

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MONEY IS NOT THE ONLY ANSWER

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, too often we have witnessed here and at all levels of government the spend ourselves rich syndrome.

Whenever testimony is heard on any subject in any committee hearing on Capitol Hill, it is close to a sure bet that at least one person will testify that the only answer to the problem under discussion is the infusion of more and more and more money.

This syndrome can be found elsewhere, as well. Recently, a group called the Citizens' Conference on State Legislatures rated the legislatures of all 50 States. The general assembly of the State of Indiana fared rather badly in those ratings, largely because Indiana believes in fiscal responsibility, and its legislators keep a tight grip on the purse strings. Indiana's Legislature has done an admirable job through the years, keeping the machinery of the government functioning smoothly, without incurring a staggering deficit.

On February 24, Donald D. White wrote very eloquently about this syndrome in his column, *The Hoosier Day*, which is carried in many Indiana newspapers. I insert that column at this point in the RECORD:

THE HOOSIER DAY

(By Donald D. White)

Highest cost is not synonymous with best quality. Money does not always solve all problems.

The Indiana General Assembly recently came under attack by an organization called the Citizens' Conference on State Legislatures. Indiana ranked 40th in a survey by the group, while California ranked first.

A part of the yardstick used to measure effectiveness was salary, offices and staff, and length of sessions. Pay for California legislators has skyrocketed in recent years, and sessions have extended until they are almost continuous.

Larry Margolis is executive director of the Citizens' Conference. He appeared before the pre-legislative conference of the Indiana General Assembly. His proposals for "improving" the sessions included a salary of \$25,000 a year, increased staff for every member, and two offices per legislator.

I agree with John V. Barnett, executive vice president of the Indiana Chamber of Commerce. Commenting on the criticism, Barnett said: "The real measurement for the effectiveness of legislatures is not the amount of time and money spent in their deliberations but the end product of those deliberations. The real measurement is whether the product is good government. And by that yardstick, Indiana ranks high."

All too frequently, our first answer to any problem is more money. Often, it is our only answer. Recently I interviewed Rendell A. Davis, executive director of Public Action in Correctional Effort (PACE).

Davis observed: "Within the past six months we have seen some changes take place, particularly at the Reformatory. We have seen changes take place that really are quite remarkable, mainly in the whole area

of human relations. They are not the kind of changes that took money, because we didn't have any money. Maybe that is something for us to see . . . that there area great many changes that can take place without money."

Indiana's correctional system does need more money. Even more, it needs a complete reorganization and a shift in emphasis for confinement to rehabilitation, from punishment to prevention.

Even in the field of National security, there are those who would have us believe that higher pay and better living conditions are all that are required for an all-volunteer armed forces.

In preparation, the Army, Navy and Air Force issued new regulations to eliminate "Mickey Mouse" requirements. Beer will be allowed in the barracks, no more routine reveille or bed checks, and we will move toward private rooms.

In the same breath, the Marine Corps announced it is going to get tougher, no matter what the other services do. Gen. Leonard Chapman, Marine Corps commandant said: "The Corps is going to be leaner, tougher, more disciplined and even more professional than ever before."

I will be the first to admit my fighting ability was not diminished by a full beard and moustache when we had no hot water or time to shave. It also was not affected by no bath in a couple of months except for the constant 30 day rain and rivers we crossed. I will also admit, some of the "Mickey Mouse" regulations prepared me to endure some hardships.

So we have relaxed and reduced the draft. Then Jordanian government troops started battling Palestinian guerrillas. Troops were alerted for possible rescue of Americans from Jordan. The Army found not one of its divisions outside of Vietnam is rated combat-ready.

The 82nd Airborne Division is part of the U.S. Strike Command, supposedly ready for quick deployment on short notice. It was so badly depleted, it could only field two of its three 4,500-man brigades. Even these were dated 2 on a scale of 4 in measuring combat-readiness. The ideal is 1, and other divisions in the Army were hurting more than the 82nd.

On this theory, we stake our lives as well as the security of our country. It is said: "Whenever someone gets something for nothing, remember, somebody got nothing for something."

TERROR IN SOUTH VIETNAM—THE PULPING OF A PEOPLE—V

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, as President Nixon said in his recent state of the world message, "Communist terrorist activities, assassinations, and kidnappings continue to exact a tragic toll from the Vietnamese people."

It is good that the President has pointed out this facet of the war in Southeast Asia which receives so little coverage in the day-to-day coverage of the war. In order to convey the real meaning of Communism and illustrate the vicious nature of the enemy we fight

in Southeast Asia I would like to insert at this point the fifth in a continuing series showing the day-to-day terror which is being applied against the people of South Vietnam.

This information is compiled by the National Police of South Vietnam and published every 24 hours. The list is incomplete as assassinations and kidnappings are not always reported from many areas and many of those listed as wounded eventually die.

Those who continually cry for the limitation of allied operations against the enemy might pause to consider the operations being undertaken by the enemy in order to decimate the people of South Vietnam.

The Roundup of Terrorist Activities, compiled by the National Police of the Republic of Vietnam follow:

ROUNDUP OF TERRORIST ACTIVITIES

Nine enemy terrorist incidents have been reported in which nine Vietnamese civilians were killed, 10 wounded and two kidnapped. Details follow:

Jan. 11—A VC squad, dressed in civilian clothes, entered Thanh Son village, Diem Ban dist., Quang Nam Prov. They threw M-26 grenades at a group of village officials, killing two and wounding two.

Jan. 10—A three-wheeled bus hit a plastic-type mine 6.5 kms north of Kontum city, Kontum Prov. Two civilian passengers were killed and four wounded.

A PSDF member and a village official were assassinated in My Phu hamlet, My An dist., Kien Phong Prov.

Jan. 9—Three civilians were wounded by VC small arms fire in an attack on Phuoc Dien hamlet, Phuoc Ninh dist., Tay Ninh Prov.

Jan. 8—One civilian was kidnapped from Duong Xuan hamlet, Hai Long dist., Binh Thuan Prov.

Jan. 7—A Vietnamese woman cutting wood in Bich Phuoc village, Tri Tam dist., Binh Duong Prov., was killed when she stepped on a booby trap.

Jan. 6—A civilian was kidnapped from the Ruong Lay area, Phan Ly Cham dist., Binh Thuan Prov.

One PSDF was killed and one civilian wounded in an enemy attack on La Van hamlet, Duc Thanh dist., Phuoc Tuy Prov.

Jan. 5—In Gia Dinh Prov., the enemy assassinated a 26-year old woman in Dong Thanh village, Hoc Mon dist.

Five incidents of enemy terrorism have been reported in which five Vietnamese civilians were killed and eight wounded. Details follow:

Jan. 11—Three civilians returning to Tan Binh hamlet, Phu Giao dist., Binh Duong Prov. stepped on a booby trap planted between their rice fields and the hamlet. Two of the victims were killed and the other wounded. An enemy unit fired into a house in Thanh Phu village, Kien Hoa dist. One civilian was wounded.

Jan. 9—Three civilians and a National Policeman, who had been cutting bamboo, were ambushed one km from Tan Canh in Kontum Prov. One of the civilians were killed. The policeman and two civilians were wounded.

Jan. 8—Six VC, wearing ARVN uniforms and carrying M-16s, entered Phu Nhieu hamlet, Phu My dist., Binh Dinh Prov. They assassinated the deputy hamlet chief and wounded his son.

Jan. 6—A small CV force entered Phuoc Hau village, Can Duoc dist., Long An Prov.

and attacked the village administrative office. A hamlet chief was killed and two civilians wounded.

Four terrorist incidents have been reported in which five Vietnamese civilians were killed, seven wounded and one kidnapped. Details follow:

Jan. 10—An enemy unit threw a grenade into a home in Yen Ne hamlet, Hoa Vang dist., Quang Nam Prov. One civilian was killed and three wounded. One high school student was assassinated and one civilian kidnapped from Dat Loc hamlet, Que Son dist., Quang Nam Prov. Two civilians were killed and four wounded when they stepped on a booby trap in Binh Duc village, Binh Son dist., Quang Ngai Prov.

Jan. 9—A sniper killed the chief of Suoi Dua hamlet, Tri Tam dist., Binh Duong Prov.

Five incidents of enemy terrorism have been reported in which two Vietnamese civilians were killed, four wounded and four kidnapped. Details follow:

Jan. 13—One civilian was kidnapped from Phong Phu hamlet, Phong Thuan dist., Phong Linh Prov.

Jan. 11—A VC squad infiltrated Mai Trai hamlet, Du Long dist., Ninh Thuan Prov. and assassinated the deputy hamlet chief.

Four civilians were wounded by 82mm mortar rounds fired into Huyen Thu village, Duc Duc dist., Quang Nam Prov.

Three PSDF members were kidnapped from Nhon Tho hamlet, Phong Dien dist., Phong Dinh Prov.

Jan. 9—One civilian was assassinated in Cai Trau hamlet, Thanh Tri dist., Ba Xuyen Prov. The victim had recently applied for a position with the National Police.

Seven incidents of enemy terrorism have been reported in which two Vietnamese civilians were killed, two wounded and 10 kidnapped. Details follow:

Jan. 13—Two women and a man were kidnapped from Binh Quoi hamlet, Tan Tru dist., Long An Prov.

Jan. 12—In Binh Duong Prov., two civilians detonated a booby trap mine near Binh My hamlet, Phu Giao dist. One man was killed and the other wounded.

Jan. 11—A 17-year old girl was kidnapped from Thach Duc hamlet, Dong Xuan dist., Phu Yen Prov.

Two Vietnamese children stepped on a booby trap mine near Tan Binh hamlet, Phu Giao dist., Binh Duong Prov. One child was killed and the other wounded.

Also in Binh Duong, a 16-year old boy was kidnapped from Kinh Nhuong hamlet, Phu Giao dist.

Jan. 6—Three women and a man were kidnapped from Thuong Nghia hamlet, Dong Ha dist., Quang Tri Prov.

Jan. 4—Also in Quang Tri, a 14-year old boy was kidnapped from Nhi Thuong hamlet, Gio Linh dist.

Four incidents of enemy terrorism have been reported in which two Vietnamese civilians were killed, one wounded and one kidnapped. Details follow:

Jan. 12—One PSDF member was wounded in an engagement with the enemy near Phu Giao hamlet, Thanh Tri dist., Ba Xuyen Prov.

Jan. 11—A 10-year-old child, gathering firewood, was killed when he stepped on an enemy booby trap mine. The incident occurred near Thuan Kiem hamlet, Phuoc Binh dist., Phuoc Long Prov.

Jan. 10—A terrorist group penetrated Tan My hamlet, Thuan Hoa dist., Ba Xuyen Prov. and assassinated one civilian.

In Hau Nghia Prov., 20 VC infiltrated Loc Hung hamlet, Trang Bang dist. and kidnapped a Hoi Shan. The PF platoon defending the hamlet attacked the enemy as they were departing and the victim escaped.

At approximately 0135 hours on Jan. 18th, the VC fired five of 82 mm mortar rounds into

Rach Gia city, Kien Giang Prov. Two children were killed and fifteen adults wounded.

This was one of six enemy terrorist incidents reported in which six Vietnamese civilians were killed, 15 wounded and three kidnapped. Details follow:

Jan. 19—10 VC entered a village in the Phu Loc dist., Thua Thien Prov. and kidnapped two men and a woman. One man was assassinated a short distance from the village. A few minutes later, the enemy unit was attacked by a PF platoon. During the engagement, the woman victim managed to escape.

Jan. 14—Terrorists assassinated a man in An Thuan hamlet, Duc Hue dist., Hau Nghia Prov.

Also in Hau Nghia, a VC platoon infiltrated Phuoc Hau hamlet, Trang Bang dist. and kidnapped one male resident.

Jan. 12—One civilian was assassinated in Hung Quo hamlet, Lap Vo dist., Sa Dec Prov.

Jan. 11—In Kien Phong Prov., one man was assassinated in Phu Cong village, Dong Tien dist.

Six incidents of enemy terrorism have been reported in which three Vietnamese civilians were killed, 15 wounded and two kidnapped. Details follow:

Jan. 19—In an engagement between hamlet defense forces and a VC unit, one member of the PSDF was wounded. Enemy casualties are unknown. The incident occurred in Bong Trang hamlet, Hieu Thien dist., Tay Ninh Prov.

Jan. 17—An enemy platoon attacked Lau Vinh hamlet, Hieu Thien dist., Tay Ninh Prov. Three PSDF were killed and three civilians, including two children, wounded. Enemy casualties are unknown, although villagers saw a number of VC being carried away from the scene.

Jan. 16—Also in Tay Ninh, two PSDF were wounded in an attack on Da Hang hamlet, Hieu Thien dist.

A VC unit fired eight 82mm mortar rounds into Dong Thanh village, Binh Minh dist., Vinh Long Prov. Seven children, one woman and a PSDF member were wounded.

Jan. 15—One civilian was kidnapped from Loc Binh hamlet, Trang Bang dist., Hau Nghia Prov.

Jan. 12—One Hoi Chanh was kidnapped from Xom Moi hamlet, Hieu Thien dist., Tay Ninh Prov.

Nine terrorist incidents have been reported in which eight Vietnamese were killed, 25 wounded and one kidnapped. Details follow:

Jan. 19—A civilian was killed and a village council member wounded in a terrorist attack in An Dinh village, Huong My dist., Kien Hoa Prov.

Terrorists abducted a PSDF in My Thanh village, Tra Tri dist., Kien Hoa Prov.

Jan. 17—One PSDF was killed by a VC unit in an engagement at Vinh Phuoc hamlet, Duc Long dist., Chuong Thien Prov.

Jan. 16—A VC unit killed two civilians during an attack against Phuoc Thanh hamlet, Long My dist. in Chuong Thien Prov.

The deputy hamlet chief and the assistant military affairs section chief were killed when a VC unit penetrated Hoa Phung hamlet and engaged PF and PSDF. The hamlet in the Duc Long dist. of Chuong Thien Prov.

Jan. 15—In an engagement between a VC unit and PF defenders in Vinh Phuoc hamlet, three PSDF and a civilian were wounded. Vinh Phuoc is in Duc Long dist., Chuong Thien Prov.

A 17 year-old cowherd was killed and 17 civilians were wounded when a VC mine exploded in Tan Hoa Khanh village, Oan Uyen dist., Bien Hoa Prov.

VC decapitated a disabled soldier, planted a flag and distributed leaflets in an incursion in Phuoc Hau II hamlet, Phuoc Long village, Phuoc Long dist., in Bac Lieu Prov.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT INCREASE NEEDED NOW

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I insert in the RECORD, part IX of the article entitled "Private and Public Retirement Pensions: Findings From the 1968 Survey of the Aged," by Walter W. Kolodrubetz.

I include the material as follows:

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC RETIREMENT PENSIONS:
FINDINGS FROM THE 1968 SURVEY OF THE
AGED—PART 9

The significance of supplementary retirement payments in the income position of the aged is further clarified when they are measured in terms of their contribution to aggregate income. According to Survey results for OASDHI beneficiary couples with more than one pension, about two-thirds of their aggregate income was from retirement benefits. Other income sources, mostly earnings and income from assets, provided the remainder (table 11). For nonmarried OASDHI beneficiaries with another pension, retirement benefits made up three-fourths of aggregate income, and other sources contributed a fourth.

Most surveys underestimate aggregate income, especially for higher income groups, and DECA was no exception. Since the underestimation was greatest for income from assets and earnings, overstatement of the relative importance of the other sources of income, especially retirement benefits, automatically occurs when income shares are considered. Nevertheless, comparison of the income shares and mean income for subgroups of the aged population is useful. In fact, such comparisons reveal striking variations in the composition of total income, as well as a clearer picture of the powerful role of dual pensions. OASDHI benefits, for example, comprised roughly the same share of total income for couples receiving private pensions as for those receiving only OASDHI benefits in retirement benefit income—37 percent and 40 percent, respectively. The mean OASDHI benefit, however, was some 30 percent lower for those receiving only OASDHI than for those also receiving private-plan benefits (table 11). Retirement benefits for those receiving two pensions accounted for two-thirds of total income, compared with two-fifths for those that had only OASDHI as retirement benefits.

A different relationship among retirement income shares emerged for aged units receiving public pensions other than OASDHI, as a result of the already mentioned differences in coverage and noncoverage under social security for this group. For OASDHI beneficiary couples with other public pension payments, combined retirement benefits accounted for 70 percent of total income—about the same proportion as that of private pensioners with OASDHI benefits. The other public pension programs accounted for the largest part of total income, however, and, consequently, of retirement income. Mean income from all retirement benefits was about the same as that for private pensioners and more than twice as much as that for couples with only OASDHI benefits in retirement benefit income. Both the share and the average amount of the OASDHI benefit were much lower for OASDHI beneficiaries with another public pension than for the other groups.

For couples with benefits from other public retirement programs but no OASDHI benefits, such payments amounted to two-thirds

of total income. Although this proportion was about the same as that represented by the combined retirement benefits of those receiving two pensions, the average retirement benefit for the first group was \$500 lower than the average for dual-pension couples. The average retirement benefit from

other public programs, however, was about double that received by couples that had OASDHI as their only retirement benefit.

The share of total income from retirement benefits for the nonmarried was generally higher than that for couples but showed the same general pattern of distribution of shares

and differences in means as the pattern for couples. As table 11 indicates, combined retirement benefits accounted for about three-fourths of total income for nonmarried beneficiaries with two pensions, and one-half of the total income of those with only OASDHI benefits in retirement benefit income.

TABLE 11.—INCOME SHARES AND MEAN INCOME BY TYPE OF RETIREMENT BENEFIT FOR OASDHI BENEFICIARIES¹ AND NONBENEFICIARIES: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF MONEY INCOME AND MEAN INCOME BY SOURCE, BY RECEIPT OF RETIREMENT BENEFITS, 1967

Source of money income	OASDHI benefits and—			Public pension other than OASDHI
	Private group pension	Other public pension	No other pension	
MARRIED COUPLES				
Number (in thousands):				
Total	1,009	392	3,438	166
Reporting on income	728	299	2,665	127
Percent of income	100	100	100	100
Total retirement benefits	66	69	40	66
OASDHI	37	24	40	
Other public pensions	2	45		66
Private group pensions	27			
Other income	34	31	60	34
Mean income from retirement benefits, total	\$3,362	\$3,372	\$1,467	\$2,876
OASDHI	1,898	1,190	1,467	
Other public pensions	(?)	2,182		2,876
Private group pensions	1,360			
NONMARRIED PERSONS, TOTAL				
Number (in thousands):				
Total	605	476	6,353	343
Reporting on income	448	365	5,160	278
Percent of income	100	100	100	100
Total retirement benefits	77	74	50	73
OASDHI	44	25	50	
Other public pensions	1	49		73
Private group pensions	33			
Other income	23	26	49	27
Mean income from retirement benefits, total	\$2,240	\$2,537	\$869	\$1,580
OASDHI	1,261	857	869	
Other public pensions	(?)	1,680		1,580
Private group pensions	956			

Source of money income	OASDHI benefits and—			Public pension other than OASDHI
	Private group pension	Other public pension	No other pension	
MEN				
Number (in thousands):				
Total	287	128	1,476	109
Reporting on income	238	103	1,268	87
Percent of income	100	100	100	(?)
Total retirement benefits	81	77	52	
OASDHI	44	24	52	
Other public pensions	1	54		
Private group pensions	36			
Other income	19	23	48	
Mean income from retirement benefits, total	\$2,451	\$3,018	\$991	
OASDHI	1,323	919	991	
Other public pensions	(?)	2,099		
Private group pensions	1,101			
WOMEN				
Number (in thousands):				
Total	317	348	4,876	234
Reporting on income	210	262	3,892	191
Percent of income	100	100	100	100
Total retirement benefits	73	72	50	69
OASDHI	44	26	50	
Other public pensions	1	47		69
Private group pensions	29			
Other income	27	28	50	31
Mean income from retirement benefits, total	\$1,999	\$2,349	\$830	\$1,291
OASDHI	1,190	833	830	
Other public pensions	(?)	1,516		1,291
Private group pensions	791			

¹ Excludes beneficiaries who received their 1st benefit in February 1967 or later, the transitionally insured, and special "age-72" beneficiaries; also excludes a small number of units

reporting private pensions but no OASDHI benefits, as well as some who did not report on private pension receipt.

² Not shown where base is less than 100,000.

MICHAEL T. LEINEN FAMILY OF PORTSMOUTH, IOWA, FARM FAM- ILY OF THE YEAR IN HARRISON AND SHELBY COUNTIES

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, in this day of huge mechanized business enterprises, in agriculture as elsewhere, it is heartwarming and heartening to know that the spirit of individual initiative lives on and continues to produce success stories. The Farmers Home Administration of the U.S. Department of Agriculture recently named the Michael T. Leinen family of Portsmouth, Iowa, the Farm Family of the Year in Harrison and Shelby Counties for just such an achievement.

By dint of hard work and persistence, Ramona and Mickey and their 12 children proved that even today the family farm is a viable enterprise and a valuable part of American life. Working their way up first as tenant farmers and then as owners of their own small farm, this close-knit family demonstrated once again the rewards of industry, diligence, and cooperation.

The Leinens are to be warmly congratulated on this splendid accomplishment. The history of their efforts, described in greater detail in the FHA release which follows, should serve as an inspiration to all families, rural and urban:

MICHAEL T. LEINEN SALUTED AS FHA FARM FAMILY OF THE YEAR IN HARRISON AND SHELBY COUNTIES

The Michael T. Leinen family of Route 1, Portsmouth, Iowa, are honored as Shelby and Harrison County's FHA "Farm Family of the Year". A certificate citing the Leinens as successful family-farm operators and commending them for their participation in community activities was presented to the Leinens today.

The award was made in their home, one-fourth mile East of Portsmouth, Iowa. Mr. Edward Hansen, Chairman of the Shelby County Farmers Home Administration Committee presented the Certificate to the Leinens.

As a boy on a Shelby County farm, where his parents were hard-working owner operators, Michael learned to love the land and dreamed of owning his own farm some day.

In due time, Mr. Leinen, now married to the former Ramona Slaven of Portsmouth, who shared his ambition to build a life on the farm, began farming as a tenant in the Portsmouth area. A Farmers Home Administration operating loan in 1961 gave the Leinens the long-term credit they needed for livestock and machinery.

They worked hard and made progress, but found that tenant farming failed to bring the satisfaction of "building something you can keep." They continued to talk and dream of owning their own place and sought the advice of many people. By 1965, they had gained enough in experience and savings that they felt prepared to take the step toward farm ownership.

Once again they turned to Farmers Home Administration for financing to take over the farm where Mr. Leinen had been raised; they would make hogs and beef cattle their main enterprises. Eventually, a suitable farm ownership loan was arranged through FHA, and in January, 1966, they became owners of 200 acres of land in Shelby County.

By this year, the Leinens have developed a hog enterprise of 40 to 50 litters per year; 15 stock cows; 100 acres of corn and 70 acres of beans. The Leinens rent 120 acres in addition to the 200 acres they own. They are joined now in the work of tending crops, raising livestock and buildings improvements on their farm by their children; Richard, 22; Edward, 21; Allen, 19; Martha, 18; John, 15; Thomas, 13; Nicholas, 10; and Anne, 8. The Leinen's four other children, Michael, 28; Jeanne, 26; Jane, 25; and Janet, 24, left the family home for homes of their own and their professions.

Community service and self-improvement as well as the chores of farming rank high on the list of activities for the Leinen family. Three of the four eldest Leinen children have graduated from college. Further education is the goal of nearly all the Leinen children. The elder Mr. Leinen is a familiar fig-

ure at sporting events in this area. "Mickey" is a baseball and basketball coach for the Town and Parochial school system. He is a director of the Mosquito Watershed, vice-president of the Portsmouth Housing Corporation, a non-profit organization to provide low-rent housing for the community, ASCS Township Committeeman, reporter, and corn sealer. Both Mr. and Mrs. Leinen are active in the affairs of St. Mary's Church, serving on the Parish Council.

The Leinen's are the second family honored in the Farmers Home Administration "Farm Family of the Year" program. Mr. and Mrs. Henry G. Matthews of Logan were selected as the two county winner in 1969. The award was established as a means of honoring farmers and rural citizens. Farming methods, financial progress, family living, property improvement, community leadership, and overcoming adversaries are some of the criteria used in making the selection.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, at times the propaganda machinery of the Soviet Union and its satellites becomes so all-pervasive that it wears down even the most sophisticated among those who are exposed to its fantasies. When the recipients of this type of information are the less informed or the gullible, the result may not only be neutrality of thought, but even a positive acceptance of the distorted message. This is, of course, the ultimate goal of the propagandist, and the proof of his total effectiveness.

A serious example where Communist propaganda has diverted attention away from its own wrongdoing is in its occupation of Lithuania. The world has been so long subjected to Communist flailings at a "dying" Western colonialism that it has neglected to appreciate the true nature of a very much alive and growing Soviet colonial system. This new imperialism has none of the enlightenment of the old colonial system, and amounts to little more than blatant holding by force of the sovereign territory of another nation.

Lithuania has a long and proud history of independence, and February 16, marked the 53d anniversary of the rebirth of this independence which was extinguished when Russian soldiers occupied its land in 1940. The United States has refused, as part of its foreign policy, to recognize the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is of utmost importance that the record be accurate for all the world to see. The continued denial of freedom to the Lithuanian nation should be pointed out as giving lie to the outrageous claims of piety on the part of the Communist imperialists, and their simultaneous attempts to direct attention away from their own misdeeds.

Most important, we must never forget the longing for liberty of the noble people of Lithuania, and we must continuously feed the flame of hope which burns within each of them. It is not

unreasonable to anticipate that in time their Soviet masters will recognize that the desire of all men to be free to choose their own destinies can never be extinguished. Thus the trend for the assertion of national independence, which is already so apparent in the Soviet bloc, will extend also to Lithuania. Let us hope it will once again take its place as a free nation living in harmony with its neighbors.

Let us therefore mark this anniversary of Lithuanian independence by encouraging the continuing struggle for freedom and by dedicating ourselves to its eventual realization.

I include the material as follows:

REVIEW OF LITHUANIAN HISTORY

SUMMARY

On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian nation declared its independence. This was a goal for which the Lithuanian people had been striving throughout a long period of Russian domination (1795-1915) followed by German occupation during the First World War. After two decades of independence, Lithuania again fell under Russian domination when it was occupied by the Red Army in the Second World War. It was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. on August 3, 1940. Following the German attack on the Soviet Union ten months later, Lithuania was in Nazi hands until reoccupied by the Soviet Army in 1944. Since then it has been considered by the Soviet Union as a component republic.

The United States has never recognized the Soviet incorporation of Lithuania or the other two Baltic States, Estonia and Latvia.

EARLY HISTORY

Lithuania has been known to history since 1009, when it was a nation divided into many principalities. Threats from abroad were an important factor in bringing the principalities together into a united state. In 1253 a delegate of Pope Innocent IV crowned Mindaugas, who had been baptized two years before, king of a united Lithuania.

By the fourteenth century the boundaries of Lithuania extended into what is now the Byelorussian S.S.R. and the Russian S.S.R. Lithuanian influence was further extended by a union with Poland. This began in 1386 as a personal union resulting from a marriage between Queen Jadwiga of Poland and Jagiello, the grand duke of Lithuania. It was at this time that Jagiello adopted Roman Catholicism. The following year Lithuania was officially proclaimed a Christian state. Two centuries later, by parliamentary action, the personal union was transformed into a legal one which lasted until 1795. One of the outstanding rulers during this period was Vytautas the Great, who extended Christianity and strengthened Lithuania's ties with Western Europe.

Of Lithuania's role in the Middle Ages one scholar has written the following:

The Lithuanians had established a powerful and independent state in Europe during the Middle Ages. They were able to check the German drive to the east for centuries. They protected Europe against the Mongols and the Tatars. They furnished a power and a government behind which the Eastern Slavs could live in peace and safety with a freedom that was unknown in Moscovite Russia. They blessed their subjects with more human freedoms than in the neighboring countries. They encouraged education and toleration, and they played their part in the general development of European civilization.¹

In 1795 during the third partition of Poland, Lithuania was annexed by Russia.

¹ Clarence Manning, *In Jurgela, C. R. History of the Lithuanian Nation*. New York, Lithuanian Cultural Institute, 1948, p. 9.

There were many attempts by the Lithuanians to throw off Russia domination, but they were unsuccessful. After a third revolt in 1831, the tsarist government began a policy of attempting to replace Lithuanian language and culture with Russian. This repressive policy was intensified after another revolt in 1863, but the Lithuanians resisted and remained faithful to their religion, language, and traditions. The policy of forcing russification was abandoned in 1905.

WORLD WAR I

Russian domination came to an end in 1915 when Lithuania was overrun by German armies. The cost of the First World War to Lithuania was great, with first the retreating Russians and then the Germans seizing or destroying everything that could be of use. However, the defeat of Germany coupled with the revolution in Russia rendered conditions favorable for Lithuanian independence. In 1917, in response to Lithuanian pressure, the German Government authorized the gathering of a congress of 200 Lithuanian delegates. The congress proposed an independent Lithuania based on ethnographical frontiers, with its capital to be at Vilnius, and elected a twenty-member council. On February 16, 1918, the council proclaimed an independent Lithuanian state based on democratic principles.

Independence was not yet a reality, however. As soon as German troops evacuated Vilnius on January 15, 1919, the Red Army entered the city and installed a Communist government. The next year the Red Army was driven out by the Polish army led by Marshal Joseph Pilsudski and Lithuanian fighting units. Russia signed a peace treaty with Lithuania on July 12, 1920, recognizing it as an independent nation and pledging itself to renounce forever all rights of sovereignty. The treaty stated:

In conformity with the right declared by the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic that all peoples have the right to free self-determination, including the right of full secession from the State of which they were a part, Russia recognizes without any reserve the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania with all juridical consequences resulting from such recognition, and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory. The fact that Lithuania was ever under Russian sovereignty does not place the Lithuanian people and their territory under any obligation to Russia.

Although a peace settlement was concluded with Russia, a dispute followed between the once united Poland and Lithuania. The principal issues were the boundaries and the fate of Vilnius, which the Lithuanians had designated as their capital even though the Poles represented a majority of the city's population. On February 3, 1923, the Council of the League of Nations adopted a resolution fixing a line of demarcation which gave Vilnius to Poland. This line was recognized by the Conference of Ambassadors in Paris, but it was not accepted by Lithuania. The Vilnius situation prevented normal diplomatic relations between Poland and Lithuania until 1938.

Although it lost Vilnius, Lithuania gained Klaipeda (Memel) in the peace settlement. The city, predominantly German but situated in a Lithuanian area, was detached from Germany and transferred to Lithuania by the Memel Convention of 1924.

INDEPENDENT LITHUANIA

The League of Nations at first denied admission to Lithuania and the other Baltic states on the grounds that they were not stable enough. They were admitted to League membership on September 22, 1921.

Under a provisional constitution, Antanas Smetona was elected the first President of Lithuania. A permanent constitution was adopted on August 1, 1922. This Constitution accorded freedom of speech, assembly, reli-

gion, and communication. The power of legislation was vested in the Seimas (Parliament), and the executive authority in the President and Cabinet of Ministers.

Gradually, however, the development of splinter political parties resulted in a situation in which no single political party or workable coalition had a majority in the Seimas, and a crisis occurred. On the night of December 16, 1926, a group of officers of the Lithuanian Army compelled the adjournment of Parliament and brought about the resignation of President Grinius. Two days later, without minority and leftist deputies, the Parliament resumed and elected Antanas Smetona President again. The following spring President Smetona dissolved the Parliament and began a period of government by decree, in effect, which lasted until 1938.

In 1938 a new constitution was brought into being by a Parliament which had been elected two years earlier. The new constitution provided stronger powers for the President, but in general reaffirmed the major provisions of the original constitution.

During the period of independence, great emphasis was placed on improving agriculture, the primary occupation of the Lithuanians. A land reform program was instituted with the result that Lithuania became a nation of small farmers. Prior to World War I approximately 450 families had owned 22 percent of all the land with a minimum ownership estimated at 2,000 acres. By 1939 there were 335,720 farming units, raising a variety of grains, potatoes, sugar beets, livestock, and poultry. In addition, industrialization progressed. In 1913 Lithuania had only 151 industrial establishments with 6,603 employees, while in 1939 there were 16,131 enterprises employing 33,000 workers.

Lithuania also made progress in social legislation, with a labor control law, the introduction of the 8-hour day, and various other social measures. Whereas there were only 1,173 grammar schools in 1930, in 1939 there were 2,328. The number of secondary schools increased from 40 in 1920 to 123 in 1927, but declined to 89 in 1937. In 1938 the University of Vytautas the Great had a student body of 3,041.

In addition, Lithuanian literature flourished. Writers found inspiration in the national folklore of Lithuania, and achievements were made in opera and music.

As to religion, Lithuania was predominantly Roman Catholic. In 1937, 80.5 percent of the population was Catholic, 9.5 percent Lutheran, 7.3 percent Jewish, and 2.5 percent Greek Orthodox. A concordat of 1927 established the church-state relationship between Lithuania and the Holy See.

WORLD WAR II

Lithuania was one of the first countries to experience the aggression of both Hitler and the Soviet Union. When the outbreak of the Second World War seemed imminent, Lithuania attempted to maintain a policy of absolute neutrality, but was gradually engulfed nevertheless. The first loss occurred when Klaipeda (Memel) was yielded to Germany on March 22, 1939, in the face of an ultimatum and the threat of German armies.

Next, a mutual assistance treaty was forced upon Lithuania by the Soviet Union on October 10, 1939. Lithuania was required to grant air bases to the Soviet Union and to admit Soviet garrisons in spite of a Soviet-Lithuanian treaty of nonaggression which had been signed in Moscow on September 28, 1926. On June 15, 1940, the Soviets demanded immediate formation of a "friendly" government and occupied the country. In July 1940 a rigged election produced a congress which requested the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. On August 3, 1940, at this "request," Lithuania was declared a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. by the Supreme Soviet in Moscow.

It is estimated that during this first Soviet occupation, Lithuania suffered the loss of about 45,000 people, as many Lithuanians fled and others were arrested or deported. For example, some 30,000 members of the Lithuanian intelligentsia were deported to Siberia on the night of June 14, 1941, and 5,000 political prisoners were executed when the Soviet forces hastily retreated under German attack.

In a second phase, repating the history of the First World War, German occupation replaced the Soviet. Only a few days after the German attack on the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941, Nazi forces overran Lithuania. During their occupation the Germans inaugurated a colonization policy and several thousand German families were settled in Lithuania. Moreover, almost all Lithuanian Jews were executed by the Nazis.

When the tide of the war turned against Germany, Lithuania returned not to independence but to Soviet domination. Vilnius, which the Soviets recognized as part of Lithuania instead of Poland, was retaken by the Soviet army on July 13, 1944. Soon all of Lithuania was occupied.

LITHUANIA UNDER COMMUNIST DOMINATION

News from the Baltic states has been very sparse since their incorporation into the Soviet Union, for the borders of Lithuania, as well as of Latvia and Estonia, have been kept sealed against the outside world and each other. Until 1959, when Vilnius was opened, no Western observers were allowed in Lithuania. The rest of the country is still closed. This is often attributed to military reasons, observers noting that the Baltic coast is ideally situated for missile bases.

As would be expected, Communist literature claims great accomplishments for Lithuania in industry, agriculture, education and culture. The Communists appear to have concentrated their efforts on industrialization and on collectivizing agriculture. However, the few who have been able to escape report a lack of freedom and the imposition of Communist methods which exists throughout the Communist world.

One visitor to the Baltic states has written:

These Baltic states demonstrate dramatically the extremely clever system evolved by the Kremlin to keep its numerous minorities under firm centralized control, while permitting them to use their ancient languages and to preserve some of their age-old customs. Moscow's controls are disguised. The Russian garrisons in Baltic states make themselves as inconspicuous as possible. I was told that the only large garrisons are confined to offshore islands, probably missile bases. The only uniformed soldiers I saw were alone or in pairs, and local residents told me most of them are native born. Members of local minorities occupy most government offices having direct contact with the public. But ranking officeholders also are members of the Communist Party—that's the key to the Kremlin's domination. The Communist Party tolerates no opposition party. Baltic Communists, like all others in the Soviet Union, are directly responsible to Moscow. . . . Unless something goes wrong, Russian officials in Baltic countries are not publicly identified. This creates an impression of more independence than actually exists.²

Because of Soviet policies, there has been a considerable change in the composition of the population of Lithuania. When the Soviets retook the country in 1944, some 80,000 Lithuanians fled to Western Germany. Another 60,000 were found in Eastern Germany and deported to Siberia. During 1945 and 1946 an additional 145,000 Lithuanians were deported. Still another massive deportation oc-

curred when some 60,000 Lithuanians were deported in March 1949 in answer to passive resistance of the farming population to the collectivization of agriculture.

It is reported that since Stalin's death the attempt to disperse the Baltic peoples has been changed, and that about a third of those deported have been permitted to return home. Most of the others, it is believed, perished in the meantime.

In addition to the loss of Lithuanians, large numbers of Russians have moved in. Visitors to Vilnius this year report hearing far more Russian and Lithuanian spoken than Polish, which predominated in that city before the war.

UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD LITHUANIA

The United States recognized the independent Lithuanian government on July 27, 1922, and it has never recognized that nation's incorporation into the Soviet Union. It continues to maintain diplomatic relations with the representative of the former independent government, which has a legation in Washington.

Like the other Eastern European states, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia have had their sovereignty violated and their freedom suppressed by the Soviet Union. Their domination has been carried even farther than that of such nations as Czechoslovakia, for they have been incorporated into the Soviet Union. Within this country there is virtual unanimity of opinion that the aggression and tyranny of which the Baltic states are the victims is the direct opposite of the freedom for which the United States stands. However, there are differences of opinion on the policy the United States should pursue in regard to these states to promote its foreign policy objective of a free and peaceful world.

The Lithuanian World Congress, meeting in August 1958 under the auspices of the American Lithuanian community, adopted a unanimous resolution declaring that "Lithuanians continue fiercely resisting the alien rule" of the Soviet Union and asserting that Lithuanians "have not accepted and never will accept Soviet slavery." The resolution called upon the free nations to "reaffirm on every suitable occasion the inalienable rights of the Lithuanian people to national independence and individual freedom." It asked that the free nations "not be party to any agreement or treaty that would confirm or prolong the subordination of the formerly sovereign Lithuanian state."³

A statement by Secretary Dulles dated February 14, 1959, marking the commemoration of the 41st anniversary of the declarations of independence of the Baltic states, recalled the methods by which these countries had been incorporated into the Soviet Union. The statement concluded:

The United States was quick to denounce this aggression and refused to recognize the forced incorporation of the Baltic states into the U.S.S.R. Today, over 18 years later, we wish to assure the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia once more that they are not forgotten. The United States still aspires, in the words of the Atlantic Charter, "To see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."⁴

The New York Times editorial on the 1959 anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day stated:

We do not propose to go to war for the liberation of the Baltic States. Nor do the citizens of those states, still resident there or in exile in other lands, argue for the sort of nationalism that existed between the first and second World War. What they do ask for is political, religious and cultural freedom. They are as aware as the rest of us that such freedom can exist only in a world of freedom.

² Bess, Demaree. Inside the Captive Baltics. Saturday Evening Post, October 31, 1959. p. 69.

³ New York Times, August 31, 1958, p. 16.

⁴ Department of State Bulletin, March 2, 1959.

In the Baltic countries the path to a better future is still dark, but it is not lost and will not be. The day of the overlords will not last forever. The time will come when the three lost little nations will be able to come out and join us.⁵

In 1967, Secretary of State Dean Rusk reaffirmed United States policy toward Lithuania. On February 11, the Secretary wrote the following letter to Mr. Joseph Kajeckas, Charge d'Affaires ad interim of the Lithuanian Legation in Washington:

On the occasion of the forty-ninth anniversary of Lithuania's independence, I extend to you the best wishes of the Government and people of the United States.

United States support of the Lithuanian people's just aspirations for freedom and independence is reflected clearly in our refusal to recognize the forcible incorporation of your country into the Soviet Union and in the warm sympathy manifested by the American people in the Lithuanian cause.

In continuing to look resolutely toward a free and independent existence, the Lithuanian people both here and abroad have established a firm foundation for the hope of free men everywhere that the goal of Lithuanian national self-determination will ultimately be realized.⁶

LITHUANIANS IN THE UNITED STATES

Lithuanian immigrants came to the United States as early as 1688, when it is recorded that they landed at New Amsterdam. Up until 1850, however, detailed information concerning Lithuanian immigration is unavailable. After that time, the chief influxes followed periods of famine or intense political oppression by the Russians. Lithuanian writers estimate that before 1899, some 275,000 Lithuanian immigrants had arrived in the United States. During the period of Lithuanian independence some 30 or 40 thousand of the immigrants returned to Lithuania, but it is estimated that only 10,000 remained there. In more recent times, 24,680 Lithuanians were admitted under the Displaced Persons Act between 1948 and 1955. Another 1,680 were admitted under the Refugee Relief Act between 1954 and 1958. It is frequently estimated that there are now approximately one million Americans of Lithuanian descent.

Among the locations in which Lithuanians settled most heavily were Illinois (particularly Chicago), Pennsylvania (Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and the anthracite regions), Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island, New York, Connecticut, New Jersey, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, Maryland, Indiana, California, and Minnesota. Most of the Lithuanians live in urban areas.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" a wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

⁵ New York Times, February 16, 1959, p. 28.

⁶ Congressional Record, March 1, 1967, p. A983 (Daily Edition).

A GRACIOUS AND KNOWLEDGEABLE LADY, MRS. ROBERT P. PATTERSON

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 1971, it was my privilege to attend the 19th annual Robert P. Patterson Memorial Award ceremony at Fort Benning, Ga., "The Home of the Infantry," Queen of Battle.

The award is presented each year to the outstanding graduate of the Infantry Officers Candidate School in memory of the late Judge Patterson's distinguished service as an infantry officer and as Secretary of War. This year's recipient was 2d Lt. Edmund Lee Davis, an exceptionally splendid young American.

In her presentation speech Mrs. Patterson, widow of Judge Patterson, addressed herself to the vital question of the role of the military in the United States today. I was most touched and impressed with the insight and effectiveness of her presentation which commends itself to the thoughtful consideration of each of us.

A GRACIOUS AND KNOWLEDGEABLE LADY, MRS. ROBERT P. PATTERSON

Lieutenant General John M. Wright, Jr., Major General Orwin C. Talbott, Second Lieutenant Edmund Lee Davis, Honored Guests and Friends:

My pleasure in being here to talk to the winner of the Robert P. Patterson Award is greatly increased by the knowledge that I am in the presence of the Infantry: for the Infantry realizes the importance of every branch of the American Military Service and joins in accepting the challenge to serve our country and its people—no matter how distant or difficult the task.

Criticism of the Armed Services offends me although it may be understandable, in view of the general confusion about the causes of world wide conflicts. One important cause of conflict is the premise that the USSR has the right to intervene indirectly in order to promote Communist rule anywhere in the world.

The idea of such violent intervention is rejected and has led many of us to bury our heads in the sand rather than admit that conflict and violence are being used to gain power in many parts of the world. It takes no great mental leap from denial of conflict and violence to a conclusion that military security is practically unnecessary.

The thought that no conflict is desired, therefore no military security is needed, has in the past few years led political leaders to pick a more popular priority than national defense. Instead, responding to the universal human longing for peace and progress, they worked on the home front to make much needed improvements in political, economic and social relationships.

Therefore the security of the United States has taken second place to urban renewal, pollution, business ethics and poverty. All of these problems are reflected in the Army and it does its best to reclaim the miserable products of ignorance, prejudice, crime and drug abuse.

The constant down-grading of our military, and also the introspection of our political leaders, have been interpreted abroad as re-

treat by the United States from global responsibility. And the uncertainty as to our firmness as world leader has caused a major revision in views about the balance of power in the world, accompanied by aggressive probing to uncover possible new power relationships in process of being formed.

For example, the Soviet Union apparently is seeking an answer to the question, "How close can we come to exerting influence and force that isolates the United States from its allies?" People who have watched the expansion of Soviet diplomatic, economic and military initiatives since Korea should not be surprised at this.

The Arab-Israeli conflict is an example of these initiatives. It calls attention to changes in the economic and military relationships between the Soviet Union and virtually all Arab countries and brings out the significance of Soviet naval activities in the Mediterranean, Atlantic, Caribbean and other international waters.

Incidentally, we cannot entirely ignore press reports of a Soviet submarine base at Cienfuegos, Cuba, 150 miles from our coast. To say the least, this rumor, hinting at a naval blockade, suggests that our sea defense may need up-grading to restore its competitive capacity.

As maneuvers against us continue our allies see a drop in U.S. claims to position in the world, and members of the Atlantic Alliance and NATO seek new relationships in directions that have attracted public concern about the firmness of their commitment to European defense.

In my opinion governments seeking Communist ties that promise economic and military assistance—whether European, Asian, African, South or even North American—may find that their bargain has cost their State its independence.

To understand the present state of world affairs let us look back to 1948 when the Czechs became dependent on the USSR and were bound by the Czechoslovakian Communist Party and by military and economic assistance agreements to turn their alliances and trade toward the USSR. In 1968 came the invasion of Czechoslovakia which exposes a common method by which Satellites are persuaded to yield. The Central Command, through the information media and native Parties, galvanizes the Satellite to attack accused friends and neighbors. Thus "People's Democracies and People's Republics" are persuaded to supply arms—and in some cases, armies—in the battle to dominate area by area of the world.

The history of attacks by North Korea and North Vietnam, supported by other so-called People's governments, including Red China and the USSR, have made it clear that the invasion policy goes beyond the consolidation of the Satellites adjacent to the Communist Heartland.

Czechoslovakia has remained subservient to Soviet foreign policy and has cooperated in the Warsaw Pact since its inception. But in 1968 she humbly asked permission for a gentler Communism within her borders. As a result, under the generalship of the Central Command, she was invaded by the other members of the Pact—although each attacking member knew that, in turn, it could be crushed by the same process.

The Invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 went as follows, according to Congressman Craig Hosmer:

In 24 hours the 25 Warsaw Pact Divisions, comprised of armored, mechanized and airborne troops, were moved 125 miles into Czechoslovakia—thereby mobilizing and deploying over half a million men and coordinating five national armies to make the greatest display of force since World War II.

This force was employed to paralyze the

victim's command and government. Its purpose was to shock, terrify, bewilder—to cause doubt and confusion—in the rear of the invaders where terror would be magnified by rumor until panic became monstrous.

The total success of this maneuver illustrates the point that confrontation by overwhelming force usually results in submission without battle, while confrontation by equal forces could result in a hundred years of battle.

Another example of surprise attack was the Tet Offensive. It attempted to defeat the status quo and counted on the support of overwhelming numbers of Viet Cong and Vietnamese attacking from all directions. The number of Vietnamese who remained steadfast was almost as marvelous as the ability of the allied armies to prevent a debacle.

This successful resistance calls to mind the overwhelming odds that Britain managed to hold out against, while here allies armed to join her defense. Unlike Czechoslovakia, Britain had the sea barrier to keep out invasion—as well as her indomitable leader whose dogged determination proved to the world that people can win in the end if their cause is just.

With this short historical background we can see that the violent confrontations in the world today do not justify relaxation of our military readiness. Instead they make it evident that moral power alone cannot prevent coercion or keep the peace because some world powers still believe that morality is whatever serves their Cause.

In short, the turn of events holds possibilities for good and bad and it is not safe to bask in a false sense of security. Whether events go one way or another is very likely to depend on foreign estimates of our readiness to exert national power to keep things in balance.

Our capacity to deter aggression is also essential in this uncertain period—and let us be grateful that our military stands between us and the power which uses local parties in more than 80 countries, in the attempt to sow civil strife, demoralize the governments and promote so-called wars of national liberation.

Obviously international affairs cannot be ignored today, and we must become stronger, not weaker as we see the enemy probing for soft spots in the hope of scaring us into panic without wasting ammunition on us. We must become more united, always remembering that our Army springs from the community—from the people—and is ready and willing to serve the people.

We hate war, of course! Therefore protection against war and against intimidation is what we need. Without effective military readiness all our efforts on behalf of the environment and people will become valueless.

We need top-notch military force in being—not only to maintain our independence in the world, but also to strengthen the position of free nations whose solidarity could give protection to every country desiring to be free. This requires popular understanding and support here and abroad—and also U.S. Congressional funding for military needs including research and development.

Lieutenant Davis, willingness to accept challenge is the quality most needed in leadership today. And you have accepted leadership at a time when the Army is the particular focus of challenge in our country as regards purpose, leadership, management and conduct. This smear campaign is foisted in part by the enemy, in the effort to demoralize our defenses and the defenses of the world. But the Army has persistently and carefully defended itself against the criticism that is baseless, inapplicable or dangerously visionary.

The Army is willingly subjecting itself to civil authority. And the military is accepting civilian judgment and showing intelligent and sensitive regard for the democratic process and the citizenry. Fortunately, the situation is becoming clearer and there is increasing public interest in military programs.

The Volunteer Army Program, in response to sentiment against the Draft, is a sincere attempt to recognize the value of individuality without diminishing the sense of mission or the soldiery attributes needed to perform a mission. However, all of us must be prepared for a return to the Draft System when the situation requires it.

The new emphasis in the Army is toward individual freedom with accompanying requirements for each man to become responsible and accountable for his acts. The military is interested in making internal reforms in keeping with civil life; but only to the extent that the reforms do not degrade military discipline and effectiveness.

From my view this new program promises a military environment that lives up to principles always held in the Army such as leadership, brotherhood at arms, integrity and sincere acceptance of duty. To me these standards seem ideal for increasing excellence while achieving relationships that are less bureaucratic and less impersonal than in the past. In Judge Patterson's case the devotion between his soldiers and himself warmed his heart to the end of his days. And I stop for a moment to mention those men who shared his love and expressed their devotion to him with courage beyond the call of duty.

Thinking now of your relationship to your new recruits, Lieutenant Davis, there will be many who will have to be trained to accept their accountability and responsibility. Some will no doubt be hippies—people without inner direction or previous exposure to a life that produces this quality. You, Lieutenant, will have to make them men as well as soldiers. Your success will be the measure of your professionalism and character, as well as your capacity to meet the demands of what General Westmoreland has called the electronic battlefield of the future.

Indeed, whatever the situations of the future, battle will continue to be the test of the military forces. I'm sure the requirements for toughness of mind and body, the will to win, thorough knowledge of the tools and tactics of war will continue to be fundamental to success in battle.

Quite obviously, Lieutenant, there lie before you great challenges and opportunities. And, since none of us like war, you will always hear clamor against it. But this dislike of war should never be transferred to military readiness. For without military readiness war becomes more probable—not less! In your case readiness will probably mean training and leading men who are proud of their jobs, their leaders, their units and the Army.

Judge Patterson would be proud of you, Lieutenant. He would say that your selection for this award is evidence that you are considered to have the attributes to meet the challenge. Your leadership in your work with fellow students and soldiers, your position as class president and your performance as Commanding Officer of the Candidate Brigade, attest to the worth that your peers and superiors ascribe to you.

