tear gas. Then, when they've used all this, they beat and handcuff them, with their wrists behind their backs. We know people who've been kept handcuffed like this for years because they refused to salute the Saigon flag.

So the 15th of November, at Chi Hoa, the colonel came back. He brought into the prison a hundred members of the *tac* squad of the Saigon police, armed with bamboo shields, helmets, bullet-proof vests, pistols, clubs, even grenade launchers. They entered every cell containing political prisoners. Each cell had from 60 to 100 people piled on top of one another. They divided each cell into tiny groups, separating people who had known each other for years. During this separation and change of cells, a lot of prisoners disappeared completely. They even mixed the Catholic students with members of the National Liberation Front, so they could be classified as communists; and all the political prisoners were mixed with ordinary ones. Then they took away the files of these prisoners, so that no one will be able to prove

that they were political prisoners, and not ordinary criminals. This was done for a very good reason. If there is a cease-fire, the criminal prisoners won't be released. If the political prisoners are indistinguishable from the ordinary ones, they won't be released either.

The Colonel also stopped family visits, with the result that families lost track of their relatives. Then sometimes, they would tell people whose time was up, that they were going to release them. So these prisoners would say good-bye to us and follow the guards. Later, prisoners would arrive at CHI HOA who had been transferred from other prisons, and they would tell us "so-and-so is in the prison we just left", while we thought he had been released.

An example I want to talk about is Nguyen Dong Ha, the younger brother of Madame Nguyen Thi Binh. His only crime is to be her brother. Because they couldn't find anything against him, they gave him a light sentence of only three years. When he had served his time, they told him he was released, and took him to the police station. There he was faced with American interrogators who asked him to sign letters defaming his sister's character and to go on Saigon television to speak against her. When he refused, he was brought back to Chi Hoa, and that was how we met him and learned his story. Then he was taken away to the camps at Poulo Condor, and no one has heard of him since. His wife was pregnant when she was brought into the prison, and she gave birth there. She too was asked to sign letters about Madame Binh, and the police threatened to take away her baby. A few days later they actually did take the child away and no one knows what became of it.

So in the last few months of our imprisonment, we realized that the colonel was preparing for a cease-fire. By mixing the prisoners, putting them out of sight, he was going to do away with the political prisoners, who should be released upon a cease-fire. There are a lot of examples of this. We knew a student, Nguyen Ngoc Phuong, who was at Camp No. 7 at Poulo Condor. He was tortured to death by officials at Poulo Condor called "specialists". We know of at least 26 other prisoners who were being tortured to death when we left.

On December 10, 16 Catholic students began a hunger strike to protest: they weren't allowed to go into the yard to get sunlight or to have visits from their families. On the 26th of December, less than three weeks after they began their hunger strike, they were taken away on stretchers to the tiger-cages at Poulo Condor. We also saw 53 political prisoners from Cell EG3, Sector FG, who had already been brought back from the tiger-cages at Poulo Condor, returned there. They were among those who had been brought to CHI HOA to be treated, but as I said, there was no medicine. There is a nurse at CHI HOA, but she had no medicine and did nothing. So when these students went there, the 53 prisoners accompanied them. They went back to the tiger-cages in the same condition they had left them: their legs broken, their joints paralysed, asthmatic and leprous, and most of them infected with tuberculosis. Andre will tell you how they got tuberculosis.

We knew that, for these prisoners we had lived with for nearly a year, this was a death sentence. We know we will never see them again. The president of the Association of Vietnamese Students, told us upon our departure, "we have to bring back all those who've been deported. Otherwise we'll never see them again. We know that we're going to be taken away too."

Why all these plans for liquidation? Why had these liquidation begun before we left? If, the Thieu regime is going to have a chance of survival after a cease-fire, they've got to get rid of everyone who has lived in



these prisons and who could tell what they've experienced, what they've seen in the camps, especially the Catholic students, the Buddhist monks, who refused military service. Obviously they can't be called "Communists", they're from well-known Saigon families, well-known to the upper classes there. It could snowball if they begin to tell what they've lived through, and what they've seen, the tortures they've undergone. Because of their religion and their social standing, people will believe them. Thus it is a matter of survival for the Thieu regime to get rid of these people. Also, there are some prisoners they haven't been able to break. Even if they've broken their bodies, they've not always broken their spirit.

The 28th of December, three days after the convoy left with the Catholic students and 53 prisoners, the French consul came to see us, to tell us that we were released and would be deported to France. It was really unbelievable, unthinkable, that after what we'd seen of the conditions of imprisonment of our brothers, we should be released now. And then when we were to go, we refused to leave, we didn't want to leave our comrades in arms, who had helped us so much. They ran the risk of being taken to the security room to be tortured; this was a room which, when American delegations came transformed into a movie theater. Then some political prisoners came to see us and told us that we had to go, to bear witness of what we had seen, of the tortures, the beatings, the assassinations, the policy of slow death. All this has been going on for dozens of years and no one speaks of it in the papers. And that's why we're here today.

I should also tell you that, in the last nine months of our imprisonment, we saw a new type of political prisoner arriving at CHI HOA. Up till then we had seen mostly members of the National Liberation Front, patriotic Vietnamese, usually peasants. But from about March 1972 we began to see lawyers, intellectuals, professors, students, even Catholic students; Buddhist monks; in fact, an entire category of prisoners that, until then, we had not been accustomed to see. At first, we were extremely surprised, then we understood: these people belonged to the neutral "Third Force" that, just now, Thieu is so afraid of. (End of Debris's testimony.)

NOTA BENE. Here is the second witness, Andre Menras, takes over. In turning the cassette tape, there is an apparent 'hole' in the beginning of his testimony. This however, is easily reconstituted, since he is describing, in detail, the type of torture carried out by the so-called "specialists". The victim is forcibly made to drink a sickening amount of dirty water, for the second time. . . .

ANDRE MENRAS

The torturers stop, after all they're specialists, they know when to stop. They then gag the victim with a piece of dirty cloth and start giving little taps beneath the ribs to force him to vomit the liquid. This time, however, the vomit does not come out through the mouth, which is gagged, but through the nose.

There exists yet another form of torture which leaves fewer traces than the others, but is much more painful and lasting. The victim, after having been bound hand and foot, is plunged into a big metal barrel filled with water up to the neck. Then the police, armed with heavy wood hammers, beat against the sides of the barrel with all their might. The water acts as a conductor of these blows, which penetrate to the internal organs of the body, especially, the liver, the heart and the kidneys. People who have been tortured this way several times, never really recover.

Then, there is what the police call the "plane trip." After the victim's wrists have been tied together behind his back, a long very strong rope is inserted through the cords

around his wrists, while the other end is attached to a pulley on the ceiling. By pulling on the rope the police can make the victim swing in the air by his wrists, which have been tied together behind his back. The effects of this action are heightened by an occasional blackjacking, or cigarette burn on the more sensitive parts of the body, particularly on the genital parts. A girl student who was subjected to this torture twice in succession, could not bend her arms or wrist joints, and her shoulder-blades were fractured. The same was true of a young male student, who after having been subjected to practically every form of torture, tried to commit suicide. He was afraid that he would break down and sign the paper they tried to force upon him. He first tried to open his veins with a piece of glass, inside his cell. He failed, however, and fainted. When the trustees saw the blood trickling under the door, they saved him in spite of himself. He then tried to kill himself by biting his tongue as hard as he could, and beating his head against the walls of the cell. Here again, he failed, a fact he seemed almost apologetic about. However, he signed nothing.

There is yet another form of torture, which is practiced on war prisoners. The prisoners are stripped naked and made to sit on a chair with a hole in the seat. A lighted oil lamp—making it possible to raise and lower the flame—is placed underneath the chair. If the prisoner refuses to talk, the flame is raised higher and higher, until it burns the anus. Some 75% of the prisoners tortured in this manner do not survive since the only possibility of saving them could be an operation on the abdomen that would permit the intestine to function normally.

In the case of young girls, while rape has always been the fate of the little peasant girls, all considered as "communists" by the Saigon authorities, at present the same thing is true of girl students. A young woman student, whose fiancé is now in the CHI HOA prison, told us that she had been raped by a veritable monster who, himself, forced a living eel into her vagina. He was known to have done this type of thing with other young women, using, among other instruments, filled cocoa-cola bottles, which he had shaken well before decapsuling. This same young woman also told us that she had had lizards let loose to run over her body, cigarette burns on her breasts, etc. She too tried to commit suicide. At first she tried to hide from her family and from her fiancé what had happened to her. But she couldn't keep it from them, and three months later, she tried again to take her life. At present she has been moved to another prison.