I am honored to present to you, Lieutenant Edmund Lee Davis, this service pistol, so beautifully engraved with your name—on behalf of all the generous friends of Judge Patterson who have made this Award possible.

It is also my pleasure to present this very serviceable check, a present from these same generous friends.

Congratulations and best wishes from all the Pattersons.

U.S. TROOPS IN EUROPE

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower once said, in reference to our forces in Europe, that "the time has now come when we should start withdrawing some of those troops." That was 1963. Since then we have heard many promises of withdrawal, but seen just one of any notable size—and that came only after the the Berlin buildup had raised our forces to record levels.

It seems as though some new international crisis or new foreign policy tactic has arisen just when reductions appeared most practical.

In 1968, for example, there were plans to bring back a large contingent of American troops; these were disrupted by the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia.

In 1970 there were reviews conducted to study the possible return of some American forces to the United States; these are meaningless now under the terms of our latest foreign policy appraisal; the argument that withdrawals of our troops would remove whatever incentive there is for a mutual force reduction agreement with the Warsaw Pact nations.

This appraisal remains the chief stumbling block to troop withdrawals from Europe. Whether it is a valid approach, whether the Warsaw Pact countries are seriously interested in such negotiations, is a highly debatable question. I cannot claim an answer.

But the resolution I have introduced today would give us the flexibility both to pursue this policy approach and to reduce our commitment to NATO. My resolution calls for a 35,000 man cutback of American troops committed to NATO, but not necessarily stationed on the continent of Europe.

This is made possible by the fact that there are 33,500 American troops stationed in the United States, but obligated to answer, within a certain period of time, any threat to the European alliance. These "dual-based" or "M-day" forces were redeployed within the United States after the Berlin crisis had subsided. Their value to NATO must be seriously questioned.

The major argument against redeployment of American NATO forces within the United States has been the claim that they cannot be effective at a distance of over 1,000 miles; that they present no plausible deterrent to the Soviet Union. Now, as long as our military leaders insist upon this line of thought we might as well pursue it a bit further. What then, we can ask our leaders, is the purpose of the 33,500 American troops in the United States, who are, in fact, committed to NATO? We need not await an answer. Within the confines of their appraisal of the situation, these troops have no practical purpose.

We should be able, therefore, to deactivate these "dual-based" forces without endangering our military position in

Europe and without undermining our most recent European policy stance. Since these troops are not based in Europe, they would not be included in any mutual force reduction agreement with the Soviet Union; at the same time, their elimination would not damage the security of the NATO alliance, because they are of little practical value even now; finally, their elimination would save our taxpayers the considerable cost of keeping them stationed and supplied in the United States, where, in fact, such costs are substantially higher than in Europe.

This, then, is one of the ways my resolution could operate. A better alternative, though a bit more complicated, would be this: send these 35,000 "dual based" troops back to Europe, where they could, indeed, be effective and cut those elements of our European force that are presently being wasted on tasks better suited for civilians.

A recent staff report of the House Subcommittee on Europe has indicated that up to 50,000 American troops on the continent of Europe are not being used efficiently; that many of them are engaged in considerable duplication of effort or in jobs they simply cannot perform properly. I will not go into the details of the report, but I would note that it suggests strongly the need for consolidation and reorganization of our European-based troops.

Such an effort would require the elimination of numerous functions now undertaken by these forces and the deactivation of at least 35,000 of them. The report emphasizes the fact that a streamlining process of this type would in no way impair the conventional combat capability of the NATO alliance, and that it would substantially reduce the cost of stationing our troops in Europe.

Now, if the experts continue to argue that the level of our European forces must remain stable for diplomatic purposes, they could replace these troops with those now "dual-based" in the United States. In this way, we would actually be strengthening our European forces, (1) because the 35,000 we replace are not being used efficiently right now and (2) because the 33,500 we replaced them with can only be effective when they are stationed on the continent. For bargaining purposes, therefore, we would have the same level of troops for military purposes, and even more effective fighting force.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that this is a long and involved argument and that, indeed, it skirts the major concern of most reduction advocates: the simple fact that there are many more pressing issues here at home and that we can no longer afford to waste our time and money on the continued deployment of 300,000 troops in Europe. This fact, of course, underlies everything that I have said.

But I believe that the advocates of reduction should not be disarmed by the most recent objection to European troop withdrawals. The use of these forces as a bargaining chip seems to make sense, even if it has not been conclusively

proven. I have merely tried to demonstrate that we can live with such a tactic; that it is not, in fact, inconsistent with the withdrawal of a large number of American troops from NATO; and that our works here at home can begin, regardless of these diplomatic appraisals. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to give this resolution their most thoughtful consideration.

COLLEGE STUDENT FINANCIAL PROVISION CHANGES

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that the President has transmitted to the Congress his proposed changes in college student financial aid provisions. Those recommendations, contained in the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 1971, would guarantee for the first time in history that every qualified student would have sufficient resources to attend college, regardless of family income. This legislation is similar to that which I introduced earlier this year along with my good friend and colleague, JOHN ERLBORN. I believe the concept is an important one and I am delighted that the President has given his endorsement to it.

The goal of providing sufficient resources for all students to attend college would be accomplished by providing grants and subsidized loans to those students whose families can least afford to aid them through school. Through those means, plus a new program of "cost of education" loans for those students who choose to attend one of our more expensive schools, every student will be assured free choice of attending any institution for which he qualifies.

Children from middle- and upper middle-income families would also be assured that aid would be available to them if needed. An additional \$1 billion in insured loans should become available next year as a result of the creation of the National Student Loan Association. This mechanism would serve as a secondary market for student loan paper and would buy such paper from banks and other eligible lenders. In turn, these lenders would use the proceeds of sales to the National Student Loan Association to make further loans.

The President's recommendations recognize that in a time of fiscal stringency the Federal Government should make its support available to the most needy, since those who are relatively well off may find alternate methods of assistance from non-Federal sources.

At the same time, it assures that those who are not among the "most needy" but who definitely need financial assistance to complete their education will be provided for as well.

I know that many of us are receiving letters daily from parents who urge us to do something to increase Federal sup-

port for higher education. I believe that the President's proposals represent an answer that makes sense and that is fiscally responsible. For these reasons, I would urge my colleagues to give the legislation their closest scrutiny and to act as soon as possible on this measure.

AND NOW, "PROTECTIVE ENCIRCLEMENT"

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, American ground combat forces are going into Laos to help rescue air crews marooned there—crews shot down or pinned down by enemy fire. These missions—missions that plainly violate the Cooper-Church amendment—are hard to challenge since their sole apparent goal is to save American lives clearly in peril. Still, Mr. Speaker, they establish a precedent that is chilling in implication.

The cryptic phrase U.S. military commanders have invented to describe the missions, "protective encirclement," is too reminiscent of other military phrases that have misled us in the past. Once "protective encirclement" becomes a comfortably familiar piece of military jargon, an inviting opportunity would arise to use the phrase as a subterfuge for expanded American ground missions in Laos.

A New York Times editorial published yesterday discusses this danger.

Mr. Speaker, I put the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

UP THE ESCALATOR

It is difficult to deny the right of military commanders to send American ground combat troops into Laos if necessary to help effect the rescue of American pilots who are downed there while supporting South Vietnamese forces in the southern panhandle.

But it is absurd to assert, as officials in Saigon and Washington have done, that such action would not represent a violation of Congressional restrictions on American combat operations in Laos. Despite official denials, the introduction of American ground combat troops into Laos under any circumstances would represent a change of policy that could perilously increase United States involvement in the widening war in Indochina.

To describe such rescue operations as "protective encirclement" is to indulge in a familiar semantic subterfuge. The phrase recalls the "protective reaction" sophistry that has been employed to cover air attacks against North Vietnam that clearly have gone beyond the avowed purpose of retaliation against missile batteries. If "protective encirclement" is accepted today for the limited, humanitarian purpose ascribed to it, it will be only a matter of time before these "rescue forces" are engaged in wider operations.

The whole history of the Indochina conflict, beginning with the use of "noncombat" advisers, is one of major escalations growing out of relatively minor increments in the American commitment, made to appear innocent by deceptive phraseology. "Protective encirclement," like the "incursion" it supports, is another step up the escalator.

STATUS REPORT ON NASA INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS IN SPACE COMMUNICATIONS

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments, of which I am chairman, has in the previous 2 years held hearings on foreign policy aspects of satellite communications and space broadcasting.

Those hearings have proved to be valuable in terms of their impact on the policies and procedures of the executive branch, on the understanding of Members of Congress, and on the education of the public to the opportunities and problems presented by space communications.

Because of the subcommittee's continuing interest, relevant agencies were asked to provide the subcommittee with reports on the status of international projects in space communications.

The report prepared by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has now been received. It describes in some detail the United States-India instructional television experiment—SITE—the Brazil-United States educational television proposal, and the proposed Canada-United States communications technology satellite—CTS—project.

In January 1970, members of the subcommittee conducted a study mission to Latin America on developmental television.

During that visit we had an opportunity to visit the Brazilian Commission for Space Activities—CNAE. We were impressed with the dynamism of its director, Dr. Fernando de Mendonca, and the quality of his staff and facilities.

Upon its return, the study mission recommended in its report that the United States should encourage and support the work of CNAE.

It is gratifying, therefore, to note that NASA has decided to allow CNAE to make use of the ATS-F satellite for certain experiments, to the extent possible.

Because of the importance of the projects outlined in the NASA status report, I am inserting it in the RECORD at this point and urge the attention of colleagues to it.

I include the material, as follows:

STATUS REPORT ON NASA INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS IN SPACE COMMUNICATIONS

NASA currently is engaged in or considering three major international cooperative efforts in space communications technology development. Two of these, the agreed Indian Satellite Instructional Television Experiment (SITE) and the proposed Brazilian educational television project (SACI), were described in detail during last year's hearings. The third effort, now under discussion with the Canadian Department of Communications (DOC), is a proposed communications technology satellite (CTS). In addition, to these cooperative projects, NASA will launch a Canadian domestic operational communications satellite (ANIK) on a reimbursable basis. The following summarizes the status of each of these projects.

INDIAN-UNITED STATES SATELLITE INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION EXPERIMENT (SITE)

As described in the 1970 hearings before the Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Developments of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, this experiment is made possible by the development of the ATS-F and G satellites. The ATS series will have considerably more power than earlier satellites in the ATS series. As a consequence, while performing a wide range of other experiments of U.S. interest, these satellites can also be used for an extensive ground experiment in community broadcasting. India will contribute this ground experiment with her own resources. Under a Memorandum of Understanding with the Indian Department of Atomic Energy, dated September 1969, NASA will make the ATS-F satellite available to India for one year in 1974, approximately a year after launch, to test satellite TV community broadcasting in an operational setting. A total of some 5000 remote Indian villages will participate in the experiment, 2000 of which will be equipped with augmented receivers for direct TV reception, while the others will receive programs relayed from ground stations. India is assuming responsibility for the instructional ground transmitters, the design and production of augmented TV receivers, the planning and content of instructional programs, and the logistics to support and coordinate all the elements of the system.

During 1970 a Joint Working Group of NASA and the Indian Space Research Organization (ISRO), established by the Memorandum of Understanding to coordinate the execution of their respective responsibilities, met three times—in India in July and at the Goodard Space Flight Center in April and December.

On the U.S. side, a major milestone was passed with the selection of Fairchild-Hiller as the ATS-F/G spacecraft contractor. A letter contract for spacecraft hardware development was awarded January 28, 1971. In late 1970 it was decided to locate the spacecraft at 35° E during the time of the SITE experiment to provide higher elevation angles for village antennas pointed at ATS-F and to permit village clusters in the hilly region in Eastern India to participate in the experiment. This location will also be advantageous from the viewpoint of carrying out other scientific and technological experiments on the spacecraft.

On the Indian side, a significant build-up in (ISRO) project staff began, and technical liaison personnel began to arrive at NASA for on-the-job assignments in the ATS Project Office and other units concerned with project implementation. At year's end there were four engineers working on various technical aspects of the spacecraft. During 1971, additional personnel will arrive to work with NASA spacecraft operations and control personnel and with NASA engineers responsible for the U.S. TRUST experiment (Television Relay Using Small Terminals).

Design work began in India on the village receiver "front-end" augmentation—the receiving antenna and the pre-amplifier-modulation converter. Three ten-foot diameter parabolic antenna designs were developed by Indian groups. Engineering models were fabricated with local Indian materials and performance measurements were made. A final choice among three designs is expected in 1971. The principal effort on the pre-amplifier-modulation converter has been a survey of the various design approaches developed outside India, coupled with a determination of component requirements and costing. Fabrication of breadboard models will take place during 1971 and a final system design will be completed. A major effort on solid-state TV set design was initiated involving about 35 Indian engineers and technicians. Laboratory units will be fabricated and evaluated in 1971.

ISRO completed plans for the development, augmentation or modification of satellite

ground stations at Srinegar, Delhi, Bombay-Poona, and Ahmedabad. The main up-link terminal for program transmission at Ahmedabad is being expanded with assistance of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and the International Telecommunications Union (ITU).

Draft operational plans for the conduct of the SITE experiment were drawn up by both NASA and ISRO. Comments on these and the Indian specifications for the small terminal ground stations are being formulated and will be discussed at the next Joint Workers Group meeting scheduled for mid-March in India.

The Indian Government has allocated \$850,000 in foreign exchange, which will meet all near-term ISRO needs for the project.

Finally, considerable progress in India was made toward developing a unified plan for a purely Indian follow-on operational satellite system. This is not part of the cooperative effort with NASA but will utilize much of the experience gained from the SITE project. A design study was completed by a joint M.I.T./Indian study team for an operational satellite concept. A total system study is planned in 1971 incorporating all aspects of the space and ground segments. Extensive contracting by India in the U.S. would be involved—mainly for a first satellite and its launching.

BRAZIL-UNITED STATES EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION PROPOSAL

Project SACI (Advanced Satellite for Interdisciplinary Communications) is a Brazilian program consisting of three phases: Phase 1—a voice, data link, and slow scan TV experiment, utilizing the ATS-III satellite by the Brazilian Commission for Space Activities (CNAE) and Stanford University; Phase 2—a demonstration broadcast experiment from the ATS-F satellite to 500 (or more) instructional centers in the state of Rio Grande do Norte; Phase 3—a nation-wide broadcast via a Brazilian-owned and operated educational satellite.

For Phase 1, it was agreed in July 1970 that NASA would provide access to the ATS-III satellite VHF transponder for a cooperative experiment involving two-way voice and data transmissions between Stanford University and CNAE for up to six hours a week for 3-6 months. This experiment is expected to begin shortly.

For Phase 2, CNAE proposed to NASA, in May 1970, the use of ATS-F for project SACI. NASA considers the proposal technically viable and desirable as a possible cooperative project. Accommodation of the Brazilian experiment must be arranged in consonance with the schedule requirements of the U.S. experiments and the prior agreement with India. Following these requirements, we would hope to make ATS-F available for Project SACI unless the satellite encounters some difficulty or a higher priority experiment intervenes.

PROPOSED CANADA-UNITED STATES COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY SATELLITE (CTS) PROJECT

In this project, presently rapidly approaching an agreement with the Canadian Department of Communications (DOC), NASA would launch a Communications Technology Satellite (CTS) into a geostationary orbit position in late 1974 for experimentation directly with earth stations in Canada and the United States. The CTS satellite would be substituted for the fifth satellite in the Alouette/ISIS series as a continuation of the successful collaboration with Canada begun with Alouette I in 1962.

The overall objective of the CTS project is to advance the state of the art in spacecraft and related ground-based technologies relevant to communications and other satellite application systems. The satellite will permit broadcast and distribution experimentation at frequencies above 10GHz in both the US and Canada. Under study for CTS experimentation is a broad spectrum of experiments to develop and test tech-

niques for services to small villages, including community TV and audio broadcast, two-way voice communications, and data linking and distribution including facsimile, which would have potential future applications for the US in Alaska and for Canada in its outlying northern areas.

The chief technological objectives of the project are to conduct communications experiments with 12 GHz ground terminals and to develop and flight test:

- (1) a 200-watt superefficiency 12 GHz transmitter tube;
- (2) unfurlable solar arrays at powers of over one kilowatt initial capability;
- (3) liquid metal slip rings;
- (4) an electric propulsion system for spacecraft station keeping; and
- (5) an accurate stabilization system for a spacecraft with flexible extended solar arrays.

NASA responsibilities would include provision of a Thor-Delta class launching, development and test of the superefficiency power tube and spacecraft environmental testing. Canada would fund, develop, and construct all other experiments; Canada would also be responsible for the spacecraft design, fabrication, integration, and systems testing, as well as for tracking, data acquisition and command and control of the spacecraft after it achieves geostationary orbit.

US and Canadian experiments would be conducted on a time-shared basis. All scientific and technical results will be shared and made generally available through publication in established channels. As in the case of other NASA cooperative projects there would be no exchange of funds between the DOC and NASA; each side will pay for its own contribution to the project.

CANADA-US REIMBURSABLE LAUNCHING AGREEMENT

NASA, with State Department concurrence, expects to conclude soon an agreement with TELESAT Canada (Canadian Corporation for Telecommunication by Satellite), a quasi-governmental corporation, for the launching of two domestic communications satellites. On a reimbursable basis, NASA would provide the launch vehicles, related launch services, and some tracking and computer support. The two satellites will be launched from the Eastern Test Range in the 1973-74 time period.

MARYLAND GI KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, a fine young man from Maryland, Spec. 5 Leonard A. Monnett, was recently killed in action in Vietnam. I would like to commend his courage and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

MARYLAND GI REPORTED KILLED IN WAR

Spec. 5 Leonard A. Monnett, the crew chief of a helicopter, was killed by hostile gunfire while on a mission February 19 near the buffer zone in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Specialist Monnett, 21, was the son of Mr. and Mrs. Norman E. Monnett, of North Branch in Allegany county.

His mother said yesterday that her son attended the North Hill High School until May, 1968.

Specialist Monnett received his basic training at Fort Knox, Ky., and then applied for helicopter training. He was sent to Vietnam

in November, 1968, after receiving his helicopter wings at Fort Rucker, Ala. He re-enlisted last April.

Surviving besides his parents are four sisters, Mrs. Mary Hook, Mrs. Virginia Kready and Mrs. Stella Mae Bauman, of Cumberland, and Miss Barbara Jean Monnett, of North Branch, and three brothers, Paul and Donald E. Monnett, of North Branch, and Frederick E. Monnett, of Greenspring, W. Va.

Services will be held at 2 P.M. Sunday at the James F. Scarpelli funeral establishment, 108 Virginia avenue, Cumberland. Burial will be in the Monnett-Lichleiter cemetery on Route 28, near Ridgely, W. Va.

THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH PLAN

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, President Nixon delivered his health message to Congress and the Nation. His proposals deserve our most serious and thoughtful consideration.

Among the press commentaries on the President's message was the following editorial in the Wall Street Journal of Monday, February 22, which I am certain will be of interest to my colleagues:

HEALTH IN THE BALANCE

"We must try to see to it that our approach to health problems is a balanced approach," said President Nixon in his health message to Congress last week.

If any Congressman, Heaven forbid, should ignore everything else in the message, we would hope he would at least remember those words. Because balance will be all important in deciding whether whatever health laws Congress enacts succeed or fail. There probably would be no health crisis if past legislation had helped more to improve the supply of health services, rather than merely expanding the demand.

By and large, the Nixon strategy is a good one, we think. At the very least, it certainly is far better than some of the alternative proposals that have been made, such as Senator Kennedy's simplistic scheme for creating a vastly expensive, all-encompassing federal health insurance bureaucracy.

The Nixon plan is complex in concept because it is aimed not at revolution but at correcting a whole series of problems and inadequacies in existing health care. It has obviously been the result of a lot of examination and thinking by people who are not simplistic in their approach.

The nation's past failures have resulted largely from stressing expansion of health insurance—which has increased the demand for services—and neglecting expansion and improvement of the services themselves. The result has been to rapidly inflate health costs.

The President's strategy is to fill gaps in present insurance coverage—protections against catastrophic medical bills, for example. But for balance, it calls for a whole series of efforts to match increased demand with better health care delivery. Federal incentives would be used to promote programs that keep people well and encourage them not to use health facilities unnecessarily and that augment the supply of doctors and other kinds of health care personnel.

It is complicated. And each piece of legislation aimed at bringing it about will have to be fought out in Congress under the intense pressures that always surround health legislation. Medical societies and other special interests will be attempting to make

their influence felt. Some groups, such as small businessmen who face an added new cost as a result of the compulsory nature of the President's insurance proposals, will have serious fears about the impact of the program.

But we would urge all these groups to take a long-range view. If the nation's health care dissatisfactions are relieved with relatively moderate and well thought out legislation now, there is far less chance that drastic and ill-considered laws will be passed in the future.

And we would urge Congressmen to resist the temptation to play political games with health. We all know that there are great political possibilities in any field where personal concerns are so intense. But a good many voters also know by now that some of the political approaches of the past have sounded good but have had very bad side effects.

Congress has been presented with an intelligent, broad strategy. To translate it into effective legislation will require further intelligent and honest reasoning.

The most important thing of all, however, is to be sure that any legislation that expands demand for health services is balanced by laws that improve the supply. We hope Congress will keep that in mind.

SUPPORT FOR OUR MANNED SPACE FLIGHT PROGRAM

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, as you and many of my colleagues know, I am a firm supporter of the manned space flight program. It is through the efforts of the Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo projects that the level of our country's technical capabilities have been enhanced.

Recently, I received a letter from one of my constituents regarding the space program and its accomplishments. I would like to quote it here, in part, for your information:

The most significant contribution of the Apollo Program to mankind is the expansion of our knowledge about the universe and this earth.

We, the United States, must demonstrate our strength and dedication to our potential enemies, either by war or some peaceful means. The space program has drawn the best talents of this nation together and shown the world we are powerful and can meet any challenge. In my opinion, this has helped limit our military activities to the small conflicts similar to Korea and Vietnam, instead of a World War III.

Today, your automobile is safer, your home life is more comfortable, and your health services have materially benefited from those things required to make the Apollo Program a success.

Another benefit from space to be considered is that our tax dollars spent on going to the moon provided challenging work for approximately 400,000 people, and almost every penny was spent in this country. These people accomplished the moon landing in addition to making our lives better and safer.

The success of our space program has enhanced our national prestige. Is there a better way to spend our tax dollar and our technical energy?

Indeed, I must agree with Mr. Fowler, the author of this letter, the space pro-

gram has been a strong plus to our country's image and technical resources. Let us hope that we in the Congress continue to support this worthy program.

HEALTH CARE: WHAT REALLY COUNTS?

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, debate is beginning over a dizzying variety of health-care plans now before the Congress. There is no question, of course, that adequate health care is now beyond the reach of many Americans. There is no question, either, about the need for a searching examination of the country's entire health-care system—a system that, despite America's acknowledged leadership in medical care and research, lags behind the systems of other nations in reach and effectiveness.

Medical experts, however, find a puzzling lack of correlation between the quality of health-care systems and health itself. Sweden, for example, has just 83 doctors for every 100,000 people—a startlingly low ratio for an industrialized European state. Yet the death rate for middle-aged men, a vulnerable group in any society, is only half the U.S. rate.

It appears that what really counts in any health-care system is public awareness of good health habits—how to eat prudently, for example, or how to shield your children against the common diseases that prey on the young everywhere.

Such obvious things as a clean environment, decent housing, sanitation, and health education mean more than all the dazzling medical hardware the U.S. technological community can marshal.

And they mean more especially among the poor.

A New York Times article, written by WCBS-TV, New York, science editor Earl Ubell, discusses the need for better health conditions and better health education.

With permission, Mr. Speaker, I put Mr. Ubell's column in the RECORD at this point:

NATIONAL HEALTH: ARE WE SPENDING MONEY FOR THE WRONG CARE?

(By Earl Ubell)

In the Congress, last week, the debate sharpened over the ways and means of spending new billions of dollars for the nation's medical care. Yet for a small but increasingly vocal group of economists, sociologists and even physicians, the whole argument seemed somewhat beside the point. More doctors and hospital beds for the millions, they believe, will do little to reduce serious illness or prevent premature deaths.

Health leaders testifying before the Senate Health Subcommittee were arguing the merits of four plans. President Nixon wants a national insurance program that will be paid for by the individual, his employer and—in small part—by Government. The American Medical Association has submitted a similar plan. Senator Edward Kennedy wants the Government to pay the bill. Senator Ja-

cob Javits seeks to extend the present health insurance for the aged to everyone.

Under such programs, the disease-care industry is likely to grow from its present \$60-billion a year to \$75-billion or even \$100-billion, making it the biggest business in America. So far the major argument has been over the means of financing—government or private—and, peripherally, over ways of restructuring our medical panopoly to provide care that is "better," less expensive and more evenly distributed.

But there is increasing evidence that the medical complex, no matter how restructured or paid for, may be irrelevant to the central health issue. Thus, for example, Dr. Eli Ginzberg, Columbia University economist, points out that, "Despite the substantial increases in expenditures for medical care, there has been no significant increase in male longevity during the past decade." And Dr. Victor Fuchs, another economist, comments: "My reading of the health literature leaves me with the impression that the greatest potential for improving the health of the American people is not to be found in increasing the number of physicians, or forcing them into groups or even in increasing hospital productivity, but is to be found in what people do for themselves."

Both views depend on two self-evident axioms. First, the doctor is helpless before ailments that account for most of the sickness and death in America—heart, kidney and blood vessel ailments, cancer, alcohol and drug abuse, accidents and the general debilitations of age. Even though he can cite individual instances of spectacular cure or life saving, in general he palliates. He reaches the patient with too much medical care too late.

As a corollary, even when doctors get there early, the statistics show little change. At least four studies have indicated that annual physical check-ups do not decrease mortality or morbidity.

A second axiom states that in the modern world, housing, nutrition, accident prevention, sanitation—clean water, food, streets and homes—have produced more health than all the doctors and hospitals combined. Recognizing this, the Community Medicine Department of Mount Sinai Hospital is developing a corps of "super" superintendents to repair toilets, clean out rat and vermin infested basements and maintain deteriorated housing in the slums. These men, it is felt, will produce more health than an equivalent number of doctors and nurses.

Dr. Nathan Glazer, the sociologist, argues further in the current issue of The Public Interest that our personal, psychological and cultural milieu—i.e., the way we have learned to take care of ourselves—may be as important as better environmental conditions and certainly more important than doctors and doctoring.

He points to a curious set of statistics: Sweden has 83 doctors per 100,000 population but it has half the death rate among middle-aged men as the United States, with 140 doctors per 100,000. Furthermore, Americans go to their doctors twice as often as Swedes do. Even within the United States, the wide variations of doctor availability do not seem to have any correlation with health. Rather, health indexes seem more related to poverty levels within states than to numbers of doctors.

Many blame the current financial medical crisis on the inefficient system and they want to improve its efficiency so it delivers more medical care for the dollar. The Kaiser-Permanente Plan and the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York (HIP), both prepaid insurance plans with doctors working in groups, are one approach to increased efficiency. President Nixon is pushing for establishment of such "health maintenance organizations." But though they can cite statisti-

cal evidence showing lower death rates among their members than among users of other kinds of insurance plans, they have been unable to untangle those figures from social and economic patterns of their patients. Thus, maternal mortality rates among blacks in the two plans are lower than those for blacks outside the plans—but higher than those for whites within the plans.

If the critics are right, the new insurance programs, if passed, will serve mainly to drive up demand for health care—which will in turn drive up costs, thereby consuming a substantial portion of our national talent and treasure—and there will be little improvement in the mortality and morbidity statistics to show for it. The alternative: Put more effort into traditional areas of nutrition, housing and sanitation, especially among the poor. And break new ground with non-medical preventive measures—campaigns for auto and home safety, massive anti-cigarette, anti-alcohol, anti-drug programs, and high-powered educational schemes to teach us to take care of ourselves.

CAPITOL MUST BE PROTECTED

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, if any doubt existed about the intentions of a small radical minority in this country, the bombing of the U.S. Capitol this morning should erase it.

Let us look at their record.

In the 15-month period between January 1969 and April 1970, this country suffered a total of 4,330 bombings, 1,475 attempted bombings, and 35,129 threatened bombings. This cruel form of terrorism accounted directly for the deaths of 40 people and for \$21.8 million in property damage. Countless others were put in imminent danger of physical injury or death.

It is apparent that the neo-fascists have decided to extend the violence to our governmental institutions.

We have laws on the books to deal with this type activity. If they are not adequate, we can pass remedial legislation.

In the meantime, we must take action to prevent a recurrence of what happened early this morning.

The American people place a very deep obligation on Congress to protect this building which is our symbol of freedom. It belongs not only to the present and to the future but to the past.

The bombing this morning indicates we have not taken adequate precautions. Therefore, I strongly urge the leaders of both parties, Democrats as well as Republicans, to institute measures that will prevent a recurrence. Perhaps measures such as have been taken at airports to prevent hijackings will be necessary. Perhaps restrictions will have to be made on entry with packages and suitcases.

I fully realize that any restrictions will be onerous, time-consuming, and inconvenient. Nevertheless, adequate precautions must be taken.

The American people will demand them.

WHO PAYS FOR POSTAGE?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, through the confrontation-prone news media we learn that the postal hike from 6 to 8 cents will be opposed in hearings urged by the taxpayer-subsidized mailers. As usual, the average American, who is the only one that pays postage, can expect not to be represented or heard.

Contrary to popular misconception by many citizens, postage and fees collected by the Postmaster do not go to run the Post Office—they go to the Treasury for deposit. All operating costs and salaries for the Post Office Department are paid for by the taxpayers. The Postal Department realizes nothing from postage increases, money orders, and the like—the Post Office does not keep its receipts. Increased postage is but another tax on users.

Who, then, pays postage?

We in Congress have a franking privilege for free postage, as do most governmental agencies. The principal bulk users of the mails are newspapers, magazines, direct mailers, and businesses—including doctors, lawyers, nonprofit institutions, tax-free groups, and professions.

Many of the bulk and news mailers are given reduced rates—which they pay—and as every business and profession using postage, they deduct the postage as an operating expense item from the quarterly income tax payment. This means businesses and professions pay and then deduct. So long as they realize a profit to deduct postage costs from, they pay no postage. It is more or less an out of one pocket into the other pocket arrangement.

This leaves us to conclude that the only Americans who pay postage—a tax toward reimbursing the Treasury for the tremendous cost of the postal service—are the average Americans. Those who write letters for personal use such as the farmer, the worker, the housewife, and the retired person are the ones who cannot deduct their postage as a cost of doing business. They are a part of the same minority which starts out paying for the appropriations for the postal service in the first place through income taxes. As such, on some, postage is a double tax.

Thus it appears, regardless of the postage rate, that we are granting special privilege in postage to some by discriminating against the nonbusiness mail user.

I include a related news clipping, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 27, 1971]

PLANNED POSTAGE BOOSTS BRING CALLS FOR HEARINGS

(By Philip Shandler)

Some 50 requests, mostly from commercial mailers, for a chance to be heard on proposed increases in postage rates have been filed with the new Postal Rate Commission.

Most of the petitioners oppose some or all of the boosts asked early this month to provide additional \$1.45 billion in postal revenue during the fiscal year that starts next July 1.

Other groups indicated they would analyze the proposals later, at hearings to be scheduled by the rate commission.

The Postal Service intends to raise all rates about May 15 by approximately a third, pending consideration by the commission of proposals for larger increases projected over the next several years.

The most substantial boosts would be for publications and records, in second and fourth class. The first class letter rate is scheduled to rise from 6 to 8 cents.

The National Association of Greeting Card Publishers, in its petition, proposes raising the first-class rate to 7 cents, with "substantially higher" second and third-class rates.

Also opposing the proposed first-class increase is Elmer Cerin, a Washington lawyer and former postal official. He is the only individual petitioner.

Former Att. Gen. Ramsey Clark has entered a petition on behalf of the Book of the Month Club, and former Postmaster General J. Edward Day is representing the Associated Third Class Mail Users.

The opposition includes charges that the Post Office has not properly assigned its costs among the different classes of mail, or has not adequately considered the value of some services provided by the mailers.

IN COMMEMORATION OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanians form one of the oldest and smallest nationality groups in northeastern Europe. Their long and glorious history dates to the late middle ages on when they created a Lithuanian Kingdom which extended from the Baltic to the Black Sea and constituted a decisive factor in East European history.

Then, toward the end of the 18th century, when the rising Russian Empire grew strong and aggressive, Lithuania's power diminished and the country became part of Russia.

In 1918 they regained their freedom and on February 16 of that year they proclaimed their national independence.

Thenceforth for a little more than two decades, during the interwar years, they lived in peace and were happy in their liberated homeland. This relatively brief period forms the happiest interlude in the modern national history of the Lithuanian people.

Having recreated and rebuilt their war-torn country, and having put their house in order, they evolved a truly democratic way of life. This happy period was ended by the changing world situation and the approaching war in the late 1930's. Soon after the outbreak of the war, Lithuania was left alone to deal with its giant neighbor, the Soviet Union. First, the Soviets imposed harsh terms by "mutual alliance treaties" upon Lithuania. Next, Soviet troops were stationed in all parts of the country, which was finally completely annexed.

Since those sad days Lithuanian independence has vanished; it now lives only in the hearts and minds of liberty-

loving Lithuanians. Today, some 3 million Lithuanians live under the unrelenting regime imposed upon them by the Soviet Union. Despite continued oppression, the stout-hearted people of Lithuania have not given up their hopes for freedom and independence. On the 53d anniversary of their Independence Day, which was celebrated on February 16, 1971, freedom-loving people the world over saluted the Lithuanians for their continuing dream of independence.

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

HON. JOHN DOWDY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a most heartwarming speech written by Barry A. Hays, a student at Lufkin High School, Tex., and the Texas State winner in the Voice of Democracy Contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary. Over 400,000 school students participated in this script-writing contest, and the State winners will be brought to Washington, D.C., as VFW guests for the final judging. I believe Barry's essay captures the feeling we all experience when we say we love America and the freedom for which it stands. Freedom is our heritage, and I wish to share the following outstanding challenge for our youth to cherish and perpetuate that heritage, and make us a more prosperous nation:

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

The United States of America—people banded together by a common dream and striving for the same glorious ideals of freedom and justice for all. Two hundred years ago, our nation was an experiment in individual freedom, and today it remains just such an experiment. From its inception, our nation has been ridiculed by those who said that our republic would not succeed. Today we still must work to prove that our ideals are feasible, for even now there are those, both within and without the United States, who challenge its power to sustain. If we accept the privilege of living in this free society, it is our responsibility to defend it by proving wrong those who state that the United States cannot survive.

But what is this freedom that we all talk about? Some persons, particularly those of my generation, would define freedom as the right to do anything one wants to do. And they would, in a sense, be correct. Every law, every ideal, every belief of the American way is based upon the premise that one has the right to do whatever he wants to do, so long as it does not infringe upon that same right of the majority. One does not have the right to rob a bank simply because he wants or needs money, for in so doing he would be depriving others of their right to save the money for which they have worked. It ceases to be one's right to drink oneself into an unwitting stupor, when behind the wheel of a car he deprives thousands of people each year of their right to live in safety. That one has nothing better to do than to disrupt the campus of an American college does not mean that such is his right, for in his disruption he encroaches upon the right of the majority of students to the education for which they have paid.

Similarly, no matter how loudly one cries that his motives are pure, our nation cannot tolerate wanton destruction and murder such as has been seen recently in the bombings at Michigan State University and at the oil refinery in Linden, New Jersey. Ignoring crimes, treachery, and treason in the name of freedom can result only in anarchy. As Americans, we must all work to protect our society from those forces which seek its destruction, and, at the same time, we must strive to improve America through logical, far-sighted change.

Those who would tell us that peaceful change is impossible—those who cry, "Burn, baby, burn!" delude their followers. Common sense tells us that destruction of the most successful system of government in its most fruitful era cannot in any way be construed as "improvement."

My generation is eager to see change and improvement, but it is unfortunate that our zeal often is channeled down the wrong course by those who scream about problems but offer no pragmatic solution. The older generation expresses great concern over the apparent lack of patriotism and the seemingly absent appreciation of freedom of the younger persons of America. But they must try to understand that we have grown up in a stable environment; we have never seen a world war, nor have we seen a Great Depression; we have not lived through the periods which have challenged America and unified our nation. The dissent which is seen among young people today cannot be attributed, as some would say, to the fact that we don't know any better. Not at all. It is because we don't know any worse! Young people simply cannot comprehend the hard times that the United States has faced. Our nation has not wavered in our lifetime. Our freedom never has been threatened.

The concern of most young Americans is not to pull our nation out of hard times. Today's younger generation of Americans is concentrating on improvement of the most perfect society ever seen by man. Our efforts cannot be perfect, for we are human. But on the foundation laid for us by two centuries of patriots, and with the help of God, we will present to our children a greater, more prosperous nation and the heritage of freedom with which we began.

FRANKFORD HIGH SCHOOL— CITY CHAMPIONS

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, at its January 25 meeting, the Philadelphia Board of Education commended the Frankford High School championship soccer team, Coach Walter Bahr and Principal James A. Killough. The team which won the Public League championship and tied Northeast Catholic to share the city championship was cited for: outstanding accomplishment in having completed an undefeated season; the display of outstanding competitive spirit in its desire to become champions; and its dedication, discipline, and good sportsmanship.

Members of the 1970 varsity squad were: Joseph Appiotti, Waldir Cavalcanti, Mark Cumberland, Paul Francis, Forrest Hartman, William Hey, Kenneth Keller, Wayne Krause, Edward Leigh, Jerry MacWilliams, Davis Mathes, Peter Maxwell, Conrad Nagle, Joseph Steffler, Gary

Wainwright, Michael Wistner, Hank Wiese, and Lewis Wolf with Edward Garofalo serving as manager.

In addition to the 1970 championships, Frankford High School's soccer teams were both Public League and city champions 4 of the 6 preceding years.

JOHN N. HARMAN, COLORADO'S STATE WINNER IN VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conducts a nationwide Voice of Democracy Contest. This year more than 400,000 high school students participated in the contest, the theme of which was "Freedom—Our Heritage."

It gives me great pleasure to report that one of my constituents, 16-year-old John N. Harman, of Colorado Springs, was the winning contestant in the State of Colorado.

Mr. Harman is an outstanding young American. One of four children, his father is a U.S. Air Force dentist and his mother is a teacher. John was president of his junior high school class for 2 years and president of his junior high school council. He is vice president of the Student Council at Air Academy High School in Colorado Springs, a member of the varsity football team, an Eagle Scout and junior assistant scoutmaster and youth representative on the Christian Social Action Committee while maintaining a 3.5 grade average in his academic work. He hopes to attend the Air Force Academy following graduation from high school.

Along with the winners from the other States of the Union he will come to Washington as the guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for the final judging on March 9, 1971.

I am most pleased to include the text of his winning speech in the Record:

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

In spite of what idealists would presume to believe, "Freedom" is not our heritage—neither does it or has it ever been a perpetually inherent part of any other culture. Freedom is not already there, but the striving for freedom was the beginning of a dream called America.

One of the most misused words in today's vocabulary seems to be freedom. The definition of freedom is the equality of opportunity for every individual, regardless of race, religion, or sex; to develop his personal potential to the highest degree that his ambition will carry him. According to this definition, then, all people in America are not free. There never has been a society of complete freedom known to man. There are still people who are slaves of bigotry—the attitude of some people that the quality of a man's mind is determined by the length of his hair; sexual bias—because women, as heads of families in poverty, are earning approximately \$1,000 less per year than men in the same occupation with equivalent background.

Concerning the question of religion, it's an interesting paradox that the true concepts of Christian neighborly tolerance for that familiar phrase "my brother" has begun to come now when reports say religious involvement in America is at an all time low. Realistically, these conditions do exist, and to ignore them would be true ignorance.

John F. Kennedy stated once, "I am an idealist, without illusions." This is also my personal attitude in viewing the unfreedoms which now exist. But learning to live without illusions and facing reality, I realize the futility of living without ideals.

The most important thing to remember is that while these inequalities do exist, there is no other country in the world where the people who do not have all the benefits of our affluent society can work to improve their conditions. We are guaranteed the right to strive for our freedoms.

These guarantees were not inherent and, as such, the cost of preserving these grantees has been the epitome in dedication of many men and women. Knowing our society was not perfect, that there were people without full freedoms, that there were paradoxes and biases, why, then, would they sacrifice their lives. Because they believed in the foundations of American democracy as a guarantee that all people could develop their full potential. Yet . . . are these foundations still a viable means of change. Yes, because this is our heritage! using the constitution and working within the framework of our government structure to alleviate the inequalities which exist as the acceptance of working with what we have to make something that's good, even better. In the initial break with the English in 1776 we still retained many of the English traditions, adopted them to our new way of life. It is imperative that we hold on to our framework, our heritage not as a root which digs deeper into itself and never sees the light of a new day, but as an anchor—one which can be used to keep us from straying and getting lost but still, when we desire it, lets us move ahead.

Our heritage includes the use of our rights as tools to gain greater extensions of the freedoms that are available.

Heritage is a rational dividend, not a way of life.

In 1858, Ernest Renan, famous French philosopher, warned the French against freedom which pretended to base itself on the principles of reasoning alone, and not tradition.

A liberal school errs in believing that it is easy to create freedom, by reasoning alone. It doesn't realize that enduring freedom can spring only from historical roots.

Let's not waste these rights by thinking we can improve freedom by destroying its anchor. Out of the revolution of the 1970s, let's bring a nation of concerned people with realistic far-sighted determination to make the United States greater than the hallmark our forefathers granted us.

Our Heritage is not freedom, but the striving for freedom.

SCIENCE SEARCH REAPS RESULTS

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, Florida was honored to place a large and versatile group among the winners of the 30th annual Science Talent Search for the Westinghouse Science Scholarships and Awards, 1971.

Among those to achieve this significant honor for high school students were five young men and women from the Greater Miami area. I would like to enter into the *RECORD* the names of these winners and the title of the projects that brought them personal distinction and their schools national recognition. These winners were:

Mr. Glenn Michael Greenwald, 17, 1510 NW 134th Street, of North Miami Senior High School for his project: "Thermal Pollution Effect on *Thalassia*."

Miss Ofelia Martinez, 17, 93 NW 17th Pl., of Miami Senior High School for "A Study of Reaction Rates of Hemoglobin With Oxygen and Cyanide."

Miss Stellan Sven Ostlund, 17, 6822 Camarin St., of Coral Gables High School for "A Computer Subroutine for Contour Plotting."

Mr. Roger Ronald Perry, 16, 302 NE 100th St., of Archbishop Curley High School for "Analysis of a Pendulum With a Barrier."

Miss Maria Elena Quiroz, 17, 5900 W. 12th Ave., of Hialeah High School for "Potentiating Effects of DMSO Upon the Fungicidal Action of Benlate."

All Greater Miamians share my pride in the outstanding achievements of these outstanding students.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS SUPPORT ANGELA DAVIS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, that we may better understand the depth to which education has sunk in our Nation's Capital, we need only reflect on the recent activities of the American Federation of Teachers in a local District of Columbia elementary school lounge.

The Washington Teachers' Union bulletin board is reported to have carried a large picture poster of Angela Davis, bearing the slogan "Free Angela Davis."

On orders of the city school administration, the school principal tore down the poster and the teachers have now filed a formal grievance defending the poster display as being union business.

The school administration reportedly intends to test whether union business includes support of known Communist subversives on the premises of tax supported educational institutions.

Should anyone wonder why so many of the District of Columbia children make up in revolutionary causes and slogans for what they lack in education, one need only consider the caliber and motives of those local teachers who subscribe to overthrowing our Government. At least it was not defended as academic freedom—yet.

I include the article as follows:

TEACHERS PROTEST ACTION ON POSTER
(By Robert F. Levey)

One day last week, a Washington elementary school principal walked into the teachers' lounge and tore down from the Washington Teachers' Union bulletin board a poster that bore the slogan, "Free Angela Davis," superimposed over a picture of Miss Davis.

That action, ordered by the principal's supervisors in the city school administration, led to a formal grievance filed this week by the union.

The union contends that the principal violated the union contract, which guarantees the union's right to place anything that is "union business" on its bulletin boards.

The administration, according to Supt. Hugh Scott, contends that "it is time to test just what 'union business' means."

The union had unanimously approved a resolution at its January meeting to lead a local fund-raising effort that would "guarantee due process for a beautiful black sister, Angela Davis."

Miss Davis, an avowed Communist and revolutionary, is awaiting trial in California on charges that she bought guns that were later used in a Marin County court house kidnapping in which three persons, including a judge, were fatally shot.

Shortly after its January meeting, the union began to pin up large Davis posters on its bulletin boards in most of the city's schools, according to Charles Cheng, union vice president.

Most boards are in teacher lounges, where students are not permitted and could not have seen the posters, Cheng said.

The union also began selling posters and "Free Angela" buttons for between 25 cents and \$1 at its downtown headquarters. Proceeds have gone to the D.C. Area Committee to Free Angela Davis. So far, about \$150 has been collected, sources said.

"We're not going off on some wild radical trip," Cheng said. "After all, Angela is one of us. She's an AFT (American Federation of Teachers) member in California. And this local here has been involved in antiwar and social issues for a long time."

Scott said in a telephone interview yesterday that he had asked the D.C. corporation counsel to study the union's contract to see if "a poster like this would be protected."

Scott said that he did not personally give the order for the one poster to be taken down and that he has "mixed feelings" about the charges against Miss Davis.

He added, however, that he "fully supports the judgment" of Dorothy L. Johnson, assistant superintendent for elementary education, who he said gave the order.

THE GIFT OF GIVING

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, in 40 years of public life I have met men and women from all walks and stations in life. Occasionally, I was fortunate to meet that remarkable individual for whom the pleasure of giving to others was its own reward.

Such a unique man is Chuck Zink, host of a children's program—"Skipper Chuck's Popeye Playhouse"—broadcast over WTVJ, channel 4, in Miami.

For the past 3 years, Chuck Zink has promoted "Carnivals Against Muscular Dystrophy" on this station. During that period, his efforts have resulted in the raising of much-needed funds in Miami to help advance the research and patient service programs of the Muscular Dystrophy Associations of America, Inc.

"Carnivals" is a project whereby the hosts of television shows invite young viewers to write for free kits which explain how funds can be raised to help children afflicted with muscular dystrophy.

The kits contain all elements needed to produce a carnival which the youngsters conduct in their own backyards. In 1970, boys and girls across the Nation held 22,383 backyard carnivals, raising more than \$500,000 for victims of muscular dystrophy. More than \$13,000 was collected in Miami.

Identification with such projects are nothing new to Chuck Zink. For many years this remarkable man has brought joy and laughter to children and passed on his sense of compassion for the less fortunate. That, Mr. Speaker, is a great gift.

NIXON'S GOAL IN VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, two editorials in the Detroit Free Press last week poked some significant holes in the curtain of confusion that President Nixon has drawn around this Nation's meanderings in the morass of Southeast Asia.

The first, on February 22, reads between some of the lines of President Nixon's press conference on that date. It demonstrates that the President still has not given up his goal of a military victory in Southeast Asia—a goal that the rest of the country has long since abandoned.

The second editorial, on February 25, points out the cruel hoax that President Nixon has played on the American people in regard to Americans held prisoner by the Communists. The President has stated that American troops will remain in Southeast Asia until the prisoners are released, although it has become obvious to everyone else that they will not be released until our troops are out of Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I insert both editorials in the *RECORD* at this point, and suggest that my colleagues take note of their message.

I include the articles as follows:

NIXON'S PURSUIT OF VICTORY FORGETS LESSON
OF HISTORY

Vietnamization takes on a new and ominous cast in the light of President Nixon's press conference Wednesday. It means far more than turning the war over to the improved South Vietnamese.

It also means more than the Wild West metaphor of one White House aide: "He's backing out of the saloon with both guns blazing."

What it seems to mean is that President Nixon intends to insure not only the safe withdrawal of American troops from the Asian mainland, but a determination that a military victory will be won—not only in South Vietnam, but in Cambodia as well.

From first-hand reports, Mr. Nixon was relaxed and thoughtful at his impromptu press conference. He had no television cameras to demand instant response, or reporters knocking each other down for a moment in the spotlight. Therefore it can be assumed that the President said exactly what he meant to say. The official text, in fact, shows where he corrected himself or sharpened his meaning.

It certainly was not necessary to invade Laos to withdraw American troops, any more than it was necessary to invade Cambodia last year. The decline in American casualties since the Cambodian invasion reflects only

that the war has shifted westward, and that the natives are doing the fighting instead of the Americans. So far, more than 20,000 Cambodians have been killed, by the most reliable estimates.

Further, the President seems determined that the war will be fought roughly along the 17th Parallel. He issued stern warnings against any contemplated North Vietnamese invasion across the DMZ, and put no limits on the possible use of American airpower.

What the President seems to be doing, then, is to carve Indochina along the middle, with the north half ceded to the communists and the southern half protected by the Cambodian and South Vietnamese armies, heavily supported by American airpower.

Once the Ho Chi Minh Trail is severed, there is no end to it. There is another trail 25 miles west. And beyond that, on the border between Laos and Thailand, is the Mekong River.

At the least, the invasion will have to go to the river. And considering that the northernmost provinces of Thailand have been in revolt against Bangkok for years, the line could continue on westward across Thailand until the whole peninsula is severed.

If there is any conclusion in Mr. Nixon's battle plan, which could conceivably succeed in a purely military sense, it is that Mr. Nixon is still thinking as he did in his Cold Warrior days, when an expansionist China had to be stopped, and President Eisenhower stopped it at the 38th Parallel in Korea. Mr. Nixon seems to think it can be stopped at the 17th Parallel on the south.

What reinforces our conclusion is that the invasion of Laos clearly sealed that nation's doom. The Pathet Lao, which already had control of most of the country, has practically been given a free ticket to Luang Prabang and Vientiane.

What then, once the line has been drawn and Mr. Nixon's Koreanization of Indochina deemed a success? Will he have succeeded?

The evidence of history indicates that he will not. Because he is doing just what President Johnson tried to do—to win a political struggle with military means.

As David Anderson pointed out recently in the Wall Street Journal, this can work in highly developed countries. It worked in World War II, it could work in World War III. But we have already dropped more bombs on North Vietnam than we dropped on Germany. We kill people, not economies and industries. And certainly not ideas.

"Indeed," Anderson wrote, "unless a powerful government is willing to exceed all moral restraint, its success in exerting its power in a developing country requires in some degree the consent of that country's residents. This was distinctly lacking for us in much of Vietnam, and our violent potential could do nothing to acquire it."

We will, then, have written off North Vietnam, fiercely independent, to the Chinese. We will have written off Laos. And we will have "saved" South Vietnam and Cambodia from homegrown economic and social revolutions which were long overdue. We will have laid waste at least three countries to maintain our 19th Century concept of Manifest Destiny.

Mr. Nixon, regrettably, has not yet learned that the days of foreign domination of Asia are over. And the cost of the lesson continues to mount.

HANOI, U.S. PLAY WAR GAMES WITH POW'S AS THEIR PAWNS

How many Americans are being held prisoner by Hanoi and how they are treated are questions of obvious concern to every American. Those of us in safe sanctuaries are responsible for them. It is our job, through our federal leaders, to get them back.