One student told of having been subjected to torture with needles. Seated at a table, his hands were attached to the table, with his fingers spread so far apart that he could no longer move them. Slowly, by means of light taps on a piece of cardboard, needles were inserted under the fingernails. Once in place, a sheet of tissue paper was attached to each needle, after which the ventilator just opposite was turned on. The breeze from the ventilator set the tissue-paper in motion and this, in turn, made the needles move, under the nails. The student told us that he stood it for ten minutes before fainting, but added that even the most hardened, could not stand it for longer than fifteen minutes. He also described to us an interrogation during which the skin of his face had been burned by high-powered lamps. The young girls especially, who, for the most part, come from well-to-do Saigon families, and who have grown up in surroundings where, more than elsewhere, children are sheltered, even spoiled, have been prepared for either physical or moral suffering. And even if the day should come when they regain their liberty, even if they are not physically marked, they will never be able to lead normal social lives.

All their lives they will be haunted by the images of the tortures to which they have been subjected. A young girl who has been raped in this manner may appear to be alive; in reality she is dead.

There have been many arrests of 15 year-olds, who took part in the movement to steal American cars whose owners refused to show the peace-sign with the broken rifle. One young boy was condemned to twenty years of hard labor and ten years banishment from the Saigon area: at present he is in the youth Center in Dalat. This shows how a person can get into prison. From then on, the penal authorities apply the policy for forcible patriotism, or rallying, as they call it. All these hard-headed rebels will have to be brought to heel, they will have to be made to salute the Saigon flag, stand at attention every morning, join the Saigon side, show that they repent. If not, they'll be black-jacked and put in the big, dark cinema hall, Jean-Pierre has told about. Then, for one, two, or three months, every morning, regularly, they'll be beaten. If they continue in their attitude of refusals, they'll be returned to a cell. They'll be in solitary confinement, no exercise in the yard, no light, reduced food and water rations. After that, they can expect to be deported, about which, at CHI HOA, all the prisoners speak. There are people who are old, sick, tubercular, paralyzed, for whom deportation will mean isolation, then death. When other prisoners in the cells, who were not yet broken in health, heard about it, they decided to resist deportation of their friends, since it would surely bring on their death. This was why they barricaded themselves in their cells; they knew that their friends were going to be sent away, and that it would mean their death. While this movement of resistance was at its height, a group of trustees entered the yards, formed in line and began to hurl nausea and tear-gas grenades into the cells. In one cell, where there were 78 prisoners, 80 grenades were thrown, leaving the inmate unconscious, their skin so burnt that it hung in shreds from their bodies. The trustees next rushed into the hall where they first beat the prisoners then dragged them by the feet into the yard. From there they were dragged again, some by their hands, others by their feet, to a more distant yard, next to the kitchens, where a number of closed army trucks were waiting. (Jean-Pierre even succeeded in taking the license number of these trucks). The unconscious bodies were thrown into the trucks, the way butchers handle animal carcasses. Once inside the trucks the prisoners were numbered and tied together by a trusty designated for this task. When the trucks were finally loaded they were driven to the Saigon quayside, where a boat—always the same one—was waiting to take them from Saigon to the Island.

The welcoming ceremony at Poulo Condor starts with the "third degree" between two rows of blackjack-wielding trustees. Then each prisoner is searched, in a way that is always humiliating. If he has succeeded in bringing a small parcel with him, with perhaps a few pieces of clothing, it is confiscated, all individual clothing being against the regulations here. This is followed by introduction to the chief of the "specialists" that Jean-Pierre spoke of. Addressing the prisoners, he says: "Here the people in charge of the prison will be very nice to you, but you too must show comprehension; you must agree to be re-educated, you must salute this flag. Otherwise, don't forget, here we are on an island, cut off from the rest of the world; no matter how loudly you cry, nobody will hear you. Don't forget either, that if one of you dies, it's just a matter of filling out a tiny scrap of paper. That's all. You have all night to think things over." Then they return to their cells. "All who refuse to salute the flag should come out." And silently, one by one, the pris-

oners come out, with behind them, little groups of "specialists", who are waiting, blackjacks in hand, to beat them until they are unconscious. Before entering the tiger-cages, they are dragged first into "buffalo-cages", Camps No. 7 and 8, where the long road toward death begins. Toward death, that is, toward the convalescence camp. Poulo Condor is a re-education center, so it has to have a convalescence camp—and this should not be forgotten—for people who are ill. Actually, there is one. Eloquent enough the prisoners call it by the name of a famous cemetery in Vietnam. All the tubercular, paralyzed, ill, or old prisoners are put in this camp, where their food rations are reduced and they are constantly beaten. There was one among them who escaped from this camp and returned to Chi Hoa; but he was re-deported on December 26. We know that we shall never see him again, since he was already in a very critical condition.

A friend told us that when this camp was built, it was surrounded by a lawn of green grass. He described how the prisoners, who were given no vegetables, dragged themselves as far as this lawn, pulled up handfuls of it, and ate it. He also told us how the trustees had beaten them, how they set up barbed-wire fences, and then, finally cut the grass, very close. This friend also told us that there was a tree growing beside the camp, and that the prisoners dragged themselves as far as the tree, in an effort to reach the leaves, to eat them. Then, he told us, the tree was cut down. He told us what the chief of the specialists said to him: "This grass and these leaves are the property of the Saigon government. You, however, are a rebel, you're a communist; you refuse to salute the Saigon flag. You have no right to this grass, or to these leaves. Nobody cares if you croak."

This then is the long road that the Vietnamese patriots must travel until they reach extermination. How do they do it? This what impressed us most. It is also for us the greatest lesson in courage we have ever learned. It's their smile, the smiling will-power of these patriots. Systematically, scientifically, their bodies are destroyed. But their spirit is not destroyed, they continue to resist. After ten, fifteen, seventeen years—we met one man who had spent seventeen years in these jails, but who still smiled, nevertheless. The symbol, perhaps, of this struggle, of this suffering, of these Vietnamese patriots in the concentration camps of the South, is the children whom we met at Chi Hoa, because there are children there also. The youngest among them, whose name is Dong, is six years old. His mother was killed by American bombing in the Delta region. His father, suspected by the Saigon regime of being a communist sympathizer, was incarcerated in Chi Hoa and brought the child with him. The child had no relatives to take care of him. The last news we have of Dong dates from December 20, 1972, when we heard him cry out in the disciplinary section where he was imprisoned with his father, with his friends. He was shouting slogans with the adults, to protest the living conditions that were forced upon the political prisoners, to protest the lack of food, the imprisoning of people in unknown places, and to demand that the prisoners be allowed to take walks outside, to take baths in water, in real water, not in urine. They were demanding water, unadulterated water, larger rations of rice, of properly cooked rice.

We also met another little prisoner who considered us his brothers, his big brothers. At twelve years of age, he had already been in three prisons. His crime was attempting to steal an M.C. rifle from a G.I. He had been taken by the police, who tried to make him say that he was part of a group that was stealing arms. The police also tried to get him to say where arms were being stored, who were his parents' friends, and, then, they wanted him to reveal names. First they gave the kid candy, then they gave him

money, and then they hit him, because he still wouldn't talk. The boy told us how the policeman who beat him justified his hitting him. He told him: "Your hands are little, but they are big enough to hold a rifle. That's why I'm hitting you."

We saw a section of forty kids in CHI HOA who organized themselves and who, when they were mistreated, got together, like adults, made up slogans. At night, when the prison camp was sleeping, they shouted these slogans so that the adults in all the different sections could hear them. They also put together little information bulletins which said, for example, "Today when we went to take a bath, the 'trusts' so-and-so hit so-and-so. He was hurt. Today our friend so-and-so was sick; they refused to give him any medicine. Today the food ration was lowered." We saw how these kids, at an age when little French children are playing marbles, are already adults. We saw how the prison authorities repressed them. No difference between them and the adults; they were put into the same category: hard-headed rebels.

There's a camp at Dalat, a concentration camp for children, where at this moment 800 young boys and girls are being held. In this center the prison authorities try as well to force the children to rally to the regime: they must salute the flag and work. There is a special torture for the kids. Dalat is situated on the high plateau, a place where it rains a lot and the nights are cold. The children who are obstinate, who refuse to salute the flag and to sing the "re-education" song, are put into a cell. They are bound so that they cannot move, and then twice during the night, they are drenched with water and left like that to dry off. Psychological tactics are often used on them as well, especially on the younger ones. They are isolated without food or water for a day or two and then the kids are told: "Your mother is sick; she is very sick. Do you want to see her? Do you want to see your mother? Well, it's easy. You just have to salute the flag and go cut wood with the others on the hill, and then you will see your mother." At the last transport of prisoners to Dalat we received word that there were four children who persisted in refusing to salute the flag; the others couldn't hold out. It's impossible to hold out for long. If you do you are dead.