It should also concern every American whether we are being told the truth about

the prisoners by our State Department, not only because we have a right to know the truth but also because the Nixon administration is apparently trying to use the prisoners as an excuse to delay final withdrawal of American troops from Indochina.

The charge that the prisoners are being used as pawns of war should not be taken lightly. Seymour Hersh, who reported the details in Sunday's Free Press, is the reporter who first told the shocking story of My Lai. Though the Army is still seeking to evade responsibility, no one has yet found anything Hersh reported about My Lai untrue.

Starting in May of 1969, Hersh says, the administration clearly changed its policy about how to handle U.S. prisoners. The policy had been to try to get them released with quiet diplomacy. But 21 months ago the administration determined, through some unknown method of reasoning, that exerting public pressure on Hanoi was a better course. At least it would focus the charge of war guilt on Hanoi.

The cumulative evidence of the change is shocking. Not only have the people of the country been lied to, but so have the families of the prisoners. As if they had not suffered enough, they were told to play roles they knew were false.

If the policy worked at all, it was in getting Hanoi to identify the prisoners it held. But it put no pressure on Hanoi to end the war. There has certainly been no slackening of North Vietnam's fighting spirit or any appreciable change in world opinion.

What change has come about is that Hanoi has seen the value of the prisoners as a bargaining tool, and the American people have seen the cruel hoax played on them. Late last year Hanoi's delegate at the Paris talks, Xuan Thuy, said that if the U.S. would suggest a "reasonable date" for withdrawal of U.S. troops, "we can immediately consider the American suggestion" to exchange prisoners.

Mr. Nixon's counter two weeks ago, that U.S. forces would be kept in South Vietnam as long as prisoners remain in the north, was no "political statement" to a delegation of wives. He was not "trapped" by the wives, as a State Department spokesman said.

In the first place, Mr. Nixon is too savvy to get trapped that way. He could just as easily have made a general statement of support and determination to get the POWs released.

In the second place, he repeated the vow again last week. As Robert S. Boyd, chief of our Washington bureau, wrote, "Mr. Nixon is asking the communists to surrender their prisoners before the war ends—an unusual step."

If anything good comes of this callous official conduct, it may be because the plan might backfire. The wives, it seems, have come to the conclusion that their husbands will not be freed until the U.S. withdraws. And the wives, disillusioned after being turned on an unsuspecting public by the State Department, are turning now on State.

CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL HALT WAS PERMANENT

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, advocates of the now-discredited Cross-Florida Barge Canal have kept up a continual attack in the hopes of eventually causing President Nixon to reverse his decision halting the project to prevent irreparable damage to the State's environment.

The canal supporters are wasting their time.

The President's halt was permanent. The canal has been reviewed repeatedly; no further review is necessary. The Cross-Florida Barge Canal, quite simply, is dead, dead, dead—as it should be.

The matter now open to discussion is what to do with the area in the future. Some work, I understand, must be done to minimize further environmental damage. Included in this is construction of a highway bridge on State Road 40 near Ocala to assist in reducing the flood hazard.

This work must not be interpreted as an indication that the President might change his mind at a later date and resume the canal project.

In fact, studies are underway to prepare recommendations for the area's future development.

To this activity I would urge all those interested in the canal—pro and con, here and in Florida—to devote their energies. Let us come up with the best possible use for the canal area—best in the interest of all.

Even advocates of the canal, for example, now say that the beautiful Oklawaha River Valley should be preserved for the use and enjoyment of this and future generations of Americans.

The canal has been discussed for 150 years. In early years, the project was rejected on economic and environmental grounds. It was not until World War II that the present project was authorized but no work was done until recent years.

The proponents have had their say all these years. Now, finally, the public is being heard on the Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

Unfortunately, canal advocates seem bent on throwing up smokescreens to hide the fact that a 107-mile ditch across the middle of Florida would do substantial damage to the environment.

The latest stratagem is to charge that President Nixon acted for purely political motives in halting the canal—a project long viewed by many as one of the worst boondoggles in our history.

If it is political to act in the public interest, to recognize that Americans are growing ecologically aware and determined to preserve our great natural heritage—if this is "playing politics," then I pray this Nation's leaders do more of it.

The slick public relations campaign launched by canal advocates is aimed at diverting the attention of the public and the Congress away from two fundamental considerations:

First. The canal will cause substantial damage to the environment of Florida, a State whose economy is largely dependent upon the blessings of nature.

Second. The taxpayer is being asked to foot a \$200-million bill for a project that will not reduce the cost of groceries anywhere in America.

Ironically, those accusing President Nixon of "playing politics" are not above playing that game themselves.

In a personal letter last week, the chairman of the Canal Authority attacks me for presuming, as a freshman Congressman, to state my support of the President's action.

He charges that I am uninformed about the canal and that I have suddenly come out against it to gain personal publicity.

The record clearly indicates that I am not new to the conservation cause: As a Florida State Senator for the past 10 years, I constantly spoke out against the canal for environmental reasons and voted against the appropriation of State funds to carry on the project.

The canal proponents have barraged the public with self-serving statements in recent weeks. I believe it is time that the other side be heard. And this freshman Congressman intend to see that it is.

THE PLIGHT OF NEW ENGLAND FARMERS

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, the Third Congressional District of Massachusetts has a very significant number of dairy, poultry, apple, and vegetable farmers. These hard-working citizens, who are well represented by the Massachusetts Farmers Association, need nonetheless all of the representation and support which their Congressman can give them. I intend to continue to talk with these farmers on a regular basis and to bring their grievances to the appropriate agency of the Federal Government.

At a recent meeting with a very large group of these farmers in my congressional district I was disturbed to learn about the serious difficulties which they face in their daily business. Let me name a few:

First. Farmers from the New England States pay exorbitant freight rates for grain and other feed materials shipped from the Midwest.

Second. In negotiations with milk dealers, farmers are prevented by anti-trust laws from bargaining on a collective basis through their cooperatives and farm organizations—a policy that is especially troublesome for the small producer.

Third. Freight rates on grain are not equitable throughout the East. New England is a grain-dependent region, and annually some 2¼ million tons are shipped to this region, almost all by rail. In comparison with the Southeast, also a grain-dependent region, rates for shipment to New England are considerably higher, and continue to increase faster than in the Southeast. Before 1967, it was at least 48 percent more expensive to get a ton of grain shipped 750 miles to New England. Now it is 50 percent more expensive, and if the proposed 1970-71 increases materialize, this gap will widen to almost 62 percent. That it should cost more to ship a quantity of material to New England in the first place is alarming; that the margin by which it costs more has been accelerating in recent years is intolerable.

Fourth. A related problem further decreases the ability of New England producers to compete effectively. Shippers in

the Southeast allow special rates for large shipments. Rate schedules provide discounts for multiple—5 to 20—car shipments and unit trains—50 to 100 ton cars. This is, of course, a reasonable business practice in light of competition. But the total absence of such incentives for New England farmers has been troublesome for some time. It has been calculated that such inequities result in a cost disadvantage of 1½ cents for a dozen eggs produced in New England.

Fifth. Dairy farmers find unlimited dairy imports very damaging. Besides being heavily subsidized by their own countries, foreign producers do not always have to meet the same standards of herd health, cleanliness, and pesticide control imposed on U.S. dairymen.

Sixth. Federal antitrust laws prevent dairymen from operating through their cooperatives in bargaining with buyers. A good case can be made for granting dairymen collectives the same exemption presently enjoyed by labor unions. As it turns out, it is the small independent farmer who is most affected by these restrictions. Unable to compete with larger chains, the small producer finds the going more difficult every year.

Despite all these difficulties, however, the history of cooperation among farmers has been very bright. In New England, for example, some 95 percent of all dairy farmers operate on a voluntary, collective basis in advertising. The need for the small producer to bargain collectively thus has roots in other efforts that they have made together, short of collective bargaining, to work together for survival.

In summary, the dairy and poultry industry of New England faces difficulties greater than at any time in recent history. The value of this industry to the region can be gaged by the unanimous consent with which the Governors of the six New England States joined together recently to oppose the 15 percent rate increase on freight presently being considered.

I can only begin to convey the urgency that I felt after meeting with those farmers. There is no such thing as an 8-hour day for a farmer. The work is hard, and the hours long. I am deeply concerned over the difficult circumstances in which these men and their families find themselves.

OCEAN DUMPING

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, dumping refuse at sea is a bad practice in even remote parts of the ocean. But, obviously, it is most damaging when it occurs in or near such ecologically sensitive points as bays and estuaries. We in Congress are called upon to restrict this abuse of the environment. I hope that sound legislation can be approved early in this Congress.

Already, citizens are taking action, as these reports in the February 21 and 27 editions of the Washington Star show.

I include the articles as follows:

DUMPING SEWAGE AT SEA

(By Roberta Hornig)

WILDWOOD, N.J.—When Clarence Shoffler spots barges carrying sewage sludge or chemicals out to sea he chases after the tugboat operators, shakes his fist at them and hollers, "Where the hell are you going to dump that stuff?"

Shoffler began his chases about six years ago, three years after the City of Philadelphia began dumping its sewage in the Atlantic, 11 miles out from the mouth of Delaware Bay, and nearer the New Jersey and Delaware coastlines. A few years later Camden and Bridgeton, N.J., started disposing of wastes there, too.

The site—5½ miles off Cape May, N.J., and 7½ miles from Rehoboth Beach, Del., both prime resort areas—was a favorite with clambers. Shoffler had angrily noted his fish and clam catches steadily going down and squarely blames ocean dumping.

In May, when the Food and Drug Administration suddenly declared the sewage site off-limits to shellfishers because of a contaminated ocean bottom, Shoffler, in his own words, "really got mad."

"I tied the boat up for a couple of weeks and started talking around," he said the other night at the Happy Hour, a gathering spot for Wildwood townspeople.

"It's not an easy life to begin with, and when the FDA comes out with a report that there's 120 square miles of ocean in your backyard polluted, then I want to do something about it," he said.

In "talking around," Shoffler, a waterman for 25 years, became the catalyst, a kind of Paul Revere for a small but vocal environment movement that has become one of the liveliest along the Eastern seaboard.

Officially incorporated as the "Stop Ocean Dumping Association," it's better known by its acronym SODA.

In its short, active life, SODA has:

Got Rehoboth Mayor Lester Johnson to join Wildwood this weekend in asking Sen. J. Caleb Boggs, R-Del., ranking minority member of Sen. Edmund S. Muskie's Air and Water Pollution subcommittee, to hold a hearing in Rehoboth on the ocean dumping. The hearing was requested by the Rehoboth Beach Board of Commissioners.

The immediate goal is to get Philadelphia and Camden and Bridgeton in New Jersey to dump their sewage sludge at least 100 miles off the coast. Ultimately it wants ocean dumping stopped.

Encouraged U.S. Rep. Charles W. Sandman Jr., R-N.J., to force a defunct Bucks County, Pa., plant to dump 3½ million gallons of toxic industrial wastes at least 100 miles out at sea. The plant originally planned to dump the poisons 30 miles offshore from Ocean City, Md.

Obtained 60,000 signatures on a petition to support congressional legislation, sponsored by Sen. Harrison A. Williams, D-N.J.; Sandman, many other senators and representatives, and the Nixon administration, to end ocean dumping as quickly as possible. This is a fairly impressive number considering that Wildwood proper has a population of roughly 7,000.

Moreover, SODA has become a household word in Cape May County, is becoming well known on the Delmarva Peninsula, and the hard core of its 98 members have become instant ecologists, if not oceanographers.

Wildwood is probably one of the few places in the country where President Nixon's ocean dumping report, published by the Council on Environmental Quality in October, has become almost a best seller.

SODA bought 200 copies and got a discount rate—46 cents each instead of the usual 55 cents—because of the number purchased. Waitresses, the mayor, realty agents and clambers quote some of the report's

statistics verbatim, from memory, and know exactly the page they want to make a point.

Several clammers have copied from the report the various kinds of ocean dumping sites in the Atlantic, which is the receptacle for an estimated 39 million tons of wastes annually. They show off their own super-sized chart version to anyone who will take a look.

Besides the sewage sludge, the Cape May-Maryland-Delaware offshore area also is a dumping ground for industrial wastes, explosives toxic chemicals, ammunition and radioactive wastes. These sites, on charts at least, are 100 miles away from the coast-line.

It is the Cape May-Delmarva ocean sewage dump, however, that particularly worries SODA. The Wildwood people fear a second Dead Sea is developing off the East Coast—similar to the only other officially designated contaminated ocean area off New York Harbor.

They are eager to spread the word, confirmed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, that roughly 140 million gallons of sludge, 110 million of it from Philadelphia, is known to be dumped annually near their shoreline.

SODA members also tick off these claims: that Philadelphia's sewage is supposed to be 90 percent cleaned up by the time it hits the Atlantic but that Philadelphia also dumps other kinds of waste ("You name it, they're dumping it"); that Camden's sewage is treated only 25 percent and that Bridgeton's (population about 30,000) gets no treatment at all.

The Wildwood clammers and townsfolk who depend on shellfish and seashore vacationers for a living were well aware of the ocean dumping off their shoreline and had long scoffed at Philadelphia as a "city of brotherly love."

"Humph! I do believe there's another outlet for their sewage other than our backyard. I wonder if they'd be offended if it were reversed," said Wilbur Ostrander, SODA's president and Wildwood's commissioner of public works.

But it was only last July 10—nearly two months after FDA closed the shellfishing grounds—that Don Long, head of the town's clam processing company was officially notified that the ocean area was contaminated and was ordered to spread the word.

It took two more months for the SODA people to get their organization off the ground.

After brooding for weeks, Shoffler in early October went to Capt. Otto Stocker, owner of the town's cruising boat, to discuss the contamination that is forcing clammers to move out further to sea or down the coast.

Then Stocker, Long and Ostrander met in Long's office and Ostrander arranged a boat trip to the sewage dump site for area officials and news media.

From the ocean bottom they dredged up, for all to see, "thousands of dead clams" and what in polite circles is called "Black muck."

The hard-core group—which by then had grown to include Wildwood Crest's mayor, Joseph Von Savage; realty agent Joseph Olwell; Anthony Bianchi, head of the Greater Wildwood Hotel & Motel Association; Mrs. Eleanor Hughes, a printer; and several watermen—then decided it needed a quickie course on ocean ecology.

On Nov. 18, a "marine conference" was held at the Lobster House, a Cape May restaurant. Guests included university oceanographers, New Jersey scientists, an FDA representative, members of the State Department of Environmental Protection and the director of the Shellfish Institute of North America.

In the words of a recently drafted "History of the Stop Ocean Dumping Association":

"Then Ostrander crossed the Delaware Bay and carried the word to the states of Delaware and Maryland."

A week ago, Rehoboth Beach joined. "They've got a good thing going and we're behind them," said Mayor Johnson. "Our only asset is our beach. If that one mile goes, we may as well close shop."

Ocean City, Md., officials are in the process of deciding whether to join up.

Even though its activism is still relatively new, SODA members are now philosophically confirmed environmentalists. They are beginning to question what they had unskeptically accepted in the past.

For example: the closing down three years ago of a once-booming menhaden processing plant in Wildwood.

According to clammer Shoffler and Erik Kirkeberd, who owns the Wildwood fishing boat dock area, the once-abundant menhaden, used for bait or converted into fertilizer, have just about completely disappeared from catches offshore Cape May County. They also report that they have been catching flounder and sea bass with "big sore rings around their fins, and with tails looking like somebody chomped on them."

"It's something out there that's doing it," Shoffler said, shaking his head.

The watermen also are beginning to question what's happening to fish in the "back creeks," the Jersey Meadow spawning grounds up and down the coast.

"In the ocean, if the fish don't like it, they go someplace else. But in the back creeks, you get fish kills," Shoffler said, and Kirkeberd agreed. In their own minds, they have decided that past pesticide spraying to kill meadow mosquitos is behind the disappearance of several species of fish.

Long produced statistics which seemed to confirm the watermen's theory, at least in part. In the last year, New Jersey has lost 1,671 acres of back creek and estuary areas because of pollution.

Shoffler calls the sewage dumping site "sheer idiocy."

"What really got me is that this area was 70 percent clam bottom and 40 percent of that was clam seed. They buried those poor things alive," he says.

"The mouth of any bay . . . it's like a fertile valley where things grow. That's a desert out there now."

In 1963, Shoffler says, his boat was taking on 2,000 to 3,000 pounds of fish a day. In the last few years, the catch has dropped to 700 to 800 pounds.

In 1963, he says, he had \$30,000 worth of lobster pots trapping 100 pounds a day. "Now you just don't see them," he said.

Clams are still on the ocean bottom, but Shoffler and the others are worried about their susceptibility to pollutants.

There are no restraints now on ocean dumping beyond the three-mile territorial limit. This is what SODA wants changed quickly. Its ultimate goal is a complete halt to putting wastes of any kind in the sea.

"Sure we want that sewage to go out 100 miles now. But even if we get those towns to take it out farther, what will it do to the new area? There's life out there too," one SODA member said.

Up to the last month, the Wildwooders operated on a pretty much out-of-pocket basis, with individuals paying their own way to "sell" Rehoboth Beach, set up the marine conference, visit the Bucks County chemical plant and to buy newspaper ads.

Since incorporating as a non-profit organization January 14, SODA has built up a kitty of \$3,000, all of it from membership dues of \$5 to \$250. The smaller amount comes from individuals. The larger comes from the Wildwood Junior Chamber of Commerce and Rehoboth. Eventually, the group hopes to get contributions in the \$1,000 range.

"Our original purpose was to combat local problems—to inform educate, persuade and seek passage of effective laws which will ensure that our sea life in every form is not annihilated," realtor Olwell says.

But now SODA sees its mission as changing. "We now recognize the significance of the ocean dumping problem, off the Gulf and Pacific coasts as well as ours," Olwell says.

With its small budget, the new environmentalists are setting out an ambitious program.

Working out of "Eleanor's house" (Mrs. Hughes), Ostrander's office at the city hall or the Happy Hour, SODA is averaging a mailing list of 300 "alert" letters a day. Its current project is sending literature to 10,000 in the next county up, Atlantic.

Next it plans mass mailings on the "down counties" on the Delmarva Peninsula.

"We plan to go up and down the coastline, a county at a time. When we're finished on the East Coast, we'll work our way around the Gulf and up the Pacific. Heck, we might even call a national convention," Ostrander says.

(By Roberta Hornig)

Wildwood, N.J.—Federal antipollution officials have been given a graphic and smelly demonstration of what the dumping of sewage sludge near the mouth of Delaware Bay has done to a prime shellfish area in the last few years.

The two officials—David Dominick, head of the Federal Water Pollution Control Agency, and Gordon MacDonald, of the President's Council of Environmental Quality—traveled to this New Jersey resort area yesterday in response to efforts of a small but vocal environment group whose efforts were reported in The Star on Sunday.

Aboard the dredge-clammer "Miss Doxsee," the two federal executives and local officials and watermen churned through choppy seas to just inside an area that in May was designated by the Food and Drug Administration as contaminated for shellfish fishing.

About 14 miles out in the Atlantic, from the mouth of Delaware Bay, the clammer put down its dredge to prove that sewage sludge being dumped by Philadelphia and two New Jersey cities was destroying the watermen's livelihood.

CATCH PROVES "WRETCHED"

A spray from the bobbing sea splattered over the passengers, the dredge was dropped and hauled, twice producing nothing but "good clay bottom," as MacDonald described it.

On the third try, however, the New Jersey activists—banded together in a group called the "Stop Ocean Dumping Association," or SODA—made their point.

The dredge came up with 200 pounds of black, smelling sewage sludge—and a lot of dead clams. "Wretched" was the way MacDonald described the catch. He and Dominick, in a business suit, pawed through the black mess. What they found were many dead clams and one clam still alive, but "barely alive," MacDonald said after looking at it.

Capt. Otto Stocker, who for years has operated a sightseeing boat in the Cape May area and is a prime mover in the SODA group, looked at the sodden catch and said, if things "were right," the dredge in that area would have produced 60 to 70 bushels of good clams on a sweep. Stocker, in his 60s and who winters in Florida, had come up specifically for the federal visit.

HEARING SCHEDULED

SODA got its start in May after the FDA declared the 120-square-mile dumping area off-limits for the shell fishermen.

Clarence Shoffler, who for years had watched his shellfish catch diminish as the dumping gained in volume, became a sort of catalyst in the formation of SODA.

SODA, its membership composed of energetic waitresses, watermen, realtor agents,

and the mayor of Wildwood, has generated tides of interest.

Hearings have been set for next month in Rehoboth Beach, Del., on the problem by Sen. J. Caleb Boggs, R-Del., the ranking member of Sen. Edmund Muskie's Air and Water Pollution Control subcommittee.

Dominick and MacDonald, during their visit to Cape May County, repeatedly urged the angry residents to seek a solution to their pollution problem by supporting President Nixon's Ocean Dumping Bill—introduced in the House, but not yet in the Senate because of a haggling over who will introduce the measure.

The legislation would, for the first time, extend American jurisdiction to 12 miles—compared to the current 3-mile limit—for ocean dumping. It also would require a permit from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for disposal within that 12-mile area. The Atlantic, about 100 miles from the mouth of the Delaware Bay, now is used as a dumping ground for industrial wastes, toxic chemicals, radioactive wastes, and military explosives.

Dominick told the SODA members that "this situation" in their area would provide "incentive to stop ocean dumping." He said the "tools" must be at hand—such as the President's proposal.

Cape May residents want the 140 million gallons of sludge dumped annually by Philadelphia, and Newark and Bridgeton, N.J., stopped immediately.

MacDonald told the SODA group that he sympathizes with their situation. He said that perhaps the federal government should respond temporarily to their pleas and seek, perhaps with federal assistance, to have the offending cities tow their sludge at least 100 miles offshore. Dominick, however, wondered if it was worthwhile to simply transfer the same problem to a greater distance.

As the 871-foot "Miss Doxsee" berthed after the trip into what the SODA group calls the "Dead Sea" area, the two federal officials continued to plead for support for Nixon's dumping bill. But the residents remained skeptical.

They have become activists and now are thinking in activist terms.

Said Stocker, "If a man's going to try to stop you from making a living out here," referring to the cities' sludge dumping, "we'll shoot to kill if we have to do it to protect our interests."

The SODA people also are talking about an armada of clam boats to surround the sludge barges from Philadelphia, Newark and Bridgeton, as they pull their loads of waste out into the Atlantic.

APATHY THREATENS SPACE GOALS

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1971, the San Diego Union published an editorial entitled "Apollo 14 Another Success—Apathy Threatens Space Goals."

I commend this editorial to you, as it carries a very pungent message, and I congratulate the Copley Press on its publication:

APATHY THREATENS SPACE GOALS

Using a term of deceptive understatement popular with technologists, the flight of Apollo 14 that ended happily in the Pacific yesterday goes into our space log as a mis-

sion that remained "nominal" from beginning to end. Despite a brief launch delay due to questionable weather, despite some temporary problems with mechanical and electronic systems aboard their spacecraft, the Apollo 14 astronauts were able to follow their flight plan down to almost every detail.

The smooth performance of both men and machines in the Apollo 14 flight shows to what an extraordinary degree our astronauts and their support teams on the ground have mastered the challenges of manned space flight.

It is ironic that their success, both in carrying out objectives and in adapting to unforeseen developments, should contribute to indifference on the part of a great many people toward the significance of their accomplishments. The estimated audience for televised portions of the Apollo 14 flight shrank considerably below those for the two previous moon landings. Even in our own Congress there is a cooling toward further financial support of manned space programs, as though we had accomplished enough in proving that we can get to the moon and back.

We are not sending astronauts to the moon simply because it is there. Apollo 14 may well produce a greater scientific return than our two previous moon landings combined. Astronauts Alan Shepard and Edgar Mitchell performed a series of assignments on the lunar surface that may be of epochal significance to the world in understanding the history and composition of the moon, especially through examination of the 108 pounds of material they brought back with them from the Fra Mauro highlands.

The impact of this knowledge about our solar system and its origin may be years in unfolding. The same can be said of the impact of space flight technology itself on our future as a nation.

The world did not stop building airplanes as soon as the Wright Brothers proved they could make one fly. The fail-safe principles of space flight we are developing in our space program are a beginning not an end, of man's striving toward the conquest of space.

As the Apollo astronauts were streaking toward home Sunday, rocket pioneer Werner Von Braun was warning a Chicago audience that it is too soon for the American people to assume from the Apollo successes that they have won a space "race" with the Russians. The Soviet space program is picking up momentum at the very time that budget restrictions are sapping the momentum of the U.S. space effort.

Questions about the future of the Apollo program raised by the failure of the Apollo 13 flight to accomplish its mission should be laid to rest with the splendid success of Apollo 14. We must hope that doubts and uncertainties that have overtaken the future of our space program beyond Apollo are also overcome to assure that the United States of America does not voluntarily yield the commanding position it holds in space technology.

SST SIDELINE NOISE REDUCED TO PRESENT LIMITS

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, one of the arguments being advanced by opponents of the supersonic transport has been that it is too noisy to be accepted at today's airports. Yesterday, Department of Transportation Secretary John Volpe an-

nounced that the U.S. SST sideline noise and noise over the communities surrounding airports will be at least as quiet as the newest four-engine subsonic jet transports. This finding was the result of the SST Community Noise Advisory Committee.

I bring this information to the attention of my colleagues so that they may now dismiss this argument from those being heard against the continuation of the SST. I include the DOT release and a report on it from the New York Times at this point in the RECORD:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION RELEASE

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. SST sideline noise and noise over the communities surrounding airports will be at least as quiet as the newest 4-engine subsonic jet transports, according to findings of the SST Community Noise Advisory Committee.

Dr. Leo Beranek, chairman of the SST noise advisory committee, said in a letter to W. M. Magruder, U.S. SST Development Director, "We reviewed in detail with Boeing and General Electric the status of engine and aircraft design of the production SST with respect to noise. This review included results of recent tests on a number of jet noise suppressors, aircraft and engine performance, and the adequacy of engineering methods in predicting the noise levels for the production SST."

Dr. Beranek, general manager of Bolt, Beranek & Newman, Inc., acoustics research firm of Cambridge, Massachusetts, reported, "We conclude that the level of technology demonstrated by Boeing and General Electric is sufficient to achieve the noise level objectives we recommended."

The noise level objectives for the U.S. SST were to satisfy the requirements set forth in Federal Air Regulation (FAR) 36, which has established 108 EpNdB sideline noise measured from a distance of 0.35 nautical miles (NM) from the centerline of the runway, and 108 EpNdB noise over the community at distances of 3½ NM from start of takeoff and 1 NM from touchdown at landing. These noise requirements effect the new Boeing 747 4-engine subsonic transport, as well as the DC-10 and L-1011 trijets expected to start airline service within the next two years.

Magruder expressed his satisfaction upon receiving the report from Dr. Beranek's committee, and added that continuing research between now and the time the SST will enter service in 1978 may very well bring even greater noise reduction.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 23, 1971]

CUT IN SST NOISE IS SEEN IN STUDY—FEDERAL COMMITTEE LISTS CHANGES IN DESIGNS

(By Richard Witkin)

Recent engine redesign and airplane improvements will enable this country's supersonic transport to meet Federal rules on noise limits, according to the Government's SST noise committee.

In a report made public yesterday, the seven-member committee said the SST manufacturers had shown they could meet the 108-decibel criteria laid down for all large new jetliners.

Most intercontinental jets now in service, including the Boeing 747 jumbo jet, do not meet these rules. The 747 must do so by the end of the year.

Officials disclosed that the developments making possible the noise reduction included increasing engine size, eliminating the use of a raucous after-burner on takeoff, and refining of wing contours to give the plane a steeper takeoff climb.

Proponents of the embattled SST acknowledged that the changes would increase the cost of the production planes and cut into their potential earning power. But they in-

sisted that the plane would still be able to make a profit.

Anti-SST forces, noting the cost increases, can be expected to intensify their questioning of the plane's economics, noise and other environmental problems during the impending Congressional battle over continued funding of the prototype supersonic program. This calls for construction and 100 hours of flight of two prototype or test versions.

The group whose optimistic report on noise from the projected plane was made public yesterday is known as the SST Community Noise Advisory Committee. Its chairman is Dr. Leo L. Beranek, chief scientist of a prominent Cambridge, Mass., acoustical firm. He had much to do with developing aircraft noise criteria while serving as a consultant to various airport authorities.

NAMED BY MAGRUDER

The committee was named last July by the director of the Federal SST project, William M. Magruder, to advise his office on the noise problem.

Last fall, the Beranek committee advised Mr. Magruder that the noise rules for production SST's should be the same as those imposed on large new subsonic jets. It did so despite complaints from the industry that, while it could get close, it saw no technological way of complying completely without disastrous economic penalties.

"We feel we had a considerable effect on the situation," Dr. Beranek said yesterday in discussing the report that the industry had now found a way to meet the stringent rules.

The rules impose a maximum of 108 EPNdb (effective perceived noise decibels) as recorded at three measuring points at an airport or in the surrounding community. These points are: one nautical mile before the runway threshold on a landing approach, three and a half miles from the start of a take-off roll, and .25 nautical miles to either side of the centerline of the runway.

The rules permit a plane to go as high as 110 at one point if this is offset by reductions below 108 at another.

A decibel is a unit for measuring the relative intensity of sounds. One decibel equals the smallest degree of difference detectable by the human ear. "Perceived" was added to the noise standard to give greater weight to more annoying high-frequency sounds, like those of a siren. "Effective" was added to account for duration of different component sounds.

It was announced months ago that supersonic planes would meet the 108-decibel level for takeoff and landing approach. But its takeoff noise to the sides appeared a good deal too high. This has been one of the craft's most vulnerable points in the struggle over whether the program should get more funds from Congress or be canceled.

The way officials tell it, three developments came together over the last two or three months to solve the problem of sideline noise.

First, when the first production version engine was completed and tested, its sideline noise was found to be 120 EPNdb, instead of 124 as paper calculations had estimated.

Second, when the latest wind-tunnel model of the proposed production plane was put in the tunnel, it was found to develop considerably more lift on takeoff than had been expected. This meant that, on takeoff, the plane would require less engine thrust than planned, and therefore would produce less noise. The new model had improved wing flaps and a subtly refined wing shape.

Third, it now became possible to solve the rest of the sideline noise problem with engine redesign that previously would have been inadequate.

Specifically, the engine size could be increased so that takeoff could be made without use of the afterburner. This is a device

at the rear of the engine that provides a large boost in thrust by burning huge amounts of fuel poured into the exhaust stream. It makes a tremendous racket.

ADVERTISING DRIVE PLANNED

(By Christopher Lydon)

WASHINGTON.—The aerospace industry and the machinists' union, which stood quietly on the sidelines last year when the Senate nearly killed the supersonic transport, announced today a \$350,000 advertising program to counter doubts expressed by environmentalists and stress the SST's importance to the national economy.

Full-page advertisements in each of Washington's three daily papers will open the campaign tomorrow, telling Congress that fears of air and noise pollution are unwarranted and, in the light of foreign competition, may also be irrelevant to the immediate question before the House and Senate.

"Congress's real choice on the SST," the ads say. "Not will it be built. But by whom? Where?" Flags of the Soviet Union, Britain and France are printed as reminders of the TU-144 and Concorde, which have already been test flown.

"The decision to build an SST is not within our power to make. Only the decision to build an American SST," the ads state.

SHIFT IN LOBBYING

The public drive by the major SST contractors and the union that represents most of the nation's aerospace workers marks a shift in lobbying strategy as Congress approaches another fight over continued funding of the \$1.3-billion development program.

The impasse last December between the House, which narrowly supported the supersonic plane, and the Senate, which rejected it, was resolved only by carrying over all transportation funding, including SST money, at an annual level of \$210-million, until the end of next month. Further work on the program to produce two working models some time in 1973, will require new votes of approval in both branches before March 31.

HELP FOR THE NEEDY

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. William (Lucy) Albright has for years written to the Glasgow Republican of Barren County, Ky. She has an unusual knowledge of American Government. Also, she has a sound philosophy as to what our Government can do and should do for the American people. For God's poor people, the lame, the halt, the blind, and the sick, she would give all assistance necessary; for those who are able to work she would provide work. I agree with her position and commend it to you for your perusal.

LUCY'S LETTER

(By Lucy Albright)

"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity do ordain and establish this constitution of the United States of America." These words are easily recognized as the preamble of the constitution and sets forth the reason and purpose of it and during these almost two hundred years, its reason and purpose has not varied

an iota. Although the formulas for the executive of the purposes, has been lengthened to embrace 25 amendments, the most recent, the 25th, on Presidential Disability and Succession.

February, is American History month, as instituted by the DAR in 1952. And it is a wonderful time to give study and appreciation and thanks to our forefathers for their profound efforts and dedication to the founding of this great nation under God. May we briefly analyze the format of the six principles of a democratic country as found in the preamble.

A house divided against itself cannot stand, and a divided country cannot long exist, hence the Civil War, the most perilous time in the history of this country, was fought to preserve the Union. To establish justice, the legislative, executive, and judicial bodies were formed, with each a check-line on the other, courts with judge and jury were established and the day of taking the law in ones own hand with conviction and execution without a trial was outlawed. Many regulations are enacted for domestic tranquility. For living together in peace on the homefront. In the old days of monarchies, a huge wall with a draw-bridge was built around the outside of nations or cities to protect them. America has never felt it needed that, but it continued to be strong enough in defense, to protect itself against any threat of an aggressor, and in this missile and atomic age, the need is greatly multiplied. And the traumatic experiences of the Civil War would only be a slight shadow in comparison with a War of today fought on the homefront. The next purpose set forth in the constitution is to promote the general welfare. Now look at that word promote closely, it did not say to provide for the general welfare. The general welfare is a wonderful thing to promote, and it is a sad thing in this affluent age in America for any to suffer from need. And the old, the sick, the needy children need support for their welfare, but when a nation undertakes to provide for the welfare of all then that becomes a gross task, which cannot be done, and should not be done if it could be, for when any person is robbed of his self respect, then there is no word in the English language which can describe his abject condition. Any country that undertakes to be a fairy godmother, without any responsibility on the part of the recipients, is in for a sad plight. And the last is the blessings of liberty, not only for those pioneer fathers, but for their posterity, and not only for us but for all forthcoming generations. And this liberty must be guaranteed, guarded, and protected. All of these things have never lost their precious values through the years. And to keep our nation, which to me is the greatest on earth, moving along in the right direction, requires not only great wisdom of leadership, but it requires a people with self respect, with honor and integrity, and a will to do, that it may always stand proud of its heritage and proud of its fulfillment.

BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, I have been proud to be associated with the Boy Scouts of America over the years and I am pleased to see the active interest that Scouting has taken in the development of young men in our inner-city areas. I am pleased to present the

following information for my colleague's information. It is about one of the excellent programs put on by a group of our dedicated citizens; it serves literally thousands of boys throughout the country:

BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Nearly four years ago with an initial grant from the Astor Foundation, the Greater New York Councils prepared a plan to deepen the penetration of the Boy Scout program in certain deeply troubled areas of New York City—the Lower East Side of Manhattan, the Upper East Side of Manhattan and the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn. In all of them there were ethnic and racial conflicts, a high percentage of families with low incomes, many unstable families and abnormally high school dropout and delinquency rates. Moreover, a small percentage of the eligible boys belonged to Scout units or to any other youth groups.

The Scout plan was named the "Saturation Project" and aimed to do exactly what its name said—to saturate the areas with Scouting units and to reach and influence a large number of boys. The aim was more than merely a greater number of Scouts. Through Scouting it was hoped that boys would be helped to rise above their environment of poverty, failure and deprivation. Through the closely supervised project it was felt that it would be possible to judge whether, by concentration on and saturation of an area, boys could really be won to Scouting. And then, if they entered, would they show positive results in their personal lives and as members of the community.

Obviously many of the results of Scouting are intangible and longterm. However in a program such as the "Saturation Project", it was felt that certain results could be measured. For example, how many of the eligible boys joined up. What percentage this represented of the community. How many dropouts came into the Scouting orbit and any evidences of boys kept from dropping out. How many were reached despite records of delinquency and evidences that by Scouting activity other delinquency was deflected. How wide a group of leaders could be developed within the community and, in particular, how many people completely new to Scouting could be attracted.

To give the "Saturation Project" a chance, it was felt that five years were needed to fairly measure its effectiveness. Under the plan, \$90,000 per year was the sum needed in each of the chosen areas to provide a fulltime field staff plus support and facilities to do a proper job. The Councils felt that since the project was meant as a special demonstration it should be financed from sources outside the normal operating budget.

Grants from four Foundations allowed a "Saturation Project" for one area to begin. Thanks to additional funds from three other Foundations—the James, Charles S. Hayden and Cleveland E. Dodge Foundations, the Bedford-Stuyvesant area of Brooklyn became the target of a program of saturation. On January 1, 1965 it got underway and within the year, a full staff of four men was on the job.

First the team of Scouting professionals surveyed their area to decide on methods, attract local leaders and spot potential sites for Scouting units. Then came the job of organizing units, finding and training leaders and then recruiting boys. Now, two and a half years later, the first results are known. They are promising. They show a pattern of growth. For example, on May 31, 1967, there were 148 units and 4125 boys in Scouting, an increase of 41 units or 38% and 853 boys, up 26% over December 1964. In attendance at Scout camps the results are also heartening. In 1965, 230 boys from 16 units went to camp. In 1966, 363 boys from 27 units were

in camp. The trend in all phases of Scouting is upward.

The "Saturation Project" is but midway in its five-year trial. Another two or three years of intensive activity along the lines now proven and established are needed to learn how effective the program has been and what are its longterm results. Only after this period of time will it be possible to decide which Scouting techniques and modifications of accepted techniques are best suited to reach and influence great numbers of boys in the troubled and deprived areas of New York City—and in inner city areas throughout the country.

In the pages of the following report, which has been published at no cost to the Greater New York Councils, is the story of the first two and a half years of the Bedford-Stuyvesant Saturation Project. It is a log of accomplishment and progress to date. With continued support, we believe that the next two and half years will bring results which can be measured, as well as methods which can be used in the underprivileged areas of America's growing Megalopolis.

SCOUTING SUCCEEDS

In Stuyford live 23,000 boys eligible for Scouting in all of its phases. Of these 4,125 belong to the Scouts. This means that 17.9% of the eligible boys in the district had joined up. This compares most favorably with the figure of 14% for the total area encompassed by the Greater New York Councils, and the 16% for all of Brooklyn. It is well on the way to equalling and perhaps surpassing the 25% average enrollment of eligible boys in the whole of the United States.

To achieve this total, the Boy Scouts of America two years ago zeroed in on the Stuyford area with a wide array of resources and talents, including several special financial grants. The idea was not to change the basic formula of Scouting time-proven in so many different lands and societies, but to concentrate it to achieve results which would be good not only for Scouting, but the community as a whole.

The aim of the Saturation Program in the long run, of course, is to swell greatly the ranks of Scouting. But at first the emphasis is not so much on numbers, welcome though they are, as on planting firm roots for Scouting. Stuyford badly needed organization and training for Scouting, just as it needed them for participation in citizenship. The Scouts have felt that when Stuyford achieved the first it would be well on the way towards the second. Before there could be any vast increase in Scout membership there had to be many more responsible sponsors and leaders. It was essential that the proper groundwork be laid so that the promises of Scouting could be fulfilled, so that eager young Scouting hopefuls would not become disappointed dropouts.

Though the results of the Saturation Program in Stuyford are just beginning to emerge, what has happened so far is both interesting and encouraging. The program came at the right moment, just as the area was starting to wake up and to feel the need to develop some community feeling. The area welcomed the effort to deepen and widen the long-established roots of Scouting in the district. It was ready to be helped. Despite its many disadvantages, Stuyford has responded with favor to the renewed appeal of Scouting. There are many reasons.

HOW?

The Saturation Program for Stuyford brought into the district a dynamic, dedicated and trained Boy Scout professional, Ed Graham, who had worked in Cleveland and Cincinnati. He was fully aware of the multitude of problems facing a worker in a so-called "inner city" area, impoverished, tough, disorganized and tense. With the aid of three more professional workers, Juan Bar-

bosa, Clifford Dawson, John Ford, two Negroes and a Puerto Rican—Graham set out to expand Scouting's base in Stuyford.

Working with key volunteers such as Arthur Bramwell, the District Chairman and Paul Stewart and others already involved in Scouting and respected in the district, Graham sought to bring in new faces and to attract all parts of the community. He roamed in the district, talking to business and civic leaders, to civil servants, policemen, firemen, teachers, office workers, doctors, lawyers and ministers. He sought out the thousands in the district who had once been Scouts. He took his message to parents and their boys directly. He confronted many in the district who had come from such rural areas that Scouting was totally unknown in their lives.

With those already familiar with Scouting his aim was to re-kindle their interest in behalf of new generations. With those who were unaware of its concepts, he tried to awaken a sympathy and active approval. At every turn he was competing with apathy, the effects of poverty, the disruptions in family life, the attractions of being a "swinger" instead of a volunteer, and the lack of many really strong organizations within the community. Even when he found interest, he would discover vast lacks in training and skills. Or, he found a fear of what Scouting might cost, both in money and time. With an almost evangelical fervor, Graham set out to overcome these formidable obstacles.

From the first Graham emphasized the do-it-yourself aspects of Scouting. He and his team were there to assist the local people. He could show them how, give them basic training and support, but then it was mainly their job. From time to time, of course, he might have to be there to throw in a lifeline. But since it would, in the long run, have to be a local effort, he concentrated on finding leadership that would be permanent.

He needed sponsorship from groups which would be in business from one year to the next. His prime list included the many churches in the district, lodges, the fire houses, the police stations and neighborhood houses. In the next echelon came schools and P.T.A.s and finally, a new venture, the storefront centers being set up neighborhood groups. Both of these last, however, offered problems. By their very nature P.T.A.s change leaders often as children come and go within the orbit of a given school. Neighborhood centers have other problems, for they are still such an innovation that permanence has yet to evolve. Their leaders come and go.

Graham spoke to school groups and to residents of blocks and neighborhoods. But his job from the first was to shore up and expand his units in the district's prime institutions. Once he had recruited a nucleus of dedicated, trained leaders, they could set up Troops, Posts and Packs in new sites.

By the middle of 1967 Stuyford had 148 Scout units—60 Cub Packs, 68 Scout Troops, 20 Explorer Posts—up 38%—during the 2½ years of the Saturation Program. The 4,125 members represented an increase of 26%. This was a significant advance which augured well for the future.

To work with these Scouts Graham and his team had to work constantly to maintain and increase his leadership contingents. Stuyford is a hard place to recruit and keep volunteers. Too many of its responsible, able-bodied people are struggling simply to keep alive and their heads above water financially. A man or woman holding down two jobs to maintain an income, is not going to have much time or energy to do volunteer work no matter how great the desire. Graham found also that constant shifting of jobs and homes by many in his district made it hard to keep his volunteers once he had recruited and trained them. It has been a constant battle, but he feels the tide is turning and

that his nucleus of trained leaders is beginning to swell.

Among those leaders are a detective, several firemen, lawyers, school teachers, civil servants and—an especially large and active group—transit authority employees, both drivers and guards. His units are established in churches, Masonic lodges, fire houses, P.T.A.s, Tenants' Associations in housing projects, a Salvation Army center and a Boys Club of America clubhouse.

Graham is not one for colorful stories but it is with quiet pride that he and his staff recount the exploit of one of their boys, Joseph Morales, of Explorer Post 530 at Engine House 230, during a fire in a Willoughby Avenue home in early June. Joseph and another boy climbed up to a second floor window ledge and helped a hysterical woman, trapped by smoke and flames and clinging precariously to the sill, to safety. "In another few seconds she would have had to jump," reads the official recommendation for a fire Department Certificate of Merit for Joseph Morales.

POSTMARK LOSS

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to identify with a number. But in this age of the computer and, I am told, in the interest of better service, we are being asked to accept a postal zone number to replace the familiar city postmark.

My home town newspaper, the Daily Astorian, carried a perceptive editorial on the loss of the city postmark. The editorial asks the telling question that, while it is difficult to knock efforts to improve postal efficiency, will the loss of the city postmark be enough improvement to warrant the change to the dehumanizing number.

Efforts are under way to commemorate the fact that Astoria at the mouth of the Columbia River was the site of the first post office west of the Rocky Mountains. I will strongly support this effort.

Meanwhile, the numbers game goes on, and I commend the Astorian editorial to my colleagues:

POSTMARK LOSS

The prospect of the Astoria, Warrenton, Seaside, Cannon Beach and other Clatsop postmarks being eliminated under a new Post Office system is disappointing. As an Astoria councilman said this week, it's hard to knock efforts to improve postal efficiency, but will it be enough improvement to warrant doing away with the postmarks?

Probably everyone would agree that postal service could stand some upgrading. This proposed upgrading would take away something important, though—the identification of Astoria, Seaside, Hammond, Arch Cape and thousands of similar places via the mails.

Important because small communities are lost in the shuffle and seldom have chances to call attention to themselves. Some communities that used to have post offices don't have them now, and the ones that have retained their post offices are about to lose their postmarks. In the future, mail from Clatsop County processed in Portland will be marked "U.S. Postal Service 970." The "970" is the postal zone number.

It's similar to what happened to phone service. The conversion to dial phones was a big step toward mechanization, and de-

humanization. Then came the switch to long-distance dialing, and with it the elimination of letters in the prefixes (Capital 8-2169 became 228-2169) and the adoption of area codes (Astoria, Ore., 325-3211 became 503-325-3211). It's all done for efficiency, but something is lost in the process.

Loss of the Astoria postmark (on all mail going outside of Astoria; in-city mail would retain the postmark) is particularly significant because of the city having been the site of the first post office west of the Rockies. Sen. Mark Hatfield's recent letter to the city said he didn't want to see Oregon City's postmark discontinued because of Oregon City's great role in Oregon history. Yes, but the senator apparently does not know of Astoria's significance in postal history.

The site of the first post office in Astoria is near 15th and Exchange, just south of Astoria Florists. It was a wooden house, facing north, a bedroom of which was made into a post office by John Shively.

Shively arrived, according to one history, in Oregon City in 1843 by wagon train and came to Astoria (then occupied by British fur-trading companies) shortly thereafter. In 1846, Shively left for the East, meeting in Washington, D.C., with President Polk, cabinet members and the British ambassador to the United States. It was at that time (June 15, 1846) that the boundary between Canada and the Oregon territory was set at the 49th Parallel. Shively returned to Astoria and set up a regional post office (how much an area it served isn't clear).

Shively's only surviving grandchild, 85-year-old Evelyn Meyer of Portland, remembers visiting the house which quartered the post office, although it was no longer a post office when she was a girl. She has said that Shively's first wife and the woman's sister lived in the clapboard structure when she visited. She remembers playing a melodeon (a small organ) there and recalls a pear orchard in back of the house.

Acting Postmaster Dan Thiel and others have shown an interest in commemorating the establishment of the first western post office. Thiel has had refurbished some old furniture that's been in Astoria post offices for decades, and some discussion had centered on making a miniature of the first post office. Mrs. Meyer has sketched the building in which her grandfather handled the mail.

Such efforts at commemoration should be carried through to mark that significant event in the history of the postal service and of the Far West. Even though the Astoria postmark is doomed to disappear.

FORMER CONGRESSMAN URGES JAYCEES TO LEAD EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EFFORT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 25, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this excellent speech by my former colleague, the Honorable Jed Johnson, Jr., before the Minnesota Jaycees earlier this month. His plea for renewed efforts to bring equal opportunity to all Americans is one of which we should all take note.

PERFECTING THE AMERICAN DREAM

(By Jed Johnson, Jr.)

I am glad to be in Minnesota. Recently, in Washington when I was telling your execu-

tive vice-president, Bob Dunbar, of my planned trip to Minnesota and that when I was invited I had been told it was snowing in Minnesota, he told me that was good if it snowed because that meant it was 30 degrees warmer than when it didn't. So I have been "thinking snow."

Since the theme of your conference is "Operation Opportunity," it seems an appropriate subject for me to discuss would be sex discrimination in employment, that is, as well as employment discrimination against minorities.

Seriously, I want to congratulate the Jaycees on initiating "Operation Opportunity." I want to encourage you to lead the way in America to a better day for all citizens: black, white, chicano, rich, middle class, poor, young, middle age and old. We will not have reached our potential as a country until all citizens are able to fully enjoy the rights and privileges of American citizenship.

Today, I would like to speak about race relations in general and equal employment opportunity in particular. It seems to me that we cannot deal with the problems of today in a vacuum. We must understand where we have been to clearly perceive where we must go.

There are no problems today that do not have historical antecedents in the past. Therefore, I would ask you to reflect with me for a few moments on the panorama of the history of where we have been as a nation, so that we might better visualize where we must go.

It is one of those interesting ironies of history that within a year of 1620, when the Pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock in search of a new society built on individual freedom, the first slave ship landed in the colony of Virginia on the James River bringing the first 20 slaves to America.

My point is that the problem of race and the relations between the races has been irreversibly intermingled from our very beginning and the antecedents date back to our earliest days as a people. And as our destiny has been one from the beginning, so it is today and so it will be one in the future.

Only slightly more than a century ago the National debate that raged was over that of human bondage. Were slaves persons or property? The Supreme Court ruled in the Dred Scott decision of 1857 that slaves were property and possessed no human rights. And until the emancipation proclamation, slaves enjoyed none of the rights of citizenship but were simply bred and sold at auction like cattle.

Of course, the contradiction of a slave society existing within a nation pledged to the protection of individual liberty came to a head with the Civil War and the Emancipation Proclamation freeing the slaves.

In retrospect, it seems to me that the tragedy of the 19th century was that although the slaves were freed from physical bondage by the Emancipation Proclamation there were no real provisions made for the freedman to survive economically in a competitive society. As someone has said, the slave was freed with only the dust under his feet and the sky above his head.

You remember that in the days of slavery, it had been against the law with severe penalties to teach a slave to read or write. So freed slaves did not even possess the most elementary tools of reading and writing. Nor were provisions made for them to have a mule and 160 acres so that they might have a chance to survive on their own.

We all know the subsequent development of "Jim Crow" and legal segregation in schools, buses, parks, hospitals, grave yards, etc. and by the turn of the 20th century racial segregation was not only a way of life, it had become the law of the land.

In the more recent past, in the 1930's the national debate was whether there should be a national law passed by the Congress against

lynching. The anti-lynching law was finally passed but not before a great congressional debate that lasted several years.

Racial segregation was so deeply engrained in our society that it was not until after World War II that we integrated our Armed Forces. And it was not until 1947 that we allowed a black to play major league baseball. You all recall Jackie Robinson broke that color bar. Until then if you were black, you were considered inferior and incapable of competing against the whites. Some inferiority!

It was not until 1948, that in my home State of Oklahoma the first black was admitted to the university law school, and even then he was separated from the whites and had to sit outside the classroom in a cage-like contraption, until that was subsequently held unconstitutional.

And finally, in 1954 the land-mark Supreme Court decision held racial segregation in public schools was unconstitutional. And yet 17 years later there are still segregated schools and segregated classrooms in America.

Now where are we today? There have been laws against discrimination in employment since 1964, yet we still get cases like a sign in a window in the Southwest saying "Job opening. Mexican-Americans need not apply."