I think I have forgotten to mention many things. When we left, we saw many friends cry for the first time, people whom we had seen suffer for two and a half years without complaint. We saw them cry, and we left them there: a part of our family. We came back with Jean-Pierre to try to save them. We know that they will be exterminated, especially in the weeks which will precede an eventual cease-fire, or even in the weeks that will follow.

We must not demobilize, we must not lose out interest in these prisoners just because the cease-fire is going to be signed. We must not say that we have peace, that it's a cease-fire, that it's finished. Not at all! It is precisely at that moment that they are going to finish them off. The same thing happened in the Nazi concentration camp. It was at that moment that they killed people off.

We have come back, then, to relate what we have seen and to arouse people's attention. We want to say that if we are still alive, Jean-Pierre and I, if we can talk to you, it is thanks to a campaign launched by the *Secours Populaire Français*, it is thanks to thousands of people who sent us letters, who were concerned about us. From the moment thousand of French people decided to pressure the Saigon fascists, from that moment on, we saw a difference in the attitude of our jailers. They stopped beating us and they took precautions with us. We also saw how the torturing of the students had been denounced, and how *The New York Times* and *The Daily Mirror* (England) printed articles which spoke of this

torture. At that moment the torturers stopped their work. They permitted families to see their children, who up to that point, had been kept in unknown prisons. And then we saw Low silence closed in after that . . . silence: and then the tortures started again.

It is not only for a day that we must cry out in alarm, that we must protest. We must continue, we must show Saigon, show Thieu, that we are constantly behind these prisoners, that we know what is happening, what they are trying to do, what they have decided to do.

Along with *Secours Populaire* we have prepared a petition to be signed demanding the release of the prisoners who have never been brought to trial; prisoners who have completed their preventive detention. At present there is a section in Poulo Condor, number 6, I think, for those prisoners who have completed their detention and who will never be released. Every six months, their imprisonment is prolonged another six months. We must have the prisoners freed; the prisoners must, in general, be humanely treated. They must not be reduced to the level of animals any longer. The *Secours Catholique Français* has joined our effort. We have visited several places in the north of France. There were many meetings. We went to Brussels; we will try to go to as many other countries as possible. Then, if we must, we will visit village by village, house by house, to say what has to be said, even to those who do not want to be concerned, to those who take refuge in their selfishness. We will search them out in their homes, if need be. But thousand, tens of thousands of Europeans, not only French, must show that they know what is happening and must exert constant pressure on Thieu's government until all these patriots who have been suffering for decades and who are fighting for the liberation of their country and for their independence have been released. (Applause.)

#### THE 55TH ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN PROCLAMATION OF INDEPENDENCE OBSERVED

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, many of us in the House have paused in the last few weeks to note the ironic fact that while Byelorussians throughout the free countries of the world were able to observe the 55th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, such celebration is not allowed in occupied Byelorussia itself. There the occasion is replaced by enforced commemoration of the Russian Bolshevik Revolution, an ironic twist of the knife as it were.

Conditions in Byelorussia under Soviet subjugation have been repeatedly described by my colleagues in the House. We all deplore this obliteration of independence. But I would like to go beyond lip service to the cause of Byelorussia and all other captive nations. I would like to see this House take action on a longstanding legislative proposal, one that I and others have been introducing and reintroducing for years now. This measure would create a Special Committee on the Captive Nations to study peaceful processes by which the United States can assist nations under totalitarian control.



Full text of my House Resolution 63 follows:

Whereas on the all-important issue of imperio-colonialism the posture of imperialist Moscow, as shown in part by the rape of Czechoslovakia and the Brezhnev doctrine, has not been adequately exposed by us in the United Nations and elsewhere; and

Whereas Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Week summon the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations"; and

Whereas the nationwide observances in the eleven anniversaries of Captive Nations Week have clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of major sections of our society to this Presidential call; and

Whereas, following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the annual observances of Captive Nations Week, Moscow has consistently displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in all of the captive nations, and particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the indispensable advancement of such basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet national economy, and monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian empire, especially inside the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas, for example, it was not generally recognized, and thus not advantageously made use of, that, in point of geography, history, and demography, the now famous U-2 plane flew mostly over captive non-Russian territories in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas, in the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our time is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom, we commence to shed popular light on this issue by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and other subjugated nations; and

Whereas the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encouragement to latent liberal elements in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic—which contains Russia itself—and would help bring to the oppressed Russian people their overdue independence from centuries-long authoritarian rule and tyranny; and

Whereas these weapons of truth, fact, and ideas would counter effectively and overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide, anti-American propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin American, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations and states; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalitarian form is psychopolitical; and

Whereas in pursuit of a diplomacy of truth we cannot for long avoid bringing into question Moscow's legalistic pretensions of "non-interference in the internal affairs of states" and other contrivances which are acutely

subject to examination under the light of morally founded legal principles and political, economic, and historical evidence; and

Whereas, in the implementing spirit of our own congressional Captive Nations Week resolution and the twelve Presidential proclamations, it is in our own strategic interest and that of the nontotalitarian free world to undertake a continuous and unremitting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for world peace with freedom and justice; Now, therefore, be it

**Resolved**, That there is hereby established a nonpermanent committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of ten Members of the House, of whom not more than six shall be members of the same political party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sec. 2. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

(c) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

Sec. 3. (a) The committee shall conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms.

(b) The committee shall make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deems proper, and shall make its first comprehensive report of the results of its inquiry and study, together with its recommendations, not later than January 31, 1972.

Sec. 4. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States to hold such hearings, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

Sec. 5. The committee may employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

Sec. 6. The committee shall enjoy a non-standing status, performing its duties in the course of the Ninety-second Congress and subject to renewal only as determined by needs in the completion of its work and further purposes of the House of Representatives.

#### U.S. BOUNTY AIDS 252 "RICH" FARMS

#### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, there has been vocal opposition, in the Congress and in portions of the press, to the termi-

nation by the administration of the rural environmental assistance program.

The program, initiated in 1936 as a conservation program in which money went for soil saving projects of small farmers, has become something far different. The reasons for initiating the program more than 30 years ago no longer exist. The program, however, until its termination in December 1972, continued to spend at the rate of about \$200 million a year.

To discover what the money was being used for today, and who was receiving it, Chicago Tribune columnist Bill Anderson investigated the \$65,000 spent by the Federal Government in Fauquier County, Va., located an hour and a half by car from Washington, D.C.

Mr. Anderson found that about 50 of the 232 farms receiving money from REAP in 1972 were owned by people who live in Washington.

He wrote—

One of these places is owned by Mrs. Joseph W. Barr, wife of the former secretary of the treasury. Since 1968, Mrs. Barr has received \$1,408 from the Federal Treasury to spend on her estate. . . . Mrs. Katherine Graham, publisher of the Post and owner of a 347-acre estate near Rectortown, has also been a Federal recipient. Records provided . . . showed that Mrs. Graham received \$976 since 1968. . . .

An examination of the REAP program, particularly as it was administered in this Virginia county, indicates that the administration has acted wisely and prudently in eliminating it. Those who have received REAP funds will, naturally, regret this action. The majority of taxpayers, however, will have a far different reaction.

Wrote Bill Anderson—

The largest amount which was spent on a farm in Fauquier County last year was about \$2,500. The average amount here last year was \$260, slightly lower than the national average per grant. Next year there will be no money unless Congress is successful in overriding the Administration's cutback.

I wish to share Mr. Anderson's column, which appeared in the Chicago Tribune of March 8, 1973, with my colleagues, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

#### U.S. BOUNTY AIDS 252 "RICH" FARMS

(By Bill Anderson)

WARRENTON, Va.—This is where people come for the Gold Cup, an annual horse race on a huge estate in Fauquier County, a place near the Appalachian Trail and National Forests set in the rolling hills of the Blue Ridge Mountains.

There are about 600 farms in this large county, and most of them are larger than Chicago's Loop. The air is clean and fresh, and there is nothing here that remotely resembles poverty or the old dust bowl farming portrayed in "The Grapes of Wrath."

Yet, there are 252 farms in Fauquier County that will be greener this spring because the federal government spent \$65,000 on them last year in a program that grew out of the plight of farmers during the dust bowl days. The federal dollars were part of a spending program of the Rural Environmental Assistance Program [REAP], currently the object of what amounts to a pilot fight between the executive and the legislative branches of the government.

The father of REAP was born in 1936 as a conservation program funded at \$374 million. In the early days, the money went for soil saving projects of small farmers, water

development, and tree planting. There are literally thousands of acres of land in the United States that are green today as a result of the program.

By 1944, as times changed, the program became strictly conservation. Spending continued at the rate of about 200 million dollars a year until 1970, when the executive branch began to run into budget problems. On Dec. 22, 1972, the Nixon administration terminated the funding [except for prior commitments] after it dropped to the \$140 million level.

In essence, a large number of congressmen said: "You can't do this to us." The Washington Post, a newspaper highly critical of the Nixon administration, has given extensive coverage to the REAP issue. One story was headlined, "As Ye Sow, So Shall Ye REAP."

Since Fauquier County is only an hour and a half by auto from Washington, the Post has considerable influence in the county—as well as among prominent, politically-connected residents who live here. About 50 of the 252 farms receiving money from REAP last year are owned by people who live in Washington.

One of these places is owned by Mrs. Joseph W. Barr, wife of the former secretary of the treasury. Since 1968, Mrs. Barr has received \$1,408 from the federal treasury to spend on her estate. The money spent on the 364-acre holding was for fertilizing, applying lime, and planting blue grass.

Mrs. Katharine Graham, publisher of the Post and owner of a 347-acre estate near Rectortown, has also been a federal recipient. Records provided to Jim Coates, a reporter for this column, showed that Mrs. Graham received \$976 since 1968, a figure somewhat less than the average payment.

Mrs. Francis Gilbert, executive director of the Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service, which administers the program on a local level, said that the money for Mrs. Graham's estate was used for a variety of projects. In 1968, there was a federal allotment of \$158 for the Graham estate for vegetation cover on 18 acres. Other money over the years went for thistle spraying and additional ground-covering projects.

"Whether you're rich or poor," Mrs. Gilbert said, "you'll still get rained on—and, no matter how prominent you are, your soil will wash away if there is no grass." The local director said the establishment of permanent vegetative cover was one of the most popular in the county. All together, REAP offers 16 grant categories ranging from animal-waste storage and diversion facilities to strip-cropping—a term used in connection with land contouring to avoid erosion.

Mrs. Gilbert explained, as did officials of REAP, that the programs are traditionally handled at the local levels in order to insure maximum benefits. The federal tax dollars are distributed first to the states and then down to the county levels. At the county level, three farmers are elected by the other farmers of the county to make the final disposition of the money.

The largest amount which was spent on a farm in Fauquier County last year was about \$2,500. The average amount here last year was \$260, slightly lower than the national average per grant. Next year there will be no money unless Congress is successful in overriding the administration's cutback.

## OBSCENE RADIO BROADCASTING—IX

**HON. JAMES V. STANTON**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks I have been

inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—February 5, 6, 7, 8, 21, 26, 28, and March 28—several items relating to controversial broadcasting by station WERE in Cleveland, Ohio, and on how this appears to be part of a national trend in programming by radio.

I am happy to report to this body that my efforts to get the Federal Communications Commission to accept responsibility for this situation have succeeded. As you know, one of my original letters on this issue was addressed to the Honorable Dean Burch, Chairman of the FCC. After receiving my letter, Mr. Burch was questioned about it when he appeared before several committees of the Congress. He and his colleagues began some serious discussions of the letter at meetings of the Commission. As Broadcasting magazine reported on March 19:

The first indication of the policy decision the commission ultimately will make (on the subject of obscenity on the air waves) will probably show up in a letter to Representative James V. Stanton (D-Ohio) . . . Commissioner Lee said the congressman "is forcing our hand."

Finally, on March 22, Mr. Speaker, Chairman Burch telephoned me in my office in the Longworth Building and gave me a synopsis of what had just occurred at a meeting of the Commission members that had concluded only a few minutes earlier. Mr. Burch praised my letter as being "well researched" and "constructive." He said that because of it, and because of some other complaints the Commission had received, a decision had been made that the agency would take some action in this area.

A few days later the FCC spelled out, in a news release, what that action was to be. On the following day, Chairman Burch, in a speech to the National Association of Broadcasters, elaborated on the reasons for the Commission's actions.

I have not yet received from Mr. Burch a written reply to my letter to him. But he did assure me in the telephone conversation that the reply would be on its way shortly. In the meantime, for the sake of continuity, and for the information of those who have been following these developments, I am inserting here in the RECORD first, a copy of the FCC news release of March 27; second, the text of Chairman Burch's speech to the broadcasters; and third, a Washington Star-News article of March 30, 1973. When I receive a copy of Mr. Burch's reply, I will insert that, too, in the RECORD.

The aforementioned materials follow:  
[From Federal Communications Commission, Mar. 27, 1971]

### CLOSED INQUIRY INTO OBSCENE BROADCASTING, CABLECASTING SLATED BY FCC

A non-public inquiry to determine whether any broadcaster or cablecaster has broadcast "obscene, indecent or profane material," in violation of Section 1464, Title 18 of the United States Code, has been instituted by the Commission (Docket 19716).

The FCC said the action was in response to information and complaints from the public. The inquiry is to determine whether any licensee, permittee or cable system operator, or "any principal, agent or employee," has engaged in obscene broadcasting, and if so, to what extent and in what circumstances.

The Commission stated that the inquiry would remain non-public unless it deter-

mines that public sessions would serve the public interest.

Authority was delegated to the Chief Administrative Law Judge of the FCC to subpoena records and witnesses, compel their attendance, take evidence and perform other duties necessary to compile a complete record. The Chief Judge was also authorized to designate an FCC Administrative Law Judge to preside at the inquiry.

The Presiding Judge may require witnesses to testify and produce evidence, under Section 409 of the Communications Act, when asked to do so by the Commission counsel. When the inquiry is finished, the Presiding Judge is to certify the record to the Commission for action.

The Commission specified that the subpoena powers delegated to the Chief Judge should be used in compliance with Sections 1.331 through 1.340 of the rules. Motions to quash or limit subpoenas may be filed with the Presiding Judge under Section 1.334, and applications for review of the Presiding Judge's rulings on these motions may be filed with the FCC within 10 days after the Judge's rulings. Witnesses directed to produce oral and documentary evidence under subpoena will have the rights to counsel specified in Section 1.27 of the rules.

Action by the Commission March 22, 1973 by Order. Commissioners Burch (Chairman), Robert E. Lee, H. Rex Lee, Reid and Wiley, with Commissioner Johnson dissenting.

[From Federal Communications Commission, Mar. 28, 1973]

### ADDRESS BY DEAN BURCH, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

As a prelude, let me say that the annual NAB speech is perhaps the most difficult task for any F.C.C. Chairman. Like any human being, I would enjoy the adulation of this immense audience—would enjoy saying the things you'd like to hear.

Believe me, it's no fun being cast as the village scold—as the one who after examining a beauty mark has to declare that it's really a mole. But it seems to me that I owe it to you—but more importantly to the public which we all serve—to notice—and to point it out clearly—when the emperor is wearing no clothes.

Three years ago before this convention I made a first attempt at stating a regulatory philosophy of "least is best"—and then, hoping perhaps that you would get the message and save both of us from an open confrontation, I laid down a blanket critique of children's programming and children's network programming in particular. My judgment was that commercial broadcasting was for the most part wasting the greatest potential educational influence since moveable type on the production of animated pacifiers. Three years, many petitions, and several Commission proceedings later, my judgment is that not very much has really changed.

Each commercial minute is more expensive. CBS is making even more money out of essentially wall-to-wall Saturday morning cartoons—and if the reports are to be believed, ABC and NBC will soon do their part to prove, once again, the immutability of the old maxim, if you can't lick em, join em. Next season, our children will have the dubious distinction of watching counter-programming in its classic form—practically carbon-copies of cartoons on all three networks simultaneously. And this at a time, mind you when the afternoon segment—children's hour so to speak—is filled with soaps, sitcoms, games, movies, and syndicated re-reads. So the problems remain and so do the deficiencies.

Then, two NAB conventions ago, I focused on the Fairness Doctrine. The thrust of that message was that the fairness doctrine would be a redundancy if licensees were living up to the statutory mandate of fairness in fact. The Commission's long overdue fairness in-



quity is still in the works and so is the Supreme Court's decision in BEM—but I'd have to say that my message of two years ago still stands.

Last year I took a second look at controversial issue programming from a different perspective. I stated it as my view that broadcast journalism had nothing to fear from the F.C.C., and never has, if it measured up to some reasonable approximation of balance, objectivity, and professionalism. We do not censor. We do not authenticate the truth. I said then that whatever the risks inherent in free investigative reporting, the risks of government monitoring were far, far greater—and I'll stand on that message too.

Three years, two years, and one year ago, my point was much the same: namely, the American commercial broadcast system "works" just to the extent that public trustees act like public trustees.

Sad to say, a few broadcasters today are in the process of rejecting that counsel of caution—are in fact in the process of forcing a public definition of the fragile distinction between freedom and license. Half way between here and the bank, however, they may just find themselves in the gutter. The word is apt—because what I'm talking about, of course, is the latest fad in competitive programming, "topless" radio and its still relatively uncommon television counterpart, X-rated films. Admittedly, I'm talking about only a very few—probably no more than a hundred people in the whole industry.