Or the woman who sought to be an airline pilot, scored in the top 90 percent of the test and had many more flying hours than required, yet was denied the job because she was female.

What about the fact that of the top 50 corporations there are only four blacks as members of board of directors out of 660. And no blacks out of 2,522 senior executive officers. And likewise there are virtually no women in these positions.

It is not that there are no capable women or capable blacks, it is that their advancement has been blocked long before the executive suite level.

The median education for Mexican-Americans in the southwest is 6.2 percent. Only two percent of Mexican Americans who enter school in Houston, the southwest's largest system, complete high school. Something is drastically wrong.

Did you know that the national median income for white high school graduates is higher than for black college graduates?

Did you know that only three percent of full-time employed women make over \$10,000 a year while 23 percent of the men do?

Do you know that in the United States that there are only 21,000 women doctors or seven percent of the total while at the same time we need at least 50,000 new doctors. Only eight percent of the dentists and only three percent of lawyers are women.

Have we so thoroughly typed persons from birth that we have prevented them from assuming roles professionally other than those pre-assigned by sex or race?

Does this make sense? I think not. What a tremendous waste of our most precious resource, our human resource.

What we must do today is see that the doors of opportunity are opened wide to all individuals regardless of their race, sex or national origin. We must see to it that the promotional ladder, too, is open to all and not just the white Anglo-Saxon male.

We must not only see that discrimination ends but take affirmative action to see that those persons are actively encouraged to develop to the fullest of their potential regardless of race, sex, or national origin.

We are a deeply divided, disturbed and distrustful society. Where do we go from here? What do we do? It seems to me there are only two possibilities.

Either we have to quit professing our con-

cepts of human freedom, the worth and dignity of the individual with inalienable rights under the law regardless of race, sex or national origin; or, we have to make those rights a reality for all. The point is, the contradiction of saying one thing and practicing another must stop. We can not have it both ways. Those rights guaranteed but not delivered can no longer be withheld without destroying the very fabric of our society.

Now, if you wish as do I, to help protect and preserve those rights to all citizens; but yet, are still being denied to some let me make some positive suggestions for action.

You can hasten the coming of the day when we all do enjoy equal opportunity. You can help make that dream a reality every day where you work, where you worship and where you live. You can help in the little things, simply by treating other human beings as fellow children of God and not pretending not to see the problems of poverty, racial discrimination and injustice.

Let me suggest to you the concept of each-one-teach-one. If each Jaycee took it upon himself to help one young minority or disadvantaged teenager get a job, help him hold that job and get him into a training program where he could prepare himself for advancement; if that were done, it would go further to solve the problems of unemployment and underemployment that haunt our ghettos and our Indian reservations than any other program I know anything about that presently exists in the private sector.

Ask yourself honestly, do you pre-judge a person and their capability for doing a job by their race, sex or accent?

Are you really freed-up in your dealing with persons of other races so that you are honest with them and communicate your real feelings?

Have you really made an effort to try to help solve the problems of the minority population in your community?

Do you know what those problems are? Why not set up a task force and find out? Pretend a day or week that you are black in your community.

Could you hold the same job? Could you live in the same neighborhood?

When the day comes that you would gladly trade places with anyone of a different colored skin or of a different sounding name or of a different accent, then the day will have arrived when the American dream is no longer a dream but a reality for all our citizens.

You can help as a chapter. You can find out the problems of the disadvantaged in your community. You can find out where it "hurts." You can do something about that hurt. Whether its starting a non-profit housing corporation as the New Haven Jaycees have done or holding a job fair like the Houston Jaycees.

You can invite a minority to your chapter to visit, to join, to help make it more representative and responsive to community needs. You could set up a minority scholarship fund . . . to help send a minority to school or to become a Jaycee.

I would suggest you establish a "Human Relations Day," possibly January 15, the anniversary of Dr. Martin Luther King's birthday. And spend that day really communicating with the minority community. Get the facts, set objectives and initiate programs to meet those objectives.

Go into North Dakota to the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation where unemployment is between 70-80 percent.

Are you helping solve the problems? Or are you helping perpetuate them?

Are you willing to stand in your community, your national organization and be counted?

That is a choice that you and I must make. I would suggest the answer which we give, and the answer our fellow Americans give, will in fact determine the future destiny of our Nation and therefore affect the future of all mankind.

Remember, we have the greatest opportunity before us of all recorded human history. Even in the glorious days of ancient Greece, only about 10 percent of the population enjoyed rights of citizenship. The rest were slaves.

We can bring the rights of full citizenship not just to 10 percent, not just to 70 percent; but to all our citizens. America has to solve her problem of race or she cannot survive. And the only lasting solution can be a just one. We can here in America in our day and age build the model for all mankind for all time to come. The choice is yours. The choice is mine. The decision is ours.

There is no going back. The past is closed. There is only the future and it is open. We can make of it what we will. Let us move forward together as Americans: Black and white, rich and poor, young and old, and establish the age-old dream of equality of opportunity once and for all as a reality in our time.

As Abraham Lincoln wrote in 1859, four years before the Emancipation Proclamation: "Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and, under a just God, cannot long retain it."

REPUBLICAN SUPPORT IS NEEDED IF REVENUE SHARING IS GOING TO BE ENACTED

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, for reason's unbeknownst to me, I receive a publication known as "The Elephant's Roar—A Gazette for Republican Leaders." While I realize that this is a Republican publication, I enjoy reading this account and I find their articles very interesting. I feel that it is necessary for me to know the Republican doctrine—even though I am not a member of that party.

In the February 20, 1971, issue, I was surprised to find an article citing the "Disadvantages of Revenue Sharing." I do not know if this publication always speaks for the Republican Party, but it seems to me that the administration—when and if it turns its wrath on the Democratic Party for failure to enact some of the President's programs—should direct a part of their public relations effort toward segments of their own party who happen not to agree with them.

I know that revenue sharing is a major part of the President's program, and I am sure that it will receive an adequate hearing within the Congress; however, I might suggest that if this program is going to be enacted, the Democratic Congress needs Republican support.

It will be difficult to single out Chair-

man MILLS and blame him if this program is not enacted—especially when “a gazette for Republican leaders” condemns the President’s revenue sharing proposal as “increasing the Federal deficit, forcing up the debt limit, making inflation worse, and depriving the people of that much more of their direct control over local government.”

The article follows:

DISADVANTAGES OF REVENUE SHARING: CALLING GOVERNMENT TO ACCOUNT

Our system of government is based on the right, the duty and the power of the American people to call their government to account for the way it collects and spends their money and exercises its authority in their name.

But it is becoming more and more difficult today for the people to call their government to account; and more and more often, when they do so, government refuses to accept their verdict and spends the people’s money in new ways designed to get around their objections.

Probably the most striking example is to be found in spending for schools. In many school districts throughout the country, and especially in California, the voters have made it known in no uncertain terms that they have “had it” with schools, the costs of which keep on rising, while the quality of the education they provide keeps on dropping, and immorality, drug abuse and even violent crime become more and more common on their premises.

Instead of taking steps to meet these widespread concerns and objections on the part of the public by changing their educational policies and methods, the first response of the education establishment in California was to “sneak through” legislation depriving the people of their right to vote on school tax increases—legislation which, after a fierce struggle, was repealed in the 1969 legislative session in California.

Now, as the people continue to vote down school tax increases, we find increasing pressure for huge increases in school funding from the State and Federal levels of government, where the voters do not have a chance to express their will on the specific issue of whether their own schools should get this much more of their tax money.

This example shows how important it is to make sure that, to the greatest possible extent, each unit and level of government raises the money it spends by its own taxes. But under the “revenue sharing” program now being hailed with such fanfare, the Federal government would turn over tax money to State and local government without specifying its use, completely separating taxation from spending. Most of the voters would not even know that their State and local governments were receiving this money, and so would not even attempt to call them to account for it. And even when they did know, obviously it would be much harder to vote a man out of office for accepting Federal funds than for raising local taxes.

There is a real need, as President Nixon has said, to transfer more responsibility to local government and away from Washington. But this should be done, and easily could be done, by Federal tax reductions, deductions or credits leaving more taxable resources available to State and local government, which could then obtain additional revenue without increasing the over-all burden on the taxpayer, provided the taxpayers could be convinced of the need for it.

But the revenue sharing proposal outlined in the President’s State of the Union address January 22, would simply add \$5 billion for state and local governments on top of all existing expenditures, thereby increasing the Federal deficit, forcing up the debt limit, making inflation worse, and depriving the

people of that much more of their direct control over local government.

The only way to keep the size and cost of government at all levels within reasonable bounds is for those who spend public money to have to raise it in taxes as well.

IS MUSKIE COOL ENOUGH?

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, in the March 1 issue of Monday magazine, published by the Republican National Committee, an article appears that should be carefully read and considered by all my colleagues. This article has relevance now, but it is especially important as it could have more relevance as time goes by. I present it now for my colleagues’ serious consideration:

Is MUSKIE COOL ENOUGH TO BE PRESIDENT?

“As a man gets angry, he falls into error”—The Talmud

While most of the media has portrayed Sen. Edmund Muskie as calm, cool and collected, those who have closely observed the Maine Democrat say that he is really a man with a very short fuse, ready to explode on a moment’s notice.

Writing in the Christian Science Monitor, Godfrey Sperling has referred to Muskie’s temper as “a potential point of vulnerability.” Noting Muskie’s testiness at a press conference, Sperling observed: “For a Presidential candidate to indicate, even slightly, that he loses his cool under pressure can very well evoke voter uncertainties on how the man might react under the much greater pressures of the presidency. ‘Would we want him to be the one who must make the decision on pushing the nuclear button?’ is the way the voter would usually put it.”

In a profile piece in the New York Times Magazine last November, Susan Sheehan wrote of Muskie’s sisters remembering him as “a stubborn young man with a nasty temper, who could tease them but not take teasing in return, and who hated to lose at anything.” Sheehan related how a friend of Muskie’s recalled that, when he was in his 30’s, he kicked over a Monopoly board after another player made a lucrative move.

In their book, “Muskie,” authors Theo Lippman and Don Hansen describe front-running Democrat Presidential candidate as being “a potentially explosive man” with “a waspish temper” often “triggered by the trivial.” “Nobody doubts that Muskie’s temper tantrums are genuine,” say Lippman and Hansen.

The two authors quote Muskie’s older sister, Irene, as saying of the possibility that her brother might become President: “I just don’t know whether he’d be able to take all the criticism that a President gets. He’s so sensitive to criticism.”

Numerous columnists have also remarked on Muskie’s surliness. Washington Star political writer, Paul Hope, has revealed how at a private meeting several months ago, Muskie went into “a towering rage” when pressed to explain in detail his position on Vietnam. “One thing that isn’t generally known about Muskie is that he has a rather short fuse,” wrote Hope. “He comes over in public as calm, cool, deliberate and confident, but in private he frequently boils and fumes.”

Columnists Evans and Novak have listed the Muskie temper as “a weakness.”

Elizabeth Drew, Washington editor of the Atlantic Monthly magazine, is one member of the press who has witnessed the Muskie malevolence first-hand. Interviewing the Senator for NET television, she asked a question which implied that Muskie was a candidate for the Presidency. Muskie snapped: “I am a United States Senator concerned with these issues, as I should be. But I will not, at this point, pitch them on the assumption that I am a candidate for anything at this point. When I want to become a candidate for anything, I think I can find the words that will make my intention clear.”

Editorializing recently on the thinness of the Muskie hide, the Bath (Maine) Brunswick Times reminded the Senator of Harry Truman’s admonition: “If you can’t stand the heat, get out of the kitchen.” If he can’t keep his cool around a bunch of newsmen, the paper declared, he might not be able to do it during a real crisis at the White House.

It is becoming apparent that the Muskie temper will be a factor in the 1972 Democratic presidential sweepstakes.

SOUTH AFRICA AGAINST THE CHURCH

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the recent arrest of the Anglican Dean of Johannesburg, South Africa, the Very Reverend Gonville Aubie French-Beytagh, is not the first time the South African Government has acted against a churchman who opposed apartheid. Here is a list of some clergymen who have lost their passports or their temporary residence permits, whose return to South Africa was refused or who were refused entry into South Africa, all because they openly expressed opposition to South Africa’s racist system:

SOUTH AFRICAN CLERGYMEN WHOSE PASSPORT FACILITIES HAVE BEEN REMOVED

Fr. Albert Danker, Catholic priest working in Durban with Young Christian Workers. Passport seized.

Rev. Ian Thomson, Presbyterian minister doing industrial ministry—Johannesburg. Passport seized.

Fr. Stephen Hayes, Anglican worker/priest in Windhoek, Namibia. Passport seized.

Rev. Basil Moore, Methodist minister on staff of University Christian Movement in Johannesburg. Passport seized.

Canon Cyprian Thorpe, Anglican priest, heading the Department of Mission in Johannesburg. Passport restricted.

Fr. Dale White, Anglican priest running Wilgespruit Ecumenical Fellowship in Johannesburg. Passport seized.

Fr. Comas Desmond, Catholic priest on staff of Christian Institute in Johannesburg. Passport application refused.

IMMIGRANT CHURCH WORKERS WHOSE RETURN TO SOUTH AFRICA FROM HOLIDAY ABROAD WAS REFUSED

Rev. C. Fobbe, German Lutheran missionary in Northern Transvaal for many years.

Fr. Ian Atkinson, English Anglican priest working in Pretoria.

ENTRY OF CHURCH WORKERS INTO SOUTH AFRICA REFUSED

Dr. Marie-Louise Martin, Swiss divinity, lecturer of Paris Evangelical Church, formerly of Divinity Department at Roma University, Lesotho.

IMMIGRANT CHURCH WORKERS WHOSE TEMPORARY RESIDENCE PERMITS HAVE BEEN WITHDRAWN

Bishop Edward Crowther, American Anglican Bishop of Kimberley. Temporary permit not renewed in 1965. Given 14 days to leave South Africa.

Miss Sally Camp, American Anglican missionary working in Ovamboland, Namibia. Left October 1968.

Miss Mary King, American missionary of the United Church of Christ working in Natal. Left January, 1969.

Rev. de Fruyt, Belgian Catholic missionary working in Natal. Left Jan. 1969.

Fr. A. M. Garrison, American Anglican priest working in Ovamboland, Namibia. Left end of 1966.

Bishop Robert Mize, American Anglican Bishop of Windhoek, Namibia, from 1960. Left July, 1968.

Fr. Pierre Dil, Dutch Anglican priest holding permanent residence visa and population registration card. In South Africa from 1957, deported in Nov. 1966 from Pretoria.

Fr. Robert van der Hart, Dutch Catholic priest, working at Hammarskraal Seminary from 1964. Left December, 1968.

Rev. Hans Haselbarth, General Lutheran pastor holding permanent residence permit. Working in Northern Transvaal and Natal from 1963. Left December, 1968.

Fr. Dick Cadigan, American Anglican priest working in Natal from 1965. Left August, 1970.

Fr. David Shanahan, Irish Catholic priest working in Sharpeville and Evaton from 1969. Left August 1970.

Fr. Robert Mercer, South African holding a dual Rhodesian citizenship and an Anglican priest. Left October, 1970.

Fr. Bernard Chamberlain, English Anglican priest. Left October, 1970.

Dr. Marcus Braun, German Lutheran pastor working in Welton and Johannesburg from 1967. Must leave by March, 1971.

And, as many of us feared, the arrest, detention, and prosecution of Dean french-Beytagh are apparently the first moves in a stepped-up effort to silence churchmen. The news items I insert in the RECORD today detail the latest South African moves to eliminate opposition to apartheid.

Mr. Speaker, Rev. Colin Davison, quoted in the Washington Post story by Marjorie Hyer, expresses a very pessimistic view of the South African situation. I am not willing to accept his diagnosis. But I do know that if men of good will are systematically silenced, Reverend Davison's predictions will be realized.

The articles follow:

[From the Evening Star, February 25, 1971]
SOUTH AFRICA POLICE RAID, SEARCH CHURCH OFFICES

JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA.—Security police today raided the homes and offices of Anglican church officials, charitable organizations and others in Johannesburg, Cape Town and Durban and seized documents, churchmen said.

The police had search warrants authorizing them to look for materials connected with various banned organizations, including the Communist party and the African National Congress, said the Rev. Neil Harrison, Anglican diocesan secretary.

Harrison said officers came to his home and those of his assistant, the Rev. Colin Collins, and two women who work for the church.

Other places searched included the office of the dean of Johannesburg, an office in St. Mary's Cathedral, the Christian Institute, and the education information center in the Institute of Race Relations Building. The

police also questioned the assistant editor of the Johannesburg Star and the night editor of the Rand Daily Mail.

"They searched every scrap of paper and photograph in my flat," said the Rev. Mr. Harrison, "and then as they left at 8:15 a.m. they asked me to accompany them to my car which they also searched thoroughly."

"It seems to have been the same pattern with everyone—a thorough search, leaving the place a mess."

Mark Collier, Roman Catholic researcher at the Christian Institute in Johannesburg, said police seized his South African passport. The institute office at Cape Town also was searched.

Security Police Chief P. J. Venter said the search was in connection with the investigation of the Anglican dean of Johannesburg, the Very Rev. Gonville french-Beytagh. The dean is free on \$7,000 bond after being charged last month under South Africa's Suppression of Communism Act. He is scheduled for a court hearing tomorrow.

Dean french-Beytagh is accused of promoting the interests of the South African Communist party and the African National Congress, a black power group.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 26, 1971]

SECURITY POLICE RAID THE HOMES OF CHURCHMEN IN SOUTH AFRICA

JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA, February 25.—Security police raided offices and homes of church leaders today in new pressure against opponents of the Government's policy of racial separation.

The early morning raids came only one day before the scheduled court appearance of the 59-year-old Anglican Dean of Johannesburg, the Very Rev. Gonville A. french-Beytagh, who faces charges linking him with the Communist party and other banned organizations.

Early this week, Brig. Pieter J. Venter, head of the security police, hinted that further charges would be placed against the dean, who spent eight days in solitary confinement before being released on bail on Jan. 28.

In the searches here police questioned the dean and officials at St. Mary's Cathedral and spent several hours at the offices of various Christian organizations in the city, including the Interdenominational Christian Institute, the South African Council of Churches and the University Christian Movement.

In Capetown they seized documents at the Ecumenical Center.

The homes of two journalists, Neumann Robinson, assistant editor of the Johannesburg Star, and Benjamin Pogrund, night editor of the Rand Daily Mail, were also searched by detectives. Mr. Pogrund has reportedly been doing research on banned organizations in South Africa.

Brigadier Venter denied that the police action was in any way a campaign against the church. "It is only the activities of individual members of churches that are being investigated," he said.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 27, 1971]

SOUTH AFRICA CRACKS DOWN ON CHURCHMEN (By Marjorie Hyer)

Two days ago in Johannesburg, Durban and Capetown, security police conducted simultaneous early morning raids on the homes and offices of a number of churchmen well-known for their opposition to the South African government's policy of apartheid.

The raids came on the eve of the scheduled opening of the trial of the Very Rev. G. A. french-Beytagh, dean of St. Mary's Anglican Cathedral in Johannesburg.

The arrest in mid-January of the 59-year-old churchman on charges of contravening South Africa's omnibus Terrorism Act

shocked church leaders throughout the world. After being held incommunicado for eight days, he was released on bail only through the intervention of the British government.

Along with this week's police raid on church leaders have come reports of a new batch of deportation orders for churchmen who are not South African citizens and passport restrictions for those who are.

Exact figures are not available, but it would appear that since the first of the year the South African government has moved against at least 15 church leaders, all of whom have taken stands against apartheid.

Government spokesmen have denied that there is any campaign against the church. But church leaders surveying the evidence are not so sure.

With this evidence in view, many churchmen are understandably reluctant to discuss the matter. One who was willing to talk was the Rev. Colin Davison, an Anglican priest who is among those ordered deported.

Mr. Davison has served in South Africa since 1963. He is on the staff of the Interdenominational Christian Institute, an organization working to further multiracial contacts, and incidentally, one of the offices raided by police this week.

Two weeks ago in Johannesburg—just 10 days after he learned of the deportation order against him—Mr. Davison talked with this reporter of the situation in South Africa.

"The government is trying to get rid of the church" is the way Mr. Davison sees it. "Nothing will stop them 'til we get more priests into prison." Only such drastic action by the clergy, he feels, will shock the white South African citizenry into a realization of what is happening in their country.

What is happening, he believes, is a replay of events in Germany three decades ago. "There is a tremendous parallel between Hitler's final solution and Vorster's," he said, referring to the South African premier's program of apartheid and "separate development" for black South Africans.

Under this program, the white minority government regulates virtually every facet of life of the black African, with both law and custom designed to keep him totally apart from white society except in certain carefully proscribed areas of employment.

Part and parcel of the government's racial policy are heavy police measures—against whites as well as blacks—used to enforce it, Mr. Davison feels. "The law is not in the hands of the citizens but of the secret police. As a result, Vorster and his people have more power than Hitler ever had."

He cited as an example the Terrorism Act, which he charged was so vaguely worded that "anything they want to construe as terrorism can be used as an excuse for arrest." Conventional legal safeguards, such as habeas corpus proceedings, do not apply to persons detained under the Terrorism Act and South African courts have no jurisdiction over persons charged under the act.

Mr. Davison charged that the arrest of Dean french-Beytagh under the Terrorism Act was "an attempt to smear the church. They picked someone high enough up that it would reflect on the entire church."

Provisions of the Terrorism Act preclude disclosure of the detailed charges against him. It is known, however, that at the time of the dean's early morning arrest, security police took from a back shelf of his office closet a packet of leaflets from the banned African National Congress. Associates of the clergyman insist that the leaflets were planted there to incriminate him.

The observations Mr. Davison was willing to make for the record many of his colleagues agreed to privately; he could afford the luxury of outspokenness since he no longer had a position to maintain. Nevertheless the interview took place in a noisy restaurant, away from the presumably bugged telephones of

both his home and his office. Such precautions are routine in South Africa.

His face was drawn from the combined struggle of his unsuccessful attempts to fight the deportation order and efforts to wind up his affairs on less than a month's notice—his wife was visiting family in England when the order came—but his voice remained gentle as he spoke of the people he had served for seven years.

"The white people are the most sick," he said. "The vast majority of white Christians are on the side of the government. Even whites who are close to me, when this thing happened their reaction was: 'Were you really telling the truth?'"

"The reaction of blacks was, 'Of course the government was lying.'"

Mr. Davison was deeply pessimistic about the future in South Africa, both for the church and for the country as a whole.

"I don't think there is really anything that whites can do here any more. The real forces of change are the black forces."

White liberals, particularly in the church, he said, need to learn to "listen to the blacks, to be prepared to accept black leadership. The only role I see for the white church is to try to prepare white people for the future. Instead of doling out charity to blacks they should be getting the whites used to change."

That "change," he indicated, would not be an easy one. "Apartheid has in it the seeds of its own destruction. It's too late now for any evolutionary approach."

He paused a moment and his face saddened as he gave voice to the unspoken terror that haunts South Africa's white minority. "It's too late, now. All we can do now is let it come—just get it over with."

FREE ENTERPRISE AND GOVERNMENTAL POLICIES

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will agree that an early return to health of our national economy, and the maintenance of its continuing growth in the years ahead, is one of our greatest urgencies. I am equally sure that you will also agree that the track record of our free enterprise system, which over the past 194 years has built the greatest industrial Nation and the highest living standard on earth, is a pretty fair assurance that we are capable not only of maintaining that record but of helping to improve it.

In reviewing the record of legislation considered by the last session of Congress, I think we might fairly say it has leaned largely toward the American consumer. We have considered numerous bills and proposals to protect our public against poor quality products and fraudulent marketing practices, which is all to the good and which I heartily endorse. We are partners of the people and pledged to protect their interests.

At the same time, in recognizing the rights of the consumer, we must also recognize our responsibility to American business, which has produced our unequaled standard of living by generating a very large part of our national revenue in corporate taxes, in payrolls and taxes

paid by jobholders, and in products manufactured and taxes paid by consumers on these products.

Recent reports of our Commerce Department have estimated that our gross national product has reached \$1 trillion. This certainly indicates that business has met the needs of the Nation and kept pace with its development—at least, up until now. And I submit that, just as we are partners of the people, we are equally and morally partners of our free enterprise system which supports the people.

What concerns me is that the needed vital concern of Congress for the consumer should not turn into a broad and unreasonable condemnation of business in general. The vast majority of the American business community has made enormous contributions to the country as a whole. Through new technology, research, and mass production, it has provided our expanding population with more and more of the daily necessities of life as well as new products to make our lives easier and more enjoyable.

The fact is that most nations today are promoting their national industries rather than restricting them as some of our Government policies are now doing. The result has been that the historic, aggressive American capability in foreign trade has become defensive. We have taken a back seat in what has become a world arena of economic warfare. And in this war we are steadily losing ground—a sad commentary on the once mighty fleet of American merchant ships that in another and prouder day flew the American flag in the major ports of the seven seas.

For example, take the case of the United States and Japan. Since the end of World War II, Japan has made significant inroads into American markets with export products and investments. The result has been a drastic imbalance of international trade between the two countries. The United States today has an unfavorable balance of some \$1.5 billion with Japan. And if this trend continues, the annual deficit will rise within 5 years to between \$4 to \$5 billion.

The Japanese Government is aggressively promoting and literally directing an export blitz on all vital international markets. In a recent *Fortune* magazine article on this subject by Louis Kraar, it was stated that—

The export offensive is commanded by Premier Eisaku Sato in person; he heads the Supreme Trade Council, where top business and government leaders quietly slice up the world market and set annual goals for every major product and country.

This article adds that, to boost exports, the government backs corporations with credit at preferential rates, attractive tax incentives, and even insurance against foreign advertising campaigns that fall short of sales targets.

Also, with specific reference to the so-called practice of dumping, the article states:

Japanese manufacturers of television sets are facing a major showdown with American competitors who have accused the Japanese of dumping—i.e., selling below recognized market prices. . . . While the Japanese TV set makers firmly deny dumping, other

Japanese manufacturers openly acknowledge that they often use cutthroat export prices for market penetration. To establish its air conditioners in Western Europe, for example, Hitachi, Ltd., deliberately sold below cost for three years.

American business stands to be further crippled by the recent trend toward protectionism that has been spurred by consideration of foreign trade legislation. Foreign nations have made it abundantly clear that restrictions on foreign imports would spark retaliatory measures against U.S. exports. Again, American industry, already in a struggle with foreign competition, would suffer. In turn, reduction in exports would create greater deficits in our balance of payments, create the possibility of greater unemployment among American workers, and generally stifle an already slow economy.

I have been aware of continuing anti-business attitudes for some time. Like weeds in the garden, they are hard to avoid. What specifically prompts my remarks today is a speech by Mr. Lee Loevinger, a former Assistant Attorney General, who for many years ably guided the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

In the course of Mr. Loevinger's talk before the Association for Corporate Growth, Inc., in New York on January 13, he discussed some recent developments in the area of Government regulation of business which are disturbing. I would commend to the attention of my colleagues the address of Mr. Loevinger which was included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Extensions of Remarks of February 11, 1971, in four parts as follows: Part I, page 2693; part II, page 2723; part III, page 2709; and part IV, page 2665 by our colleague from San Diego, Calif., the Honorable Bob Wilson. Entitled "How to Succeed in Business Without Being Tried," Mr. Loevinger's speech is an interesting commentary on governmental attitudes toward business.

According to Mr. Loevinger, the Department of Justice has launched a crusade against business, and a crusade that is contrary to present law and past precedents. Under the guise of "potential injury" to competition by large, diversified companies, Mr. Loevinger says, the Department of Justice is trying to make "bigness" a crime. Such an attack on business is contrary to law, and has been so held many times by the highest courts of the land. I might add here that, if "bigness" indeed is a crime, the Department of Justice might do well to look into the Federal Government's broom closet.

Parenthetically, I think it is worth noting that this theory of bigness and potentiality has not yet exactly run away with the show. In March 1969, the Department of Justice began a series of suits against conglomerate mergers by large companies. These suits were based on claims that the mergers in question would promote too great a concentration in the general economy, that they would eliminate potential competition between the merging companies, and that they would provide opportunities or potentiality, for the practice of reciprocity. It is

enough to say here that, so far, these suits have been unsuccessful.

As Mr. Loevinger points out, an irrationality of the potentiality theory is that it ignores the difference between mere possibility and reasonable probability, and that anything and everything is possible under potentiality, even to the point of concluding that a pan of water on a hot stove may freeze.

The dangers inherent in such a practicing theory of the Department of Justice are many. Such principles can easily come to be applied to small business as well as so-called big business. And, as I have already pointed out, if we hope to keep up with other nations such as Japan and Germany in the world economic struggle, we are going to need the help—not the hindrance—of our Government, because companies in other nations are getting not only the active encouragement, but also the full support and even the direction of their governments.

There is still another danger—and the most frightening of the many—which this policy holds over the civil rights and political liberties of every American.

As Mr. Loevinger has stated:

The basic thrust of the potentiality theory is to equate the mere possibility of social harm or abuse with proof that such consequences are likely to occur; and, if potentiality equals proof, then accusation equals conviction. . . .

I speak here, not as a defender of any special interests, but as one deeply concerned about the obvious implications of our present antitrust policy. And it is for this reason that I call the attention of my colleagues to Mr. Loevinger's speech as the most clearly reasoned analysis I have yet seen of this particular Government-fostered problem.

THE STATE OF THE WORLD

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I took the opportunity to sit down and carefully read the President's state of the world message, "Building for Peace." You will recall that last year the President established the precedent of sending to the Congress a separate state of the world message, that one entitled, "A New Strategy for Peace." I think this is a most commendable precedent, and hope it will continue to be observed by subsequent Presidents. As the President pointed out in his latest message:

In a democracy, policy is the public's business. I believe the President has an obligation to lay before the American people and its Congress the basic premises of his policy and to report fully on the issues, developments, and prospects confronting the Nation.

I therefore have little time for those critics who, grasping at straws, have dismissed the message on such frivolous grounds as being "too long," a "rehash,"

"nothing new," or "a reversion to old policies." Such comments indicate to me that they either have not taken the time to read the message or did not comprehend the full import of his previous state of the world message. For in his first message, the President did set forth a radically new foreign policy for America, one tailored to the realities of the seventies. Even more basically, the President established a new approach to handling foreign policy issues. As he put it in his latest message:

Our fundamental goal . . . is to get at the roots of crises and to build a durable structure of international relationships.

In both messages he has gone into considerable detail as to how this is being handled procedurally in the National Security Council with respect to each of the areas covered in his message.

To those who criticize the recent message as being a "rehash," let me say that foreign policy should not be the same as marketing a new brand of toothpaste every year. If there are similarities between the two messages, and indeed there are, it is an indication to me that the President's policy is both correct and being consistently applied and pursued. Perhaps the best comparison between last year's message and this year's, is summed up in two sentences from the most recent message:

We have set a new direction. We are on course.

That new direction is what the Nixon doctrine is all about. It is grounded in the realities of both national and international politics. In our own country there has been an understandable reaction to overextension; and in other countries there has been a growing strength and autonomy. According to the President, the Nixon doctrine was prompted by a "perception of the growing imbalance between the scope of America's role and the potential of America's partners." He went on to say that—

Partnership that was always theoretically desirable is now physically and psychologically imperative.

Mr. Speaker, partnership is really the essence of the Nixon doctrine. I have read some commentators who fault the Nixon doctrine on the grounds that it is not altogether clear cut—that it is ambiguous. What they fail to understand is the nature of true partnership. In the President's words:

We recognize that the Doctrine, like any philosophic attitude, is not a detailed design. In this case ambiguity is increased since it is given full meaning through a process that involves other countries.

And again:

To attempt to define the new diplomacy completely by ourselves would repeat the now presumptuous instinct of the previous era and violate the very spirit of our new approach.

That is not to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Nixon doctrine is without design. The President has spelled out the three guiding principles of the new partnership approach. First, the United States will keep its treaty commitments both because of their intrinsic merit and the

destabilizing impact sudden shifts would cause. In the President's words:

To desert those who have come to depend on us would cause disruption and invite aggression.

Second, our nuclear shield extends to those who are allied with us in the event they are threatened by a nuclear power. It is this assurance that is at the heart of the nuclear proliferation treaty.

And finally, where other types of aggression is threatened, we shall continue to furnish economic and military assistance to our allies, but we shall look to them to assume the primary manpower burdens for their defense.

Mr. Speaker, once again the President has cautioned the American people not to overreact to overextension. As he put it:

There are lessons to be learned from our Vietnam experience . . . but there is also a lesson not to be drawn: that the only antidote for undifferentiated involvement is indiscriminate retreat.

And again:

Our new policy calls for a new form of leadership, not abdication of leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I think any realistic assessment of the progress made under the Nixon doctrine over the last year will indeed support the President's views that we are on course. While the record shows disappointments as well as satisfactions, I think the President must be commended for laying the groundwork for a generation of peace.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. speaker, as a member of the bipartisan coalition which last week introduced legislation authorizing much-needed and far-reaching reforms of our campaign finance laws, I want to express my sincere hope that the administration will forcefully and publicly join with us so that the influence of money in politics will be reduced in the 1972 elections.

This bill is by no means perfect but I agree with its principal thrust and most of its provisions. Its two major aims—to broaden the base of political finance and to reverse the trend toward exorbitantly expensive campaigns—are shared I am confident, by the great majority of Americans and their elected representatives.

I think the bill could be improved in these areas:

First, a specific limit on radio and television advertising should be set, since this represents the single largest expenses in most statewide campaigns and in Presidential campaigns. By setting a limit only on aggregate spending in five areas the bill permits statewide candidates in New York, for instance, to spend nearly \$2 million on the electronic media, over and above the amount of radio and television time subsidized under the bill.

Second, if we really intend to broaden the base of campaign finance, we should give taxpayers an option between the 50-percent tax credit on contributions up to \$50 and perhaps a tax deduction for the full amount of the contribution up to \$500. For some taxpayers, the credit would be a positive incentive while for others, a deduction would be more attractive.

Third, the apportionment of publicly subsidized broadcasting time for major candidates seems unfair. In New York State, the formula would give a candidate for the U.S. Senate—a candidate who would represent some 18 million citizens—a total of 3 hours while a House candidate who would represent half a million citizens or less, receives a total of 2 hours. The 2-hour figure might be reasonable for a House candidate; the 3-hour figure for a Senate candidate seems totally unreasonable in a State the size of New York. Perhaps consideration should be given a media formula based on population.

Mr. Speaker, despite these criticisms, the campaign finance legislation we have introduced deserves support and prompt action. I think it only fair to point out that this bill incorporates, in large part, the recommendations of President John F. Kennedy's Commission on Campaign Costs. President Kennedy's words, in transmitting that Commission's report to Congress nearly 9 years ago are pertinent today:

The problems of political finance are not limited to any political party, but are common to all, and all will benefit from action on the legislation herewith transmitted. Enactment of these proposals will go a long way to improve the political climate.

A WAY TO CURB INFLATION

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, inflation and unemployment, the twin evils of a sluggish economy, have defied solution for too long now. A New York Times editorial published yesterday suggests a promising way to make these stubborn problems yield. The Times proposes a national "income policies board"—a board with quite limited and quite explicitly defined powers—to focus public attention on situations that threaten the economy.

By using the moral force of public opinion, the Times argues, such a board could help stop excessive profits and excessive wage demands.

Mr. Speaker, I place the editorial in the RECORD at this point.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 28, 1971]

INCOMES POLICY NEEDED

Events are propelling the Nixon Administration toward the development of a national incomes policy, but in such a spasmodic and confused way that it is still impossible to know what sort of policy will emerge.

In order to suspend the Davis-Bacon Act last week, the President had to declare that a national emergency existed. But only a few

days before, spokesmen of his Administration were hailing a one-month slowdown in the rate of rise of the consumer price index as evidence that inflation was well under control. Mr. Nixon had to resolve the seeming contradiction by describing construction as a special case, just as steel and oil were described as special cases previously.

What is needed now is a national incomes policy which will bring under genuine control a broad-based inflation that has already lasted far too long and that threatens to continue indefinitely. Is there any reason to suppose that, without a new policy, the country will not see a continuation of seriously inflationary wage settlements and price actions this year?

The nation needs an incomes policy that will be not just a response to present problems but one that it can live with over the long haul. This does not mean a return to World War II-type wage and price controls, with the enormous administrative apparatus that would be required to enforce them if they could be enforced at all. It does mean establishment of a wage-price board which would have limited powers of recommendation in selected industrial disputes or pricing situations that appeared to be of national significance. This would constitute an open means of exerting pressure on the principals through the force of public opinion. But in the end the decision-makers among both management and labor would have to bear responsibility for their own actions.

As voluntaristic as this approach may be, we believe it nevertheless could make a contribution toward changing the inflationary expectations and behavior of labor, business, and the public. Given the heavy cost to the nation of inflation, unemployment, and a continuation of stop-go economics, it is now becoming increasingly urgent that the effort be made.

The President already has stand-by authority granted him by Congress to declare a temporary freeze on wages and prices in all industries. A freeze of extremely short duration, a matter of weeks, would serve two purposes: dramatize the end of the period of inflationary drift, and prevent a last-minute scramble on the part of those who would like to get the final massive wage boost or price increase before the new national wage-price board could be set up. In those few key bargaining situations in which the board decided to become involved, it would have power to postpone, for a limited time, the effective date of wage agreements or price actions until it had a chance to review the case for such actions and to make its own recommendations. If the parties chose to ignore its recommendations, the board would have no further powers of enforcement.

The board would strive to lead the nation back toward lasting price stability by gaining broad acceptance of certain fundamental principles which have now been well established by economic analysis. Most important is the principle that wage settlements in individual industries should be in line with the long-term growth of national productivity. However, this principle need not be a straitjacket; exceptions could be made to deal with inequities resulting from past inflation or to meet special needs of expanding industries.

It is true that past incomes policies have had only partial success—or have failed—both here and in other countries. In the United States, the failure of wage-price guideposts was primarily due to the unwillingness of the Johnson Administration to adopt fiscal and monetary policies adequate to restrain the inflation that resulted from the piling of the Vietnam war on an already fully employed economy. In Britain, the failure of incomes policy under the Labor Government was primarily a result of wavering and unclear guidelines and an unwillingness to stand up to militant trade unions or irre-

sponsible wildcat strikers. But the lack of incomes policies has produced even worse results, as recent experience has demonstrated both in this country and in Britain.

How to combine price stability with high and growing employment remains the cardinal problem of all modern industrial nations. The Administration, determined to bring about a rapid return to full employment, has the obligation of developing an incomes policy to assure that expansion will not be accompanied by still further inflation—which in turn could bring about another dose of unemployment-boosting deflation.

CRUELTY TO THE POOR

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, we hear so much these days from the news media and from some Members of Congress about the need to reorder our national priorities and to spend much greater amounts for relief of the poor.

At the same time, I believe that far too little consideration is being given to the effect of the massive increase in non-defense spending that has occurred over the last decade. Our aim, of course, is to see everyone as prosperous as possible. No man should be forced to live in degradation. The real issue, then, concerns how we can most effectively achieve that aim. Many of the new programs are proving ineffective because they fail to recognize a need to incorporate the basic principles of self-reliance and productivity. In not recognizing these principles, we are actually thrusting upon the poor a form of economic slavery, by creating a state of dependency on the Government. The Government, of course, is the average taxpayer who already works 5 full months of the year just to pay his total tax load.

Increased productivity, not increased taxation, points to the effective solution of our poverty problems. Results of the 1970 census demonstrate that in terms of real income, there has been a 4½-percent increase per year—which is 3 to 4 times the rate of population growth. Moreover, the results show that this increase in national wealth was, to a large measure, evenly distributed among the various income groups. These are perhaps the most encouraging statistics to be produced by the census.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to my previous comments concerning ill-directed Federal programs, I commend to the attention of my colleagues, the following letter written by Mrs. Dorothy Ella Potts of Houston. Mrs. Potts' cogent remarks were recently printed in the Houston Post:

CRUELTY TO THE POOR?

I believe being black, poor, and middle-aged qualify me to make the following statements.

I believe the present welfare and poverty programs in this country will destroy what little guts poor people have left. Charity is a malignancy that will destroy one, and poor people are being given an overdose, and turning into invertebrates by the thousands.

Ignorant people are being given houses, food, medical care, legal advice, etc. They aren't asked to contribute anything in return, maybe, except enlarge the earth's population.

Many welfare programs create ill will. Have you ever noticed working people in a grocery checkout line when the young woman who has just checked out \$50 in groceries, 40 per cent of which was precooked meats, precooked pastries and breads, frozen dinners, etc., then pulls out food stamps to pay the bill? Or have you noticed how many common law marriages have come to be since after a period of time the state will accept these people as married but the welfare department will say this is a poor mother with dependent children that we should help? Or the young woman who always prefers a night job so she can be home when her "case worker" comes to call? Notice she never tells she has a regular job?

What are we trying to prove? Where are we supposed to be heading? Who in the . . . we kidding? People are a product of their past and their environment. You can change the environment a lot faster than you can change the person. But if we are to be of any help to our fellowman we must change both. Today our confused country feels we can build a clean house, give one a clean shirt, a clean meal, and suddenly everything dirty will go away. If the mixed-up politician would look back on his way out of the ghetto he would see the people conforming their new surrounding to look and really be a replica of the old.

The sad part is how these people are being used. It always seems to the taxpayer that these are professional parasites looking for a handout, when in reality most of these people don't know or care what programs are in effect. They are told to vote for Joe Blow and items one and four. Hardly anyone will refuse an easy way out. The government is offering to pay these people's way out of the bottom and they are accepting. They realize they are traveling a round track but it does not cost to travel, so—

The lawmakers, the rich, and others are being cruel to those they say they want to help. I wonder if we can get the do-gooders to turn loose the poor's hand long enough for him to get hold of his boot strap?

DOROTHY ELLA POTTS.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, February 24, marked the 53d anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Estonia.

I am united in spirit with this tenacious people who seek self-determination and freedom from the chains of tyranny.

Those of us who are the custodians of democracy have a responsibility and an obligation to those who do not share this precious right; for no man is entirely free until all men are free.

While the Estonian people have been deprived of their liberty and their property—their spirit is undaunted. I salute this courageous people and fervently share their aspirations of restored freedom.

POW'S MUST FEEL THE UNITED STATES CARES

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an article by Ray Cromley entitled "POW's Must Feel United States Cares."

Mr. Cromley is Washington correspondent for the Newspaper Enterprise Association, and as a prisoner of war during World War II, knows what it means to be a prisoner of war and has personally experienced the pangs of frustration, suffering, and sorrow of the man incarcerated because of his citizenship.

It was my privilege when I first came to Congress to meet Ray Cromley and to hear firsthand about some of his experiences and reactions. Later, as a member of the Commission that was sent to Manila to represent our Government at the inauguration of the Philippine Republic, I had the pleasure of seeing him in Tokyo where he had returned at the request of General MacArthur to serve as an adviser.

Much has been written about our prisoners of war in North Vietnam. In all of the wars the world has known prisoners of war always suffer and our sympathy and admiration should go out to them and their loved ones, who are left behind. Mr. Cromley has a message that all should read, and I commend his article to all of you who missed it when it was first published.

The article follows:

POW'S MUST FEEL THE UNITED STATES CARES
(By Ray Cromley)

I have been a prisoner of the enemy in war. Six months solitary confinement in a Japanese prison in World War II.

Perhaps, then, I can suggest in some small way how the American prisoners of war now in North Vietnam feel after the attempt at their rescue.

Thinking back 28 years to my own feelings, I remember two things quite vividly:

The Doolittle raid of April, 1942, and the visit of the Swiss government representative, after I'd spent about five and a half months in solitary. During the war the neutral Swiss represented U.S. interests in Tokyo.

I remember strongly even today because these incidents brought hope to the heart of a prisoner who, through no one's fault, had had no sign from his government and his country during the months of imprisonment.

It did not matter that the Doolittle raiders had not come to free us prisoners but were over Tokyo for an entirely different purpose. You could look out the barred window and see American fliers were there. For hours afterward you could relive this flight by watching the rising smoke and by listening to the excited conversations of the guards. You could feel and hear and know yourself that something was being done—and in a way you could feel that it was being done for you. You were part of it.

When the Swiss came, I cried. I cried because I said to myself, "My country cares!" I said it over again and over again in happy agonizing gulps. In the months of holding in during daily questioning by teams of guards and of sitting, eating, sleeping in my cell, I had not realized how alone I had come to feel myself.

The freedom in my soul and in my voice was not the thought of rescue or release (pleasant as that would be) that mattered so much as the thought that my country cared enough for me—for us, that the Swiss should come to see each of us individually even for a few minutes and should be attempting, whether successfully or not, to do something for us.

I still remember the room in which my Swiss visitor and I sat. I remember the expression on his face and the way his lips moved when he talked.

He asked me a few questions and we talked a little, the normal things men say to each other. He did not promise anything. It was then not yet clear whether negotiations for an exchange of prisoners would be successful. But I walked back down that prison hall with my heart singing as loudly, as strongly, as powerfully and as triumphantly as a gigantic choir in a cathedral as if heaven had opened wide.

I was a man and an American and nothing could defeat my soul.

I never saw my Swiss friend again. But he will remain my friend until the day I die.

It is hope that men require when they are prisoners of war. And a belief that their country cares. And their wives and children.

With these a man can endure all things. Sickness, loneliness, beatings, death.

OPPOSITION TO THE PRESENCE OF U.S. ARMED FORCES IN CAMBODIA

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the General Council of Ford Local 600 of the United Auto Workers in Dearborn, Mich., unanimously adopted on February 14, 1971, a resolution expressing their opposition to the "continued presence and use of U.S. Armed Forces in Cambodia and the rest of Indochina," their desire for "speedy termination of the war," and their prayer for peace in that "unfortunate area."

The General Council's persuasive argument is of benefit to all Americans and I include the resolution at this point in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION ON OPPOSITION TO THE PRESENCE OF U.S. ARMED FORCES IN CAMBODIA

We are gravely concerned with the growing role of the United States in the Cambodian War. Far from decreasing, all indications are that, contrary to the Cooper-Church Amendment to the Military Appropriation Act of 1970 and to the oft-repeated declarations from the NIXON Administration, the United States role and military presence in Cambodia is actually increasing.

Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird stated recently that "we're going to use air power (in Cambodia) and I don't care to get into a question of semantics on that."

Competent U. S. news reporters in Cam-

bodia, however, indicate the phrase "air power" is being used by the Administration to cover a multitude of military activities beyond the conventional task of airplanes.

Vice-President Agnew indicated on August 23 that "we're going to do everything we can to help the Lon Nol government" because "the whole matter of Cambodia is related to the security of troops in Vietnam." The argument of the Vice-President is precisely the one now used by the Administration to explain the invasion of Cambodia last spring.

This Administration, which came to power on the promise to disengage from war in South Vietnam, is clearly not keeping its pledge. Increasing military assistance to South Vietnam will further widen the fighting and will not bring this tragic war to an end.

This administration's concept of ending the war obviously seems based on the hope that it can win. The fallacy of that concept should have become clear in the years since U.S. advisors were first sent into Vietnam.

National governments in a democracy are expected to abide broadly by the wishes of the people rather than by the wishes of their generals. If the two are opposed, the former should prevail. We thus unreservedly condemn the use of any American troops in Cambodia in the air, on the ground or by any other means.

If our presence in Indochina could ever have been justified in terms of our obligations to others, that obligation has been more than met by the 43,000 dead, hundreds of thousands maimed and wounded, and hundreds of bombed and burned villages and towns in Indochina. Let us now commit ourselves to a speedy end to the war and the restoration of peaceful conditions in Indochina.

Further, the excessive and prohibitive expenditures of billions of dollars for military purposes in Indochina has placed a tremendous strain upon our national economy; it has been a very important factor in the creation of the present rampant inflation in our country. It has resulted in the constantly increasing number of layoffs and unemployment in our nation today.

These billions of dollars which have been, and are being wasted, in financing this unfortunate war in Indochina, and elsewhere, could be utilized much more constructively in solving the many grave problems that exist in our country and could thereby reduce inflation, unemployment and layoffs.

The General Council of Ford Local #600, in session on February 14, 1971, representing a total of 33,000 in-plant employees and 15,000 retired members, unanimously approved the recommendation of the Local Officers and Executive Board, to urge our government to take immediate steps to effectuate the speedy termination of the War in Indochina and the restoration of peace.

IF THE MILITARY IS TO BE USED TO QUELL RIOTS, IT IS ENTITLED TO KNOW ABOUT THE TROUBLEMAKERS, THEIR BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATIONS

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the recent disclosure of the Army's "civil disturbance information collection plan," has generated a considerable amount of publicity. Some understandable concern has been expressed by those who feel the

scope of surveillance, and the implementation of the plan, were too broad and that names of some individuals were mentioned who obviously were not suspect in any sense of the word.

But let us see what this is all about and not throw the baby out with the wash. Mistakes that were made—and there must have been some—should be corrected. Although the plan has been rescinded, it would seem that, in the public interest, some sort of surveillance will be continued. If not carried out by military intelligence, I would assume the FBI can be expected to continue to be active in that role. It would seem that in view of the monumental scope of the problem, both sources should be drawn upon.

This does not mean that in keeping track of troublemakers the investigators should use scatter guns or involve any innocent people in their factfinding operations. The important thing to keep in mind is that the Army's recent surveillance activities should not be condemned willy-nilly, because the objectives were obviously valid and laudable.

Let us examine those objectives. When initiated on May 2, 1968, the plan was explained in these words:

The Army is well aware that the overwhelming majority in both the anti-war and racial movements are sincere Americans. It also realizes that in both groups there is a small but virulent number who are out to tear America apart. . . . These are the activists that control the violent action.

If the Army must be used to quell violence it wants to restore law and order as quickly as possible and return to its normal protective role—to do this it must know in advance as much as possible about the well-springs of violence and the heart and nerve causes of chaos.

The Army seeks only to collect that needed to exercise honest and sound judgment of the measures to be taken in suppressing rampant violence and restoring order. . . .

Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that the objectives thus expressed are valid. No one would quarrel with the fact that if the Army, including the National Guard, is to be kept trained for riot control, it should be armed with information about the people responsible for such riots, their backgrounds, and motivations.

The military has been called upon many times to quell riots and other civil disturbances. That has happened in the past and it will happen in the future, when civil authorities find it necessary to call for such help. Thus, knowledge about those who seem to habitually spearhead such disturbances is implicit in the mission the military is called upon to perform.

A very lucid and timely discussion of this topic is contained in a letter to the editor, carried in the February 26 issue of the Evening Star, written by a former staff director of the Committee on Un-American Activities. That letter follows:

DEFENDS MILITARY SLEUTHING

SIR: Recent headlines have convicted the Army of "Civil Spying" and "Snooping." The caption on a Carl Rowan column proclaimed "Military Threatening U.S. Freedom" (by "spying on civilians"). Frank Getlein has stated that the as yet unproved charges

against the Army are "an authentic outrage" which should "make us all tremble." A Star editorial stated that all Americans should be "startled" by the charges and, while proclaiming that you would not pass judgment until more facts are available, strongly implied that the Army was guilty of unconstitutional action.