But the problem is not easily contained. In the first place, it's an open question how long the competition can hold out. In the second place, the listening and viewing public does not always make fine distinctions between the few and the many.

First of all, let's get our categories straight. I am not talking about sanitized movies. Neither am I talking about the occasional use of cusswords, in context. I simply do not believe that a "hell" here and a "damn" there is going to destroy the nation's moral fibre.

Nor am I talking about the greater and even refreshing candor with which such no-no's as homosexuality or VD or racial strife are now handled during prime time, either on essentially entertainment shows or in a purely educational format. These are controversial public issues in most of the communities I know anything about, and broadcasters ought to take them on in good taste.

And I am certainly not talking about serious works of art with their judicious use of graphic language or almost unbearable realism, as for example, "A Long Day's Journey into Night".

No, this is not what all the fuss is about. What I am talking about is the prurient trash that is the stock-in-trade of the sex-oriented radio talk show, complete with the suggestive, coaxing, pear-shaped tones of the smut-hustling host. I am talking about three, four, five solid hours of titillating chitchat—scheduled during daytime hours—on such elevating topics of urgent public concern as the number and frequency of orgasms (during a single "sitting" so to speak), or the endless varieties of oral sex (including practical tips on learning to love it), or a Baker's dozen of other turn-ons, turn-offs and turn-downs.

This is garbage pure and simple. And it's no less garbage because a sizable number of so-called "adults" seem to want to listen to it. I take leave to doubt that it can be seriously defended on such grounds, any more than explicit how-to-do-it shows on rape or murder could be defended as meeting the demands of potential rapists or murderers. Nor can it be argued that it's all a matter of free choice by consenting citizens age 21 and older: certainly Washington, D.C. is not the only city in the country whose chil-

dren have transistor radios growing out of their ears.

In the last analysis, it is not dog-eared sex manuals we're talking about, or exploitation comics, or peep shows, or "feelthy" postcards.

We are talking about a medium whose transcendental quality is its pervasiveness. A medium that has no point of purchase, requires no admission ticket, no visit to a book store or a magazine counter.

A medium available in the automobile, the living room, the bedroom—even in the nursery. A medium, which, like the goddess of justice, is blind, in that once unleashed it travels in every direction, uncontrolled and relentless.

And for this reason it is a medium that is licensed to public trustees in order to serve the public convenience, interest and necessity. And if electronic voyeurism is what the authors of the Communications Act had in mind, I'll eat my copy.

It is particularly ironic that this new fad comes at a time when all journalists, broadcast and otherwise, are seeking greater safeguards against intrusions into the essential processes of their professional craft—safeguards either by statute or by the broader application of First Amendment guarantees. The ultimate irony is that the boundaries of the First Amendment may next be tested in the context of the right to broadcast garbage—and, don't kid yourselves, it will be tested.

The Commission has now acted, and will take further action in this difficult field as necessary. It is my hope and the purpose of this statement to make further government action moot.

The Commission does not know, indeed none of us knows, what the metes and bounds of the First Amendment are with respect to this free, mass communications medium. But maybe—just maybe—in the process we'll all learn something critical about that distinction between freedom and license to which I referred earlier.

One thing I do know, however—that broadcasters cannot ignore this problem. That in my book is a cop-out, and I cannot square cop-outs with the responsibilities of licensed trustees. You're not buying time, you're buying eventual grief—and you will all end up paying the price for a handful of your brethren who are deliberately thumbing their noses at good taste and good sense.

And the price may be high. Because this comes at a time when broadcasters are seeking greater stability in the renewal process, longer license terms, selective de-regulation, and less detailed intrusion into journalistic discretion in the treatment of controversial issues of programming. And it is eminently right and proper that you should be seeking relief from overbearing regulation, at the hands of the Commission or the Congress or the Courts.

We support these efforts. We owe you a climate where broadcasting can flourish—can entertain, can inform. When we pull egregious boners like WHDH, we undermine the necessary stability of the industry.

We owe you regulatory procedures that take account of the marked differences between television—with its relatively few licensees—and radio with its thousands, with its abundance of service in the large metropolitan areas. We are embarked on a long serious undertaking here. We need your full cooperation.

We owe you policies in the fairness area that will permit broadcasting to make a maximum contribution to an informed electorate. The search for perfect fairness is not only impractical but destructive of the very goal of robust, wide-open debate. But to go beyond reasonable attainment of that essential goal—to become bogged down in the day-to-day workings of broadcast journal-

ism—is to render both journalism and the public a great disservice.

All these matters are now pending before the Congress or the Commission. And all are dependent on the nation of the responsible public trustee. Do not, ladies and gentlemen, do not permit the gamesmen and the schlock operators to call down on all your heads the open-ended and unpredictable consequences of their perverse folly. The responsible broadcaster has access to solid tangible profits. And he has access to the intangibles as well—to the rewards of public service that few of us, and I mean every word I say, can ever aspire to. A couple of rating points and a few easy bucks for riding the wave of a passing fad are simply not worth it.

About 7:00 last evening—after I thought this speech had been put to bed I received the following letter from Vince Wasilewski: (Letter at end of this address.)

Perhaps, after receipt of this letter—a letter whose statement of purpose I applaud mightily—I might have rewritten my remarks today—or deleted them entirely—but upon reflection I decided to add only this postscript.

This decision by the NAB Board of Directors is exactly what I had hoped for when I set out to prepare these remarks.

We are dealing with a crisis in the health of the broadcasting industry and the cure requires the delicate hands of a surgeon. The type of surgery that you can best prescribe—and perform—within your own ranks. I fear as you do the hands of the government that will be called upon as a last resort—the stubby, gnarled bureaucratic hands that belong on a 3rd string catcher in the minor leagues, not on a public interest physician.

I know I speak for millions of Americans when I wish you the very best of health.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION  
OF BROADCASTERS,

Washington, D.C., March 27, 1973.

HON. DEAN BURCH,  
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BURCH: I am pleased to advise you of the following action taken by the Board of Directors of the National Association of Broadcasters, by a unanimous vote at its meeting today.

"The Board of Directors of the National Association of Broadcasters recognizes the tremendous responsibility of broadcasting, whose audience includes children and adults of all ages and embraces all races and all varieties of religious faith, and educational background.

In view of this great responsibility, the Board of Directors unequivocally and vigorously deplores and condemns tasteless and vulgar program content, whether explicit or by sexually-oriented innuendo.

The Board of Directors directs the Radio and Television Code Boards to undertake immediately such action as is necessary to assure compliance of Code subscribers with the Radio and Television Codes.

In addition, the Board of Directors strongly urges all broadcasters, whether or not members of the National Association of Broadcasters, to examine their programming policies in order to comply with decent and good taste requirements."

Sincerely yours,

VINCENT T. WASILEWSKI.

FCC PROBE CITED: "TOPLESS RADIO" SHOW QUILTS

LOS ANGELES.—Bill Ballance's Feminine Forum, the pioneer "topless radio" show, is being taken off the air following a Federal Communications Commission blast at talking about sex on the air.

When Ballance, now on vacation, returns to work Monday, he will be operating with

a new format, station KGBS announced yesterday.

Storer Broadcasting Co., which owns the station, issued a statement saying the show was hurt because of its imitators, which were less restrained and prompted an FCC probe of the whole breed.

Ballance's program started nearly three years ago. Women telephoned and were put on the air, discussing with Ballance intimate details of their lives, frequently including their sex lives.

The show was a great success, made a celebrity of Ballance locally, drew heavily listener response, big audiences and was syndicated to dozens of stations across the country.

Imitators sprang up, along with variations on the format (a woman announcer host taking calls from men).

Dean Burch, chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, appeared to have the trend in mind when he spoke to the National Association of Broadcasters on Wednesday, and called such shows "garbage pure and simple."

"And it's no less garbage because a sizable number of adults seem to want to listen to it," he added.

Peter Storer, executive vice president of Storer Broadcasting Co., said:

"We feel that the image of the Bill Ballance Feminine Forum has been colored and damaged by many less restricted imitators.

"None of our stations would knowingly contribute to the lowering of standards of this industry, and we have exercised careful supervision and control over this program to prevent exactly that.

"However, rather than add to the problems of an industry with already enough major difficulties in the areas of governmental relations, we prefer to be responsive."

## OUT-MIGRATION FROM CITIES TO RURAL AREAS URGED

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have urged the passage of legislation to make our smaller towns and rural areas more attractive to encourage an out-migration from our metropolitan areas to our rural communities.

In this connection I noted with interest in a recent article in the Washington Post that Dr. Peter C. Goldmark, who is conducting a study sponsored by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, has reached the same conclusion.

In a letter to then President Johnson on July 27, 1965, I wrote, in part:

I would like to propose a new concept which, if accepted and implemented, would attack many of our social and economic problems from a new direction, in a new dimension. My suggestion basically is that rather than continuing to encourage urban growth, we shift emphasis and encourage a national small town improvement and development campaign.

My letter also pointed out that large metropolitan complexes have become unmanageable, unwieldy and ungovernable; that the community concept inherent in small towns is basic in our American system because it embraces the

dimension of identification with community so often lacking in the "lonely crowds" in large cities; and that people move to cities from rural areas for economic reasons, not because they prefer to live there.

My letter added:

What is needed is a concentrated effort to strengthen the small town base of America, to bring industry and business to small towns, to create towns that embody the best of the new technology and the best of the old philosophy.

I was interested to note that Dr. Goldmark drew a similar conclusion:

The best of the urban life and the best of the rural life. That is really what this is about. And for the first time the technology is available to make it possible.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I place in the RECORD herewith the article from the Washington Post concerning the study by Dr. Goldmark.

The article follows:

### TOWARD AN URBAN VILLAGE

(By Robert J. Donovan)

STAMFORD, CONN.—Among other things, Dr. Peter C. Goldmark invented long-playing records and pioneered color television. Now he is a leading figure in a government-sponsored study to see how the tide of migration to the cities might be reversed and the population spread out more evenly from coast to coast in what he calls "the new rural society."

If Goldmark's vision comes true, 100 million Americans (roughly a third of the future population) will in the next century or so shun the big cities and take up life not in so-called new towns but in presently established cities and towns whose population is now 100,000 or less. He calculates that there are well over 5,000 such communities.

"Because there are so many," he explained in a recent interview, "their growth would be trivial when the 100 million were distributed among them."

He is one of those who believe that American civilization is headed for destruction by the 21st century if it persists on its present course. Thus, without ignoring the gigantic problems of redistributing a third of the population, he thinks that there is no real alternative—and that Americans will find their country a lot more enjoyable when they have accomplished the task.

The reason for giving Goldmark a leading part in the study funded by the Department of Housing and Urban Development lies in the fact that he is responsible for some 160 inventions in such fields as television, film reproduction, phonograph recording and acoustics.

It is generally recognized that rural communities and small cities cannot attract new business and masses of city dwellers without a phenomenal increase in telecommunications that will tie them into the commercial, cultural, educational, athletic and medical activities of the entire nation.

"These are the things that drew people to the cities in the first place, even though conditions are now such that they no longer make use of many of them," Goldmark said. "Most people want to live in a stimulating and attractive environment, and we will have to see to it that the rural areas are no longer isolated and deprived of theaters, concerts, opera, museums and sporting events. Live performances from Broadway, for example, could be shown in all the cities and towns."

"With a new high-resolution color television system they could be shown on large screens in local theaters or over local cable

television. The 20th century, or 21st century, counterpart of the village common would be the community communications center.

"When people started moving to the suburbs they thought they would be going far enough. They were afraid to go farther away because they wanted to have the advantages of the nearby big cities and the rural charm of the suburbs. Today they have neither. The city doesn't have the amenities and there is little of the rural charm left in the suburbs."

"People go into the city and get out as fast as they can because nobody wants to get mugged or get tangled up with drug addicts. Already the population density of the city is resulting in the alienation of people. The paradox of communication is that the closer together people live the harder they find it to communicate."

"High population density seems to spawn crime, pollution and drug addiction. People are already at each others' throats in some metropolitan areas. It is just like a bunch of rats when they are put under such stress that they behave erratically and then destroy each other and their society. Clearly we are already experiencing a decomposition of our social fiber in this situation where 80 per cent of the population is crowded into less than 10 per cent of the land."

A native of Budapest, Goldmark is former president and director of research of CBS Laboratories and former vice president of the Columbia Broadcasting System. He retired a couple of years ago and established his own firm, the Goldmark Communications Corp., a subsidiary of Warner Communications, Inc., in Stamford. He is called the inventor of the first practical color television, although not the system in general use today.

New towns are not the answer to the population problem, Goldmark says, because one would have to be built every third day for the next thirty years to handle the number of persons involved. On the other hand the thousands of existing cities and towns of under 100,000 population are going concerns with facilities already intact.

"So we must persuade some 100 million Americans to remain in or move to attractive rural areas," he said. "To do this we have to, among other things, get business to relocate, because you can't attract people unless they have choices of employment. Many organizations want to leave metropolitan areas, but they don't go far enough. They stop at the suburbs, which is just spreading congestion and adding to the dilemma. To get them into the rural areas we have to prove they won't suffer. We have to show them we can give them communications facilities they don't know exist."

"If they will go farther they will find greater well being among their employees, happier lifestyles, more land, lower taxes. With telecommunications you can do a great deal to offset distance. And we are still doing only a fraction of what could be done with communication to improve the quality of life for everyone."

"In this plan we would be making use of our most valuable resource—land. We have plenty of it, and it is nonsense to say we mustn't use it."

"We are not talking here of heavy industries. For the most part they will stay where they are. During the next 30 years manufacturing manpower requirements will remain steady or even decrease. But employment in service industries will increase."

"So we are talking mostly about relocating insurance companies, electronics firms, banks, pharmaceutical manufacturers and business of that kind. They won't interfere with the rural well being and attractiveness."

"People who live and work in these communities would be encouraged to walk, use bikes, small cars and small delivery trucks in order to save gasoline and cut down on pollution. There would be a complete change of lifestyle. Problems of crime, poverty, traf-



fic, pollution and other ills of large cities would exist in smaller communities, but they would be on a much smaller scale and would be more manageable.

"Most airplane trips would be shorter and travel patterns could be dispersed and air traffic congestion lessened. There would be more small airports rather than the present few crowded ones. Deluxe buses could run from one community to another. The post offices would be electronic.

"With the present intolerable load removed from the big cities they could revert to what they were supposed to be in the first place as cultural centers and headquarters for business.

"The best of the urban life and best of the rural life. That is really what this is about. And for the first time the technology is available to make it possible."

IN SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT  
NIXON'S EFFORTS TO CURTAIL  
EXCESSIVE SPENDING

HON. WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III  
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad for the stand taken by the Senate in sustaining the President's veto of S. 7, thereby exercising fiscal restraint. It seems to me that the time has come for the Congress to stop promising what it cannot deliver. All the passage of S. 7 would accomplish is to widen the expectation gap by raising false hopes in our handicapped citizens.

The real issue at stake was that of fiscal responsibility. The Congress must do its part to hold down excessive spending if our Nation's economy is to be stabilized.

At the present level of funding, vocational rehabilitation will receive some \$650 million in 1974—an increase of \$9 million over 1973. This seems like a reasonable figure, whereas the authorization in S. 7, which over the next 3 years would exceed the budget projections for those years by \$1.3 billion, strikes me as unreasonable and excessive. Initially, I voted for the substitute measure, which had a more moderate approach to both authorizations and burgeoning bureaucratic functions, but against S. 7 when this subject was before the House originally.

The President is doing all in his power to provide responsible Government—rendering the necessary services required by the American people in the most economical manner.

Adequate funds have been set aside for domestic programs in the areas of health, housing, education, and aid for the poor. These amounts more than double the money spent on programs for human needs 4 years ago.

But the President is also making every effort to hold the line on Federal spending, the fuel that feeds inflation.

If the Congress continues to insist on spending more than recommended in the budget, the American people will be faced with an estimated 15 percent increase in their income tax, and I am

pledged to vote against such a possibility.

I want to emphasize that my concern for our handicapped citizens is very high on my priority list, but we must continue to keep it and other pressing demands on our total budget in responsible perspective and focus. Senate bill 7 had the distinction of being the first of many big spending bills now on their way through the congressional mill, to get an up or down decision at the White House. Organizations working for the handicapped naturally feel theirs is a special case, even though Federal support for rehabilitation has gone up by more than 50 percent over a 4-year period. The difficulty is that almost every spending bill can be defended in some way as a special case. In effect, President Nixon is saying: "I can't make an exception." It is a strategy I do not necessarily applaud, for the administration's budget and order of priorities should never be thought of as sacrosanct. But I believe the strategy is understandable for without it there appears little likelihood that Congress will choose to reverse its fiscally irresponsible drift.

I am favorably disposed toward substitute legislation that will provide a viable alternative to the act vetoed by the President, and have joined in co-sponsoring such a bill. To provide for the genuine needs of people and still put an end to inflation and further Federal deficits is a difficult goal to achieve, but it must be done.