The following facts, it is hoped, will help your readers place in proper perspective some of the extremist, highly emotional statements made by Star and other writers, based on Senator Sam Ervin's allegations against the Army.

Beginning with the Harlem riot of 1964 and continuing through the national antiwar "demonstrations" of this year, this country has been plagued by recurrences of mass violence. They have led to several congressional investigations and the appointment of a National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (the Kerner Commission) to study the causes and propose solutions to what the overwhelming majority of citizens have considered a grave danger to our country.

In its report published in the spring of 1968, the Kerner Commission pointed out that 75 disorders already studied by a Senate subcommittee had resulted in 83 deaths. More people have been killed in hundreds of disturbances that have taken place since then and property damage from recurring, large-scale violence has cost the American people hundreds of millions of dollars, in addition to thousands of personal injuries.

ACCURATE INFORMATION ABSENT

The Kerner Commission in its recommendations for a program of national action to solve the problem of mass violence made the following statement:

"The absence of accurate information both before and during a disorder has created special control problems for police. Police departments must develop means to obtain adequate intelligence for planning purposes, as well as on-the-scene information for use in police operations during a disorder.

"An intelligence unit staffed with full-time personnel should be established to gather, evaluate, analyze, and disseminate information on potential as well as actual civil disorders. It should provide police administrators and commanders with reliable information essential for assessment and decision-making. It should use undercover police personnel and informants, but it should also draw on community leaders, agencies, and organizations in the ghetto."

The police forces of a few of our major cities have had excellent intelligence units for years. The New York City police force, for example, has penetrated a plot to blow up the Statue of Liberty, the Washington Monument and Liberty Bell and other criminal-political conspiracies. The Chicago police did an outstanding job of developing intelligence on the planned disruption of the 1968 Democratic Convention. Because of underfinancing, however, most police forces in the U.S. have had no intelligence units or inadequate ones. This is one of the reasons massive violence took many of our largest cities by surprise. Without intelligence they were caught completely unprepared.

COULD NOT CONTROL IT

The violence of 1967 was so great that local police and National Guard forces could not control it, and the Army was given the duty of lending assistance. A costly riot control center was erected at the Pentagon. The Army assigned seven task forces, each of brigade size (about 2,000 men) for immediate response to calls for federal assistance in controlling civil disorders.

The above quote from the Kerner Commission report concerning the vital importance of police intelligence gathering became applicable to the Army when it was assigned riot-control duties.

Increased attention to police departments

and the problem of riot control has improved the overall police intelligence situation, but it is still far from adequate. The FBI has very effectively penetrated the older subversive groups, but there has been such a proliferation of new organization of this type in recent years that logic indicates its penetration of them is not on the same level. Moreover, it is not keyed primarily to riot-control intelligence and on-the-spot coverage of the numerous demonstrations that are continually taking place. For this reason, in an era of continuing, widespread confrontation-demonstrations, many of which contain the seeds of violence, it would seem that auxiliary forces in his area are required. The traditional agencies just don't have the personnel needed for the task.

A recently released annual report of the FBI states that black extremist groups are still "promoting racial unrest and discontent" and have conducted "guerrilla-type warfare." It also points out that the Weathermen are concentrating on "urban guerrilla warfare" and asserts that "physical riots and confrontations," along with bombings and terrorist attacks by the New Left, are "a distinct danger to our national security."

HAS CONTINUING OBLIGATION

Thus, as long as the Army has its riot-control assignment, it has a continuing obligation to gather all possible information about organizations and individuals who have or may instigate rioting and violence.

This letter is not intended as a complete defense of all the Army may have done in the area of intelligence gathering in relation to its riot control duties. Some mistakes may have been made (though none has been proved as yet). With hundreds of intelligence agents, many of them young and relatively inexperienced, suddenly thrown into a completely new type of work—gathering data on domestic dissident groups—it would be a miracle if there were not some booboos. If there were some, they are to be regretted—and corrected. But they are not grounds for wholesale, free-swinging denunciation of the Army and its taking steps which, the majority of authorities agree, are essential to sound riot-control operations.

No one could object if Star columnists, reporters and editors uncovered some mistakes in the Army's operations and calmly called for their correction. What must be deplored is the fact that the items published on this subject have not treated the subject objectively and in perspective, defending the right and indicating the need for Army intelligence gathering in this area in line with its riot control obligations.

Not long ago The Star favorably reviewed an excellent book on this general subject, "The Riot Makers," by Eugene Methvin, who has devoted ten years to the study of U.S. and foreign riots, their instigation and control. News coverage of the Army "spying" controversy indicates a compelling need for study of this scholarly work by many writers and commentators.

FRANCIS J. McNAMARA.

REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT CONSTITUENTS—MARCH 1, 1971

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the second of three reports on the Nation's growing welfare crisis:

WASHINGTON REPORT—MARCH 1, 1971

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the second of three reports on the Nation's growing welfare crisis.)

President Nixon, in his State of the Union Message, scored the country's welfare system as a "monstrous, continuing outrage." He found, in that choice of words, widespread agreement—from recipients of welfare who say payments are not enough to sustain a decent life—from administrators of welfare, who wrestle with red tape and regulations to deal with the most disadvantaged in our society—and from the taxpayers, who foot the bill for all of it.

As the costs of welfare (\$14.2 billion last year) and the number of recipients (13.5 million last year) accelerate, the financial stability of State and local governments is being threatened. As the need to pay for welfare has increased, some State and local officials have been forced to cut back on other public services.

There is a growing rebellion at this level of government against the rising costs of welfare. The governors of Indiana and California have been quoted as saying they are considering withdrawing their states from the Federal-state program and operating a much less costly system of benefits on state and local funds.

Understandably, the ire of middle-income wage earners is rising, too, as welfare costs go up. Those who carry the main burden of taxes are angered and frustrated at the prospects of funding cuts for public services to accommodate burgeoning welfare rolls.

Out of this frustration has grown the belief that most welfare recipients are lazy individuals who would rather live on a dole than work. Periodic reports of welfare fraud (e.g. Nevada's recent elimination of 22 percent of Aid for Dependent Children cases because of undeclared income) have added to the myth. In the absence of detailed information about the people on welfare, this view has become ingrained in the public's mind.

The first detailed census of the numbers on public assistance wasn't developed until the mid-1960's. It revealed, among other things, that of the 7.3 million Americans on welfare at that time, only 150,000 were males old enough to work. Of that number, 100,000 were incapacitated beyond the ability to work or to be trained for work. That left 50,000 employable men on the welfare rolls—less than one-tenth of 1 percent.

The largest category of welfare recipients was that of the children—3.5 million. Another 2.1 million were over 65 years of age, and most of them were women. Another 700,000 were blind or so severely handicapped they could not work, and still another 900,000 were mothers of young children.

The President's Commission on Income Maintenance Programs, which recently completed a 22-month study of welfare programs, concluded: "The poor cannot be divided into those who will work and those who will not. Unemployment or underemployment among the poor is often due to forces they cannot control."

If the present welfare crisis was primarily a matter of "free loading" or cheating on welfare rolls, the solution to the problem would be relatively easy. The problem is far more complex. To begin with, it helps to separate fact and myth:

Myth: Most welfare recipients are black. Fact: White recipients account for 58 percent of the total. Seventy percent of the Nation's poor are white.

Myth: Some are getting rich on welfare. Fact: Benefits for Aid for Dependent Children (AFDC) families now average \$185 a month across the country, which is 43 percent below the Federal government's poverty line.

Myth: Many are freeloaders. Fact: Obviously there is some cheating, but recent government studies estimate that only four out of every 1000 of those on welfare cheat.

Myth: Once on welfare rolls, they stay on. Fact: The typical AFDC recipient stays on welfare for 23 months, according to HEW figures. About 60 percent of the AFDC families are receiving welfare for the first time.

Myth: They have children to stay on welfare. Fact: The average AFDC family is four, compared to a national average of 4.2 children. Moreover, in two-thirds of the welfare families, all the children have the same parents.

CONGRESSMEN VERSUS PRESIDENT

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on 2 successive days last week, the Peoria Journal Star published editorials candidly discussing the actions of some Members of Congress in their methods of opposing the President's programs, especially his handling of the war in Vietnam.

The editorials speak for themselves in loud and clear tones and need no further comment from me to bolster the import of their message. I include the editorials from the February 22 and February 23 editions of the Peoria Journal Star in the RECORD at this point:

FEBRUARY 22—A BAD DAY: CONGRESSMEN VERSUS PRESIDENT

Today is the true Washington's birthday, but it also marks, oddly enough, the day when American politics sunk to its lowest, rottenest, most viciously partisan point.

On Feb. 22, over 100 years ago, the House of Representatives voted a charge of impeachment against Andrew Johnson, President of the United States by reason of Lincoln's assassination.

The Congress, then controlled by "Radical Republicans" from the northern states and stooges placed in office via the military government of southern states, had passed a "law" over Presidential veto whereby Congress named the Secretary of War and Congress ran the War Department instead of the President.

The law was patently unconstitutional, and Johnson promptly fired the Secretary of War to assert his authority and bring the matter to a test before the Supreme Court on constitutional grounds.

Instead, the House of Representatives voted the bill of impeachment to try the President before the Senate and throw him out of office for "violating a law of Congress" and defying the Congress.

The trial in the Senate was held, and the anti-Johnson men had the votes regardless of the evidence.

But in the final crunch, they lost by a single vote because one man couldn't bring himself to such a dishonest political act and usurpation of power under false pretenses. He accepted political oblivion to preserve the Constitution and the continuity of the United States as a government of separate powers.

(Congress was also moving to take over the Supreme Court at that time.)

In the fullness of time, history has labeled Senator Thad Stevens as a dangerous, unstable power-mad fanatic and his chief ally, Senator Ben Wade, as an utter scoundrel.

All now agree the impeachment effort was a purely political trial and the most disgraceful performance ever staged by the Congress of the United States.

It is curious that such a struggle should mark its anniversary in an atmosphere where once again there is, indeed, a battle between an opposing political faction in the Congress and the President involving the President's traditional and constitutional powers as Commander-in-Chief.

It is curious that once again there is a major effort by a group in the Congress to exert specific controls over the decisions of the Commander-in-Chief in terms of his function in the field.

As in Andrew Johnson's day, the issue is charged with emotionalism and passionate appeals to feeling.

As in Johnson's day, there is much more actually involved and at stake than the wisdom of today's limited actions in today's specific situation.

At stake is the very structure of decision-making, and the question of whether administrative decisions can continue to be made in pace with events, or whether the legislative, deliberative, and debating section of the U.S. government is going to begin making administrative decisions.

Events do not wait upon legislation in the fields of foreign policy or military policy.

Events proceed with or without us. Events in these fields, all experience demonstrates, will not await a Congressional debate.

That is the real problem. A legislative body is not designed to make executive decisions and cannot function responsibly or effectively in the administrative area.

This is not a question of philosophy or of desirability.

It is a fact with which we are obliged to live—or pay the inevitable price for default.

Either system will be imperfect, but delay and inaction is certainly the surest way to guarantee utter disaster in some future circumstances in which events demand an immediate answer—or else.

In their eagerness to have their way in a passing situation of this day, and in their political fervor, some of our Senators are tampering with a very basic principle of operational government and practices which could cripple us in unknown future emergencies.

It is a dangerous game to play in 1971, even as it was over 100 years ago. And one which ultimately brings odium not fame in history's cold eye.

WEIGH NIXON ON DEEDS

Richard Nixon is supposed to be, according to his long-time critics, "Tricky Dicky," a completely amoral political gimmick artist with no principles or purpose other than to manipulate to be on the side of winning public opinion.

Ever since Lyndon Johnson decided not to run there has been a cheerful whoop-de-do among the demonstrator groups, and some of the more chauvinistic newscasters, that "we did it," and that public pressures creates national policy in all matters.

This "justifies" such people to themselves (and makes the TV hucksters feel immensely powerful) in the business of "making things happen" through public uproar.

Another version is the urge which often strikes some, quite naturally, who come to the newspaper and want us to front a "Letter-writing campaign." "If they get enough letters, they will do such and such," is the pitch. Well, far be it from us to belittle our own business, and evidence of public opinion at any given time is certainly a factor in decision-making in a democracy.

But it is only one factor. Public opinion cannot make it feasible to shorten the moon-flight to 10 hours, for ex-

ample, or increase the capacity of Apollo to carry five next time.

Public opinion will not persuade a doctor to do brain surgery to remove a splinter from a toe.

And whether it is an academic process of decision-making and "who wins the argument" to us or not, people working with experience and expertise in the realm of the possible have no choice but to consider time, space, numbers, dollars, and other physical factors in determining what is likely to work and what is not.

They are involved with the physical problems involved in detail, and those problems and the means of solving them are potent factors which cannot be overlooked and are often less changeable than public opinion.

The State engineers are not going to commit \$26,000,000 to building a bridge at Peking, for example, that they are convinced would turn into a fiasco after it was built—no matter what public or political pressure might exist for some such site. The first essential is that it has to work after it's done.

The physical conditions, specific events, and physical actions of others have to be taken into account as well as domestic "opinion."

There's no choice, really, unless a fellow is completely amoral.

And whether it makes some folks howling mad in their direct passions on this issue or not, the obvious truth is that the president who had the cool nerve to add up the physical facts available to him and okay the South Vietnamese plan to cut the cancerous Ho Chi Minh trail simply doesn't jibe with the "opportunistic" Nixon "image," pursuing popularity at any price.

He has obviously done what he thought would do the most good even though it had to be a painful decision politically.

You can't have it both ways. It's time to get off the kick that Nixon is a cheap political opportunist if he does one thing and damn him as a tricky tyrant sinfully "defying" public opinion, when he does something else.

That double-standard conduct can only be explained by unjust, unfair, unreasonable prejudice.

It's about time we viewed the president as a man with a very tough job trying to do it the best he can—and measure him simply by how well he succeeds. How do his decisions come out?

OUR COURSE IN SPACE

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the recent monthly lunch of the National Space Club provided us with a good opportunity to hear an address by William Anders, one of our outstanding astronauts, who now serves as executive secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

Bill Anders' speech was of interest to all of us who attended the lunch. He made special note of President Nixon's space policy for the 1970's and gave an excellent analysis of the administration's budget proposals, which support that policy.

As I believe that Bill Anders' speech is of interest to my colleagues and the American people, I am placing his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for wider coverage.

I am also including the introductory remarks to Bill Anders' speech given by Alan Smith of WTTG-TV, Washington, D.C. Mr. Smith, an outstanding television journalist, is anchorman on the 10 o'clock evening news for Metromedia Television in the metropolitan Washington area. Mr. Smith's reporting of the exciting Apollo lunar missions has brought many distinguished awards to Metromedia news.

INTRODUCTION OF WILLIAM ANDERS BY ALAN SMITH, METROMEDIA TELEVISION (WTTG-TV WASHINGTON)

I'm especially pleased to be here since now I can learn from the experts what all those alphabet-soup space-terms we throw around so easily on television really mean. . . .

Frankly, until the Apollo 14 mission, those of us in TV had finally managed to memorize most of the lingo. But now it seems we have to learn a whole new set of exotic terms . . . like . . . bogie . . . birdie . . . eagle . . . mashe and 6 iron. . . .

Seriously, if I may, I would like to say that I am quite proud of our country's space accomplishments . . . and so, it is not merely a job when we cover a space mission . . . it is something we have a deep interest in.

Frequently, we hear the argument of "priorities at home," and they can't be ignored. But it would be terribly short-sighted, I believe, to throttle space-exploration . . . and the benefits to man that can accrue from that, by subscribing to that "priorities argument." I believe there can be a sensible balance in both areas.

As for manned, versus unmanned space-flight . . . I believe the human factor will prevail. I think the problems of the Apollo 14 attest to that. As we said on the air at the time . . . as sophisticated as we can make machines, two inanimate sensors . . . haven't the ability yet to stick their heads together and say . . . Hey, let's try this. The Apollo 14 mission might well have been scrubbed, had it been an unmanned flight . . .

In addition, I happen to feel that man's ability to evaluate the intangible, can provide far greater understanding of space (with the help of his machines, of course) than could those machines alone. . . .

And that brings us to our guest this afternoon . . . whom I am very proud to introduce.

I think it is quite unnecessary to run off the long list of credentials and honors belonging to our guest today . . . I am sure they are well-known to all of you, since he is a Governor of the Space Club . . . and his face and deeds have been well-documented on television.

You may recall that he spent Christmas 1968 . . . out of the country . . . on a trip that was the first of its kind . . . The Apollo 8 mission to the Moon. Since that historic feat, our guest has chalked up many honors . . . among them NASA Distinguished Service Award . . . and the Air Force's Distinguished Service Medal. . . .

In 1969, because of his space knowledge and expertise, he was appointed by President Nixon to head the staff of the National Aeronautics and Space Council. The Council has the responsibility of advising and assisting the President in the policies and performance of the entire Aeronautics and Space Field.

It's my pleasure, therefore, to introduce . . . former Astronaut . . . and now, Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council . . . Mr. William Anders. . . .

OUR COURSE IN SPACE

(Address by William A. Anders)

Last December I listened to Pat Moynihan's farewell remarks to the Cabinet and Sub-Cabinet when he pointed out some areas in which we in the Administration could improve the way we were doing our jobs. One

point that I particularly remember was his claim that too often it seemed that we had not really listened to what the President had said. Our own actions, he suggested, were too often guided by what we imagined the President wanted or did not want, based on some other source than the President's own words. This lack of aural acuity was a great shame, Moynihan continued, because in his first two years in the White House President Nixon had made a series of important and innovative policy statements, ones which those in his Administration sometimes appeared not to hear, not to believe, or even to forget.

As I listened to Moynihan, it occurred to me that somewhat the same thought could be applied against some members of the space community. I hear talk about the lack of a U.S. space policy for the 70's. This surprises me a bit, for there is a clear and forward-looking statement of that policy on the books—a policy issued by President Nixon last March. Quite frankly, I think that some have not paid enough attention to that statement, and its implications for the pace and character of our future space activities. This statement still stands and, in my view, is an authoritative description of "our future course in space."

I want to begin, therefore, by reminding you of the substance of the President's policy for the 70's and then review this year's budget proposals in light of that policy. I believe that a consideration of the character and pace of the program shows that the President has backed up his policy with funding for its implementation. However, even a Presidential plan for a comprehensive and balanced space program is not self-executing. We who favor a continuing and aggressive program of space activities must help to maintain and expand their base of support. Working with the Administration and with Congress, we must convince the people of our country that such a program is, and remains, a worthwhile investment of national resources. In my estimation, there are at least two major selling points to be made in a campaign of this nature. One is that the program of the 70's, in addition to its exploration and basic scientific content, will produce real, relatively short-term, and easily evident practical applications and benefits. The other is that a strong national space program is a prerequisite for productive international cooperation in space. I believe the President has underwritten a viable program and that he now needs our support in gaining its nationwide acceptance.

First then, what about the program and its budget for FY72?

After he had reviewed the Space Task Group report and had heard other advice regarding the future of space, in the context of the total range of our national needs, the President issued his space policy statement. That statement contained some specific conclusions "concerning the future pace and direction of our nation's space efforts." I believe those conclusions—expressed in terms of three general purposes and six more specific objectives—form the basis of a sound and balanced program, one which we can, and should, offer to the nation with little hesitation.

The Administration and, I believe, the people want a balanced program aimed at exploration; at increases in knowledge; and at producing practical applications and benefits here on earth. To these ends, he has proposed six objectives as guidelines for our future activities; let me remind you of them:

1. exploration of the moon;
2. exploration of the planets and the universe;
3. substantial reduction in the cost of space operations;
4. extension of man's capability to work and live in space;

5. hastening and expanding the practical applications of space technology;

6. encouraging greater international cooperation in space (the theme of our Goddard dinner).

I think that if you examine this year's budget proposals and other actions of the past year in light of these objectives you will find that, in the context of the tremendous demands on our nation's resources, the President is taking meaningful steps toward achieving each of those six objectives. Let me give you some examples:

First, *exploration of the moon.*

This year's budget contains funds for all three remaining Apollo missions to the moon, spacing these missions to maximize their scientific returns. Even from the very preliminary reports of the Apollo 14 mission, I think we can once again appreciate the great value of man's presence in lunar exploration. The discrimination a highly trained explorer exercises in selecting geologically important lunar material means that each flight significantly advances our understanding of lunar structure, lunar evolution, and, most interestingly, the origin of the earth. To capitalize on man's special abilities, Apollos 15, 16 and 17 will carry lunar roving vehicles to increase very substantially the explorer's radius of action. Each succeeding flight will carry more advanced scientific equipment.

Next, *exploration of the planets and the universe.*

Funds for unmanned exploration of the solar system and the universe have been increased in this year's budget proposal. Highlights include substantial increases or new starts in programs aimed at landing a spacecraft on Mars in 1976 to conduct experiments to determine whether life exists there; programs aimed at sending spacecraft both to the vicinity of the outer planets and to the inner planets; and programs aimed at developing new orbiting observatories for observing high-energy emissions from the far reaches of the universe and to study the sun and other celestial bodies.

Third, *substantial reduction in the cost of space operations.*

Here funds are committed for engine development and for continued airframe design studies for the space shuttle. As you well know, the reusable space shuttle is the key to reducing the cost of space operations, whether those operations involve men or not. In fact, I don't believe that the shuttle should be thought of as a manned flight program per se, but rather as a transportation system servicing both manned and unmanned science and applications activities in orbit. Current estimates are that the initial space shuttle will be the "DC-3 of space" for at least a decade after it becomes operational. It is of utmost importance, therefore, to make sure we select the right shuttle design. We expect, on the basis of ongoing studies now being conducted by NASA, to have developed a sound basis of understanding concerning shuttle economics and airframe design by this summer. I feel confident that then an appropriate airframe selection can be made and that the funding required for its development will follow. I believe that a cost-effective shuttle system will be flying during this decade and that the caution and study now being exercised will further that end. It is encouraging to note that the Air Force and NASA have recently agreed on a single set of performance characteristics for this national space system.

Fourth, *extension of man's capability to work and live in space.*

In the lunar program we have seen the value of having man there—able to make on-the-spot decisions. To push ahead and explore further man's capability to work and live in space, we have the very important Skylab program, which will provide the essential experience needed for the development of our future space activities. Skylab

is an experimental space station in which, over a period of nine months to a year, three crews of astronauts will perform important scientific and engineering tasks and will conduct biomedical experiments related to their own abilities to live and work in space. In the Mercury and Gemini programs, and in Apollo itself, we only opened the door to our understanding of man's capabilities and usefulness in space. Though there is much promise, we can only guess at the ultimate uses of human discretion, when applied to such diverse problems as earth resources survey, ultraviolet astronomy, manufacturing and processing in ϕ gravity, weather and the atmospheric environment observation, and further exploration. The Skylab orbiting laboratory is, therefore, a central feature of our space program of the 70's, in which I strongly believe is very necessary.

Fifth, *hastening and expanding the practical applications of space technology.*

The proposed budget provides funding of the previously planned space applications program, including two Earth Resources Technology Satellites, Two Nimbus Experimental Weather Satellites, two Synchronous Meteorological Satellites, and two advanced communications experiments with ATS F&G. In addition, an extensive set of ERS sensors will be flown on Skylab, and other applications-oriented activities will be carried out by the crews of this space laboratory. May I repeat my belief, and yours, too, I am certain, that one of the main hopes and justifications of our future space program, manned and unmanned, lies in this extraordinarily important realm of practical applications. More on this in a moment.

Finally, *encouraging greater international cooperation in space.*

There have been intensifying efforts to explore possible forms of international cooperation. Specifically, very important negotiations are currently underway to enlist European participation in the design and construction of the space transportation system. If these negotiations are successful, Europe may well commit a billion dollars to the program, making it by far and away the largest cooperative space effort we have ever undertaken. Our discussions with other developed and developing nations range from coordinated programs to intimate partnership in research, development, and operation. Also, the talks we are having with the Soviets on possible cooperative space activities are important because of their implications in broader arenas. The fruit of these efforts is likely to become clearer in the next year or so, and offers great hope and challenge for us—more on this also in a moment.

In summary, then, I am convinced that we do have a plan for space in the 70's. By taking Pat Moynihan's advice, and listening to the President, we find its objectives clearly stated in his March 7 statement. An examination of the FY72 budget proposal shows his support of its objectives. Although we in the Space Club may wish for even greater funding, this budget seems to me to be a good balance between our capabilities and opportunities in space and the many other competing pressures for use of resources. Also, this budget does represent an end—one which I hope will be permanent—to the decline in allocations to space activities. It does, I think, as did last year's budget, represent a transition from the Age of Apollo to a somewhat more balanced and evenly-paced space program better suited for the 70's. Sure, speaking as an advocate of space, I'd like to be able to do more, but speaking as a realist, I think this budget is the basis of a good program, one which merits support from those who believe in the importance of our space activities in ensuring national progress, power, pride, and international cooperation.

Let me now return briefly to two areas

which I think deserve particular attention in our campaign to expand the base of support for the program—one is the need for greater attention to the practical applications of space technology, and the other is the realization that expanded international cooperation in space can only be based on a continued and strong national space program.

It has been suggested, and my experience on Apollo 8 convinced me that it is true, that one of the most important impacts of our space activities to date is the change they are producing in the way men think about the planet on which they live. Apparently, we have had to leave earth, either in reality as I did, or vicariously through the pictures of earth we have brought back from space, to see our planet as a whole—as a single, seemingly fragile, outpost in the universe in which hundreds of millions of human beings have a stake. The psychological impact of this is an intangible thing, but I think it has had very tangible and far-reaching effects. I doubt whether the widespread concern about the "environment" would be as great as it is if this new consciousness of the boundaries of "Spaceship Earth" did not exist.

I believe that we must build upon this concern for the environment of our home planet in designing our future activities in space. The possibility of helping this important endeavor was one of the major reasons I decided to come to Washington and to the Space Council. During the latter part of the 60's, national concerns turned increasingly toward problems within our borders. We are no longer in a political environment in which a program aimed almost entirely at dramatic journeys of exploration and motivated in large part by a desire to provide a spectacular demonstration of our nation's technological competence is completely acceptable to the public. That kind of program did serve our needs during the 60's. It was undertaken and carried out, much to our credit as a nation, by men of vision—some of whom are here in this room. But, for the 70's if the program is to maintain and expand its public support, I believe it must demonstrate clearly its relevance to the national and international problems and concerns of the 70's.

I think that there is little doubt among those familiar with space operation that this can be done, and, in fact, is being done, not only by transferring space-age techniques to other undertakings, but more by using our unique space capabilities for such practical efforts as meteorology, communications, resource management, and the like. For this reason, I believe that a major thrust of the United States' space program of the 70's must be designed, as President Nixon has said, to "hasten and expand practical applications." Our manned and unmanned activities and the space shuttle will support this thrust. Communications by satellites have become commonplace and have literally shrunk our globe to a "neighborhood" of nations. Another excellent example of practical applications is our weather satellites. Not only have we been able to improve significantly our weather forecasts, but the general public knows this has happened. They see satellite cloud cover photographs on the evening television news. Similarly, we must be sure that the earth resources survey program is organized and carried out so that the useful results of even the early experimental missions such as ERTS-A and -B and Skylab are disseminated as widely as possible. As some of you know, the Space Council staff has taken the lead in an inter-agency study of the relationships between the experimental ERS program and a future operational program, as well as the roles and responsibilities of government agencies in both. This study, which has just been com-

pleted, also suggests various alternatives for effective management of the ERS program.

I believe this study is a good example of the kind of broad overview activity that can best be undertaken by an organization such as the Space Council and its staff. The Council can select areas of particular promise that cut across lines of agencies' responsibilities, and can serve as a central focus for the development of policy recommendations in those areas. The Council staff can then act as a catalyst for coordination. Increasingly, activities in space will become linked with activities on earth; this, inevitably, will mean increased interagency coordination and, perhaps, even new methods will be needed of conducting programs involving many federal agencies. The small staff of the Space Council intends to remain active, not publicly, but working behind the scenes, in just these complex areas of high potential payoff. Another such area is international cooperation, and is the subject of my final point.

The U.S. has, in the past 18 months or so, developed a complex network of contacts and negotiations aimed at expanding international involvement in the U.S. program. These activities involve every aspect of our space operations. They involve the industrial countries in Europe, Canada, Japan, Australia, and some of the developing countries. There are high hopes that these latter countries will be able to make important use of the earth resources survey satellites. My recent trip to Moscow, incidentally, convinced me that the Soviets now are genuinely interested in expanding our areas of coordination and cooperation. Expanded international cooperation is an important and worthwhile objective, both because it means a better space program and because the habit of cooperation in space may spill over into cooperation in other areas. But, I say again, that it is crucial that we maintain a strong and successful national space program if we expect to have successful international cooperation in space. It is the scope and success of our national achievements to date which has made us desirable partners for other nations, and they will not be interested in expanded cooperation if we do not maintain that scope and success in the future. Although international competition may not be as great a driving force for space activities in the near future as it has been in the past, the United States is still in economic and political competition with other nations. A strong space program will continue to be an asset in that competition. A healthy balance between a national program and international cooperation, between competition and collaboration, is what is needed but difficult to achieve. I believe that, through hard work, we will be able to effect this balance to our benefit and to the benefit of all mankind.

In conclusion, I want to point out again that the President has given us his general plan and specific budget for space as we move into the 70's. It is vitally important to our continued success that we listen to and remember what he has said about the program and that we explain and demonstrate its benefits to the nation. We in the space community cannot do this by talking only to ourselves; we must do a better job of convincing the people of the United States why they should continue to support a national space effort. We must do this in their frame of reference; not ours. This is not just NASA's job either; it's up to all of us if we hope to progress successfully. It has been said that a progressive and successful society is one which mixes in its undertakings both visionary enterprises and practical activities. Our space program for the 70's contains both the vision (our continued trips to the moon and planets) and the practical (our assessment from space of our earth's potential).

The recent Apollo 14 flight leaves no question that the United States is currently the world's leader in space exploration. I know that you believe as I do that it is imperative that we do all we can to ensure that we maintain this leadership.

Thank you.

BRUSSELS DECLARATION ON SOVIET JEWS

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 25 a 3-day conference of national and international Jewish organizations on the plight of Soviet Jewry was concluded. This conference was convened at Brussels to consider the religious and cultural oppression being visited upon the Jews of the Soviet Union, and the restriction of their right to emigrate.

The World Conference of Jewish Communities on Soviet Jewry issued a declaration which I particularly commend to my colleagues. I urgently hope that its import will bring home to the government of the Soviet Union the disapproval of the world community for its actions regarding its Jewish citizens. The declaration called for three substantive steps by the Soviet authorities:

To recognize the right of Jews who so desire to return to their historic homeland in Israel and to insure the unhindered exercise of this right.

To enable the Jews in the Soviet Union to exercise fully their right to live in accord with the Jewish cultural and religious heritage and freely to raise their children in this heritage.

To put an end to the defamation of the Jewish people and of Zionism, reminiscent of the evil anti-Semitism which has caused so much suffering to the Jewish people and to the world.

The full text of the Brussels Declaration on Soviet Jews follows:

BRUSSELS DECLARATION ON SOVIET JEWS

We, the delegates of this conference, coming from Jewish communities throughout the world, solemnly declare our solidarity with our Jewish brothers in the Soviet Union.

We want them to know that—and they will take encouragement from this knowledge—that we are at one with them, totally identified with their heroic struggle for the safeguarding of their national identity and for their natural and inalienable right to return to their historic homeland, the land of Israel.

Profoundly concerned with their fate and future, we denounce the policy pursued by the Government of the Soviet Union of suppressing the historic Jewish cultural and religious heritage. This constitutes a flagrant violation of human rights which the Soviet Constitution pledges to uphold and which is enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. To cut them off from the rest of the Jewish people, as the Soviet authorities are attempting to do, is a crime against humanity.

Soviet spokesmen claim that there is no need for Jewish culture and education, that there is no Jewish problem in the Soviet Union and there is no anti-Semitism. These assertions have been proven false by the Soviet Jews themselves. The entire world has heard their protests.

Tens of thousands of Jews have petitioned the Soviet authorities for the rights to settle in Israel and raise their children in the Jewish tradition and culture. Letters, messages and petitions, sent at the signatories' peril from the Soviet Union to individuals, to governments, to the United Nations and other international organizations, all demand recognition of these rights.

The reaction of the Soviet authorities to this Jewish awakening has been to mount a campaign of harassment, arrests and virulent anti-Jewish propaganda. The Leningrad trial, shocking to the world, was but one manifestation of such persecution. Far from being crushed by such intimidation, Soviet Jews today demand their rights with even greater courage and determination.

This conference urgently calls upon the civilized world to join with us and with the Jews of the Soviet Union in urging the Soviet authorities:

To recognize the right of Jews who so desire to return to their historic homeland in Israel and to insure the unhindered exercise of this right.

To enable the Jews in the Soviet Union to exercise fully their right to live in accord with the Jewish cultural and religious heritage and freely to raise their children in this heritage.

To put an end to the defamation of the Jewish people and of Zionism, reminiscent of the evil anti-Semitism which has caused so much suffering to the Jewish people and to the world.

We, assembled in this conference, commit ourselves by unceasing effort to insure that the plight of Soviet Jewry is kept before the conscience of the world until the justice of their cause prevails.

We will continue to mobilize the energies of all Jewish communities. We will work through the parliaments and governments of our countries, through United Nations and other international bodies, and through every agency of public opinion.

We will not rest until the Jews of Soviet Union are free to choose their own destiny. Let my people go!

THE WAR IN INDOCHINA—TIME FOR CONGRESS TO REASSERT ITS AUTHORITY

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I was very distressed to hear an interview recently on the CBS Morning News with Dr. Henry Kissinger, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, in which the following dialog took place:

INTERVIEWER. Dr. Kissinger, could we get your thoughts on what we've been hearing about in a speculative sense of the President not ruling out the possibility President Thieu indicating that something might be underway at sometime in the future, his office changing about some move by the South Viet Nam, that is, into the North?

Dr. KISSINGER. Well, it's a novel problem because so far its North Viet Nam that invaded all the neighboring countries and the idea that any of the Indo-Chinese countries might be invading North Viet Nam would have been unthinkable, even a year ago. So that this indicates a certain evolution in the relative balance of strength.

INTERVIEWER. Any chance of the evolution becoming a reality?

Dr. KISSINGER. Well, its not the dominate probability at this moment.

INTERVIEWER. Well, who would decide that, Doctor? The South Vietnamese or us?

Dr. KISSINGER. Well, the United States will certainly decide, as the President has pointed out, about any American participation. The South Vietnamese could not involve us in any military move by any American forces even of a purely logistic nature without the approval of the President of the United States.

Dr. Kissinger seems, to imply that American forces could be committed to such an action, merely at the whim of the President. And it is this presumption which I find particularly distressing; for this conversation is a clear indication that the President's top adviser on foreign affairs is under the impression that the President alone shall decide matters, such as the participation of American troops in an invasion of North Vietnam, without first consulting with Congress.

This thinking is completely contrary to my understanding of the decisionmaking processes in this country with respect to the military. It has always been my understanding that under the Constitution of the United States, the President and Congress jointly share the responsibility for establishing and defining foreign military commitments.

Congress has only recently emphasized and reestablished its authority in this area. In 1970 we repealed the Gulf of Tonkin resolution and passed the Cooper-Church amendment, which specifically denies the President the authority to provide any additional assistance to Cambodia without first consulting with Congress, came about as a direct result of the President's invasion of Cambodia last spring without prior consultation with Congress. The clear intent of this amendment was to prevent us from repeating the same mistakes in Cambodia which we made in South Vietnam and to remind the President that Congress, as well as the Chief Executive, has a voice indetermining the actions of the U.S. Armed Forces.

Yet since this action took place, the President has expanded the war even further into Laos, still without consulting with Congress, and now we are hearing talk of a possible invasion of North Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, it is time once again for Congress to assert its authority. When the President's top adviser on foreign affairs, without making one reference to Congress, casually indicates that any decisions about an American role in a possible invasion of North Vietnam shall be made by the President, and when the President himself states that the only limitation he will place upon the use of airpower is to rule out the use of tactical nuclear weapons, it is time for Congress and the people of this country to make their voices heard at the White House.

It is time to remind the President of the constitutional powers of Congress, and it is time once again to remind the President that he cannot invade countries at his personal whim, that he cannot commit this Nation to military adventures in foreign countries without prior consultation with Congress.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I am joining with 33 of my colleagues today in introducing a bill which will prohibit an invasion of North Vietnam by U.S. ground forces and which will prohibit the use of U.S. air combat support or U.S. logistical or advisory activities within the borders of North Vietnam without the prior and explicit authorization of Congress:

The text of this bill is as follows:

A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to prohibit any involvement or participation of United States Armed Forces in an invasion of North Vietnam without prior and explicit Congressional authorization.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Chapter I of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 620A. (a) Congress finds and declares that under the Constitution of the United States the President and the Congress share responsibility for establishing, defining the authority for and concluding foreign military commitments; that the repeal of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution raises new uncertainties about the source of authority for American involvement in Vietnam; that the United States can in no way participate in or support an invasion of North Vietnam without prior and explicit Congressional authorization.

(b) On and after the date of enactment of this section, in accordance with public statements of policy by the President, no funds authorized or appropriated under this or any other Act shall be used to carry out an invasion of North Vietnam by U.S. Armed Forces without prior and explicit authorization of the Congress.

(c) On and after the date of enactment of this section, no funds authorized under this or any other Act shall be used to carry out combat air support or U.S. logistical or advisory activities within the borders of North Vietnam without prior and explicit authorization of the Congress."

MISINFORMATION ABOUT DMSO

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution transferring the responsibility for testing and evaluating the drug DMSO from the Food and Drug Administration to the National Academy of Sciences. Identical legislation has been introduced in the Senate by Senator MARK HATFIELD of Oregon.

I am taking this step because of the confusion and misinformation surrounding the drug, and the seeming inability of FDA after 7 years to come to any decision on the efficacy of DMSO.

DMSO—dimethyl sulfoxide—is a wood fiber extract first synthesized in 1866. A scientific curiosity for many years, it gradually found widespread acceptance in industry—chiefly the wood products industry—because of its hydroscopic qualities.

In the early 1960's two University of Oregon Medical School physicians began experimenting with the drug for human use. Their efforts produced great prom-

ise in the treatment of such ailments as burns, arthritis, bursitis, sprains, and a number of others, and the drug was soon being hailed as the most promising since the discovery of antibiotics.

Because of competing claims concerning DMSO and the seeming inability of the Food and Drug Administration to separate fact from fiction, the drug has never been released for human use here although it is available by prescription in Europe. The reasons given were that investigations on DMSO had been abused by the pharmaceutical industry, and also that the drug after massive applications produced alterations in the eyes of some experiment test animals.

Presently DMSO is certified by the FDA for limited testing, but the redtape involved in getting the agency to approve an application for its use has discouraged more than one pharmaceutical firm from pursuing the matter.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a scientist. But I am convinced that the weight of evidence shows DMSO has great potential for healing and I am most anxious that it be given every chance to prove its efficacy in the alleviation of pain and suffering.

It is in this spirit that I introduce this resolution. Perhaps in view of the many impediments encountered with FDA the clarification and creditability of all concerned will best be served by removing the responsibility for testing DMSO from the Food and Drug Administration and placing it with the National Academy of Sciences.

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud of Miss Tausbee Ordway of Douglas, Alaska. Miss Ordway, daughter of Mr. A. W. Ordway and Mrs. June Ordway, is the winner of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy contest in the State of Alaska.

Each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This year, over 400,000 school students participated in the contest.

By being the Alaska State winner in the Voice of Democracy speech contest, she adds a new honor to her already long list of outstanding achievements.

Presently Miss Ordway's achievements include Outstanding Teenager of America Award and several honors awards. I think you will find her speech both enlightening and perceptive, and I include it in the RECORD:

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

Two centuries ago a famous American statesman by the name of Patrick Henry stood before the Virginia Provincial Convention and presented his famous "give me liberty or give me death" speech. He called on the American people to fight for their freedom against the tyranny of mother England. Our forefathers answered his call and as a result of their determination to defend our country and its flag, the stars and stripes, we today live in one of the best societies

that has ever existed for the benefit of its citizens. I ask you, where else in the world, but in America, do the majority of people have so many advantages? Where else in the world do the people have so much?

Our constitution grants citizens of the United States numerous rights and privileges. For instance, Americans are allowed to live in the privacy of their own homes. They have the right to the possession and enjoyment of their homes and property without interference from others. They are free to travel and see the world around them. They can express their thoughts and ideas without fear of death or persecution. They are free to worship as they please. They can go to college and pursue the career of their choice. Most fantastic of all is their power to elect or reject their own leaders.

The question arises, what can we as teenagers do to maintain freedom? I think the answer to this lies in a young person's willingness to learn what freedom is. You can't possibly believe in freedom unless you understand it. If your freedom has never been seriously threatened, you naturally do not comprehend what life would mean without it. Our soldiers in Southeast Asia know freedoms meaning because they have been exposed to a situation in South Vietnam where men, women, and children have had to make a daily sacrifice in order to keep their country free from communism. Young Americans, who have never had to fight for freedom, would do well to investigate the histories of people in Vietnam, Korea, China, and Czechoslovakia, who have in recent years struggled for a free form of government and the inner freedoms that are so important to a human beings happiness.

Another thing I think American students could do to maintain freedom is to take an active interest in local politics, get to know the candidates, and learn the ropes of party machinery. Only through experience of this kind can young people learn the importance of participation in political elections, in which the people must vote for men who will protect their freedoms both at home and abroad.

I think it is good for young people to be aware of other countries and other forms of government. To be able to compare our standard of living in the United States with that of an average Ukrainian in Russia, for example, is an invaluable lesson in the advantages of a free, democratic society. What incentives are there for a person who knows that he will never be able to own his own land or be able to own his own business? There are no incentives for people who live under socialism. The people are not important. Only the communist state is important.

Freedom, of course, is a tremendous responsibility, and obviously if people were to misuse it, everyone would suffer. That is why it is pertinent to teach youngsters, as early as possible, the significance of freedom and the penalty for infringing upon another person's liberties. We teenagers represent the future of America, and it is with pride and honor that we should accept the obligation to keep our country strong and independent. No one can have total freedom, but on the other hand, one must be given enough freedom to make life worth living.

ASH COUNCIL REPORT ON GOVERNMENT TERMED SUPERFICIAL

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the

RECORD an excellent article appearing in the New York, N.Y., Times of February 21, 1971, by the very able reporter, Eileen Shanahan, entitled "Ash Group's Report on Government Termed Superficial."

It is hoped that this excellent article will alert both the Congress and the administration to the defect of the Ash Council recommendation on the regulatory agencies which appears to have missed the mark by a wide margin.

The article follows:

ASH GROUP'S REPORT ON GOVERNMENT TERMED SUPERFICIAL (By Eileen Shanahan)

WASHINGTON.—The report on the Federal Government by the Ash Council is something less than a work of a great depth.

Except for the chapter on the regulation of transportation, it reads as though its authors had decided what to say after a discussion of a day or so and then left the staff to give the thing some tone of scholarship by looking up some citations and writing the footnotes. Indeed, the dissenting opinion by Frederick R. Kappel, the retired board chairman of the American Telephone and Telegraph Co., hints that this is precisely the way the study was done.

The evidences of superficiality, of lack of consideration of facts and information that were available to the council, are everywhere. For example, the report is replete with tables and charts that show that the workload of the Federal regulatory agencies has increased enormously, in some cases several hundred-fold, over the last decade or so, but that their personnel has risen by comparatively insignificant percentages during the same periods, and, in some cases, has even declined.

Yet these facts, and their obvious implications for any analysis of the regulatory agencies and their work, are nowhere discussed in the report itself.

Surely distinguished businessmen and lawyers who made up the Council, including Roy L. Ash, himself, the president of Litton Industries, Inc., and chairman of the Council, and the new Secretary of the Treasury, John B. Connally Jr., do not reach decisions on their everyday jobs without considering such relevant data.

Or take another example: The council proposed that in the cases of most of the regulatory agencies, the traditional commission form be abolished and a single judge-administrator be appointed instead. But it made an exception of the Federal Communications Commission because, it said, that the commission's authority over the contents of broadcast programs was too important and too much a matter for subjective opinion to be left to the judgment of one man.

In fact, the F.C.C. is forbidden by law to get into matters of program content. The issue of over-all programming has come up in a handful of cases, where it was alleged that a broadcast licensee was so outrageously and consistently biased or had so totally and persistently failed to serve the needs of his community that his license ought not be renewed.

There are also many inconsistencies and omissions in the Ash report. The most startling is its failure to touch upon the question of the desirability or undesirability of ending the regulation of rates on some types of freight transportation.

Advocates of de-regulation (including most economists and several Presidents of the United States) have long held that there is enough competition now to insure ground freight rates that will be fair to customers. But while the Ash Council speaks at length of the desirability of regulating all transportation under one roof, it never reaches the question of reducing the vast scope and volume of this regulation—which may well be a

necessary prerequisite to making the proposed unified system work at all.

None of these deficiencies constitute the central failure of the Ash Council report, however. That central failure has to do with the council's central recommendation: the proposed transformation of the commissions into agencies headed by a single individual.

The council is, indeed, persuasive, to those who have watched the regulatory agencies operate over the years, when it argues that the traditional defects of regulation may be traceable to the very commission form itself, the collegial form of decisionmaking, as the Ash Council puts it. The inordinate delays, the lack of development of clear and consistent policies and, above all, the difficulties in attracting and keeping qualified commissioners may well be caused, as the report says, by the multihedged structure.

But it never comes to grips with what the regulated industries will obviously fear the most—the consequences of one-man rule.

And even more importantly, as a matter of public policy, it never debates the crucial issue of independence vs. Presidential or Congressional control.

One of the main reasons the Ash Council sets forth for proposing a single administrator is the greater degree of "accountability" that he would have than the present multi-headed commissions do, both to the President and to Congress. But the council never says what it means by this. Are Presidents to be allowed to—encouraged to?—intervene in and overturn specific cases? Or are they merely to set an over-all tone of tougher or looser regulation? How would the administrator be accountable?

These are the sorts of questions, it is hoped, that will be dealt with in comments on the Ash report that interested parties have been asked to file by April 20.

SLAVERY—NATIONS OR INDIVIDUALS?

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a veteran newspaperman who has a grasp of history as well as journalism which makes him one of the most knowledgeable observers of the Washington scene is bureau chief emeritus of the Chicago Tribune, Walter Trohan.

His column of February 16 very effectively dramatizes the difference between the treatment of individuals in our country and the internal policies of the U.S.S.R. The article follows:

SLAVERY—NATIONS OR INDIVIDUALS?

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, February 16.—Slavery was abolished in the United States more than a century ago, but it still exists in the Soviet Union and no American should forget it. Of course, vestiges of slavery continued in fact in America, but efforts have been and are being made to weed them out, while slavery is being made a way of life in Russia.

Slavery was abolished by the constitution of Vermont in 1777, before Vermont became a state in 1791. In 1780 Massachusetts ended slavery and Pennsylvania launched a gradual program of emancipation in the same year. Other northern states followed.

On Jan. 1, 1863, Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation which freed some 4,300,000 Negroes in the South. It was not until the passage of the 13th Amendment

to the Constitution that slavery was abolished throughout the U.S.

Russia has held peoples in slavery under the czars and under communism. This month two captive nations celebrate their independence days in chains—Lithuania today and Estonia on Feb. 24. Also this month, the Captive Nations Committee has issued its own commemorative stamps to remind Americans of the many peoples under Communist domination by conquest rather than inclination.

The civil rights movements, which so many regard as a praiseworthy manifestation of the American conscience, has prompted wide demands for black studies in our schools and colleges, even though most blacks have been on these shores longer than their fellow white citizens and few can, like their fellow white citizens, spot the towns, areas or even the countries from which they came and where they were seized by black masters and sold to white slavers.

However, most of us have no quarrel with learning of any kind. All of it has value. So we say let us have black studies, but let us also know the history of our fellow whites.

How many of us can name the captive nations? They include Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Byelorussia, Bulgaria, China, Croatia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, North Korea, North Viet Nam, Poland, Rumania, Serbia, Slovakia, the Ukraine and others.

Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania were seized by Russia in 1940 almost without protest from those fighting the Rome-Berlin Axis or by neutrals like the United States.

Others were seized after the war, but the Ukraine, Byelorussia and Azerbaijan are among territories and peoples conquered by the czars. The Outer Mongolia Republic came after World War II and remains a bone of contention with Red China.

Some blacks are agitating for the release of Angela Davis, the former California Communist college instructor, merely because she is a black. She is awaiting trial for her part in supplying arms and direction of a courtroom outrage in which several convicts seized a judge and attempted to escape with him as a hostage. They and the judge were killed.

Last December Simas Kudirka, a Lithuanian radio operator, who sought asylum aboard an American Coast Guard cutter, was returned to Soviet captivity in a shameful and callous disregard for humanity and American sovereignty. Responsible Coast Guard officers were forced to retire, but the part of Washington officials, especially in the State Department, was not made clear.

Signs calling for the release of Angela are found across the country, but there are none for the release of Kudirka. It is strange that the State Department did not suggest a trade of Davis for Kudirka. It would serve to demonstrate that we have Angela, while we have only a Communist report that Kudirka is alive and well and has not been punished.

SENATOR HUGH SCOTT RECEIVES 1971 B'NAI ZION AMERICAN-ISRAEL FRIENDSHIP AWARD

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 21, 1971, I had the pleasure and privilege of introducing Senator HUGH SCOTT to the assembled guests when he received the American-Israel Friendship

Award at the 63d annual dinner of B'nai Zion at the Hilton Hotel in New York City. I include in the RECORD my introductory remarks and those of Senator SCOTT on that happy occasion:

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE EMANUEL CELLER

When America-Israel friendship is ardently embraced by Hugh Scott, we must then know that the cause has gathered unto itself men of the highest caliber and of great achievement. When Hugh served with me on the House Committee on the Judiciary, he gained not only my affection, but my great respect for his perceptions, his scholarship, and his understanding. It surprised me not at all when Hugh became Minority Leader of the U.S. Senate.

For those of us who know him, for those who have followed his career in politics, and still further, for those who have read his books and essays, we remain assured that his friendship is not lightly given.

His great friendship for Israel is no secret, of course. How could it be otherwise, student world scholar as he is? He is aware of the thriving democracy in the Middle East and the promise it holds for the development of that entire area. He knows better than most that the failure to maintain a democratic stronghold in the Middle East could lower a dark curtain upon the world, not even to mention the word "Iron." He has watched Israel develop from a hope and a prayer to a nation which is the foundation of freedom in a once remote part of the world. Given the facts, given the understanding how portions of this earth have an undeniable interdependence, Hugh Scott could not deny the dictates of logic and could not deny the birth, the life, and the viability of a new nation dedicated to the nourishment and growth of democracy.

Will you join me in applause for Senator Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania.

REMARKS BY SENATOR HUGH SCOTT

I am pleased to join you tonight and I am proud and honored to be the recipient of your award. I am also happy that I can bring you a positive assessment of our Government's policy in the Middle East.

All of you know that I have long been enlisted in the struggle for a Jewish state—a Jewish state blessed by security and peace. I have battled on this front from the very beginning of my political career.