PUBLIC OPINION POLL

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, on March 28, I met with representatives of Local 5051 of the Communications Workers of America from Ottawa, Ill. They presented me with a copy of the public opinion poll they recently conducted which points out the thinking of the American people on such important issues as budget cuts, import tariffs, energy resources, draft evaders, consumer protection, mass transit, and equal rights. I know the results of this poll will be interesting to my colleagues and request that the public opinion poll be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The public opinion follows:

LOCAL 5051 LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE OPINION  
POLL

1. Social Security:
  - A. Do you feel the Social Security program should continue on its present course? Yes 29%; No 71%.
  - B. Would you favor an option for compulsory participation in either the present System or a private plan? Yes 74%; No 26%.
  - C. Are you in favor of raising the amount a pensioner can earn and still collect benefits? Yes 88%; No 12%.
2. Are you in agreement with proposed budget cuts in the following categories? Indicate yes or no following each subject:
  - A. Housing, Yes 75%; No 25%.

- B. Education, Yes 23%; No 77%.
  - C. Welfare, Yes 83%; No 17%.
  - D. Defense, Yes 55%; No 45%.
  - E. Agriculture, Yes 47%; No 53%.
  - F. Veteran's Benefits, Yes 11%; No 89%.
3. Do you favor higher import tariffs on foreign import goods? Yes 67%; No 33%.
  4. A. Do you feel the U.S. is becoming too dependent on foreign countries for energy sources? Yes 77%; No 23%.
    - B. Would you favor a government subsidy for procuring existing energy within the U.S.? Yes 61%; No 39%.
    - C. Would you favor a government subsidy for research and development of new energy sources? Yes 87%; No 13%.
  5. Now that the war is over, do you favor unconditional amnesty for: A. Deserters, Yes 6%; No 94%.
    - B. Draft evaders, Yes 8%; No 92%.
  6. Now that the war is over, do you favor conditional amnesty (equal time spent in a non-military service): A. Deserters, Yes 20%; No 80%; draft evaders, yes 30%; No 70%.
  7. In your opinion, do the women who hold the same job as men, do an equal amount of work? Yes 37%; No 63%. If no, do they do: A. More 8%, less 92%.
  8. How do you rate the President's overall performance on: Foreign affairs: below average, average, above average? B Avg. 10%; Avg 33%; A Avg 58%.
    - Domestic affairs: below average, average, or above average? B Avg. 37%; Avg. 50%; A Avg 13%.
  9. Are you in agreement with Phase III of the economic controls? Yes 23%; No 77%.
    - If not, which of the following do you favor? A. No controls. B. Additional controls on wages, prices, rents, interest rates. C. Less controls on wages, prices, rents, interest rates? See Attachment.
  10. Do you favor post-war aid to Indochina? Yes 18%; No 82%.
  11. Do you favor a Federal ban on the manufacture and sale of handguns? Yes 28%; No 72%.
  12. Do you favor a Federal control on the manufacture and sale of handguns? Yes 54%; No 46%.
  13. Do you agree with the Supreme Court ruling on abortion? Yes 57%; No 43%.
  14. Do you believe that freshness codes on perishable foods are clear enough to do any good? Yes 15%; No 85%.
  15. Do you believe that existing consumer protection is adequate? Yes 15%; No 85%. If no, in what area do you believe a concentrated effort should be made? See attachment.
  16. Do you believe the volunteer army is a good thing? Yes 78%; no 22%.
  17. Are you in favor of national health insurance? Yes 52%; No 48%.
  18. Are you in favor of the state government using any or all of the gas tax for public mass transit? Yes 27%; No 73%.
  19. Which of the following are you in favor of? A. Federal no-fault insurance program. 37%.
    - B. A Federal modified no-fault insurance program. 17%. No Federal insurance program. 46%.
  20. Are you an favor of a Women's Rights Bill in which women would be guaranteed equality to men in all aspects of life? Yes 45%; No 55%.
  21. In regard to this, do you believe either partner should pay alimony when no children are involved? Yes 19%; No 81%. When children are involved? Yes 74%; No 26%.
  22. Providing the bill is passed, do you believe that court cases involving child support and custody should be decided by the individual's ability to pay, and not by sex? Yes 91%; No 9%.
- The results of this poll will be used by your Legislative Committee to guide our course of action in the upcoming Legislative Conference in Washington.

## ATTACHMENT

9. Which of the following do you favor?  
 A. No Controls, 13%.  
 B. Additional controls on wages, (46%) prices, (57%) rents, (55%) interest rates, (58%).  
 C. Less controls on wages, (20%) prices, (14%) rents, (15%), and interest rates (16%).  
 15. If no, in what area do you believe a concentrated effort should be made? The following were of primary concern:  
 Food, Advertising, Automobiles, Appliances, Warranties, Packaging.  
 The following were of secondary concern:  
 Better Inspections, Drugs, Health and Safety items, Gas, Oil, Utilities, Credit, and Loans.

THE CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES  
SECURITY ACT OF 1973

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, a recent New York Post article concerned itself with the criminal diversion of methadone from manufacturing companies, clinics and commercial trucks. The minimal security precautions that are now taken to prevent the theft of the dangerous narcotic are unreasonable and unnecessary. We can and must see to it that methadone is administered by physicians rather than junkies, and in clinics rather than on city streets. The "Controlled Substances Security Act of 1973" that I will soon introduce in the House of Representatives will serve to properly regulate the handling and shipping of controlled substances. I welcome the cosponsorship and support of my colleagues in the House.

I now submit for your attention and the attention of my colleagues, the New York Post article of March 6, entitled "Methadone Delivery a Casual Job."

METHADONE DELIVERY A CASUAL JOB  
(By Robert Bazell)

Methadone, which has become a major part of the illegal drug market here, is shipped to treatment clinics through the mails or via commercial trucks with few security precautions.

A survey of pharmacists at several clinics revealed that boxes of the heroin substitute are dropped off at the clinic in the same manner as cotton bandages and other supplies except that the druggists must sign a special federal form when they receive the delivery.

One pharmacist, who asked not to be identified, said truck drivers on three occasions had pulled up before the clinic opened and left several boxes of methadone with a street value of \$12,000 each on the doorstep.

A spokesman for the Eli Lilly Company in Indianapolis, principal suppliers of the drug, acknowledged that methadone was shipped mostly by truck—and by mail when the orders were small.

In 1972, he said, 12,027 methadone pills were lost in transit—all in New York City. But he emphasized the amount lost represented one-tenth of one per cent of the total quantity Lilly delivers to clinics across the country. New York accounts for 60 per cent of all methadone used in the U.S.

More than 30,000 addicts receive methadone from federally-licensed treatment programs here. At the same time, thousands

of others buy the drug in the street, where it is readily available, if they are unable to purchase heroin.

## TWO MAJOR SOURCES

Authorities are not entirely certain where the huge quantities of illegal methadone sold here come from. But they say "unscrupulous" doctors who obtain federal licenses to sell the drug and addicts who sell part of their daily dose from clinics are two major sources.

Federal narcotics agents are "concerned" about the means drug companies use to ship methadone.

It is a "potential problem," says Gene R. Halslip, executive assistant to the director of the federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. "But all our information indicates that the street methadone is not being diverted from legitimate shipments."

Police recently began a drive to arrest small-scale pushers in order to question them and gain information on the methadone black market.

Addicts taking illegal methadone experience largely the same effects as those in treatment. But officials are concerned about the large amount of methadone on the street because if a non-addict takes a normal dose it can prove fatal.

LETTERS AGAINST LEGAL  
SERVICES

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, very few people will disagree with the contention that everyone accused of a crime—rich or poor—is entitled to legal counsel. While most of us occasionally need a lawyer, the United States does not need a national legal services system financed with the tax dollars of the American taxpayer.

The Legal Services program of the Office of Economic Opportunity has received a great deal of criticism in the past few weeks. Allegations have been made that the program has become too political, too involved in law reform; and has neglected the cornerstone upon which Legal Services was developed: The relationship between the individual client and the lawyer.

The March 1973 edition of the American Bar Association Journal contained three letters to the editor which I think will help to shed light on the activities of many Legal Services programs. I am inserting these letters in the RECORD at this point:

LEGAL SERVICES CONTROVERSY  
INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

In the November Journal (page 1190), I find an editorial bemoaning the fact that Title IX, creating a National Legal Services Corporation, was deleted from the Economic Opportunity Amendments Act of 1972. The editorial not only expresses disappointment at its defeat, but notes further that the American Bar Association has been a leader in urging the creation of such an independent agency to operate a national legal services program.

In addition, an article in the same issue of the Journal (page 1178), by William R. Klaus asserts that the O.E.O. national legal services program should be applauded for its achievements, not attacked for its "minor and often exaggerated defects."

Finally, the November issue of American Bar News notes that the O.E.O. legal services program survived an effort to control the activities of its project attorneys, and that the Association through Robert W. Meserve, sent telegrams to all senators opposing this effort and the proposed restrictions.

Please be advised that a substantial majority of the membership of the Indianapolis Bar Association has recently expressed its vigorous opposition to the creation of any type of public interest law firm or legal services corporation, and further that there is considerable dissatisfaction with the activities of L.S.O. attorneys in this area. The complaints in this area are neither minor nor exaggerated. They are very real; and I happen to be one of the group that is opposed to both the establishment of any type of public interest law firm on a local basis, and certainly on a national basis, and to some of the activities of L.S.O. counsel which have no relationship whatever to the provision of competent legal services to the poor. Moreover, here in Indianapolis, we have adequate facilities for providing such service through our legal aid society activities, and have no real need for further programs in this area....

MILTON ELROD, JR.

MATTOON, ILL.

From its inception I felt that the legal services program of the Office of Economic Opportunity was an ill-conceived adventure in the field of jurisprudence—an imprudent venture, hostile to established and sound professional practice in our system of jurisprudence. A venture provocative of degrading and harmful practices, and a vehicle for barratry, nuisance litigation, and even malpractice.

In my opinion, subsequent events more than confirm my apprehension.

Also in my opinion, the Association in proper service to the legal profession and our system of jurisprudence is and remains delinquent in its failure to condemn said legal services program.

CARUS S. ICENOGLU.

BERKELEY, CALIF.

Your editorial, the essay by Mr. Klaus, and the letters responding to Mr. Agnew's article prompt me to express some of my own observations and some of my views concerning the legal services program. Recently, a deputy city attorney from San Francisco who deals with a great number of domestic relations problems reported to me that as far as she was concerned, the poverty lawyers that she had seen were simply using the clients for their own advantage. She reported that they appeared in court time after time never having seen or talked to their clients between court appearances and that an already burdened system is being bogged down by this conduct.

I invite Mr. Adelman ("Views of Our Readers," November Journal, page 1130) to come from Bellerose to California because we have innumerable instances in this state where by word and deed the taxpayers' subsidized attorney has ignored the client's needs and on at least one instance refused even to render any assistance unless the client would act as plaintiff in a "set up" suit against a county welfare director.

These indiscretions are being dealt with by the disciplinary committee of our state bar, and it is doubtful O.E.O. lawyers will again sign the names of other people to telegrams, but the main crux of the problem is not the irresponsibility of individual attorneys and the lack of direction by the administrators of the program but it is the overall direction in which the program appears to be moving....

WILLIAM L. KNECHT.



MR. HERSEL WELLS

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, once, maybe twice, one encounters a man after whom his life should be patterned.

I wish to share with my colleagues the story of Mr. Hershel Wells, of Summer Shade, Ky., as it appeared in the *Edmonton, Ky., Herald-News* for September 21, 1973.

I commend Mr. Wells for his fine record of achievement and contribution. Teacher, farmer, civil servant, banker, his store of knowledge has made him an authority in many fields of endeavor.

It should be said that he will never be a grump, if he ever grows old.

HERSHEL WELLS—"I'M NOT GOING TO BE GRUMPY WHEN I GET OLD"

Such words as humorous, witty and entertaining come to mind in trying to describe Hershel Wells. Or you could just say he is a close relative of Earl Harvey's then no other description would be necessary.

At any rate, he says he made up his mind a long time ago that he was not going to be grumpy when he gets old. If he keeps going the way he is now, when he gets old he will never be called a grump.

A resident of Summer Shade, Rt. 3, Wells was born in Barren County, but according to his own testimony, as soon as he got big enough to know anything, he had his folks move him to Metcalfe. This all took place of course when he was somewhere around the age of one.

In early manhood, Hershel was a teacher in the rural schools of Huffman, Lone Star and Beaumont. He married Mary Agnes Barrett, one of his pupils from Huffman School. The attractive Mrs. Wells explained this saying, "well, I thought I had to mind the teacher so when he said, 'Marry me, I did!'"

Giving up teaching, Hershel worked for a number of years in the ACP (now ASCS) office in Edmonton and also was later employed at the Edmonton State Bank as a teller. Moving nearer home, he took a job as cashier at the Bank of Summer Shade for about two years before settling down at the Deposit Bank in Tompkinsville for a period of sixteen years.

He became president of the bank there and is still on the board of directors, although he has retired. Looking back over the different types of jobs he has held, Hershel said, "I'd rather draw Social Security than anything I ever did!"

Actually, he claims his real reason for retirement had nothing to do with age.

"I never had stayed home long enough to get to know my wife and she always seemed like such a nice person, I decided it was time I got acquainted with her."

They have spent some time traveling since

his retirement, visiting the Black Hills of South Dakota, and making a couple of trips to Florida and Alabama. They agree that the most delightful trip they have ever taken was through eastern Kentucky.

Hershel hopes that he will be like an Uncle Ocee Wells of Oregon. "Although 81 years old, he drove from Los Angeles to Indiana to settle a business deal then drove from there back to his home in Oregon."

Hershel and his wife are members of the Christian Church at Summer Shade, where he was superintendent of Sunday School for a number of years. Now he is assistant teacher of the men's class and an elder of the church.

Reflecting briefly upon the condition of the world today, he says it is no wonder people are turning to drugs and alcohol as an escape from life. "Without faith and hope in Jesus, how can anyone face the future?"

The wells have two daughters and a son all married and settled nearby. They also have been blessed with ten grandchildren and two great-grandchildren.

While they have never had to baby sit with all of them at once, Hershel says, "We baby-sit constantly. The grandchildren all love us dearly, for which we are proud. They bring their clothes and come to our house and would never leave."

Through all of the different types of public work he has held, he has farmed consistently. And although his crop is rented out, he always finds enough to do to keep busy, even now, helping out on his own farm and keeping an eye on things for his son and son-in-law, who farm and work in Tompkinsville, too.

Not long ago, Wells' father-in-law was in Summer Shade and met a fellow who was looking for hands to help cut his tobacco. The story goes that Mr. Barrett told him he knew who he could get to help. "Hershel Wells," he said, "He's got three crops and another one ain't gonna hurt him none."

Deciding that he had mentioned everything in his life that was of importance, Wells glanced at his wife, and asked "Have I done anything else, except be one of the best husbands you've ever had?"

She allowed that he hadn't and that since he was the only husband she'd ever had, he must surely have been the best.

This does seem to be one pupil-teacher relation that is pretty nearly perfect.

## GREAT NECK RESOLUTION

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the Record a resolution unanimously adopted by the members of the Great Neck, N.Y. Chamber of Commerce in favor of continuing Federal funds for community agencies which

provide the much needed and appreciated assistance to the elderly, the sick, the poor, and the disabled. I would like to commend the Great Neck Chamber of Commerce for its sense of humanitarianism:

A RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED BY THE GREAT NECK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, MARCH 15, 1973

Whereas, the Great Neck Chamber of Commerce wishes to foster the continuation of federal funding for health, education, housing and antipoverty programs within the community; and

Whereas, the Chamber of Commerce is proud of the record of accomplishment achieved by community agencies which receive federal funding here; and

Whereas, no arrangements have yet been made for other agencies to assume the burden from the federal government, and even a temporary loss of funding would produce undue hardships for persons and programs; and

Whereas, funds are available on the federal level, unless priorities are given to funding human services, an undue burden is placed on a state, county, and local level.

Therefore, be it resolved that the Chamber of Commerce petitions the President of the United States, the Congress, and all our local officials to create a climate of financial support for all programs, local and national, providing human services for the sick, the aged, and the poor.

## THE DISCONNECTED

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 3, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, in 1972, Columbia University Prof. Penn Kimball wrote a book entitled "The Disconnected." Mr. Kimball presented studies of important American urban elections and the related problems of voter registration. In the introduction, Mr. Kimball wrote:

There will probably be no significant improvement in public participation in the electoral process until the federal government takes the initiative to qualify eligible voters rather than place the onus upon individuals thwarted by outmoded state and local regulations. Voting in America is enmeshed in a spider's web of prior restraints.

The National Voter Registration Rights Act of 1973 (H.R. 4846) that I have introduced in Congress will serve to bring millions of "The Disconnected"—blacks, chicanos, the poor, rural citizens—into the American political process.

I highly recommend Mr. Kimball's book to my colleagues in Congress.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, April 4, 1973

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit.*—Romans 14: 17.

Eternal God and Father of us all, ever near, ever loving, ever ready to help, purify our hearts, clarify our vision, and strengthen our spirits as we wait upon

Thee. Deliver us from discouraging doubts, free us from fretful fears, save us from the spirit which promotes disunity and produces division. Lead us into the fresh air of faith and freedom and keep us in the atmosphere of life and love that the benediction of Thy peace and the blessing of Thy presence may rest upon us, upon our Nation, and upon our world.

"Send down Thy peace, O Lord;  
Earth's bitter voices drown  
In one deep ocean of accord;  
Thy peace, O God, send down."  
Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's pro-