Throughout this long period, I have never hesitated to be critical of our Government when I felt that its policies lacked vigor, determination or foresight. Many times I have raised my voice in protest—whether the administration was Democratic or Republican.

In the light of this long experience, I am glad to be able to offer the view that the United States and Israel have never been so close in their perceptions and their objectives on Middle East problems.

Let me speak about the decisive turn in our Government's policy in 1970.

In 1970, the Administration, after long deliberation, decided to advance generous credits to enable Israel to purchase sophisticated planes and other weapons which she deemed essential to her security and survival.

In 1970, our Government pressed for Arab-Israel negotiations, in the hope that these would lead to a lasting and final peace settlement.

In 1970, we recognized that we could come closer to peace if we stood solidly with Israel—and that the attainment of peace depended to a great extent on the strength and cordiality of U.S.-Israel relations.

In 1970, it became clear that the interests of the United States and Israel had converged—that the security of the United States and the Free World would be strengthened by a policy which recognized the importance

of our assistance to Israel's economy and defense.

Let us hope that the policies of 1970 continue through 1971 and that our Government will not hesitate to stand with Israel on two major fronts:

One—We must continue to provide Israel with planes and other military equipment in order to deter the threat of attack—for we must always keep in mind—in all our deliberations—that Israel today faces a massive Soviet-Egyptian buildup on the Suez front.

Two—We must continue to play a key role in the achievement of peace. Our Government must insist that the Arab states recognize Israel and obligate themselves to work for the attainment and maintenance of a genuine peace. We cannot be satisfied—we must not be satisfied—with arrangements which fall short of that goal.

These two principles are fully supported in the Congress of the United States. We had evidence of that in 1969 and 1970.

In 1969, I joined with Senator Ribicoff in the circulation of a declaration which called for direct Arab-Israeli peace talks and warned against any attempt by the Great Powers to impose a settlement. That declaration was signed by 70 Senators and 283 members of the House.

In 1970, I was one of ten members of the Senate who joined in the circulation of a letter to Secretary of State Rogers which called for phantom jets for Israel.

That letter was endorsed by 79 members of the Senate—a dramatic expression of congressional support for Israel, reflecting the view of the great majority of the American people.

I am convinced that these declarations helped to promote a positive and constructive response by the Administration to Israel's appeals, for the effect of them was to assure the Administration that Congress would support a strong U.S. posture vis-à-vis Israel.

But the United States was not only saying "Yes" to members of Congress; it was saying "No" to the Soviet Union. It was informing the Soviet Union that the United States would stand by its friends, that we would not permit the Russians and the Arabs to weaken Israel and to bring about her diplomatic and military defeat.

The United Nations envoy, Gunnar V. Jarring, has resumed talks with Israel and the Arab states in the hope that he might be able to bring them to the peace table. All of us pray that these talks will lead to a real settlement.

It has always been our view that sooner or later—and the sooner the better—Israel and the Arab states must sit together in direct negotiations.

We know that this is what Israel has always wanted—for experience has shown that as long as the Arabs and Israelis do not talk to each other, there is not the slightest chance of a genuine settlement.

To me, it seems very strange to be talking about a genuine settlement before a settlement is reached. I am afraid that the effect of this exercise would be to rescue the Arab states from the need to sign any kind of agreement with Israel.

For her part, Israel insists—as she must—on genuine peace treaties, sincerely negotiated and signed by the parties themselves. It goes without saying that the Big Powers should be willing to safeguard the settlement, for that, indeed, is their responsibility and obligation as permanent members of the UN Security Council.

But the major obligation must be assumed by the parties themselves, by the Arabs and the Israelis. They have a triple obligation to preserve the peace—an obligation to themselves, to each other and to the world community.

If we review the record of the last 20 years, we can understand why Israel cannot

not place much confidence in Great Power guarantees.

All of us recall how the Great Powers faltered in 1948, when the Arab states took military action to resist the implementation of the 1947 UN partition resolution. The permanent representatives of the UN Security Council met and staged Big Power talks. They had the power to enforce the peace and to carry out the UN resolution. But they were weak and impotent. And our own Government came forward with a proposal to suspend the partition resolution and to establish a UN trusteeship in Palestine.

It remained for the Israelis to carry out the partition resolution themselves—to bring their state into being despite the Arab aggression—despite the Big Power default.

The 1948 experience was a demoralizing revelation of the futility of Great Power guarantees. And it was not the last.

After Israel came into existence pursuant to that 1947 resolution—and almost entirely thanks to her own desperate commitment to survival—the Great Powers were unable to bring about a peace settlement.

The UN Armistice Agreements negotiated in 1949 were regarded as stepping stones to peace. The Arab states flouted them by persisting in war.

In violation of their agreements and in defiance of their obligations as members of the United Nations, the Arab states remained in a state of belligerence. They closed the Suez Canal and the Straits of Tiran to Israel shipping, and Arab leaders dispatched Fedayeen into Israel's territory to wage terrorist warfare against Israel's men, women and children.

This led, in 1956, to the Sinai war. The Israelis swiftly won that conflict. But they lost the peace, thanks once again to the blunder of the United States and the plotting of the Soviet Union. Our Government joined with the Soviet Union to compel Israel to withdraw from the Sinai Peninsula and the Gaza Strip, without a peace treaty.

Israel was told that she might rely on assumptions—assumptions that the maritime powers would uphold her right to transit the international waterways of Suez and Tiran. Israel was assured by our Government that if her rights were denied she could resort to Article 51 of the UN Charter—the provision which permits a nation to take military action in self-defense if that should become necessary.

Many of us then spoke up to protest against a settlement which denied peace and which turned Israel's victory into defeat. I raised my voice and I was joined in the House by some 40 Republican colleagues who did not hesitate to criticize, even though it was a Republican Administration we were criticizing.

In the Senate, there were two eloquent voices of protest—Senators William Knowland and Lyndon Johnson—the two floor leaders.

But Israel had no alternative. She was isolated. She had to yield to the pressures from Washington and the threats from Moscow. She was forced to withdraw from Sharm el-Sheikh, from Gaza and from Sinai, without any commitment by the Arab states to make peace.

She wanted peace, they wanted war. Yet she was damned as the aggressor and forced to surrender to those who had made war against her.

In 1967, largely because the Soviet Union believed that Israel was vulnerable and the United States was preoccupied elsewhere, the Egyptians—with Soviet backing—mobilized in Gaza and Sinai, expelled the UN emergency force, closed off Israel's waterway to Africa and the Orient and threatened Israel with blockade, invasion and annihilation.

In that crisis, the Great Powers and the United Nations were again found wanting.

They were weak and derelict. The UN debate during the fateful days preceding the outbreak of the war was irrelevant—a cynical travesty.

The powers which had asserted in 1957 that Israel had a right to transit the Straits of Tiran were silent. The three powers which had signed the 1950 tripartite declaration pledging action to prevent aggression were not disposed to move. The 1957 Middle East Doctrine, another pledge to halt aggression, was forgotten, even though it had been approved by both the Senate and the House.

Israel, relying on the UN Charter and exercising her right to defend herself, had no alternative but to sweep away the forces which were threatening to destroy her.

Now I do not recite this melancholy history merely for the sake of reminiscence. It is relevant to the Middle East crisis today, for once again the Arab states are proposing that Israel become a trusteeship area under the patronage of others, dependent on outsiders for her very existence.

Against this background we must view the deadlock that persists until tonight.

Israel insists that she must have a genuine peace, that her neighbors must recognize her, that her borders must be defensible. She can no longer live in a state of siege with an international defense canopy which is swiftly blown away by the first blustering wind from Cairo out of Moscow.

We are providing Israel with the arms she must have to protect herself. Let us hope this policy continues.

We are helping Israel with credits—largely low-interest short-term loans. Let us hope that we give sympathetic consideration to her plea for economic assistance. The people of Israel should not be compelled to carry this huge defense burden unaided.

In a reversal of past thinking, we now believe that the best hope for peace is to keep Israel strong.

We have come to realize that there is a genuine convergence of interest between Israel and our Government—that a strong Israel helps to strengthen the Free World, not only militarily—but in a demonstration of the meaning and vitality of the democratic way of life.

Any weakening of our commitment to Israel greatly enhances Soviet power and weakens friendly governments in the Middle East, Africa and Europe.

We have learned that we must not yield to threat and blackmail. Much of it is empty bluff. Despite all the alarming threats hurled at our embassies abroad, the Middle East did not fall apart and American interests were not liquidated when we provided Israel with the arms and credits so vital to her survival.

I pledge to you, my friends, that we will work for a genuine understanding between Israel and her Arab neighbors, that we will insist that Israel be strengthened so that she has the means to deter her enemies from a new assault. This means weapons. It also means economic aid.

The peace we seek—an Arab-Israeli peace of understanding—will prove of tremendous benefit to all the peoples of the area, to the Arabs as well as to the Israelis.

There is no doubt in the minds of fair minded observers that the primary responsibility for the deadlock today rests on the Soviet Union, which uses the Arab-Israeli conflict to further its own imperialistic ambitions in the Middle East.

Since 1954, the Soviet Union has given the Arabs all-out diplomatic support. It has provided them with huge supplies of weapons. It is partisan, rigid and inflexible. For Moscow, the Arabs can do no wrong. Israel is expendable.

Beginning in 1967 and continuing until 1970, the U.S. hesitated to grant Israel's requests for military aid. As a result, the Soviet Union felt completely free to pour new and more menacing weapons and equipment

into the Arab States. They more than replaced the equipment destroyed in the Six-Day war. They also greatly expanded the supply of planes and inevitably they provided the pilots and other military personnel.

We would like to think that many Egyptians are tired of war and that many Egyptians recognize that there would be great benefits to all the people of the Middle East if Egypt and Israel could begin to cooperate in genuine understanding and peace.

It is clear that the Jarring mission will not succeed if the Soviet Union and Egypt regard it as an instrument to force Israel's surrender on the issue of territories and to deny Israel genuine peace.

And, so, once again, it seems that the Jewish people are made the pawns in a political war.

I look forward to the day when Israelis and Arabs will be able to turn away from war, when they will be free to end the huge waste of defense expenditures, when they will be able to raise the sights of their people and develop their lands.

Our commitment to Israel is a vital commitment because the survival and growth of Israel means a positive contribution to the welfare of people in many parts of the world.

And here is where American and Israel interests really converge. We share a common commitment—the commitment to freedom, to liberty and to the welfare of humanity.

LAW AND ORDER—AND JUSTICE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, many on the extreme left of the political spectrum, who insist that justice must accompany law and order, scream with anguish whenever one of their friends is brought to trial. Good examples are the cases of the Berrigans and Angela Davis.

Yesterday's New York Sunday News had an editorial on the subject that put the matter of justice in proper perspective. I believe my colleagues will be impressed by the writer's lucid comments:

KEEP THE RECORDS STRAIGHT

We take note of innumerable rallies, here and elsewhere, on behalf of the Revs. Daniel and Philip Berrigan and of Angela Davis, with the hat passed at virtually every such powwow.

The claim of the rally arrangers is that the Berrigan boys and the Davis woman are being persecuted by the filthy U.S. "establishment," whatever that is, and that the people should be stirred up to rise in wrathful majesty or majestic wrath and stop the persecutions.

These are lies, compounded originally by Communists and other subversives, and we should all keep the facts in the two cases straight; namely:

The two priests currently are doing time in the federal prison at Danbury, Conn., in connection with the burning of some draft records in Maryland. Also, they are under indictment and facing trial in an alleged plot to kidnap White House adviser Henry Kissinger and wreak criminal damages on government property in Washington.

This is a case of the law having taken its course in one instance, and of its preparing to take its course in a second instance. No persecution is involved, and no radicals can or should be permitted to thwart the law.

Angela Davis is an admitted Communist. She is accused of having furnished some or all of the guns used in a hideous court kid-

napping and shootout in San Rafael, Calif., which caused the deaths of four persons. Under California law, she is charged with murder, kidnapping and conspiracy as if she had been at the massacre.

Davis is awaiting regular trial in a California court, and nobody is persecuting her. Her fellow Reds are using her case as a means of raising money for their Party of Traitors, and they give not a hoot whether Davis goes to California's gas chamber or goes free.

Those are the basic facts in these much-debated cases, and let's not forget them, rave the Reds though they may.

OIL CONTAMINATION AND THE LIVING RESOURCES OF THE SEA

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the RECORD an excellent paper published by Max Blumer, senior scientist, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole, Mass.

If our people are not frightened of oil spills, and the consequences, this excellent paper should scare the daylights out of them:

OIL CONTAMINATION AND THE LIVING RESOURCES OF THE SEA

(By Max Blumer)

ABSTRACT

Pollution introduces an estimated 5-10 million tons of crude oil and oil products into the ocean per year. The threat to the living resources of the sea is most severe in the coastal environment. There, oil pollution adds to the growing stresses from sewage, insecticides, chemicals, overfishing, and the filling of wetlands.

All crude oils are poisons for all marine organisms; many crude oil distillates are more severely poisonous because they contain higher proportions of the immediately toxic compounds. Long-term toxicity may harm marine life that is not immediately killed by spills, and oil can be incorporated into the meat of marine animals, making it unfit for human consumption. Crude oil and oil products may cause cancer in marine organisms and in man; even at very low concentrations oil may interfere with processes which are vital for the propagation of marine species.

The most immediately toxic fractions of oil are water soluble; therefore, recovery of oil slicks is often futile, except for the aesthetic improvement. Treatment with detergents, even the "nontoxic" ones, is dangerous because it exposes marine organisms to higher concentrations of soluble and toxic hydrocarbons and because it disperses oil into droplets that can be ingested and retained by many organisms.

Natural bacterial action eventually decomposes spilled oil; however, the most toxic fractions disappear much more slowly than the more harmless ones. Within the lipids of marine animals and in sediments petroleum hydrocarbons are stable for long time periods.

MARINE RESOURCES—MULTIPLE USES

Throughout history man has used the ocean and especially the coastal waters as a source of food and of minerals, for shipping and for disposal of his wastes. Today, more than ever, the ocean has a very large tangible and intangible value and an even greater

potential. The present annual world income from marine fishing is now roughly \$8 billion. The world ocean freight bill is nearly twice that. In contrast, the mineral recovery has a relatively small value; the world oil and gas production from the seabed is worth approximately half that of the fish catch, and all other mineral production adds only \$250 million.¹ The value of the ocean for recreation and for waste disposal is not easily put into similar figures; through its interaction with the terrestrial ecosystems a healthy ocean may well have critical importance for the survival of the human species.

The economic and aesthetic potential of the coastal regions is far greater than what we realize now; it has been estimated that with presently available technology Puget Sound (in western North America) alone could produce annually 6 million pounds of oyster meat, equal in value to the entire present U.S. fish catch.² Most of the potential marine productivity is concentrated in coastal waters. Ryther³ states that the open sea—90 percent of the ocean—is essentially a biological desert, that produces a negligible fraction of the present fish catch and has little potential for yielding more in the future. The coastal waters produce almost the entire shellfish crop and nearly half of the total fish crop; the remainder comes from regions of upwelling waters that occupy one-tenth of 1 percent of the ocean surface and that are located near the margins of some continents. Similarly, recreational values, oil and mineral resources and marine waste disposal areas are concentrated almost entirely in the coastal regions of the ocean.

MARINE RESOURCES—MULTIPLE STRESSES

Our growing population and our expanding technology lead to an increasing dependence on marine values. Different uses of the marine resources are often in conflict and are being made and planned with little regard for the marine environment as a large interrelated ecosystem. Many unrelated causes contribute to the deterioration of the environment; oil pollution, the subject of this review, is only one of them. Additional stresses come from the loss of marshland, from overfishing, from pollution with persistent chemicals and with domestic and industrial wastes. The marine environment is tolerant of changes—up to a point. Many individual actions and even single large stresses can be tolerated; whether this is still true for the sum of the stresses imposed on the environment now, should be a matter of great common concern. We have polluted many of our rivers and lakes, including some large bodies of water like Lake Erie. The wastes that now enter the ocean are similar to those that have damaged the Great Lakes; in fact they are probably more toxic and more persistent. Given the same damaging input, the ocean differs from the lakes principally only in its size and time constant; changes may take a much longer time to become evident but as a direct consequence, restoration of a polluted ocean will also require an entirely different time scale. A polluted small lake can be reclaimed within a few years. Lake Erie may or may not be restored within fifty years but a polluted ocean will remain irreversibly damaged for many generations.

Ketchum⁴ has pointed out "that nature has a tremendous capacity to recover from the abuses of pollution, so long as the rate of addition does not exceed the rate of recovery of the environment. When this limit is exceeded, however, the deterioration of the environment is rapid and sometimes irreversible."

It is not within the scope of this paper to consider the entire field of marine pollution; the further discussion is restricted to the problem of marine oil pollution because of the increasing extent of oil spillage and be-

¹Footnotes at end of article.

cause of its severe, but largely unrecognized, biological effects.

OIL POLLUTION—EXTENT

Oil pollution is the almost inevitable consequence of our dependence on an oil-based technology. The use of a natural resource without losses is nearly impossible and environmental pollution occurs through intentional disposal or through inadvertent losses in production, transportation, refining and use. Large catastrophes like that of the "Torrey Canyon", the blowouts at Santa Barbara and in the Gulf of Mexico get the attention of the public because of the obvious aesthetic damage and the harm to birds. Small and continuing spills and their far greater impact on less visible resources are less apparent to the public. It is estimated that 10,000 pollution incidents occur annually in U.S. waters alone and that oil pollution accounts for 7,500 of these. We have estimated that the present practices in tanker ballasting introduce about 3 million tons of petroleum into the ocean. The pumping of bilges by vessels other than tankers contributes another 500,000 tons. In addition, in-port losses from collisions and during loading and unloading contribute an estimated 1 million tons.⁹

Oil enters the ocean from many other sources whose magnitude is much less readily assessed; among these are accidents on the high seas (Torrey Canyon) or near shore, outside of harbors (West Falmouth, Mass.), losses during exploration (oil based drilling mud) and production (Santa Barbara, Gulf of Mexico), in storage (submarine storage tanks) and in pipeline breaks, also, spent marine lubricants and incompletely burned fuels. A major contribution may come from untreated domestic and industrial wastes; it is estimated that nearly 2 million tons of used lubricating oil is unaccounted for each year in the United States alone, a significant portion of this reaches our coastal waters.¹⁰

Thus, the total annual oil influx to the ocean lies probably between 5 and 10 million tons. There is an urgent need for a more accurate assessment of the pollution of individual oceanic regions and of the relative contribution of different oils.

OIL—COMPOSITION AND PERSISTENCE

Petroleum is one of the most complex natural materials and contains many thousand different compounds. Different crude oils differ markedly in their physical properties, such as gravity, viscosity and boiling point distribution. It is beyond the scope of this paper to describe the crude oil composition more than superficially (see reviews in: Eglinton and Murphy).⁸ However, for our discussion, considerable simplification is possible since every crude oil contains the same homologous series of closely related compounds. Different crudes differ mainly in the relative contribution of the individual number of these series. However, within these homologous series, chemical properties and toxicity vary little. Thus, low and high boiling saturated and aromatic hydrocarbons occur in every crude oil and though their numbers may go into thousands, individual members of these series have very similar chemical and biological properties. It follows that in their chemical, biological and toxicological properties crude oils are very similar, in spite of marked differences in individual composition and overall physical properties.

Petroleum and petroleum hydrocarbons in the marine environment are remarkably stable. Hydrocarbons that are dissolved in the water column are eventually destroyed by bacterial attack, though it should be pointed out that the most toxic compounds are also the most refractory ones.

We have demonstrated that hydrocarbons that are ingested by marine organisms can

pass through the wall of the digestive tract and can be retained for long time periods.^{9,10,11} Thus, oysters that had been polluted by a fuel oil spill were removed to a clean aquarium. After six months the analyses showed that the amount and chemical composition of the fuel oil hydrocarbons in the fat of the animals remained nearly unchanged.¹² Hydrocarbons can be transferred from prey to predator; they spread through the marine food web in a manner similar to that of other persistent chemicals, e.g. DDT.^{10,13}

Within marine sediments, hydrocarbons are also well protected from bacterial degradation, especially if the sediments are anaerobic or become anaerobic as a result of pollution. Thus in a spill of fuel oil in 1969 at West Falmouth, Massachusetts, U.S.A., oil was incorporated into the sediments of coastal waters, rivers, harbors and marshes. The oil is still present in the sediments, now, one year after the accident, and transport of oil laden sediment has contaminated more distance areas that had remained unpolluted immediately after the spill.¹⁴

OIL—IMMEDIATE TOXICITY

All crude oils and all oil fractions except highly purified and pure materials are poisonous to all marine organisms. This is not a new finding. The wreck of the "Tampico" in Baja California, Mexico "created a situation where a completely natural area was almost totally destroyed suddenly on a large scale . . . Among the dead species were lobsters, abalone, sea urchins, starfish, mussels, clams and hosts of smaller forms".¹⁴ Similarly, the spill of fuel oil in West Falmouth, Massachusetts, U.S.A., has virtually extinguished life in a productive coastal and intertidal area, with a complete kill extending over all phyla represented in that habitat.¹⁵ Toxicity is immediate and leads to death within minutes or hours.¹⁶

Responsible for this immediate toxicity are principally three complex fractions. The low boiling saturated hydrocarbons have, until quite recently been considered harmless to the marine environment. It has now been found that this fraction which is rather readily soluble in sea water produces at low concentration anaesthesia and narcosis and at greater concentration cell damage and death in a wide variety of lower animals; they may be especially damaging to the young forms of marine life.¹⁷ The low boiling aromatic hydrocarbons are its most immediately toxic fraction. Benzene, toluene and xylene are acute poisons for man as well as for other organisms; naphthalene and phenanthrene are even more toxic to fishes than benzene, toluene and xylene. These hydrocarbons and substituted one, two- and three ring hydrocarbons of similar toxicity are abundant in all oils and most, especially the lower boiling, oil products. Low boiling aromatics are even more water soluble than the saturates and can kill marine organisms either by direct contact or through contact with dilute solutions. Olefinic hydrocarbons, intermediate in structure and properties and probably in toxicity between saturated and aromatic hydrocarbons are absent in crude oil but occur in many refining products, e.g. gasoline and cracked products, and they are in part responsible for their immediate toxicity.

Numerous other components of crude oils are toxic, among those named by Speers and Whitehead¹⁸ cresols, xylenols, naphthols, quinoline and substituted quinolines and pyridines and hydroxybenzoquinolines are of special concern here because of their great toxicity and their solubility in water.

It is unfortunate that statements which disclaim this established toxicity are still being circulated. Simpson¹⁹ claimed that "there is no evidence that oil spill round the British Isles has ever killed any of these (mussels, cockles, winkles, oysters, shrimps, lobster, crabs) shellfish." It was obvious when this statement was made that such animals

were indeed killed by the accident of the Torrey Canyon as well as by earlier accidents; work since then has confirmed the earlier investigation. In addition, by its emphasizing only the effect on adult life forms such a statement implies wrongly that juvenile forms were also unaffected.

OIL AND CANCER

The higher boiling crude oil fractions are rich in multiring aromatic compounds. It was at one time thought that only a few of these compounds, mainly 3, 4-benzopyrene, were capable of inducing cancer. As R. A. Dean²⁰ of British Petroleum Company stated "as far as I know, no 3,4-benzopyrene has been detected in any crude oil . . . it therefore seems that the risk to the health of a member of the public by spillage of oil at sea is probably far less than that which he normally encounters by eating the foods he enjoys." However, before that time carcinogenic fractions containing 1,2-benzanthracene and alkylbenzanthracenes had already been isolated²¹ from crude oil and it was known that "biological tests have shown that the extracts obtained from high-boiling fractions of the Kuwait oil . . . (method) . . . are carcinogenic." Further "Benzanthracene derivatives, however, are evidently not the only type of carcinogen in the oil. . . ."

In 1968, the year when Dean claimed the absence of the powerful carcinogen 3,4-benzopyrene in crude oil, this hydrocarbon was isolated in crude oil from Libya, Venezuela and the Persian Gulf.²² The amounts measured were between 450 and 1800 milligrams per ton of the crude oil.

Thus, we know that chemicals responsible for cancer in animals and man occur in petroleum. The causation of cancer in man by crude oil and oil products has been observed some years ago, when a high incidence of skin cancer in some refinery personnel was observed. The cause was traced to prolonged skin contact by these persons with petroleum and with refinery products.

According to Wilber¹⁶ "there is evidence that even a highly refined, diesel engine lubricating oil obtained from a naphthenic base crude oil, and lacking in substances ordinarily known to be carcinogenic, can induce tumors of the digestive tract of animals." Also, "Cutting oil is known to have carcinogenic potency."

These references and a general knowledge of the composition of crude oils suggest that all crude oils and all oil products containing hydrocarbons boiling between 300 and 500° C should be viewed as potential cancer inducers.

This has severe implications for fisheries and human health. In our study of the West Falmouth oil spill^{11,12} we showed that oil from that spill was taken up by shellfish and built into their body fat without fractionation of the hydrocarbons. In that specific accident an oil boiling between 170 and 370° C was involved; this boiling range overlaps with that within which carcinogens have to be expected. Human consumption of such contaminated shellfish and other fisheries resources should therefore be viewed with great suspicion.

Carcinogenic hydrocarbons can enter the chain leading to human food at an even lower level of the food chain; thus, it was shown by Doerr²³ that intact plant roots can take up carcinogens like 3,4-benzopyrene from their growth medium.

The level of oil pollution encountered in many oceanic regions suggests that fisheries resources may often be contaminated with toxic petroleum derived hydrocarbons at levels that may constitute a public health hazard. Laboratories to assay fisheries products for such contamination do not exist. Public health authorities should be urged to establish such laboratories for continuous surveys of the pollution level encountered in commercial sea food.

Footnotes at end of article.

Other questions suggest themselves: Floating masses of crude oil now cover all oceans and are being washed up on shores. We have shown that such lumps, even after considerable weathering still contain nearly the full range of hydrocarbons of the original crude oil, extending in boiling point as low as 100° C. Thus, such lumps still contain some of the immediately toxic lower boiling hydrocarbons. In addition, the oil lumps contain all of the potentially carcinogenic material in the 300-500° boiling fraction. The presence of oil lumps ("tar") or finely dispersed oil on recreational beaches may well constitute a severe public health hazard, through continued skin contact.

OIL—DESTRUCTION OF FISHERIES RESOURCES

It has been said that "a review of the literature indicates that in deep water, whether in the open ocean or a mile or so offshore, no significant damage to marine life is encountered from even large oil spills because pelagic fish avoid the spill and few other marine species are present". We wonder whether anyone could take such a statement seriously, who knows the established toxicity of crude oil, the richness of coastal life and the complexity of marine life cycles. The dead fish washed ashore after the West Falmouth oil spill¹⁵ clearly were unable to avoid the spill, nor will the fish fry in estuaries and marshes or the planktonic food organisms in the open ocean be able to avoid a large spill or the plume of toxic dissolved hydrocarbons descending from it. Unfortunately, investigation of the effects of major accidents (e.g. Torrey Canyon, Santa Barbara) have very largely concentrated on the study of damage to adult fish or of any immediate reduction in fish catches. This is not sufficient; we must also consider the damage to the often more delicate juvenile forms and to the food organisms on which commercial fishes feed. Damage to these will not show up immediately nor will it be evident necessarily at the location of the accident. A large spill may lead to a gradual reduction of productivity over a large but diffusely defined area. The combined effect of many such spills and of other stresses, e.g. from overfishing and from the filling of marshlands may lead to a reduction in fishing income which is difficult to trace to any single cause.

The so called "tainting" of fish and shellfish by oil spills has been recognized for many years, however, it was not realized until now that oil passes through the intestinal barrier and is incorporated into and stabilized in the lipid pool of the organisms^{11, 12}.

It has been widely assumed that fish and shellfish "tainted" by oil will again be fit for human consumption after a period from 2 weeks¹³ to several months¹⁴. Our experience referred to above makes this highly improbable. If the oil were contained solely in the gut of the animals it might be readily displaced, however oil is resorbed and incorporated into the lipids where it may not be readily mobilized as long as the animal lives.

The disappearance of an "oily smell" is no clue whether fish or shellfish has cleansed itself of the oil pollution. Only a small fraction of the petroleum has a pronounced odor and loss of these compounds may occur while the more harmful high boiling, taste-and-odorless carcinogens are retained. It has been reported that boiling or frying will remove the odor; however, it will not affect the presence of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons.

OIL-LOW LEVEL EFFECTS

We are concerned that oil pollution, even at very low levels, may be responsible for long term damage to the marine ecology. Many biological processes which are important for the survival of marine organisms and which occupy key positions in their life processes are mediated by extremely low

concentration of chemical messengers in the sea water. We have demonstrated that marine predators are attracted to their prey by organic compounds at concentrations below the part per billion level¹⁶. Such chemical attraction—and in a similar way repulsion—plays a role in the finding of food, the escape from predators, in homing of many commercially important species of fishes, in the selection of habitats and in sex attraction. There is good reason to believe that pollution interferes with these processes in two ways: by blocking the taste receptors and by mimicking for natural stimuli; the latter leads to false responses. Those crude oil fractions likely to interfere with such processes are the high boiling saturated and aromatic hydrocarbons and the full range of the olefinic hydrocarbons.

It has long been known that lobsters are attracted to crude oil distillate fractions, especially kerosene^{17, 18}; this has now been confirmed in the laboratory and with purified hydrocarbon fractions derived from kerosene.¹⁹ Thus it is likely that an oil spill will attract lobsters away from their normal food and guide them into the direction of the spill, where they are more likely to be severely contaminated or killed. Again, this is in direct contradiction to the opinion quoted above²⁰ that marine animals will actively avoid oil spills. It may be relevant that after the West Falmouth oil spill numerous dead lobsters were washed ashore.

Interference with normal taste reception at very low and seemingly innocuous pollution levels may have disastrous effects on the survival of many marine species, the damage may extend to other species through their links in marine food web.

COUNTERMEASURES

Compared to the number and size of accidents and disasters the present countermeasures are inadequate. However, a rapidly advancing technology is hopeful of developing techniques that will be effective in dealing even with very large spills under severe sea conditions. Yet, while we may hope that the gross aesthetic damage from oil spills may be avoided sometime in the future, there is no reason to believe that existing or planned countermeasures will eliminate the biological impact of oil pollution.

The most immediately toxic fractions of oil and oil products are soluble in sea water, therefore, biological damage will occur at the very moment of the accident. Water currents will immediately spread the toxic plume of dissolved oil components and, if the accident occurs in inshore waters, the whole water column will be poisoned even if the bulk of the oil floats on the surface. The speed with which the oil dissolves is increased by agitation, and in storm conditions the oil will partly emulsify and will present a much larger surface area to the water; consequently, the toxic fraction will dissolve more rapidly and reach higher concentrations.

From the point of view of avoiding the immediate biological effect of oil spills, countermeasures can be completely effective only if all of the oil is recovered immediately after the spill. The technology to achieve this goal does not exist. Some comments on existing countermeasures and their biological effects appear appropriate:

Detergents and dispersants

The toxic, solvent-based detergents which did so much damage in the clean-up after the Torrey Canyon accident are presently only in limited use. However so-called "non-toxic dispersants" have been developed. The term "non-toxic" is misleading, these chemicals may be nontoxic to a limited number of often quite resistant test organisms but they are rarely tested in their effects upon a very wide spectrum of marine organisms including their juvenile forms, preferably in their normal habitat. Further, in actual use the dispersant-oil mixtures are severely toxic,

because the oil is toxic and bacterial degradation of "non-toxic" detergents may lead to toxic breakdown products.

A dispersant lowers the surface tension of the oil to a point where it will disperse in the form of small droplets. It is recommended that the breakup of the oil slick be aided by agitation, natural or mechanical. Thus, the purpose of the detergent is essentially a cosmetic one, and it appears attractive to those who wish to alleviate only the aesthetic damage. However the recommendation to apply dispersants is often made in disregard of their ecological effects. Instead of removing the oil, dispersants push the oil actively into the marine environment; because of the finer degree of dispersion, the immediately toxic fraction dissolves rapidly and reaches a higher concentration in the sea water than it would if natural dispersal were allowed. The long term poisons (e.g. the carcinogens) are made available to and are ingested by marine filter feeders, and, they can eventually return to man incorporated into the food he recovers from the ocean.

For these reasons I feel that the use of dispersants is unacceptable, inshore or offshore, except under special circumstances, e.g. extreme fire hazard from spillage of gasoline, as outlined in the contingency plan of the Federal Water Quality Administration.²¹

Physical sinking

Sinking has been recommended: "the long-term effects on marine life will not be as disastrous as previously envisaged. Sinking of oil may result in the mobile bottom dwellers moving to new locations for several years; however, conditions may return to normal as the oil decays."²² Again, these conclusions disregard our present knowledge of the effect of oil spills.

Sunken oil will kill the bottom faunas rapidly, before most mobile bottom dwellers have time to move away. The sessile forms of commercial importance (oysters, scallops, etc.) will be killed and other mobile organisms (lobsters) may be attracted into the direction of the spill where the exposure will contaminate or kill them. The persistent fraction of the oil which is not readily attacked by bacteria contains the long term poisons, e.g. the carcinogens, and it will remain on the sea bottom for very long time periods. Exposure to these compounds may damage bottom organisms or render them unfit for human nutrition even after the area has been repopulated.

Combustion

Burning the oil through the addition of wicks or oxidants appears more attractive from the point of view of avoiding biological damage than dispersion and sinking. However, it will be effective only if burning can start immediately after a spill. For complete combustion, the entire spill must be covered by the combustion promoters, since burning will not extend to the untreated areas; in practice, in stormy conditions, this may be impossible to achieve.

Mechanical containment and removal

Containment and removal appear ideal from the point of view of avoiding biological damage. However, they can be fully effective only if applied immediately after the accident. Under severe weather conditions floating booms and barriers are ineffective. Booms were applied during the West Falmouth oil spill; however, the biological damage in the sealed-off harbors was severe and was caused probably by the oil which bypassed the booms in solution in sea water and in the form of wind-dispersed droplets.

Biological degradation

Hydrocarbons in the sea are naturally degraded by marine microorganisms. It is hoped to make this the basis of an oil removal technology through bacterial seeding and fertilization of oil slicks. However, great obstacles and many unknowns stand in the

Footnotes at end of article.

way of the application of this principally attractive idea.

No single microbial species will degrade any whole crude oil; bacteria are highly selective and complete degradation requires many different bacterial species.³⁰ Bacterial oxidation of hydrocarbons produces many intermediates which may be more toxic than the hydrocarbons; therefore organisms are also required that will further attack the hydrocarbon decomposition products.³⁰

Hydrocarbons and other compounds in crude oil may be bacteriostatic or bacteriocidal;³⁰ this may reduce the rate of degradation, where it is most urgently needed. The fraction of crude oil that is most readily attacked by bacteria is the least toxic one, the normal paraffins; the toxic aromatic hydrocarbons, especially the carcinogenic polynuclear aromatics, are not rapidly attacked.^{12, 13, 30}

The oxygen requirement in bacterial oil degradation is severe; the complete oxidation of 1 gallon of crude oil requires all the dissolved oxygen in 320,000 gallons of air saturated sea water.³⁰ Therefore, oxidation may be slow in areas where the oxygen content has been lowered by previous pollution and the bacterial degradation may cause additional ecological damage through oxygen depletion.

Cost effectiveness

The high value of fisheries resources, which exceeds that of the oil recovery from the sea, and the importance of marine proteins for human nutrition demand that cost effectiveness analysis of oil spill countermeasures consider the cost of direct and indirect ecological damage. It is disappointing that existing studies completely neglect to consider these real values. A similarly one-sided approach would be, for instance, a demand by fisheries concerns that all marine oil production and shipping be terminated, since it clearly interferes with fisheries interests.

We have to start to realize that we are paying for the damage to the environment, especially if the damage is as tangible as that of oil pollution to fisheries resources and to recreation. Experience has shown that cleaning up a polluted aquatic environment is much more expensive than it would have been to keep the environment clean from the beginning.³¹ In terms of minimizing the environmental damage spill prevention will produce far greater returns than clean-up—and we believe that this relationship will hold in a realistic analysis of the overall cost effectiveness of prevention or clean-up costs.

SELF CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

The oil industry has an outstanding personnel and plant safety record. Oil refineries probably operate more safely than any other plants of equal production capacity. The industry has achieved this record through internal control because of the realization of the cost effectiveness of personnel safety.

We believe that in the past the oil industry has not been fully aware of the substantiated toxicity of oil in the marine environment. We hope that the increasing recognition of the threat of oil pollution to marine resources will lead industry to aim for an ecological safety record similar to the plant safety record.

It would be unrealistic to expect that intentional and negligent oil pollution can be stopped through education or appeals to man's responsibility. In this respect law enforcement will have to speak more strongly. Methods for the identification of oil spills by day and night through spectroscopic surveys from airplanes are becoming available.³² Active tagging of oil in marine transit³³ should provide for simple and conclusive identification of spills. Even without active tagging, which depends on the willing co-

operation of the ship owners and operators, each oil and oil product has its unique fingerprint. Fast and simple analytical techniques are available (e.g. capillary gas chromatography combined with mass spectrometry) that can qualitatively and quantitatively determine hundreds of different compounds in a spilled oil within a very short time. These techniques should be a great aid to more effective law enforcement.

In their effectiveness for law enforcement these techniques could be greatly supported if the oil industry would make available samples or analyses of those crude oils and products which are being transported across the sea.

CONCLUSIONS

The toxicity of crude oil and oil products to marine life and the danger of oil pollution to the marine ecology has been established in several independent ways:

(1) Studies of crude oil composition and isolation of compounds known to be toxic, e.g. low boiling aromatic hydrocarbons and the carcinogenic, high boiling polycyclic aromatics.

(2) Laboratory studies of the effect of oil and oil fractions on marine organisms.

(3) Field studies of the effect of oil spills on marine organisms in their normal habitat.

Pollution with crude oil and oil fractions damages the marine ecology through different effects:

(1) Direct kill of organisms through coating and asphyxiation.³⁴

(2) Direct kill through contact poisoning of organisms.

(3) Direct kill through exposure to the water soluble toxic components of oil at some distance in space and time from the accident.

(4) Destruction of the generally more sensitive juvenile forms of organisms.

(5) Destruction of the food sources of higher species.

(6) Incorporation of sublethal amounts of oil and oil products into organisms resulting in reduced resistance to infection and other stresses (the principal cause of death in birds surviving the immediate exposure to oil³⁵).

(7) Destruction of food values through the incorporation of oil and oil products, into fisheries resources.

(8) Incorporation of carcinogens into the marine food chain and human food sources.

(9) Low level effects that may interrupt any of the numerous events necessary for the propagation of marine species and for the survival of those species which stand higher in the marine food web.

Some oil products may be more poisonous than whole crude oils—thus, kerosene and #2 fuel oil are particularly rich in the low boiling water soluble poisons and higher boiling distillates are rich in carcinogenic hydrocarbons. However, the toxicity of oil is spread over such a wide boiling range, and the composition of different crudes in terms of their chemical type distribution is so similar, that all crude oils and distillates must be considered severe environmental poisons.

Crude oil and most products are persistent poisons; they enter the marine food chain, they are stabilized in the lipids of marine organisms and they are transferred from prey to predator. The persistence is especially severe for the most poisonous compounds of oil; most of these do not normally occur in organisms and natural pathways for their biodegradation are missing.

The presence of toxic and potentially carcinogenic hydrocarbons in fisheries products may constitute a public health hazard. Laboratories to measure routinely the contamination level and to assess the public health hazard do not now exist; such laboratories should be organized to carry out continuous surveys of the safety of fisheries resources to public health.

Because of their low density, relative to sea water, crude oil and distillates should

float; however, both the experiences of the "Torrey Canyon" and the West Falmouth oil spill have shown oil on the sea floor. Oil in inshore and offshore sediments is not readily biodegraded; it can move with the sediments and can contaminate unpolluted areas long after an accident.

None of the presently used containment and recovery techniques prevents the ecological damage and the damage to fisheries products from oil spills. Toxicity is evident immediately and the poisonous fraction will be carried in water solution away from the accident, even if the surface spill is contained and recovered rapidly. The sinking method and the use of detergents and dispersants, while cosmetically effective, are especially harmful since they introduce all the oil into the environment. There are no dispersants that are not toxic in the presence of oil. The use of sinking agents and of dispersants should be most strongly discouraged.

Natural mechanisms for the degradation of oil in the sea exist; unfortunately, these are least effective for the most severely toxic components of oil. As a result, the most toxic fractions are also the most persistent ones. The breakdown products of oil and dispersants may also be toxic. Further, oil that has been incorporated into the lipids of marine organisms and into the sediments at the sea bottom and in estuaries and marshes is largely unavailable to the natural degradation; poisoning of the bottom habitats and of the marine food web will therefore be more severe and more persistent than the poisoning of the water column itself.

The tolerance of the marine ecology to oil spills is unknown. The great persistence of oil and the existence of low level effects suggest a lower tolerance than we would expect by considering only the immediate toxicity of oil at high concentration levels.

The effects of oil pollution, especially in the coastal environment cannot be considered without also considering the other stresses on these most productive regions of the ocean.

The combined impact of oil and oil products, chemicals, domestic sewage and municipal wastes, of the filling of wetlands, of dredging and of overfishing might lead to a deterioration of the coastal regions similar to that which we have brought about in the Great Lakes. Because of the much longer time scale of the oceans such a catastrophic deterioration would not likely be reversed within many generations; it would have a deep and lasting impact on the future of mankind.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Holt, S. J., "The Food Resources of the Ocean," Scientific American, Vol. 221, pp. 178-194, 1969.

² Westley, R., "Conference on Pollution of the Navigable Waters of Puget Sound, the Strait of Juan de Fuca and their Tributaries and Estuaries, Seattle," Vol. 1, pp. 174 f-m, 1967.

³ Ryther, J. H., "Photosynthesis and Fish Production in the Sea," Science, Vol. 166, pp. 72-76, 1969.

⁴ Ketchum, B. H., "Testimony before the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution," Senate Committee on Public Works, March 5, 1970. Unpublished Manuscript.

⁵ Blumer, M., "Scientific Aspects of the Oil Spill Problem," Presented at the NATO/CCMS Conference on Ocean Oil Spills, Brussels, Nov. 2-6, 1970.

⁶ Anon., "Final Report of the Task Force on Used Oil Disposal," American Petroleum Institute, New York, N.Y., 1970.

⁷ Murphy, T. A., "Environmental Effects of Oil Pollution," Paper presented to the Session on Oil Pollution Control, American Society of Civil Engineers, Boston, Mass., July 13, 1970.

⁸ Eglington, G. and Murphy, M. T. J., Ed.,

"Organic Geochemistry," Springer, Berlin, 1969.

⁹ Blumer, M., "Hydrocarbons in Digestive Tract and Liver of a Basking Shark," *Science*, Vol. 156, pp. 390-391, 1967.

¹⁰ Blumer, M., Mullin, M. M. and Guillard, R. R. L., "A Polyunsaturated Hydrocarbon (3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18 heneicosahexaene) in the Marine Food Web," *Marine Biology*, 6: 226-36, 1970.

¹¹ Blumer, M., Souza, G. and Sass J., "Hydrocarbon Pollution of Edible Shellfish by an Oil Spill," *Marine Biology*, 5, 195-202, 1970.

¹² Blumer, M., Sass, J., Souza, G., Sanders, H. L., Grassle, J. F. and Hampson, G. R., "The West Falmouth Oil Spill," Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Ref. No. 70-44, Unpublished Manuscript, 1970.

¹³ Blumer, M., Sass, J., Souza, G., Sanders, E. and Sass, J., "Phytol-Derived C₁₅ Di- and Triolefinic Hydrocarbons in Marine Zooplankton and Fishes," *Biochemistry*, Vol. 8, p. 4067, 1969.

¹⁴ North, W. J., "Tampico, a Study of Destruction and Restoration," *Sea Frontiers*, Vol. 13, pp. 212-217, 1967.

¹⁵ Hampson, G. R. and Sanders, H. L., "Local Oil Spill," *Oceanus*, Vol. 15, pp. 8-10, 1969.

¹⁶ Wilber, Ch. G., "The Biological Aspects of Water Pollution," Ch. C. Thomas, Publisher, Springfield, Ill., 1969.

¹⁷ Goldacre, R. J., "The Effects of Detergents and Oils on the Cell Membrane," pp. 131-137, Suppl. to Vol. 2 of Field Studies, Field Studies Council, London, 1968.

¹⁸ Speers, G. C. and Whithead, E. V., "Crude Petroleum," In "Organic Geochemistry," Eglinton, G. and Murphy, M. T. J., Ed., Springer, Berlin, pp. 638-675, 1969.

¹⁹ Simpson, A. C., "Oil, Emulsifiers and Commercial Shell Fish," pp. 91-98, Suppl. to Vol. 2 of Field Studies, Field Studies Council, London, 1968.

²⁰ Den, R. A., "The Chemistry of Crude Oils in Relation to their Spillage on the Sea," pp. 1-6, Suppl. to Vol. 2 of Field Studies, Field Studies Council, London, 1968.

²¹ Carruthers, W., Stewart, H. N. M. and Watkins, D. A. M., "1,2-Benzanthracene Derivatives in a Kuwait Mineral Oil," *Nature*, Vol. 213, pp. 691-692, 1967.

²² Graef, W. and Winter, C., "3,4-Benzpyrene in Erdoel," *Arch. Hyg.* 152/4, 289-293, 1968.

²³ Doerr, R., "Alkaloid and Benzopyrene Uptake by Intact Plant Roots," *Naturwissenschaften*, Vol. 52, p. 166, 1965.

²⁴ Contingency Plan for Spills of Oil and Other Hazardous Materials in New England; Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, Draft, 1970.

²⁵ Little, A. D., Inc., "Combating Pollution Created by Oil Spills," Report to the Dept. of Transportation, U. S. Coast Guard, Vol. 1: Methods, p. 71386 (R), June 30, 1969.

²⁶ Whittle, K. J. and Blumer, M., "A Predator-Prey Relationship. Sea Stars-Bivalves. The Chemical Basis of the Response of *Asterias vulgaris* to *Crassostrea virginica*," Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Ref. No. 70-20, Unpublished Manuscript, 1970.

²⁷ Prudden, T. M., "About Lobsters," The Bond Wheelwright Co., Freeport, Maine, 1967.

²⁸ Anon. (Editorial), "Sea Secrets," Vol. 13, No. 11, p. 7, 1969.

²⁹ Boylan, D. B., unpublished results, 1970.

³⁰ Zebell, C. E., "Microbial Modification of Crude Oil in the Sea," Joint API-FWPCA Conference on Prevention and Control of Oil Spills, Press Release, Dec. 17, 1969.

³¹ Ketchum, B. H., "Biological Effects on Pollution of Estuaries and Coastal Waters," Boston Univ. Press, In Press, 1970.

³² Swaby, L. G., "Remote Sensing of Oil Slicks," Joint API-FWPCA Conference on Prevention and Control of Oil Spills, Press Release, Dec. 17, 1969.

³³ Horowitz, J., "Oil Spills: Comparison of Several Methods of Identification," Joint API-FWPCA Conference on Prevention and Control of Oil Spills, Press Release, Dec. 17, 1969.

³⁴ Arthur, D. R., "The Biological Problems of Littoral Pollution by Oil and Emulsifiers—a Summing up," pp. 159-164, Suppl. to Vol. 2 of Field Studies, Field Studies Council, London, 1968.

³⁵ Beer, J. V., "Post-Mortem Findings in Oiled Auk during Attempted Rehabilitation," pp. 123-129, Suppl. to Vol. 2 of Field Studies, Field Studies Council, London, 1968.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful for continued support of our work on origin and fate of hydrocarbons in the sea by ONR, NSF and FWPCA (current grants and contracts, NOO 14-66-CO-241, GA 1625, EBN 18050).

The concern and suggestions of many colleagues has contributed. Special gratitude goes to Drs. R. H. Backus, V. T. Bowen, J. M. Hunt, B. H. Ketchum, J. Ryther, H. L. Sanders and O. C. Zafriou.

This is Contribution No. 2474 of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution.

THE PEACE CORPS' 10TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. Speaker, if I might lift a riddle from a recent invitation I received: "What is in 60 countries, has 18,000 legs, is red, yellow, black and white, survives on peanuts, is loved by all, and is 10 years old on March 1st?"

In case you have not already guessed the answer is, "The Peace Corps." Today the Peace Corps marks its 10th birthday. President John F. Kennedy first established the Peace Corps by Executive Order on March 1, 1961. Later that year the Congress gave the new agency statutory authority under the Peace Corps Act of 1961. Under that authorizing legislation, the Peace Corps was to have three main purposes: first, to help meet the needs for trained manpower in the developing countries; second, to help promote a better understanding of the American people overseas; and third, to help promote a better understanding of other peoples on the part of the American people.

Over the last 10 years, some 48,000 Americans have served in the Peace Corps, 8,000 of whom are serving today in 60 countries around the world. The Peace Corps has known the outstanding leadership of Sargent Shriver, Jack Vaughn, and Joe Blatchford, the current director. Over the years, the young volunteer agency has adapted to changing world conditions and priorities. The Peace Corps of today is different in many respects from the Peace Corps of a decade ago, just as the world of 1971 is different from the world of 1961. The Corps' adaptability and flexibility is perhaps the key to its continued success and popularity abroad.

As one who has supported this organization over the last 10 years, I want to extend my heartiest congratulations to it on its 10th anniversary, and to wish it another decade of success.

At this point in the RECORD I include an article from the October 1970, Foreign Affairs, entitled, "The Peace Corps:

Making It in the Seventies," by Peace Corps Director Joe Blatchford. The article explains the "new directions" at Peace Corps under the Blatchford administration—directions that will enable the Corps to play a continuing constructive role in the third world in this decade. I also include an article from the February 1, 1971, U.S. News & World Report, entitled, "A 'Super Peace Corps' at Home and Abroad?" This article discusses President Nixon's proposal to merge our various domestic volunteer agencies with the Peace Corps into a "new volunteer service corps." I commend these articles to the reading of my colleagues.

[From Foreign Affairs, October 1970]

THE PEACE CORPS: MAKING IT IN THE SEVENTIES

(By Joseph H. Blatchford)

I

Ten years ago this fall John Kennedy first spoke about sending Americans overseas in voluntary service. By the following summer the idea had a name—the Peace Corps—several hundred Volunteers were in training, and even as Congress debated the program it became clear that the idea was catching on. The Silent Generation was ready to be heard from and young Americans were flooding the Corps' makeshift headquarters with thousands of applications. The public saw in it an opportunity to "show what Americans are really like" and redeem the image portrayed in Eugene Burdick's best-seller, "The Ugly American." Surveys revealed thousands of jobs to be done abroad. It seemed obvious that the most modern nation in the world could provide the needed manpower. Despite misgivings, Congress baptized the experiment by overwhelming votes.

The original plan proposed to the President by Sargent Shriver envisioned a role for Americans of all ages, skills and backgrounds and Kennedy responded by calling for all kinds of Americans to volunteer. It was, however, almost exclusively the young who answered the call. They were ready, willing and available in such numbers that it became an immense task to find enough assignments for them abroad.

But the times were propitious abroad as well as at home. In Africa the beginning of the Peace Corps coincided with the first few years of freedom from colonial rule. Many new governments, uncertain of their needs, signed up for anyone who could help. The Peace Corps was invited to send hundreds of teachers for rural schools as young governments expanded an elite colonial school system, trying to reach more of their citizens and educate its own civil service. At one time the Peace Corps provided half of all the secondary school teachers in Ethiopia and Sierra Leone.

The Peace Corps was Point Ten of the Alliance for Progress and thus part of President Kennedy's assistance package for Latin America. Living there at the time, I recall the early sixties as an era of renewed promise. The greatest number of democratically elected governments in Latin America before or since had great schemes for rapid social change, such as a sixth-grade education for every child by the end of the decade. The Peace Corps was to be part of the peaceful revolution; its Volunteers poured in by the thousands.

The agency grew in almost geometric progression. In 1961 there were 750 Volunteers and trainees; in 1963, 6,500; and by 1966, 15,500. The number of countries grew from 8 in 1961 to 44 in 1964. Volunteers were sent in large groups. For example, there were 1,133 in India in 1967, 716 in Nigeria in 1966, 720 in the Philippines in 1968, 625 in Micronesia in 1968 and 639 in Brazil in 1966.

Americans felt genuine excitement and pride when it was discovered that, contrary to our affluent image, Volunteers could live in the villages or barrios and love it. They proved to be popular with the people, and the best of them made remarkable impressions. The American people, in a public opinion poll, declared the Peace Corps to be the best investment among our foreign assistance programs. The agency opened a massive community development program in Latin America avowedly to bring "social revolution" through "agents of change." Great faith was placed in the ability of a young American to mobilize a rural village without substantial training, supervision and support. By the middle of the decade Peace Corps officials were speaking of the possibility of 100,000 volunteers. The idea also caught hold in Europe where a half-dozen countries started smaller groups of their own.

However, problems beneath the surface, ignored in the early excitement, soon began to emerge. Governments became disturbed by the presence of foreigners in schools which transmitted their history and culture. They therefore reduced the number of Volunteer teachers, restricting them to less sensitive subjects and to rural areas. In Ethiopia the Peace Corps seemed to have helped educate a revolution. Students opposed to the Selassie government and the American support of it demanded the withdrawal of Volunteers from education. Student agitation also led to withdrawal of Volunteers from universities and capital cities in several countries, most notably Turkey and the Philippines.

In Latin America the community development venture almost disappeared. It had been founded on the belief that a young American college graduate could mobilize *campesinos* to build up their communities and to demand their full rights as citizens. The Volunteers were thought of as super-pioneers, new frontiersmen for a new society. But, as it became clear, this means of setting the Volunteers out on their own (which came to be called "parachuting") failed because of a lack of extensive training, thorough supervision and substantial prearranged local support. At the same time it was found that other projects throughout the world were not sufficiently oriented to the immediate needs of the country.

In 1967 Pakistan decided not to request additional Volunteers "because it has determined that its needs were for technicians and specialists of a more sophisticated level than the Peace Corps generally provides." The Peace Corps left nine other countries in the late sixties, most of them for reasons of domestic or international politics, as in Libya and Somalia, where military governments came to power in 1969.

As the decade came to a close, pressures of this kind, plus a growing suspicion within the Peace Corps of the "numbers game" which emphasized the quantity of Volunteers overseas, steadily reduced the number of Volunteers. The press no longer found it exciting. If the public had any thoughts on the subject they could be summed up in one query: "Whatever happened to the Peace Corps?" The Senate Foreign Relations Committee provided one answer when its 1970 report noted that the Peace Corps was "increasingly becoming the target of anti-American sentiment . . . The committee believes that the time is near when the assumptions and concepts on which the Peace Corps was founded need complete reexamination."

What would a reexamination reveal? Has an idea which seemed so timely nine years ago now become outdated? Certainly the election of Richard Nixon, who has no need to champion the Peace Corps, and the shifting outlook of Congress toward foreign aid and involvement abroad, make the Peace Corps fair game for criticism. Are we seeing the beginning of the end for the Peace

Corps, or is it perhaps the end of the beginning?

II

There can be little doubt that, as originally intended by the Congress, Peace Corps Volunteers have presented another and more favorable view of the United States, particularly in small countries where they are most visible. Nor can it be doubted that nearly 40,000 Volunteers have provided this country with a new wealth of knowledge and understanding of foreign cultures. Moreover, the Peace Corps experience has equipped Volunteers for innovative roles upon their return to the United States.

There have also been notable examples of success in "meeting the trained manpower needs of developing countries," as Congress expected. However, the Volunteers themselves have put that in perspective. A questionnaire completed by 7,000 returned Volunteers last year revealed that 92 percent thought their service "very valuable" to them and 45 percent felt it had been very valuable for the United States, but only 25 percent felt it had been very valuable for the foreign country. If those who have been through the Peace Corps are accurate judges, the Peace Corps must do more to fulfill its first goal: to help countries meet their needs for trained manpower.

What we have seen so far is that the Volunteer is a unique and valuable resource. The dedication and idealism associated with the Corps concept make the Volunteer willing to persevere. The fact that he serves a comparatively short time, outside of the local civil service systems, can make him constructively impatient and genuinely innovative. The fact that he will live among the people insures that he can understand how to apply his know-how or a particular technology in a way that makes sense in the local situation. The transfer of technology has to start with a desire to receive and use it, which in turn requires that someone see the problem through the eyes of the recipient. This approach, so often ignored, has been at the heart of the Peace Corps. What remains to be done is to hitch this approach consistently to problems of higher priority.

To meet the needs of this new decade the Peace Corps has been undergoing a renewal process for more than a year. In May 1969, a task force drawn from government, business, labor, Peace Corps staff and returned Volunteers undertook a study of 10 specific aspects of the Peace Corps. A survey was taken to get the suggestions of returned Volunteers; another national poll surveyed college seniors; a management consultant firm studied the organization of the Peace Corps and recommended reorganization and a 22 percent headquarters staff reduction, both of which have now been carried out. On two occasions we met with leaders of European peace-corps type agencies and for the first time in the agency's history the 60 overseas country directors were assembled to discuss the future of the Peace Corps and make recommendations.

The Task Force felt that with only 10,000 Volunteers in a world dramatically short of trained manpower, it was still possible to make a substantial contribution. However, they suggested a number of guidelines for increasing the value of their contribution, which have been adopted by the Peace Corps in the form of five new directions for the 1970s. These plans have been approved and supported by President Nixon and generally endorsed by Congress.

The first of these new directions is to shift more Volunteer assignments to the high priority needs of developing countries. Long-range planning is the first step; Country Directors have therefore been asked to work out with local leaders a four-year plan to utilize Volunteers. We expect this planning to take the Peace Corps more heavily into vocational training, irrigation, small

business development and such hitherto ignored areas as educational television, self-help housing and urban planning.

In this search we will be making a number of new assumptions.

First, we are willing to seek out and send overseas a single man or woman with a special skill, or to put together a small team of people. Large numbers are not important and can even create an unhealthy dependency. What is important is providing people with the particular and often unusual skills found in a modern society, which a developing society cannot afford to educate—for example, a soil scientist, a man trained in forest fire control or a cattle rancher. Operating on this assumption the Peace Corps will soon have overseas Volunteers in over 320 skill categories.

Second, we will work with those private agencies which have standing within the country and work on important needs. In the past the Peace Corps has dealt almost exclusively with central governments.

Third, once a need is identified we will consult with volunteer-sending agencies in other countries, most of which are in Europe, to put together multinational teams of Volunteers. If carefully selected, these teams will provide a greater capability than Volunteers from a single country and will be less susceptible to political changes.

We hope to build into all projects an indigenous capacity to perform the task for which American Volunteers are being imported; in other words, each project should work itself out of a job in a given number of years. Even in projects such as an immunization program or the building of an irrigation system, where the job needs to be performed only once, the Peace Corps must try to serve a training function.

Using these guidelines, local governments have identified dozens of new projects, 39 this summer alone. In Guinea (which dismissed the Peace Corps in 1966) Volunteer mechanics and electricians have put the bus and truck system of Conakry back on the road, trained Guineans to operate maintenance system and are now going to expand into other parts of the country. This summer in Thailand, Volunteer engineers and agriculturalists began a project to bring irrigation water from the Nam Pong Dam, part of the Mekong Development complex, to thousands of farmers. In India last winter officials told me of the need for Volunteers to go beyond the miracle rice and wheat projects which have involved them for several years to second-stage problems of the green revolution, such as food distribution, grain storage and repair of farm machinery.

The second new direction is to recruit the Volunteers with the skills which meet these higher priority requests. To attract Volunteers from a wider spectrum of American society, the Peace Corps has to broaden its appeal. Many people still think that to serve they must have a college degree or be under 30 years of age. A new message must go out, a new call to all Americans to volunteer. These will, in turn, require new rules and recruiting methods. For example, an experienced engineer, or a machinist, carpenter or farmer is more likely to be married than the typical recent college graduate. To enable him to serve abroad, Peace Corps must relax its prohibition against Volunteers with families. This year 200 families will be serving overseas on an experimental basis to determine the feasibility of such a plan. To recruit the kinds of Volunteers requested overseas, Peace Corps must also achieve closer cooperation with unions and business so that craftsmen or mid-career professionals may join the Peace Corps without jeopardizing their seniority or advancement. In this, as in the recruitment of Volunteers, we already have the cooperation of the AFL-CIO, the UAW and numerous businesses.

Naturally there is widespread skepticism about the agency's ability to attract people

with the critical skills, but I would suggest this skepticism misreads the changing times. In 1970 Americans are more mobile and flexible; they are unwilling to stay on one job or even live in one place for 30 years. We are therefore operating on the assumption that Americans with the needed skills will respond in this decade just as did the liberal arts graduate in the last decade.

Moreover, I am confident that the young person, single, just out of college, will continue to join the Peace Corps under the right conditions. This is a terribly serious generation. Today's student wants to apply his skills to significant social problems. If the Peace Corps speaks in slogans and vague pleas, it will not appeal. But it will attract students if we say, "Here is what has to be done in X country and here is the training we will provide to equip you to do the job." To cite just one example, the Peace Corps has initiated a program with the State University of New York at Brockport under which junior year math and science majors are recruited for study and training during their senior year at college and then for volunteer service as teachers in Peru. This year the University received over 10,000 inquiries to fill just 60 positions. Intern programs like this combine study with action in a dosage which appeals to today's students.

Intern programs are also one means of recruiting members of minority groups into the Peace Corps. Until now less than one percent of Volunteers have been black, and only a handful have come from the Spanish-speaking community. Africans, for one, feel that the Peace Corps is "lily white." The Peace Corps has set up a special division to recruit members of minority groups and recently appealed for the assistance of predominantly black colleges. Intern programs have been established with Shaw, Atlanta and Texas Southern Universities to provide training for Volunteers going to Africa and will award college credit for the service abroad. The same is true of Texas A & M, which is helping to send Mexican-Americans to Peru. We have already doubled the number of minority members in the Peace Corps but this is only the first step.

III

The third new direction of the Peace Corps concerns its relationship to the host country. For as long as we have operated them, aid programs have been presented in terms of cooperation and partnership between giver and receiver, but in fact genuine partnerships have been rare. For the most part the United States has played the benefactor who imprinted the signs of his generosity on all that he gave, like the rich uncle afraid his ragged nephews would forget his generosity. This has engendered in the recipients a hostility quite contrary to the friendship the aid was intended to inspire. Technical assistance has perhaps been better received, but too often the technicians have been clustered in the capital cities, well paid, well housed and isolated from the countryside. Of late, technical assistance has been conducted almost exclusively by contractors who serve a relatively short time overseas. Some do not speak the local language and very few speak the colloquial or tribal languages or understand the culture behind them.

In the beginning most Peace Corps projects also were clearly identifiable as being American undertakings but this slowly changed until in many instances the Volunteer is today responsible to a local ministry and sees the Peace Corps mainly as a paymaster and a source of occasional support. In the process I believe the Peace Corps has demonstrated something about how to conduct assistance programs. A modest living allowance insures that Volunteers will experience life below the level of the elite. Moreover, the Peace Corps has been increasingly concentrated in the sectors of society where change

is taking place most rapidly, for example in the application of miracle wheat and rice technology, teacher training, and in the unique professional services which are crucial to development.

But if the Peace Corps has done better than some agencies, it is still behind the times. Somehow the Peace Corps must become a genuine partnership effort so that the undertaking will be "theirs" as well as "ours." It is difficult for Americans to understand the depth of local pride or how easily it can be offended. Dependency—whether in terms of markets or the need for outside manpower—is the bane of all who are conscious of this sense of national identity. In order for the Peace Corps to avoid engaging in a kind of Volunteer colonialism, it must be rooted in local desires and its projects administered by local people.

Therefore we have taken certain concrete steps to help make the Peace Corps a co-operative venture. Our goal is to fill 50 percent of the Peace Corps overseas staff positions—including the upper echelons—with local citizens. The entire process by which projects are selected, operated and evaluated will henceforth be a joint responsibility.

When I visited India in February, the Speaker of the Maharashtra State Assembly and two of his ministers urged me to place responsibility for the Peace Corps under local advisory committees—all the way from a small committee in the township where each Volunteer worked, to national groups which would concern themselves with one type of project or with the operation of the entire Peace Corps in that country.

This idea is now being pursued in most of the 60 countries where the Peace Corps operates. One role for these local committees might be to encourage the establishment of local volunteer corps. These could range from groups of high school or college students working part-time to full-time service like Iran's successful Army of Knowledge, under which 37,000 young Iranian men and women teach or work in the area of their special training for one year upon completion of academic training.

Whether within governments or in semi-public or private organizations, dozens of such service corps are now springing up around the world as leaders recognize the value in harnessing academic training and the energy of youth to national development. The Peace Corps is lending staff and volunteer support to these movements wherever possible. In many cases these local volunteers will take over projects which now engage American Volunteers.

Encouraging volunteer service by international and multi-national teams is the Peace Corps' fourth new direction. My experience has been that most countries still prefer to receive volunteers on a bilateral basis. However, this is not true in all cases. Sometimes one country cannot supply all of the skills needed in a particular project; sometimes governments—particularly those most sensitive to East-West tensions—prefer to avoid too close an identity with any one other government; and many of today's potential Volunteers prefer to serve under an international flag or in concert with Volunteers from other countries. (In a recent poll of college seniors, 80 percent favored service in the Peace Corps as part of an international team.)

The Peace Corps has already begun the process of assigning Volunteers to U.N. agencies and enthusiastically supports the idea of the U.N. Corps, which was approved by the U.N. Economic and Social Council last July and recommended to the General Assembly. If the proposal is adopted, requests will be formulated by U.N. agencies and member countries and their Volunteers supplied through existing private and governmental agencies like the Peace Corps. We expect to provide our share of Volunteers

in the years ahead, and more immediately, to undertake joint projects with volunteers from other countries, principally in Europe, before the year is out. Twenty-three such projects have been identified. For example, the Peace Corpsmen in the Mekong River Project will be working with volunteers from England, Austria and Canada.

IV

If the first four new directions emphasize a greater contribution to the foreign country, the fifth is intended to relate the Peace Corps to the enormous problems in the United States. It is common for Americans to ask today, "Why go overseas when there is so much to be done at home?"

The answer to the question is also best exemplified in the nearly 40,000 Volunteers who have now served in the Peace Corps and returned home. After living among the poor abroad and struggling in the agonizing process of change, they are not satisfied with "band-aid" cures. Neither are they given to simplistic solutions such as revolution or benign neglect. It is not surprising that 40 percent of Volunteers change their career plans while in the Peace Corps or that upon returning they continue a life of service to society. Of those employed today one-third are in teaching, many of them in ghetto schools. (It was returned Volunteers who staffed the Cardoza Project in a Washington ghetto school which served as a model for the Teacher Corps.) Another third are working at all levels of government, particularly in community action and poverty programs. Twelve percent work in international and nonprofit organizations and foundations. The young man in Chicago who helped transform a Chicago street gang into a thriving economic development corporation is one of the more dramatic examples of the hundreds who have begun a life of promoting social change.

Still, the returned Volunteer is underutilized. There is too little effort to relate his work abroad directly to needs at home; moreover, with the Corps' emphasis on classroom teaching and rural community development, Volunteers have been prepared to meet only a limited number of America's problems.

In the future we expect the Peace Corps to play a larger role abroad in population, ecology and conservation problems, curriculum reform, vocational education and urban planning. In each of these areas the foreign experience can provide training to meet a need in the United States. We will also undertake programs of "combined service," in which a Volunteer would sign up for three years instead of two and serve part of his time in the United States and part of it abroad. We expect this year to undertake joint projects with the Smithsonian Institution in the fields of ecology and the environment overseas and to double and then triple the number of Volunteers working in cities.

More directly, we are working out "internships," under which Volunteers will return to specific change-oriented jobs in big city governments. Such programs have already been worked out with the cities of Cleveland, Atlanta and San Juan and more will follow with urban-oriented private organizations.

V

These five new directions are essentially untested, and the test flight is coming at a time when the political winds are as turbulent for the agency as at any time since 1961. There is bitter disillusionment over the Vietnam war among the Peace Corps' traditional college constituency. For many of these students the Peace Corps is tainted by the war, an arm of the Establishment, merely the most tolerable part of an intolerable government. An organized and vocal minority of returned Volunteers call the Peace Corps "the smile on the devil's policy."

Moreover, as the country turns inward, voluntary service at home becomes more attractive than service overseas. In the shifting and often fickle competition among social causes the Peace Corps trails well behind ecology or domestic politics. Then, too, the election of Richard Nixon could alter the traditional allegiances. Some think the President will allow the Peace Corps to die of inattention. In the Congress the Peace Corps could fall victim to partisan politics. As for the new directions, none of them lack detractors. Some people are opposed to the partnership approach, others to working with international agencies and volunteers from other countries. One critic has already called our recruitment of skilled workers, farmers and members of minority groups "a disaster," and more charitable commentators are still skeptical that the Peace Corps can recruit in sufficient numbers beyond the campus. To say the least, there is no reason to expect a smooth course for the Peace Corps in the years ahead.

And yet I believe there is reason for optimism. The Peace Corps is in 60 countries, trusted and respected in the main. There is genuine enthusiasm for the new directions among host countries, as reflected in the requests we receive. Two years ago 73 percent of the requests were for "A.B. Generalists," recent college graduates in the liberal arts. This summer the figure was 38 percent. Two years ago the request for experienced farmers was 5 percent of the total; this year 15 percent. The figure for skilled tradesmen and vocational instructors is two and five percent, and rising rapidly. Overall, the number of total requests are "up" for the first time in 4 years.

These requests are being filled in 1970. For the recruiting year ending August 31, we have met 94 percent of all requests. This includes over 260 separate skills. For example, Kenya has received 20 civil engineers and 20 experienced farmers and farm mechanics. Volunteers sent to India this summer include a tool and die maker, a welder, an electrical technician, a psychologist, x-ray and medical technicians, and an operational therapist. Iran got 11 experienced mechanics and craftsmen with 148 years combined experience. In total, the Peace Corps this year provided 157 engineers, 332 experienced teachers, 392 farmers, 127 with skill trades, 53 with backgrounds in forestry and conservation.

A Peace Corps so composed might not have been possible 10 years ago but today the volunteer spirit is expanding to students in the professional schools and older Americans who are no longer content to keep their place in the line for affluence and retirement. Millions of Americans still ask themselves what they can do for their country. They, too, are unwilling to undertake "hand-aid" assistance overseas, so it is the responsibility of the Peace Corps to insure that the jobs we ask them to do are of high priority and match the skills they have to offer.

As for President Nixon, one would not expect him to shower the Peace Corps with attention as did President Kennedy, but neither would such a confirmed internationalist and advocate of voluntarism overlook the Peace Corps. This President sees the Peace Corps as a source of innovation, a proving ground for new ideas and a people-to-people form of nonpolitical assistance. The separation of the Peace Corps from foreign policy considerations has been reconfirmed by this Administration and the new directions given full support.

The possibility continues that the Peace Corps could suffer from the climate of apathy and skepticism which surrounds most forms of American assistance. Yet in the Congress support spans the political spectrum from Senator Goldwater who recently called the Peace Corps "the best thing we have going

in the field of foreign relations" to Senator Church, who has proposed that the Peace Corps take over more of technical assistance.

And there is much more that could be achieved through the Peace Corps. The present system is built on subsistence living and saves \$75 a month for Volunteers—taxable and without interest—in the United States. Under these conditions, there are limitations on what can be expected even if the important tasks are identified and matched to the skills of Americans with high idealism. Although we encourage as many as possible to extend for a third or fourth year, too few can afford to delay a return to some degree of savings accumulation and therefore go home at the time they become most effective and might be most willing to stay if they were given some additional incentive.

So we ask ourselves, should there be a second or perhaps a third level of Peace Corps service? Could a successful Volunteer be given additional training and sent back into the field, again living in a modest fashion but working at a higher level of sophistication with additional compensation held for him at home? Should the Volunteers be supported by a cadre of university-professional level experts serving less than two years, again living modestly and with their compensation held in the United States? Particularly in the smaller countries where the Peace Corps seems to have the greatest impact, should it be allowed to give material assistance in small quantities, or at least call upon funds from another grant and loan institution?

Finally, should the Peace Corps remain within the government in future, and if so, where? The Peterson Report has recommended that scientific and technical assistance and social development grants come from an institute having a private-public board of directors and operating like an independent foundation. Should the Peace Corps be part of such an institute?

Mention of these possibilities will no doubt fuel the criticism of those who see the Peace Corps becoming a junior AID—traditional technical assistance in new clothing. Instead of idealistic youth, it will be alleged, the Peace Corps will be the haven of professionals come to practice their trade among the élite; and we will be right back to where we started in 1960.

But the Peace Corps will continue to be a people's agency, dealing primarily with training others and distinguishable by the living style of its Volunteers. Language, adaptation to local culture, and modest living habits will continue to be at the heart of the Peace Corps. This will continue to be so not because idealism is somehow tested and made pure by adversity (villagers consider such reasoning irrelevant or a bit mad) but because the Volunteer must live among the people to become credible and to understand how his knowledge can be applied. As a country we must continue to work directly with the poor and middle classes abroad, particularly in those endeavors where change can take place most rapidly. Certainly an upper-echelon, government-only assistance effort would inappropriately represent the desire of the American people to aid their fellow men. In the Peace Corps, and also in all our dealings with other countries, there must be forged a hitherto unknown spirit of partnership not only with local citizens—which is the most crucial element—but also with international organizations and people from other countries. The Peace Corps cannot speak for others but we can pledge this spirit for ourselves, just as we can recognize the universality of human deprivation and help the returning Volunteer apply his skills to the problems of his homeland.

The world is long on plans today, but short on implementation because somehow the grand designs break down before someone carries them to the level of the people.

This is where the Peace Corps must be found in the 1970s—near enough to the impoverished and disenfranchised to understand their problems, yet in touch with the larger forces which course through every society. We promise no panacea and the times have robbed us of the euphoric thrill found in leadership of a youth movement. But in the seventies the Peace Corps can be more lean, more innovative, more capable—a contributor to substantial change in a decade which sorely needs it.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 1, 1971]

A "SUPER PEACE CORPS" AT HOME AND ABROAD?

It's more than a reorganization of volunteer programs that Nixon seeks. Already, Peace Corps and VISTA are changing. Bigger changes are seen ahead.

President Nixon's idea for "a new volunteer service corps" is beginning to take shape as something resembling a "super Peace Corps" that will operate in the U.S. as well as overseas.

It is to offer Americans of all ages an opportunity to serve their country—and their fellow man—in many peaceful ways.

The result, if Congress goes along with the President's idea, will be a big new federal agency. It will bring together a number of existing volunteer groups—and some to be added.

How large it may become is not yet determined. But organizations already marked for inclusion enlist more than 20,000 volunteers and spend in excess of 150 million dollars yearly. And new agencies that are set up in Washington have a tradition of growing.

The present Peace Corps, which now operates only in foreign nations, is to be a part of the proposed agency. So is the home-based VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America). The Teacher Corps, which also operates in the U.S., is expected to be brought into the new setup, along with several other existing volunteer programs.

EXPANDED ROLES

New forms of voluntary service are to be created. One form: Citizens concerned about pollution are to be given a chance to help clean up the nation's environment.

A place may be made in the proposed agency for conscientious objectors who are willing to work—but not to fight—for their country.

President Nixon, revealing his plan in a January 14 speech at the University of Nebraska, gave an indication of its broad scope. Said the President:

"One thing government must do is to find more-effective ways of enlisting the dedication and idealism of those young Americans who want to serve their fellow man."

"Therefore, I will send a special message to the 92nd Congress asking that the Peace Corps, VISTA, a number of other agencies now scattered through the Federal Government, be brought together into a new agency—a new volunteer service corps that will give young Americans an expanded opportunity for the service they want to give, and it will give them what they do not now have offered to them—a chance to transfer between service abroad and service at home. . . .

"I intend to make it an agency through which those willing to give their lives and their energy can work at cleaning up the environment, combat illiteracy, malnutrition, suffering and blight either abroad or at home."

"To the extent that young people respond to this opportunity, I will recommend that it be expanded to new fields, new endeavors." What all this could lead to, eventually, is a wide system of "national service"—on a voluntary basis.

What it means, for the immediate future,

is significant changes in several existing programs.

Already some big changes are taking place—particularly in VISTA and the Peace Corps. The new emphasis is away from the youthful idealist with great enthusiasm and limited skill. The stress now is on a tougher, better-organized attack on the problems of a developing nation or a U.S. poverty area.

The so-called A.B. generalists—the liberal arts graduate—made up 85 to 90 per cent of the early Peace Corps volunteers. By next summer, less than 1 in 3 new volunteers will be generalists. There will be more plumbers, electricians, mechanics, along with trained teachers, farmers and professional men.

Much of the same sort of changes are under way in VISTA, sometimes referred to as the domestic Peace Corps.

It was the almost instant success of the Peace Corps that stimulated creation of VISTA and the Teacher Corps a few years later.

President John F. Kennedy established the Peace Corps in 1961 and named his brother-in-law, Sargent Shriver, to lead it. Mr. Shriver was later head of the Office of Economic Opportunity when VISTA was organized as part of the OEO in 1964.

Peace Corps volunteers serve two years without pay. They receive living expenses, and when they leave the Corps they are given a readjustment allowance of \$75 for each month they served.

AT ITS HEIGHT

The Peace Corps grew quickly to more than 12,000 volunteers in nearly 50 nations by 1966. Volunteers taught school, worked in community development—anywhere a need was felt. At one time, Peace Corpsmen made up half of all secondary-school teachers in Ethiopia and Sierra Leone.

"This was the time of the Peace Corps' great popularity among college students," says C. Payne Lucas, director of returned volunteers, who has been with the agency since its first year.

"Students volunteered in droves and the Peace Corps rushed them overseas often without sufficient training or investigation of proposed assignments. . . . They were sustained more by the glamour and spirit of the Peace Corps than by the belief that they were accomplishing anything useful and permanent."

By the time Jack Vaughn replaced Mr. Shriver as director in 1966, problems were beginning to surface. Some governments were upset over the presence of so many foreigners in their schools. Some were finding the Peace Corps couldn't provide the skilled people they needed. Requests from host nations fell off in the mid-'60s. Eleven countries asked the Peace Corps to leave.

Applications for the Peace Corps began falling in 1965. By 1967, the number of volunteers overseas also began to drop. Currently, there are 7,770 volunteers abroad, compared with a peak of 12,313 in 1966.

Changes had been in the wind for several years when Joseph H. Blatchford was named by President Nixon in 1969 to replace Mr. Vaughn. Mr. Blatchford, 35, spent nine years running his own private volunteer-service corps in Latin America before coming to the Peace Corps.

"I have seen Peace Corps volunteers come into developing countries and be unable to solve the problems," he says. "I look at this from the point of view of the developing countries. They don't need unskilled people. They need people who can do something."

CLOSE COOPERATION

Soon, Mr. Blatchford had committed the Peace Corps to these new directions:

Development of programs which require higher skills, but meet the more pressing needs of host nations.

Recruiting a new type of volunteer to provide these skills.

Giving host nations a larger role in planning and running programs.

With those objectives in view, fewer volunteers will go overseas than in the past, but those who do will be better trained. Plans call for keeping about 8,000 overseas.

Biggest demand is for agricultural experts. Recruiters say they could place everyone graduating in agriculture in the U.S. annually for years to come.

Recruiters visit labor unions and professional societies as well as campuses. A person with a needed skill may take his family overseas with him.

Officials say the new thrust in recruiting is effective. Says one staff member:

"We seem to be getting the very solid work-oriented type of people. That is what the countries want. They feel they can't afford to baby-sit some of our kids and help them grow up for two years. That may be harsh and it probably is unfair, but there is that feeling. On the other hand, we must remember that if these kids hadn't made a significant contribution, we wouldn't be in more than 60 countries today."

TROUBLED WATERS

Whereas the Peace Corps was an instant success, VISTA had trouble from its start.

Except for the fact that its volunteers serve only one year—and that year in the U.S.—VISTA is closely modeled after the Peace Corps.

But, while the Peace Corps generally has stayed out of local politics, VISTA has been embroiled repeatedly in political controversy. In helping the poor, VISTA workers often ended by organizing them to protest their plight. The Nixon Administration has attempted to end this controversy.

The new policy was explained last summer by acting VISTA Director C. Robert Lane. He said:

"VISTA is no longer going to be the place where you can do your own thing . . . especially if that means confronting the Establishment. We hope, predict and are striving for a new type of volunteer who will work within the system and lower the noise level. It might make VISTA more popular and more accepted."

VISTA went for more than two years without a director before Mrs. Carol Khosrovi was named last September. There were rumors that the Nixon Administration planned to cut it back sharply, or even eliminate VISTA. Now, it appears likely to survive, and possibly even expand, in the new combined organization.

A MERGER?

The Teacher Corps also works in poverty areas. It grew out of an experiment using returned Peace Corps volunteers as inner-city teachers. Many staff members, including Director Richard Graham, are former Peace Corps officials.

Created by the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Teacher Corps recruits college students and experienced teachers for two years. They are paid according to qualifications—except while training, when they receive only expenses. Experienced teachers serve as team leaders, supervising teaching "interns." A team teaches two years together. An intern is awarded a degree of bachelor or master of education when he finishes.

A new program indicates what may happen in the future. Volunteers join the Teacher Corps, train and teach in a U.S. school for a year, then serve two years overseas teaching in the Peace Corps.

Some of the other programs which may become part of the new agency now include:

Foster Grandparents and the Retired Senior Volunteer program, whose members work with children and the elderly.

Senior Corps of Retired Executives and the International Executive Service Corps, which

provide advice for small businesses at home and abroad.

To head the new agency, Mr. Nixon said he would appoint Peace Corps Director Blatchford.

Summing up Peace Corps accomplishments, Mr. Blatchford says it changed the image of Americans in many foreign lands and proved the U.S. "was willing to put up its money and its own human beings to try to help."

Now Mr. Nixon wants to provide even wider opportunities to apply this willingness to tackle more problems.

INDOCHINA TRAGEDY PROLONGED BY NIXON

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that there are few if any Members of this House who are not familiar with the name of John S. Knight, the head of Knight Newspapers. I am proud to say that Mr. Knight is a native of Akron, Ohio, the principal city in my district. However, Mr. Knight is much more than the editor of a local newspaper. Knight Newspapers publishes the Akron Beacon Journal, Philadelphia Enquirer, Detroit Free Press, Miami Herald, Charlotte Observer, Tallahassee Democrat, and Macon Telegraph and News. His Editor's Notebook appears each Sunday as the lead editorial in those newspapers. It also appears in 16 other newspapers extending all the way across the United States from Massachusetts to California and from Florida to Alaska.

Mr. Knight's editorial writings have earned him many distinguished national and international awards. There are, indeed, few living newspapermen whose record of achievement and courage in journalism can match that of John S. Knight.

But Mr. Knight is also much more than than a newspaperman. He is one of the few men of national stature who, from the very beginning of our Nation's tragic involvement in Indochina, has had the foresight and the courage to speak out publicly and repeatedly against the folly of our Indochina policy. With such a record, one might think that any new statement by Mr. Knight would add very little to what he has said before.

However, in his Editor's Notebook published on Sunday, February 28, John S. Knight outdid himself in the most succinct and compelling analysis of the administration's Indochina policy that I have seen in public print. It deserves to be read and pondered by every Member of Congress:

THE EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK: INDOCHINA TRAGEDY PROLONGED BY NIXON

One year ago, I found President Nixon's State of the World message to Congress "an admirable statement which took recognition of former follies and gave hope that we will make more realistic judgments in the future."

One year ago the President was vague on Vietnam but he appeared to be giving assurance that we can at least avoid future in-

volvements of this nature." He still seems, I wrote, "to hold high hope for Vietnamization of the war, a program which in my opinion has but a slim chance of success."

One year ago, Mr. Nixon talked of freer trade with Russia, shifting by the United States from dominance to partnership in the community of nations—a long stride away from the "massive retaliation" doctrine of John Foster Dulles.

The President called his message "a watershed in American foreign policy." The speech impressed me "as a sane and rational assessment of world problems and a guide to our future role in dealing with them."

On Thursday last, President Nixon delivered his second State of the World report and the message was in a different vein. Although he did allude to lower casualties in Indochina and a \$11 billion year reduction in war's cost, the message was grim, defensive and foreboding.

While defending our invasion of Laos as enabling Americans to leave South Vietnam in safety, the President conceded that the North Vietnamese "have the manpower, the logistical network and the dedication to continue fighting if they wish."

In another reference to Indochina, Mr. Nixon said the enemy remains "a considerable threat in South Vietnam and has the capacity to step up its pressures against the Cambodian government or to increase its hold on Cambodian territory."

Moreover, the President raised some questions about South Vietnam's military leadership and its capacity to assume support as well as combat functions, assist Cambodia, destroy the Viet Cong in the countryside and manage the economy without corruption.

While calling this "a formidable agenda," the President praised South Vietnamese accomplishments to date as demonstrating their capacity to deal with it. According to the President, there are 90,000 North Vietnamese troops in Laos, 100,000 in South Vietnam and more than 50,000 North Vietnamese and Viet Cong in Cambodia.

"If winding down the war is my greatest satisfaction," the President stated, "the failure to end it is my deepest disappointment."

The President called Vietnam "the nation's most anguishing problem but not the most dangerous." He gave "that grim distinction to the Middle East with its vastly greater potential for drawing Soviet policy and our own into a collision that could prove uncontrollable." Mr. Nixon did not find Soviet actions in the Middle East, Berlin and Cuba encouraging.

Mr. Nixon was not optimistic about the Paris peace talks; he is prepared to see Red China "play a constructive role in the family of nations" but would not deprive Nationalist China of its membership in the United Nations.

The President warned of growing Soviet strength in submarines and missiles and the serious threat to "our land-based forces in the absence of agreed arms limitations on both defensive forces."

The contrast between President Nixon's expressions of hope one year ago and his most recent assessments of world conditions is striking. He is now facing up to the stern realities of our involvement in Indochina while warning that we cannot be swept "toward an isolationism which could be as disastrous as excessive zeal."

This kind of rhetoric is unconvincing. Wiser men than the President have long warned against the folly of committing land forces to the jungles of Southeast Asia. Yet even at the time when Mr. Nixon was praising his withdrawal program, we repeated previous follies by making incursions into Cambodia and Laos.

As Editor Mark Etheridge has said in the Detroit Free Press: "What it seems to mean

is that President Nixon intends to insure not only the withdrawal of American troops from the Asian mainland, but a determination that a military victory will be won—not only in South Vietnam, but in Cambodia as well."

And, to quote Pulitzer Prize winner David Halberstam who spent years in Vietnam as a correspondent, the Laos adventure "reeks of all the old misconceptions and illusions."

"One," says Halberstam, "is the belief that when we make a move the other side has no alternative, no counter move. This is perhaps the most remarkable continuing illusion of the war. Its entire history going back to 1946 has been that the Vietnamese Communist forces possess the greater roots in society, the greater willingness to die for their ideas."

Whereas Americans tend to think of things and men to be destroyed as in World War II, the Communists deal in ideas and determination. Halberstam quotes Hanoi's Pham Vam Dong as saying four years ago: "How long do you Americans wish to fight? One year? Two years? Twenty years? We will be glad to accommodate you."

The inexplicable side of Nixon is that he now admits the enemy's capacity to mount impressive military forces and fight on relentlessly in a limitless time frame. Nevertheless, the President is imbued with the idea that a non-Communist South Vietnam is vital to our interests.

There can be no other explanation for the risks he has taken in Cambodia and Laos—an actual widening of the war at the very time he is pledged to a program of withdrawal.

This raises the question as to whether the President Nixon who talks of peace isn't actually attempting to achieve a military victory. In a sense it is reminiscent of President Johnson who once thought of Vietnam in terms of World War II—the destruction of Germany's industrial capacity—while failing to comprehend that fighting in Southeast Asia is a war of a different color.

More bombs have been dropped on North Vietnam than the U.S. Air Corps let fall on Germany. But this is not a war with a highly developed country which depends upon industrial production to sustain its armies and guerrilla forces.

Despite our efforts to cut the Ho Chi Minh supply trail, the enemy continues to move its supplies both on this trail and alternate routes. The South Vietnamese in Laos have been unable to capture the city of Sepone, an announced objective when they entered the country.

Yet President Thieu of South Vietnam has been reported as saying that a march on North Vietnam is only a matter of time. If true, this could be the crowning misadventure of the war.

President Nixon is considered to be a pragmatic man, constantly assessing and reassessing the chances of success or failure on the many grave and complicated problems which confront him every day.

It is my opinion that he has misread the situation in Indochina, placed too much confidence in his Vietnamization program, underestimated the will and determination of the North Vietnamese and even now is not comprehending the dangers of intervention by Red China.

We are now playing the fourth act of a stark tragedy. The first three acts revealed the innocence of Eisenhower, the poorly advised dispatching of troops by a reluctant Kennedy and the simplistic notions of a prideful Johnson who once advised his generals to "bring back the coonskin."

The appalling futility of it all—the damage to our society, the blood and tears, depletion of our national treasury—calls for an end to a conflict over unattainable objectives being fought in a land where only the Asians can truly find their own destiny.

GALLAGHER PROPOSES STUDY OF ENDING NAVY DEPARTMENT'S PROJECT: GROUP TECHNOLOGY

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I insert an exchange of correspondence between the Department of the Navy and myself, on the issue of a Navy commissioned study entitled "The Value of Human Life: An Initial Analysis." I also insert the study itself, and I would ask my colleagues here in the House whether they believe that studies of this type are worthy recipients of some \$1.5 million of Federal funds.

I include the material as follows:

FEBRUARY 17, 1971.

HON. JOHN H. CHAFFEE,
Secretary of the Navy,
The Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have recently read a new book: The Choice: The Issue of Black Survival in America, by Newsweek reporter Samuel P. Yette. Mr. Yette is a reputable journalist who has produced a work of great importance to our Nation, for he responsibly documents the encircling web of our society's repressive capacity and the erosion of guarantees to our citizens under the Bill of Rights. One of the most startling and disturbing revelations in the book is the disclosure of a study commissioned by the Office of Naval Research, Group Psychology Programs, Contract No. N00024-67-A-0026, NR 177-911. The work is by Siegfried Streufert and Glenda Y. Nogami and is entitled "The Value of Human Life: An Initial Analysis."

Two somewhat trivial thoughts leap to my mind: 1, the Streufert/Nogami axis as professors at Purdue University is reminiscent of a catastrophic devaluing of human life; and 2, as "an initial analysis" it seems to strongly discredit such earlier works on the value of human life as, for example, the Bible.

But the truly chilling implications of this January 1970 report can best be described by portions quoted in Mr. Yette's book:

"However, value of life is not only relevant to military settings. Several writers have in the last months and years been concerned with life and death, particularly with the future life of the human species on this planet . . . Bonner (1967) has suggested that if current trends are continued the 'haves' will eventually exterminate the 'have nots' so that the 'haves' can benefit even more. Muller (1970) points out a number of effects of 'overdevelopment' in the nations of the 'haves' that will destroy the 'good life,' acceptable human values, and human nature as we now know it. Konrad Lorenz (personal communication) is even more pessimistic; he suggests the respect for others' life will cease as overcrowding reaches levels that are not yet themselves destructive."

The report then goes on to discuss a method devised by Streufert/Nogami, based on a questionnaire, to determine how dearly individuals value life. Mr. Yette raises several points about this incredible Federally financed study and, while he may be extrapolating too much from the document itself, the very fact that Navy funds were used to undertake such a study is a source of great concern to me, especially in a time when, rightly or wrongly, many citizens view ac-

tions of the Federal establishment with increasing suspicion.

As you may know, Mr. Secretary, the House Privacy Subcommittee which I have the privilege to chair, has long been concerned with the use of science and technology to create structures which undervalue American traditions. In 1965, for example, we investigated psychological testing and in 1970 one of our concerns was with the Department of the Army's nationwide data bank of information on the Constitutionally protected activities of civilians. Based on my own personal involvement in protecting American civil liberties, I must say that I can well understand the alarm with which Mr. Yette views "The Value of Human Life: An Initial Analysis." I would be very interested to learn of the rationale for such a study, especially raised, as it was, in the context of whether the "haves" are more deserving than the "have nots" of a right to survive. I fail to immediately discern the Navy's legitimate interest in such matters, but I strongly feel the need to have such an understanding and to have that understanding shared broadly by my colleagues in the Congress and by the American people.

Therefore, Mr. Secretary, I respectfully request answers to the following questions:

1. What is the amount of Federal funds expended on this study?
2. What action, if any, has been taken by the Navy on this study, and has anything beyond "an initial analysis" been performed by Drs. Streufert and Nogami?
3. May I have a complete list of documents produced by the Office of Naval Research, Group Psychology Programs, and the amount of Federal funds used for each?
4. Most important, why is the Navy interested in this area?

I believe that Mr. Yette's important new book, *The Choice*, deserves and will receive a wide readership. For this reason especially I look forward to your reply at the earliest convenience.

With continued best wishes,

Sincerely,

CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER,
Member of Congress.

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY
OF THE NAVY.

Washington, D.C., February 20, 1971.

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GALLAGHER: In the absence of the Secretary of the Navy, I am responding to your letter of February 17, 1971, in which you requested information regarding the Office of Naval Research Group Psychology Programs and expressed an understandable concern regarding the interpretation of a technical report issued under a research contract with Purdue University. The report in question (entitled "The Value of Human Life: An Initial Analysis") was authored by Professor Siegfried Steufert, who is the Principal Investigator under the contract, and a graduate student of his from Hawaii named Glenda Y. Nogami.

The report was concerned with one small aspect of a larger project (entitled "PERSONNEL TECHNOLOGY: Group Information Processing and Decision-Making in Complex Military Situations") which is a series of scientific inquiries into human capabilities for making coordinated military-type decisions requiring the interpretation of large amounts of diverse information. The research employs the technique of laboratory simulation based upon conditions prevalent in cold and limited warfare situations and seeks to identify the factors which influence the various experimental subjects to make the decisions that they make under the simulated conditions.

The simulation used by Professor Streufert in his project is designed so that differ-

ent decision makers can respond in different ways, if they are inclined to do so. Early results indicated that there were wide individual differences; i.e., marked tendencies for different individuals to respond differently when faced with the same situation. Much of the work of Professor Streufert has been concerned with seeking an understanding of the many different approaches of persons in simulated situations requiring decisions. In this light, he sought to determine if there were differences in the broad philosophical outlook of the 41 student volunteers who participated in the experiment. To this end, Professor Streufert, in his work associated with "The Value of Human Life: An Initial Analysis", assembled a list of items of the type conventionally used in such laboratory studies and asked the participants to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with each of the items. It is important to emphasize that the volunteers were assured that the completion of the questionnaire was entirely voluntary that the respondents would be anonymous. The questionnaire was tried out on a preliminary group of 56 Purdue undergraduates and then administered to a group of 41 additional student volunteers who participated in the simulation experiment itself. The questionnaire was designed to determine the extent of the agreement or disagreement among the volunteer students to the questions posed.

An analysis indicated that the questionnaire lacked certain necessary statistical properties. The report cautioned the reader concerning the tentative nature of the results and indicated that corroboration of the findings would be required before a high degree of confidence could be placed in the interpretations reported. It was the authors' intent to call attention to the tentative nature of the interpretations by means of the subtitle of the report, "An Initial Analysis".

The contract with Purdue has been in force for about four years. In response to the first question on page two of your letter, the program operates at an annual rate of approximately \$42,000. Although it is difficult to "cost out" precisely the work associated with this single report from a prolific researcher and his associates, it is estimated that the particular report in question and the work associated with the experiment involved about \$4,000 of Federal funds.

The paragraph reportedly quoted in the book by Mr. Yette from the Purdue report was an introductory paragraph for the purpose of indicating that many writers had recently expressed concern for "the future of the human species on this planet". With the current emphasis upon ecology, there can be little doubt that such concern is widespread. The Purdue report and the research unit as a whole do not deal with racial or minority issues and are in no sense "part of an emerging government strategy to subjugate and oppress Negroes", as was stated in an Associated Press release. Moreover, none of the authors mentioned in the paragraph quoted from Mr. Yette's book (i.e., Bonner, Muller, and Konrad Lorenz) nor Mr. Yette himself have ever received any funding support from the Psychology Program of the Office of Naval Research.

With respect to your second question regarding Navy action beyond the "initial analysis", no further analysis of the questionnaire has been undertaken or is planned. Consistent with the Department of Defense and Office of Naval Research policy, efforts have been made to share the information obtained from Professor Streufert's work by means of unlimited access to his technical reports and by encouraging him to publish his procedures and findings in the open scientific and professional literature. In addition, systematic efforts have been made to guarantee interaction between Professor Streufert and appropriate members of the

staffs of the National War College, Industrial War College, the Naval War College, and the U.S. Naval Academy, since this work is concerned with decision making in complex military situations. In addition, close contact has been maintained with the Department of State which shares an interest in the improvement of the content and techniques involved in programs for training U.S. Personnel in negotiation and decision making skills.

In response to your third question, enclosure (1) lists the technical research reports and journal reprints that have been published by the current contractors in the Office of Naval Research Group Psychology Program during the past two years. The dollar amounts shown are the annual rates of support for each of these research efforts.

In connection with your fourth question, "Why is the Navy interested in this (Group Psychology) area?" the answer is straightforward: to maximize the effectiveness of military personnel. The Group Psychology Program seeks to produce information and techniques to improve the military performance of Navy and Marine Corps personnel operating in teams and crews. The program is organized around such topics as leadership, decision making, morale, group and inter-personal conflict and conflict resolution.

I trust that the above provides the information you desire on our Group Psychology Program and has allayed your fears concerning civil liberties. I can assure you that the Secretary of the Navy shares your objectives and will continue to exert every effort to insure that Navy research programs do not pose a threat to such liberties.

Thank you very much for your interest in this very difficult but very important area of our research program.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. FROSCH.

GROUP PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAMS

Smithsonian Institution/L. Carmichael \$24K, Personnel Technology: Scientific Consultation Services on Navy Personnel Research Problems.

REPORTS

Campbell, Robert D., "United States Military Training for Cross-Cultural Interaction, NATO Conference on Special Training for Multilateral Forces, Brussels, July 1969," 4 Jun 1969.

Glenn, E. S., "Cognitive Structures, Culture and Social Organization," TR, 30 July 1969.

Steed, R. E., "A Study of Leadership Effectiveness at the U.S. Naval Academy," 1969.

Bobrow, Davis B., "Adaptive Politics, Social Learning, and Military Institutions," Final Report, 25 Nov 1970.

University of Michigan/R. Likert \$55K, Personnel Technology: How to Introduce Needed Change in Navy Organizations.

Taylor, J. C., "The Conditioning Effects of Technology on Organizational Behavior in Planned Social Change," TR, 30 Sep 1969.

Taylor, J. C., "An Empirical Examination of a Four-Factor Theory of Leadership Using Smallest Space Analysis," TR, 30 Sep 1969.

Bowers, D. G., "Three Studies in Change: An Account of Data-Based Organizational Development Activities in Three Continuous Process Firms," TR, 30 Sep 1969.

Bowers, D. G., "Work Organizations as Dynamic Systems," TR, 30 Sep 1969.

Barrett, J. H., "Integrating Individual Goals and Organizational Objectives," TR, 30 Sep 1969.

Bowers, D. G., "The Effects of Group Composition and Work Situation upon Peer Leadership," TR, 30 Sep 1969.

Barrett, J. H., "Individual Goals and Organizational Objectives: A Study of Integration Mechanism," TR, 1 Apr 1970.

Taylor, James C., "Measuring Sophistication of Production Technology: Background, Development, and Results," July 1, 1970.

Bowers, David G., "Perspectives in Organizational Development," September 1, 1970.

Taylor, James C., "Advanced Technology and Work Group Behavior in a Setting of Planned Social Change: A Replication Study," TR, July 1, 1970.

Frohman, Mark A., "An Empirical Study of A Model and Strategies for Planned Organizational Change," TR, Oct 1, 1969—Oct. 1, 1970.

Frohman, M. A., and Sashkin, Marshall, "The Practice of Organization Development: A Selective Review," Technical Report, October 1970.

Iman, Stephen, "Three Studies in Change II, Part A, Project Development with the D Company," Technical Report, October 1970.

Likert, Rensis & Bowers, David G., "Conflict Strategies Related to Organizational Theories and Management Systems," Technical Report, 1 Oct 1970—1 Oct 1971.

Taylor, James C., Bowers, David G., "The Survey of Organizations: Toward a Machine-scored, Standardized Questionnaire Instrument," Technical Report, September 1970.

University of Oregon/G. Patterson \$56K, Personnel Technology: Increasing Cooperation among Navy Crew Members.

Ziller, R. C., "Homogeneity-Heterogeneity of Group Membership," TR #1, Nov. 1969.

Ziller, R. C., et al., "The Self-Other Orientations of the Marginal Man," TR #2, Nov. 1969.

Ziller, R. C., "A Helical Theory of Personal Change," Feb. 1970.

Ziller, R. C., et al., "The Neutral in a Communication Network under Conditions of Conflict," American Behavioral Scientist, Vol. XIII, No. 2, Nov/Dec. 1969.

University of Rochester/B. Bass \$49K Personnel Technology: Improving the Effectiveness of Key Navy Personnel through Management Training

Barrett, G. V., and Franke, R. H., "Communication Preference and Performance: A Cross-Cultural Comparison," Paper, 1969; & TR #29, Aug. 1969.

Ryterband, E. C., and Barrett, G. V., "Managers' Values and Their Relationship to the Management of Tasks: A Cross-Cultural Comparison," TR #25, 1969.

Bass, B. M., "The American Advisor Abroad," TR #27, 1 Aug. 1969.

Porat, A. M., "Planning and Role Assignment in the Study of Conflict Resolution: A Study of Two Countries," TR #28, Aug. 1969.

Thiagarajan, K. M., and Whittaker, W. S., "Realistic Goal Setting as a Key Indicator of Entrepreneurship: A Cross Cultural Comparison," TR #30, Sept. 1969.

Thiagarajan, K. M., and Prahalad, C. K., "Some Problems in the Behavioral Science Education of Managers and Management Instructors in Developing Nations," TR #31, September 1969.

Barrett, G. V., and Franke, R. H., "Social Economic, and Medical Explanations of 'Psychogenic' Death Rate Differences: A Cross-National Analysis," TR #31 October 1969.

Bass, Bernard M., "When Planning for Others," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science Vol. 6, No. 2.

Alexander, R. A., et al., "Empathy, Projection and Negation in Seven Countries," TR #35, May 1, 1970.

Barrett, Gerald V., and Bass, Bernard M., "Comparative Surveys of Managerial Attitudes and Behavior," TR #36, May 1970.

Barrett, G. V., et al., "Combating Obsolescence Using Perceived Discrepancies in Job Expectations of Research Managers and Scientists," TR #37, July 1970.

Ryterband, E. C., et al., "How to Succeed

in Business According to AIESEC Applicants from Six Countries for Work Experience Abroad," TR #39, July 1970.

King, Donald C., and Bass, Bernard B., "Leadership, Power and Influence," Paper No. 280—June 1970.

Campbell, Richard J., "On Becoming A Psychologist in Industry (A Symposium)," Personnel Psychology 1970, 23, 191-221.

Thiagarajan, K. M., and Deep, S. D., "A Cross Cultural Study of Preferences for Participative Decision-Making by Supervisors and Subordinates," TR#33, September 1969.

State University of New York at Albany/R. Teevan \$33K Personnel Technology: What Motivates the Effective Naval Leader?

Moot, S. A., and Teevan, R. C., "Fear of Failure and the Zeigarnik Effect," TR#30, 1968.

Teevan, R. C., and Manganello, J. L., "Relationship between Hypnotic Susceptibility and Fear of Failure Motivation," TR#31, 1969.

Teevan, R., "The Effect of Two Levels of Success Incentive on Persistence in the Face of Failure," TR 32, 1969.

Teevan, R. C., "Fear of Failure and General Achievement Behavior," Final Report, October 1969.

Teevan, R. C., "Chromatic vs. Achromatic Pictures in the Scoring of Need for Achievement and the Hostile Press Measure of Fear of Failure," TR 33, 1969.

Teevan, Richard C., et al., "Fear Arousing Situations and the Fear of Failure Individual," TR#34, 1970.

Teevan, R. C., "Category Analysis of the Scoring System for Hostile Press," TR#35, 1970.

Brenner, F. S. and Teevan, R. C., "Motivation and Perceptual Selectivity Using Need for Achievement and Hostile Press Measures," TR#36.

Western Michigan University/R. Ulrich \$36K Personnel Technology: How to Prevent Unwanted Aggressive Behavior.

Ulrich, R. E., and Symanek, B., "Pain as a Stimulus for Aggression," TR#6, Apr. 1969.

Ulrich, R. E., and Wolfe, M., "Research and Theory on Aggression and Violence," TR#5.

Taylor, R., Ulrich, R., and Colasacco, A. P., "Variables Influencing Cooperative Escape and Aggressive Behavior," TR#4.

Ulrich, R., Wolfe, M., and Dulaney, S., "Punishment of Shock-Induced Aggression," TR#7, May 1969.

Svinicki, Marilla S., "An Exploratory Study of Methods for Quantifying: The Analysis of Human Aggression," TR#3, June 1969.

Symanek, B., "Avoidance of Time-Out From, and Withdrawal of, Positive Reinforcement in Humans: Reduction in Actual and Potential Reinforcement as a Stimulus for Aggression," TR, 1970.

Ulrich, R., Dulaney, S., Kucera, R., and Colasacco, A., "Side Effects of Aversive Control," Symposium on Schedule-Induced and Schedule-Dependent Phenomena, Univ. of Toronto, May 1970, Vol. I.

Michael, W. A., "An Experimental Analysis of Human Social Behavior in a Competitive Situation with the Opportunity for Aggression," TR.

Gonick, Alan M., "An Analysis of Climatic Influences on Aggression,"

Rutgers University/K. Berrien \$16K Personnel Technology: Psychological Characteristics Which Contribute to Navy Disciplinary Problems

Berrien, F. K., and Turner, F. D., "Values and Public Dissent: I—Preliminary Measures," TR #1, August 1969.

Stanford University/P. Zimbardo \$54K Personnel Technology: Factors Producing Disruptive Behavior Among Military Trainees

Maslach, C., "The 'Truth' About False Confessions," TR, April 1970.

Schiffenbauer, A., "The Modification of

Selective Recall of Central and Incidental Task Features by Emotional Arousal," TR, May 1970.

Zimbardo, P., "Modifying The Impact of Persuasive Communications with External Distraction," TR, June 1970.

Schiffenbauer, A., et al., "The Modification of Selective Recall of Central and Incidental Task Features by Emotional Arousal," ONR Tech. Rpt. Z-02, May 1970.

University of Washington/F. Fiedler \$44K PERSONNEL TECHNOLOGY: An Investigation of Training Leading to Improved Adaptability of Potential Navy Leaders

Triandis, H. C., et al., "A Cross-Cultural Study of Role Perceptions," TR#67, December 1968.

Vassiliou, V., et al., "Intercultural Attitudes after Reading an Ethnographic Essay: An Exploratory Study," TR#68, December 1968.

Fiedler, F. E., "Leadership Experience and Leadership Performance—Another Hypothesis Shot to Hell," TR#70 (68-15), December 1968.

Fiedler, F. E., "Group Performance Under Experienced and Inexperienced Leaders: A Validation Experiment" TR#69 (68-14), December 1968.

Fiedler, F. E., "Group Atmosphere and the Perception of Group Favorableness," TR#71 (68-16), December 1968.

Fiedler, F. E., "Group Structure and the Measurement of Potential Leader Influence," TR#72 (69-1), March 1969.

Fiedler, F. E., "Social Reinforcement, Personality and Learning Performance in Cross-Cultural Programmed Introduction," TR#73 (69-2), March 1969.

Fiedler, F. E., Triandis, H. C., "Communication, Cooperation, and Negotiation in Culturally Heterogeneous Groups," Final Report, August 1969.

O'Brien, G. E., and Owens, A. G., "Effects of Organizational Structure upon Correlations between Member Abilities and Group Productivity," TR#75, June 1969.

O'Brien, G. C., Hewett, T. T., "The Effects of Programmed Culture Training upon the Performance of Volunteer Medical Teams in Central America," TR#76, June 1969.

Mitchell, T., Gagerman, J., Schwartz, S., "Greek Culture Assimilator," Spring, 1969.

Fiedler, F. E., "Validation and Extension of the Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness: A Review of Empirical Findings," TR#70-4, Apr. 1970.

Fiedler, F. E., "Do Leaders Really Learn Leadership?" Technical Report, September 1970.

Stewart, Thomas R., "Individual Differences in Cognitive Interaction," Tech Rpt #70-6, April 1970.

Foa, Uriel G., "Differentiation Matching," TR#70-7, May 1970.

Mitchell, Terence R., Biglan, Anthony, "Instrumentality Theories: Current Uses in Psychology," TR#70-10, October 1970.

Purdue University/S. Streufert \$48K Personnel Technology: Group Information Processing and Decisionmaking in Complex Military Situations.

Streufert, S., and Castore, C. H., "Information Search and the Effects of Failure: A Test of Complexity Theory," TR#18, December 1968.

Streufert, S., and Ishibashi, S. T., "Chinese and American Perceptions of Nations in Conflict," TR#19, February 1969.

Higbee, K. L., and Streufert, S., "Group Risk Taking and Attribution of Causality," TR#21, April 1969.

Streufert, S., and Streufert, S. C., "American and Chinese Perceptions of Information Relevance in a Complex Decision-Making Environment," TR # 22, June 1969.

Streufert, S., "Information Availability and Complex Perceptions of Americans and Chinese," TR # 23, July 1969.

Streufert, S. C., "Effects of Information Relevance on Decision Making in Complex Environments," TR # 24, August 1969.

Streufert, S., "Complexity and Complex Decision Making," TR # 20, March 1969.

Streufert, S. and Fromkin, H. L., "Tactical Conflict Complex Decision Making, 'The Effects of the Three-Party-Duel on Military and Economic Behavior of Decision Making Groups in a Complex Environment,'" TR # 25, October 1969.

Higbee, K. L., "Hypothetical vs. Actual Group Risk Taking and The Value of Risk in a Complex Decision Making Environment," TR # 26, November 1969.

Streufert, S., and Nogami, G. Y., "The Value of Human Life: An Initial Analysis," TR # 27, January 1970.

Streufert, S., et al., "A Tactical and Negotiations Game: Rationale, Method and Analysis," TR # 1, June 1967.

Streufert, Siegfried; Fromkin, Howard L., "Cognitive Complexity and Persuasion," TR # 28, March 1970.

Cafferty, Thomas and Streufert, S., "Factors in the Choice of a Comparison Other," TR # 29, 1970.

Halpin, Stanley, "Logical Comparison in a Complex Environment," TR No. 30, 1970.

Streufert, S. and Driver, M. J., "Consistency and Motivation," TR # 31, August 1970.

Heslin, R., Streufert, S., "Task Familiarity and Reliance on the Environment in Decision Making," *The Psychological Record*, 1968, 18, 226-237.

Streufert, S., Streufert, S. C., "Effects of Conceptual Structure, Failure, and Success on Attribution of Causality and Interpersonal Attitudes," *J. of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1969, Vol. 11, No. 2, 138-147.

Streufert, S., and Streufert, S. C., "Information Load, Time Spent, and Risk Taking in Complex Decision Making," *Psychon. Sci.*, 1968, Vol 13 (6).

Streufert, S., Streufert, S. C., and Castore, C. H., "Complexity, Increasing Failure, and Decision Making," *J. of Experimental Research in Personality*, Vol. 3, Number 4, April 1969.

Streufert, S., "Increasing Failure and Response Rate in Complex Decision Making," *J. of Experimental Social Psychology* 5, 310-323 (1969).

Higbee, K. L., and Streufert, S., "Perceived Control and Riskiness," *Psychon. Sci.*, 1969, Vol. 17 (2).

Streufert, S., and Streufert, S. C., "The Perception of Information Relevance," *Psychon. Sci.*, 1970, Vol. 18 (4).

Streufert, S., and Streufert, S. C., "Effects of Failure in a Complex Decision-Making Task on Perceptions of Cost, Profit and Certainty," *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 5, No. 1, January 1970.

Human Sciences Research/D. Havron \$95K Personnel Technology: Developing Combined Action Capabilities for Vietnam and Future Contingencies.

Allnutt, B. C., "Marine Combined Action Capabilities: The Vietnam Experience," ITR, December 1969.

FEBRUARY 26, 1971.

HON. JOHN H. CHAFFEE,
Secretary of the Navy,
The Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I want to thank the Assistant Secretary for Research and Development, Mr. Robert A. Frosch, for the prompt and extensive reply to my letter of February 17, 1971, to you. While I sincerely wish that his letter had relieved my doubts about "The Value of Human Life: An Initial Analysis" and that I could join with you in quieting the alarm raised by Mr. Yette and others over its implications, I must say that I am more concerned than ever.

The program under which the Streufert/Nogami report was produced, "Personnel Technology: Group Information Processing and Decision-Making in Complex Military Situations", has cost the Department of the Navy approximately 1.5 million dollars according to the figures Mr. Frosch so kindly provided. It is my judgment, based on a review of the titles of the studies and an analysis of the Purdue report, that those funds could be far more usefully spent by the Navy. I note that Mr. Frosch states that the work under discussion, costing about \$4000, will not be the subject of additional work or study at the Navy, but that Dr. Streufert has been encouraged to publish his findings in the technical literature. I also note that several other titles in the project of Personnel Technology have been published in behavioral research journals. Were these independent media informed of the Navy's sponsorship of the papers and of what value is it to the Navy to encourage publication of documents which seem to have no value to the Navy itself?

For the past eight years, I have been conducting hearings with my Privacy Subcommittee and speaking out on the growing tendency in the United States to regard technology as an autonomous force, only tangentially related to the needs of our citizens. I find the very title of the project, Personnel Technology, to be an indication of these trends to regard people as merely cogs in an indifferent machine. I certainly recognize that a military situation, even in "cold and limited warfare situations," is considerably different from a strictly civilian situation, but I do believe the prediction or simulation of the way men will act under great stress cannot be totally accurate. While that may make me sound somewhat anti-intellectual, I believe that a study of the prior and subsequent lives of winners of the Congressional Medal of Honor would bear out my contention that it is irrelevant, to say the least, to try to define a rigid framework in which effective military action by individuals can be predicted or even understood.

I also believe that the Navy is letting itself in for unnecessary public censure when it funds studies with a title like "Category Analysis of the Scoring System for Hostile Press." I have been informed that "hostile press" is psychological jargon for a tension-laden personal situation, but even the faint suggestion that the Navy is studying categorizing unfriendly newsmen is unfortunate in today's society.

To speak specifically to "The Value of Human Life: An Initial Analysis," Mr. Frosch merely defined the method employed by Streufert/Nogami and did not, in my opinion, directly confront the suspicion that the findings could be used to discern attitudes of Americans toward whether the "haves" or the "have nots" are more deserving of a right to survive. I well appreciate the widening discussion of ecology, but I understand that word and the movement associated with it to mean the active encouragement of an environment in which *all men* have an equal right to survive. I cannot be anything other than alarmed with the following sentences on pages 2-3 of this Federally financed study:

"Do individuals and groups display the same attitudes or the same behavior with reference to aggression, capital punishment, mercy killing, abortion, suicide, and other concepts or actions that relate to life and death? Probably they do not. It might be safe to assume that at least some of those who have engaged in mass killings might hold more value for their own life than for the lives of at least some others."

The assumption in that last sentence is probably the safest assumption ever made by a scholar, but I believe that the use of Navy

funds to pay for this study and the others in the project of Personnel Technology is extremely dangerous, especially in a time when military spying on civilians is so widely discussed.

Mr. Secretary, I simply do not understand the justification for the Department of the Navy to be spending 1.5 million dollars on this sort of thing. I would welcome the opportunity to discuss these matters personally with you or Mr. Frosch, but I do now strongly recommend that you conduct a complete review of Personnel Technology with a view toward finding other areas in which to spend the taxpayer's money.

Thank you again for the prompt and comprehensive reply of your Department.

With continued best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER,
Member of Congress.

THE VALUE OF HUMAN LIFE: AN INITIAL ANALYSIS

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 27

(Siegfried Streufert and Glenda Y. Nogami, Purdue University)

Prepared in connection with research done under the Office of Naval Research, Group Psychology Programs, Contract No. N00024-67-A-0226-0007, NR 177-911.

Reproduction, translation, publication and disposal in whole or part by or for the United States Government is permitted.

This document has been approved for public release and sale, its distribution is unlimited.

ABSTRACT

A Value of Life Questionnaire (VLQ 1) is developed to measure the components of persons' attitude toward human life. It is demonstrated that value of life consists of several dimensional components which are similar in size (factor loadings) and remain relatively stable over several administrations of the questionnaire (both across and within samples). Some effects of participation in a military/economic decision-making task on shifts for value of life are observed. It is concluded that the VLQ scale may be useful for analysis and prediction of relevant decision-making under complex situational constraints.

One of the concerns of any decision maker who wants to maintain the morale of his associates must be their well-being. For the military decision maker, this kind of concern may even be more crucial; in combat the lives of men are in danger, and any decision might increase that danger. Not only their morale would be affected by an "unnecessary" decision that would increase the probability of death or injury; the success of a mission may itself fall when the number of men who are able to fight is diminished. In addition, the military decision maker may be concerned with lives of the enemy, or with the lives of a local population. When is it morally justifiable to kill, and when is it not? What degree of respect or disrespect for the life of another people can be expected from a soldier who is, or who is not, following orders? What are the motivations, or the belief systems, that are underlying the behavior of military personnel who were involved in the death of civilians at My Lai or at Kent State University? Whether or not these actions were justified in the view of society, were they and are they justified in the views of those who were directly concerned?

To answer questions of this kind, we must initially learn what "value of human life" is. Currently we do not know whether value of life is a unitary concept, or whether it consists of a number of components. We do not know whether people's views of value of human life are stable, or whether they shift

from time to time, or from situation to situation. The research reported in this paper is an initial attempt to isolate the components of the "value of life" concept. If such a concept can be identified, and if the components of the concept appear to be stable, then one might expect some important interpersonal differences in decision making by military personnel under constraints of complex situational requirements.

However, value of life is not only relevant to military settings. Several writers have in the last months and years been concerned with life and death, particularly with the future life of the human species on this planet. Probably the most vocal has been Paul Ehrlich (1968, 1969), who proposes that life as we know it might be destroyed by the "population bomb," by overcrowding, and the polluting and destructive side effects of overcrowding. Others have made similar predictions based on related evidence. For instance, Bonner (1967) has suggested that if current trends are continued, the "haves" will eventually exterminate the "have nots" so that the "haves" can benefit even more. H. J. Muller (1970) points out a number of effects of "overdevelopment" in the nations of the "haves" that will destroy the "good life," acceptable human values, and human nature as we now know it. Konrad Lorenz (personal communication) is even more pessimistic; he suggests that respect for others' life will cease as overcrowding reaches levels that are not yet themselves destructive. A slightly less pessimistic view is expressed by J. Weir (1967). He proposes that the more people become the way they want to be, the more excited with life they would become. This would turn them away from aggression and destruction. However, it appears that the views of Weir are—to say the least—reflecting a minority position.

Whether or not any of these theorists will have an impact on the behavior of individuals or groups—or for that matter societies—should in part depend on the value placed on human life. Events in recent history (destruction of Jews in Germany during the Hitler regime, the wholesale killing of Indians in Brazil, incidents reported from Vietnam, and now more recently from Cambodia) suggest that not all persons hold similar values about life and death.

Any attempt to understand, to predict, and in the long run to potentially influence attitudes or values about life and death would presuppose some amount of knowledge about these values. Currently we know more about values toward death (e.g., Feifel, Hanson, Jones, & Edwards, 1967; Feifel & Jones, 1968; Feifel, 1969) than we know about values toward life. This paper presents an initial attempt to analyze values about life; one's own as well as the lives of others.

The question whether "value of life" is a unitary concept was raised above. For instance, do individuals and groups display the same attitudes or the same behavior with reference to aggression, capital punishment, mercy killing, abortion, suicide and other concepts or actions that relate to life and death? Probably they do not. It might be safe to assume that at least some of those who have engaged in mass killings might hold more value for their own life than for the lives of at least some others. Public debates about the question whether a fetus is a "life" with as great (or greater) value than the life of any adult, or whether it may be freely aborted, demonstrates possible orthogonality of yet another group of life values. One might then assume that there can be various different values toward life within the belief and behavioral systems of a single individual, and that these different values might interact with each other. These values might have been created by the learning history of the person; they might be determined by training in

general cultural values, by morality, and by the person's social reinforcement history. The values might be affected by other belief systems: religion, political attitudes and covariates of changes in social status.

Whatever the values are, however, they might show further change in response to transient situational characteristics. In other words, situational demands may interact with established values toward life to produce situation specific behavior—behavior which may or may not be reflected in value changes.

Research on human values toward life and death would—at least in the long run—have to take into account all the interactions between value and situation components that have been listed. The current research takes one step in that direction. A Value of Life Questionnaire (VLQ) is developed in an attempt to measure values toward human life in a number of areas (see above). This questionnaire is given repeatedly to determine whether the obtained factors are spurious or reliable. Further, the scale is given before and after the respondents participated in the Tactical and Negotiations Game, a simulated decision-making setting in which participants had to make decisions about the life and death of troops and members of local populations.

METHOD

Scale Development

To tap potential differences in value of life with relevance to divergent concepts and situations, items for the Value of Life Questionnaire (VLQ) were written in the following areas: (1) abortion, (2) suicide, (3) nationalism, (4) mercy killing, (5) aggression, and (6) morality. The order of the items was randomized. Responses to scale items were collected on a Likert scale. The VLQ is presented in the appendix of this paper.

Data Collection

Twenty-nine items concerned with the value of life (see above) were included among a total of 135 attitudinal statements. The remaining 106 items for the test were drawn from various attitude scales. The value of life items were randomly interspersed among the other items.

The scale was administered on three separate occasions. It was first administered to 56 students in an introductory social psychology class at Purdue University. The students were not required to respond to the VLQ, but participation in taking the test was encouraged. Responses were anonymous.

Participants in the Tactical and Negotiations Game (Streufert, Kilger, Castore, & Driver, 1967) served as subjects in the second and third administration of the VLQ. Forty-one participants in the simulated decision-making game responded before participation, and again responded after participation approximately five hours later. In the interim, participants in the game made decisions about simulated troops and civilians, decisions which would likely lead to increased or decreased death rates among these groups.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data analyses for the three administrations of the Value of Life Questionnaire were carried out separately. Subjects' responses to each item were correlated and factored using varimax rotation procedures. Two through nine factors were extracted from each of the correlation matrices. Items that were not concerned with the value of human life were not included in the analysis. We will discuss the results obtained in each analysis in sequence, and will summarize communalities among the analyses at the end of this paper.

INITIAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE VLQ

The results for the initial analysis are drawn from the responses of 56 subjects to

29 VLQ items. Correlations among the items reached levels of .4 to .6, so that factor analysis and rotation procedures are legitimate. The first five factors, cumulatively accounting for 57% of the variance, remained stable through all rotation procedures. The variance accounted for by each of these factors was 13.8, 10.6, 10.8, 11.7, and 10.2%, respectively. Factors six through nine accounted for 6.7% or less of the common variance and were discarded from interpretative analysis. We will discuss the interpretation of each of the first five factors obtained below:

Factor 1. The following items produced high factor loadings on the first factor:

Item 34: Revenge is usually justified: an eye for an eye, a life for a life. (Loading +.733).

Item 51: In our society a life is worth only as much as that person can or has contributed. (Loading +.526).

Item 57: If a man points something at you through his pocket, assuming you had a gun, you should shoot first and ask questions later. (Loading +.449).

Item 80: An insult to our honor should always be punished. (Loading +.637).

Item 83: Criminals who commit violent crimes should be put to death. (Loading +.828).

Item 101: An insult to the honor of our nation should be punishable by death. (Loading +.692).

Item 25: All criminals should be rehabilitated, not punished. (Loading -.609).

Item 44: Capital punishment should be abolished. (Loading -.813).

This factor appears to be concerned with aggressive, or retaliatory, behavior. In other words, with denial of the value of human life for those who have engaged in behavior which is unacceptable to the respondent. In line with these conclusions, the factor will be defined as "aggressive punishment."

Factor 2. The following items produced high factor loadings on the second factor:

Item 75: In our society, abortion, as a means of limiting population, should be permitted. (Loading +.585).

Item 77: It should be made mandatory that an incurably ill patient should turn over his body for organ transplants. (Loading +.463).

Item 85: Living an immoral life is better than being dead. (Loading +.488).

Item 88: It should be permitted for an unwanted pregnancy to be terminated. (Loading +.800).

Item 10: Abortion is never justified because the fetus is still a human life. (Loading -.773).

Item 54: Society should not permit abortion even when performed with medical competence. (Loading -.704).

The responses loading on this factor are concerned with abortion, organ transplants, and morality. The emphasis of the responses appears to be placed on a "scientific" approach to human life vs. a concern about morality. In line with these conclusions, this factor will be defined as "morality."

Factor 3. The following items produced high factor loadings on the third factor:

Item 18: A person's life is more important than his nation. (Loading +.735).

Item 35: No cause is worth risking a human life. (Loading +.804).

Item 79: No nation is so important that one should be willing to risk his life for that nation. (Loading +.837).

Item 91: When our freedom is at stake, we must be willing to sacrifice some lives. (Loading -.642).

The items loading on the third factor are primarily concerned with the value of human life when there is concern with some cause, e.g., a nation, freedom, etc., for which one might lose one's life fighting. In line with these conclusions, we are defining this factor as the presence of concern about "human life viewed in relation to causes and nationalism."

Factor 4. The following items produced high loadings on the fourth factor:

Item 25: All criminals should be rehabilitated, not punished. (Loading +.514).

Item 28: Every person should have the right to decide about his own life and death. (Loading +.594).

Item 94: People should have the right to commit suicide to end a worthless life. (Loading +.519).

Item 50: Suicide is not within a person's freedom of choice which can be permitted to human beings. (Loading -.830).

Item 87: Suicide is another form of murder. (Loading -.767).

Except for Item 25 (the lowest loading item we are reporting), all items are concerned with suicide. Positive lower order loadings on this factor, however, include items that are also not concerned with suicide, e.g., Item 85: Living an immoral life is better than being dead. This factor, then, appears to have drawn items that are concerned with an individual's rights with regard to his own (rather than other persons') life and death. It will be labeled "individual rights about life and death."

Factor 5. The following items produced high loadings on the fifth factor:

Item 4: If a terminally ill patient asks to die, one should comply with his wishes. (Loading +.766).

Item 13: If a person has an incurable and painful disease, science should not try to prolong his life. (Loading +.703).

Item 6: As long as anyone shows the slightest signs of life, science should try to prolong his life. (Loading -.795).

Item 99: No mercy killing is ever justified. (Loading -.546).

The concern represented in items loading on this factor appears to be with mercy killing, the "right to die under unfavorable circumstances."

Second (Pre-TNG Game) Administration of the VLQ

The results for the second administration of the VLQ are drawn from the responses of 41 subjects who were about to participate in the Tactical and Negotiations Game. Correlations among the 29 items of the VLQ again reached the levels of the initial administration, so that factor analysis and rotation procedures appear legitimate. The first five factors in this analysis cumulatively accounted for 51.19% of the common variance, and for 13.68, 10.23, 9.68, 8.84, and 8.75% of the variance, respectively. Factors 6 through 9 accounted for less than 7% of the variance each, and were dropped for purposes of data interpretation. We will again discuss the factors in sequence.

Factor 1. The first factor in this analysis loads highly on most of the same items that we listed above for the second factor of the first VLQ administration: Item 10 (loading +.814), Item 54 (loading +.566), Item 75 (loading -.590), Item 85 (loading -.727), and Item 88 (loading -.715). The high loading for the parallel factor in the previous analysis for Item 77 did not recur. Two new items loaded highly on this factor in the present analysis:

Item 43: A person would be better off dead than living a consistently immoral life. (Loading +.613).

Item 50: Suicide is not within a person's freedom of choice which can be permitted to human beings. (Loading +.604).

The characteristic items describing the "morality" factor are maintained; the concern is with abortion, organ transplants, morality, and in one case (in this analysis only), suicide.

Factor 2. The second factor in this analysis loads highly on many of the same items that described the first factor in the previous VLQ administration: Item 25 (loading -.744), Item 44 (loading -.685), Item 83 (loading +.859), and Item 101 (loading +.679). The

first of these three items is concerned with punishment for criminal acts, and the fourth prescribes the death penalty for an "insult to our honor." Items 34, 51, 57, and 80 did not load on the factor in this administration. These items represent more aggressive or defensive acts which are not necessarily associated with an already committed crime or serious infraction. There were no new high loadings on this factor. Its characteristic "aggressive punishment" theme appears to be generally maintained, possibly with greater emphasis on the punishment component.

Factor 3. The third factor in this analysis shows some similarity to the third factor in the initial analysis. Among the common items in the current analysis are Item 18 (loading +.655), Item 79 (loading +.812), and Item 91 (loading -.442). All three items are concerned with sacrifice of life for nation or freedom. The loading of Item 35 ("No cause is worth risking a human life") was diminished to +.263. New high loadings on the factor were obtained for:

Item 43: A person would be better off dead than living a consistently immoral life. (Loading +.514).

Item 97: Severely mentally retarded children, who become burdens on society, should be killed at birth. (Loading +.516).

We interpreted the parallel factor in the first analysis as a concern with "human life in relation to causes and nationalism." Should the latter two items not turn out to be spurious, they might well fit into a cause point of view, particularly if one considers the midwestern population from which the subjects were drawn.

Factor 4. The fourth factor in this analysis contains high loadings on all items that loaded highly on factor five in the previous analysis—Item 4 (loading -.614), Item 6 (loading +.790), Item 13 (loading -.693), and Item 99 (loading +.422). The factor was previously interpreted as representing items describing the "right to die under unfavorable circumstances." Although items 51 (loading +.543) and 87 (loading +.433) show some positive loading on the factor in this analysis, they appear to have no logical relationship to the remaining items, and—unless the loading would recur—will not be considered. We are, in other words, suggesting that the characteristics of this factor reproduce the characteristics of Factor 5 in the previous analysis.

Factor 5. The fifth factor in the current analysis appears to be a new combination of items. High loading items are:

Item 35: No cause is worth risking a human life. (Loading +.762).

Item 57: If a man points something at you through his pocket, assuming you had a gun, you should shoot and ask questions later. (Loading -.444).

Item 80: An insult to our honor should always be punished. (Loading -.722).

Item 87: Suicide is another form of murder. (Loading -.483).

Item 94: People should have the right to commit suicide to end a worthless life. (Loading +.578).

The items loading on this factor suggest that the concern is with external vs. internal (personal) control over life and death.

Third (Post-TNG Game) Administration of the VLQ

The results for the third administration of VLQ are drawn from the same subjects who were used for the second analysis. In this case, the same 41 subjects were retested with the same 29 VLQ items. In the interim, the subjects had participated in the Tactical and Negotiations Game, and had made decisions about the "life and death" of troops and civilians under their simulated command or control. Correlations again were sufficiently high to permit factor analysis and varimax rotation. The first five factors

obtained in this analysis accounted cumulatively for 51.51% of the common variance and each accounted for 14.70, 9.14, 11.65, 10.18, and 9.83% of the total variance, respectively. Factors 6 through 9 each accounted for less than 8% of the variance, and were dropped from interpretative analysis. We will again discuss the obtained factors in sequence:

Factor 1. The first factor in this analysis reproduces the first factor in the second (pre-game) analysis with one exception. Item 50 drops from a loading of +.604 to +.157. It is interesting to note that this item did not load on the comparable factor in the first analysis (+.073), and it will consequently be considered "spurious." In all other ways, the loadings on the post-TNG analysis are highly similar to the loadings obtained on this factor in the pre-TNG analysis, and the factor characteristic of "morality" is maintained.

Factor 2. The second factor in the post-game analysis appears to represent a new series of items with high loadings:

Item 13: If a person has an incurable and painful disease, science should not try to prolong his life. (Loading -.795).

Item 77: It should be made mandatory that a terminally ill patient should turn over his body to science for organ transplants. (Loading -.780).

Item 101: An insult to the honor of our nation should be punishable by death. (Loading -.711).

Lesser loadings were obtained for:

Item 6: As long as anyone shows the slightest sign of life, science should try to prolong his life. (Loading +.327).

Item 97: Severely mentally retarded children, who will become burdens on society, should be killed at birth. (Loading -.422).

The factor represented by these items appears to be a direct effect of participation in the TNG game experiment. All items are concerned with death under conditions where death may be unnecessary. It is interesting to note that items where death is related to important "causes" or to violence committed by the person (who is potentially threatened with death) show near zero loadings on this factor. Apparently the subjects experienced "unnecessary" violence in the game, so that violence either became more or less acceptable. In line with these arguments, we will refer to this factor as the "Game" effect.

Factor 3. The third factor in this analysis shows some similarity to the third factor in both previous analyses. High loadings were obtained on Item 18 (loading -.762), Item 35 (loading -.693)—this item did load highly on the initial analysis for this factor but did not in the pre-game analysis, Item 29 (loading -.913), and Item 91 (loading +.691)—this item did load in the same direction on the pre-game analysis, but loaded in the opposite direction in the initial analysis. No new loadings on this factor were obtained. The concern with life in relation to some superordinate "cause" seems to have been clearly maintained in this factor.

Factor 4. The fourth factor in this analysis shows some similarity to the fourth factor in the pre-game analysis and to the fifth factor in the initial analysis. High loading items are Item 4 (loading -.726), Item 28 (loading -.542)—this item did not load on this factor in either of the previous analyses, Item 50 (loading +.680)—this item loaded highly on the pre-game analysis only, Item 95 (loading -.698)—this item loaded highly on the initial analysis, and Item 99 (loading +.420). Loadings on Item 6, which had loaded highly on both previous analyses, dropped to +.231, and loadings on Item 13 dropped to near zero. Loadings on Item 87, which had loaded previously on the pre-game analysis, dropped to +.389, and loadings on Item 97, which had previously loaded

on the initial analysis, were near zero. The characteristic of this factor, a concern whether a person has the "right to die under unfavorable circumstances," is clearly maintained.

Factor 5. The fifth factor in the current (post-game) analysis shows considerable similarity to the first factor in the initial analysis, and the second factor in the pre-game analysis. However, the variance contributed by the factor is considerably reduced, particularly when compared to the initial administration of the VLQ. High loading items in this analysis are Item 25 (loading —.873), Item 44 (loading —.511), and Item 83 (loading +.860). No new high loadings were obtained, and no changes in comparison to the pre-game administration. Factor 2 were found. Items 51, 57, and 80, which had loaded on the equivalent factor for the analysis of the initial administration of the scale only. The characteristic description of this factor as "aggressive punishment" is maintained, with emphasis on punishment for criminal acts.

COMPARISONS AMONG THE FINDINGS

On first view, the low variance contributed by each of the factors would suggest that the factors and their loadings might be quite spurious across several VLQ administrations. The opposite appears to have been demonstrated; several of the factors appear to recur with considerable reliability. The general conclusions that might be drawn from these studies are (1) persons have several orthogonal views about divergent areas of concern with life and death, and (2) the dimensions on which these views might be placed are fairly constant over comparable samples and over at least short periods of time.

Four of the five factors obtained in all three of the analyses are constant: (1) the concern with aggressive punishment vs. rehabilitation of criminals or others violating certain codes, (2) the concern with morality, (3) the concern with whether a life should or should not be sacrificed for a superordinate cause, e.g., a nation, and (4) the concern about an individual's right to die if circumstances are unfavorable, e.g., under conditions of painful terminal disease. Each of the administrations of the scale yielded one factor that was not repeated: in the first administration the non-repeated factor indicated concern with general individual rights about life and death; in the second (pre-Tactical and Negotiations Game) administration, the analysis yielded a factor concerned with external vs. internal (personal) control over life and death; and in the post-game administration, a factor that appears to have been specifically game relevant was obtained.

Whether any of the latter three factors will be replicated remains to be seen via future administrations of the VLQ. It is possible that the three factors are not as much at cognitive variance with each other as one might assume on first view. The general concern with life and death which was demonstrated in the first analysis may well have given way to the internal vs. external discrepancy in the pre-game administration, since participants for the game had already read the game manual and were prepared to make decisions which would be concerned with others' life and death. More specific experience in the game may then have modified that concern into the direction of the "Game" factor—toward greater concern with when loss of life is justified and when it is not.

Further analysis of the data obtained in the VLQ administrations before and after the participation in the game may yield additional interesting data. It appears, as stated above, that the factor structure for the two administrations remained fairly constant; however, there might have been shifts in potential factor scores for individuals, or for

groups of individuals. Information about specific effects of participation in a life relevant task on factor scores rather than on factors will also have to await further analysis.

REFERENCES

- Bonner, J. The next ninety years: Proceedings of a conference held at the California Institute of Technology, March, 1967, 31-41.
- Ehrlich, P. R. The population bomb. New York: Ballantine Press, 1968.
- Ehrlich, P. R., & Holdren, J. P. Population and panaceas: A technological perspective. *Bioscience*, 1969, 19, 1065-1071.
- Feifel, H. Attitudes toward death: A psychological perspective. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1969, 33, 292-295.
- Feifel, H., Hanson, S., Jones, R., & Edwards, L. Physicians consider death. *Proceedings, 75th Annual Convention, American Psychological Association*, 1967, 201-202.
- Feifel, H., & Jones, R. Perception of death as related to nearness to death. *Proceedings, 76th Annual Convention, American Psychological Association*, 1968, 545-546.
- Muller, H. J. The children of Frankenstein: A primer on modern technology and human values. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1970.
- Streufert, S., Kliger, S. C., Castore, C. H., & Driver, M. J. A tactical and negotiations game for the analysis of decision integration across decision areas. *Psychological Reports*, 1967, 20, 155-157.
- Weir, J. The next ninety years: Proceedings of a conference held at the California Institute of Technology, 1967, 53-70.

APPENDIX

THE VALUE OF LIFE QUESTIONNAIRE (VLQ) USED IN THE RESEARCH REPORTED IN THIS PAPER

Items analyzed for the VLQ are numbers 4, 6, 10, 13, 18, 25, 28, 34, 35, 43, 44, 50, 51, 54, 57, 75, 77, 79, 80, 81, 83, 85, 87, 88, 81, 94, 97, 99, and 101.

PUBLIC OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

The following is a study of what the general public thinks and feels about a number of important social and personal questions. The best answer to each statement below is your *personal opinion*. We have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view; you may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others. Whether you agree or disagree with any statement you can be sure that many people feel the same as you do. It is very important to read through the entire statement before you make your rating.

We have provided you with an answer sheet. Please indicate your degree of agreement and disagreement on that sheet ONLY. The items on this questionnaire are numbered. Respond on the corresponding numbers of the answer sheet.

Write +1, +2, +3, or -1, -2, -3, depending on how you feel in each case.

- I agree very much +3
- I agree on the whole +2
- I agree a little +1
- I disagree a little -1
- I disagree on the whole -2
- I disagree very much -3

1. Only a misguided idealist would believe that the United States is an imperialist war-monger.

2. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children deserve more than mere imprisonment: such criminals ought to be publicly whipped, or worse.

3. Our country should not participate in any international organization which requires that we give up any of our national rights or freedom of action.

4. If a terminally ill patient asks to die, one should comply with his wishes.

5. The businessman and manufacturer are much more important to society than the artist and the professor.

6. As long as anyone shows the slightest sign of life, science should prolong his life.

7. Our country is probably no better than many others.

8. It's perfectly clear to all decent Americans that Congressional Committees which investigate communism do more harm than good.

9. No sane normal decent person could ever think of hurting a close friend or relative.

10. Abortion is never justified because the fetus is still a human life.

11. Anyone who is really for democracy knows very well that the only way for America to head off revolution and civil war in backward countries is to send military aid.

12. When a person has a problem or worry, it is best for him not to think about it, but to keep busy with more cheerful things.

13. If a person has an incurable and painful disease, science should not try to prolong his life.

14. Familiarity breeds contempt.

15. It's the fellow travelers or the Reds who keep yelling all the time about Civil Rights.

16. Some people are born with an urge to jump from high places.

17. A person must be pretty gullible if he really believes that the Communists have actually infiltrated into government and education.

18. A person's life is more important than his nation.

19. War should never be justifiable even if it is the only way to protect our national rights and honor.

20. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.

21. It is known with complete certainty that the urge to jump from high places is learned, not inborn.

22. It is very foolish to advocate government support of religion.

23. The success of modern science proves that every important thing can ultimately be understood by the human mind.

24. It would not be wise for us to agree that working conditions in all countries should be subject to international control.

25. All criminals should be rehabilitated, not punished.

26. An international police force ought to be the only group in the world allowed to have armaments.

27. Plain common sense tells you that prejudice can be removed by education, not legislation.

28. Every person should have the right to decide about his own life and death.

29. Only if prewar authorities are kept out of the German government, will true democracy be achieved in that country.

30. No weakness or difficulty can hold us back if we have enough will power.

31. It's the agitators and left-wingers who are trying to get Red China into the United Nations.

32. History clearly shows that it is the private enterprise system which is at the root of depressions and wars.

33. Our country should not cooperate in any international trade agreements which attempt to better world economic conditions at our expense.

34. Revenge is usually justified; an eye for an eye, a life for a life.

35. No cause is worth risking a human life.

36. It would be a dangerous procedure if every person in the world had equal rights which were guaranteed by an international charter.

37. It's all too true that the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer.

38. When a person has a problem or worry, he should drop everything and concentrate on it until the solution appears.

39. Most of our social problems would be solved if we could somehow get rid of the immoral, crooked and feeble-minded people.

40. The wild sex life of the old Greeks and Romans was tame compared to some of the goings-on in this country, even in places where people might least expect it.

41. Any intelligent person can plainly see that the real reason America is maintaining armed strength is to stop aggression.

42. It would be better to be a citizen of the world than of any particular country.

43. A person would be better off dead than living a consistently immoral life.

44. Capital punishment should be abolished.

45. What the youth needs most is complete freedom from discipline in order to flow naturally into the onward stream of cooperative progress for the benefit of all mankind.

46. Nobody ever learned anything really important except through suffering.

47. Nowadays more and more people are prying into matters that should remain personal and private.

48. It's the radicals and labor racketeers who yell the loudest about labor's right to strike.

49. All national governments ought to be abolished and replaced by one central world government.

50. Suicide is not within a person's freedom of choice which can be permitted to human beings.

51. In our society, a life is worth only as much as that person can or has contributed.

52. We ought to have a world government to guarantee the welfare of all nations irrespective of the rights of anyone.

53. An insult to our honor should always be overlooked, for "whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also."

54. Society should not permit abortion even when performed with medical competence.

55. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.

56. Homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.

57. If a man points something at you through his pocket, assuming you had a gun, you should shoot and ask questions later.

58. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude and respect for his parents.

59. A person must be pretty stupid if he still believes in differences between the races.

60. What the youth needs is strict discipline, rugged determination, and a will to work and fight for family and country.

61. The truth of the matter is this! It is big business which wants to continue the VietNam War.

62. A person who has bad manners, habits and breeding can hardly expect to get along with decent people.

63. If necessary, we ought to be willing to lower our standard of living to cooperate with other countries in getting an equal standard for every person in the world.

64. It's simply incredible that anyone should believe that socialized medicine will actually help solve our health problems.

65. Patriotism should be a primary aim of education so our children will believe our country is the best in the world.

66. Because human nature is improving, war and conflict will eventually be eliminated.

67. A love of freedom and complete independence are the most important virtues children should learn.

68. Most people don't realize how much our lives are controlled by plots hatched in secret places.

69. People can be divided into two distinct classes: the weak and the strong.

70. Our country should refuse to cooperate in a total disarmament program even if some other nations agreed to it.

71. It's already crystal-clear that the United Nations is a failure.

72. Every person should have complete faith in his own independent judgment, not in some supernatural power whom he obeys without question.

73. The rebellious ideas that young people sometimes get must be encouraged and developed at all costs to guarantee mature citizenship in adulthood.

74. We should be willing to fight for our country without questioning whether it is right or wrong.

75. In our society, abortion, as a means of limiting the population should be permitted.

76. Make no mistake about it! The best way to achieve security is for the government to guarantee jobs for all.

77. It should be made mandatory that an incurably ill patient should turn over his body to science for organ transplants.

78. What this country needs most, more than laws and political programs, is a few courageous, tireless, devoted leaders in whom the people can put their faith.

79. No nation is so important that one should be willing to risk his life for that nation.

80. An insult to our honor should always be punished.

81. A person's body is inviolable, even after death.

82. Science has its place but there are many important things that can never possibly be understood by the human mind.

83. Criminals who commit violent crimes should be put to death.

84. It's perfectly clear to all thinking persons that the way to solve our financial problem is by a soak-the-rich tax program.

85. Living an immoral life is better than being dead.

86. Nowadays, when so many different kinds of people move around and mix together so much, a person has to protect himself especially carefully against catching an infection or disease from them.

87. Suicide is another form of murder.

88. It should be permissible for an unwanted pregnancy to be terminated.

89. It's mostly those who are itching for a fight who want a universal military training law.

90. Human nature being what it is, there will always be war and conflict.

91. When our freedom is at stake, we must be willing to sacrifice some lives.

92. If people would talk less and work more, everybody would be better off.

93. All prices for exported food and manufactured goods should be set by an international trade committee.

94. People should have the right to commit suicide to end a worthless life.

95. We should strive for loyalty to our country before we can afford to consider world brotherhood.

96. You just can't help but feel sorry for the person who believes that the world could exist without a Creator.

97. Severely mentally retarded children, who will become burdens on society should be killed at birth.

98. Nowadays, since democracy demands that people of widely different background and station mix together, a person should not be finicky about catching a disease from any of them.

99. No mercy killing is ever justified.

100. All the will power in the world will not help us when weaknesses and difficulties stand in our way.

101. An insult to the honor of our nation should be punishable by death.

102. Wars and social troubles may some day be ended by an earthquake or flood that will destroy the whole world.

103. The deeper and more enduring qualities in getting along well with people are far more important than external things like manners, habits and breeding.

104. It is best to have some Nazi authorities

in German government to keep order and prevent chaos.

105. Every person should have complete faith in some supernatural power whose decisions he obeys without question.

106. When I have a number of problems to solve, I like to think about them all for quite some time. I rarely solve them quickly or one at a time.

107. It usually takes me quite some time to make decisions—after all there are so many things to consider.

108. I would rather not be working in a job where I have a planned future. I would much more enjoy a situation where my advancement would be determined only by the quality of my work.

109. I make sure I don't get acquainted with people who are very different from each other.

110. If your thinking in clear, most questions can be answered "yes" or "no".

111. When I am in doubt about an issue, I usually try to find the answer as quickly as possible.

112. I enjoy spending a great deal of time thinking or talking about ideas that don't seem to agree with each other, even if I reach no quick conclusions.

113. The more I know about an issue the less certain I feel about it.

114. I can come to several different conclusions using the same facts.

115. When I have leisure time I enjoy learning about notions that are different from my own.

116. When a decision has to be made it is best made quickly. Long indecision is likely to confuse the issues involved.

117. Science has advanced man further than philosophy because it has organized all aspects of the world into a neat system.

118. The future holds great fascination for me. I would rather not know what I will do in later life.

119. When I am confused I cannot rest easily until the doubt has been resolved and its place has been taken by certainty.

120. I don't mind arriving at a movie halfway through the show.

121. I often enjoy taking a different point of view than my own in a discussion.

122. There is no "quick" answer to many of the problem in life.

123. When I am in doubt about an issue, I prefer to consult the best authority on the matter and to accept his viewpoint.

124. The group I have most enjoyed working with has been willing to discuss most matters at some length before deciding on a course of action.

125. When I am given too many choices, I feel uncomfortable. I like to be sure of what I want and then go ahead and get it.

126. I like to know how far I can go with people. That way I can act appropriately and I will not make a bad impression.

127. When I am in doubt about an issue, I prefer asking a number of people what they think. I usually end up with a view slightly different from all others.

128. I find it difficult to work with people who cannot make up their minds. One should not waste time with indecision. A problem requires action, not talk.

129. I have trouble looking at both sides of the story.

130. Most of the great men of the world have succeeded because they have had the ability to make fast and final decisions.

131. If your thinking has been clear about an issue, you will come up with several possible answers.

132. Many problems originate because people make too quick decisions.

133. Once I have reached a conclusion, I would rather not think about the matter again. Why should I waste time—I would only come to the same conclusion again.

134. It is better to let sleeping dogs lie.

135. My friends seem to be very different from each other.

GOLD OF YESTERDAY—OIL OF TODAY

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the proposal to build an 800-mile hot-oil pipeline across the State of Alaska brings to mind the great damage that was done to the fragile ecology of that area during the gold rush days.

In my view, the recollection of the sorry history of those gold rush days convinces me that it is about time that we put first things first.

The statement follows:

FIRST THINGS FIRST

A Ton of Gold! That was the headline that brought Alaska to the attention of the world in 1897. A steamer from the far north had just docked in Seattle bearing a cargo of fabulous nuggets fresh from the Klondike. News of the big gold strike attracted prospectors and stampedeers by the thousands. The rush was on!

Like termites, men with picks and gold pans swarmed Alaska's creek bottoms and ripped up the gravel. Later came the giant dredges, hydraulic monitors, and heavy equipment. Gold was all that mattered. In the words of Robert Service, the stampedeers had "gone mad with the lust for gold." In their madness, they thought of nothing else.

Each summer they would set the woods afire—just to keep down the mosquitoes. And the forest fires burned all summer, until heavy snow put them out in the fall. Thus, millions of acres went up in smoke. But nobody cared; the timber was considered worthless; gold was all that mattered.

Today, more than 70 percent of Alaska's forest land has been burned over at least once. Some areas have burned several times. As late as 1957, more than 5 million acres went up in flames in a single season. But nobody seemed to bother much. Is gold—or its substitute—all that matters in Alaska?

I could extend my analogy to the salmon industry, big game, and other resources, but what I really want to examine here is oil. To paraphrase Robert Service, "have we gone mad with lust for oil" the same as we did for gold? Are we still burning up the forest just to smoke out the mosquitoes?

The gold rush seems far in the past; it was more than half a century ago. But I seriously wonder—if, in another 50 years, we will look back on our actions of today and find that they were just as shortsighted and foolish? Will we find that we have ripped up the tundra, upset the environment, plundered the wilderness, destroyed the age-old way of life of the Eskimos and Indians, opened the arctic frontier to tourist traffic, hotdog stands, and bulldozers, polluted the rivers, and ruined wildlife habitat—all for the exploitation of the oil resource? Perhaps in another 50 years oil will be no more valuable to us than gold is today. Perhaps then, unspoiled land will be our most precious resource.

Life magazine ran a feature article on public lands in its January 8, 1971 issue. This is the lead paragraph:

"The public lands have always been the arena where Americans fought for their dreams. The dream of wealth, the dream of home, the dreams of peace and escape chase each other across the history of these lands like streaks of light across the Western sky. They are now, as they have always been, inseparable from our national destiny. What we do with them tells a great deal

about what we are, what we care about and what will become of us."

What is to become of us? That is the question. What is to become of us when we no longer care about things wild and free?

We have been repeatedly warned of the hazards that accompany the building of the Alaska pipeline—the dangers to the environment, impact upon the Natives, threats to wildlife, serious damage from earthquakes, enemy action, or sabotage, pollution problems, and oil spills. But warnings are not always sufficient. Years before the Great Alaska Earthquake of 1964, the Geological Survey had warned the people of Anchorage that a major portion of their city was built on unstable ground. They had even mapped out the probable slide areas in the event of a violent earthquake. Well you know what happened. No one heeded the warnings, and on Good Friday, March 27, 1964, at 5:36 P.M., disaster struck at Turnagain Heights and downtown Anchorage. It also struck at Valdez and in Cooper River Basin through which the proposed pipeline is planned to pass.

They say that lightning never strikes twice in the same place, but earthquakes do. Earthquakes are a way of life in Alaska. The people learn to live with them. And if we build the pipeline, it, too, will have to "live" with earthquakes.

This is a decision that we must consider with great care. This is a time when we should put first things first. Or as Thomas Paine said, "These are the times that try men's souls."

We are no longer living in the pioneer days of the Klondike gold rush. We live now in the decade of the environment. This is supposed to be a time of enlightenment and scientific understanding of the earth's ecology. No longer can we afford to burn our forests just to smoke out a few pesky mosquitoes.

In closing, I shall again quote Robert Service. In his famous poem "Spell of the Yukon," he shows us that—"somehow the gold isn't all":

SPELL OF THE YUKON

No! There's the land. (Have you seen it?)
It's the cussedest land that I know,
From the big, dizzy mountains that screen it
To the deep, deathlike valleys below.
Some say God was tired when He made it;
Some say it's a fine land to shun;
Maybe; but there's some as would trade it
For no land on earth—and I'm one.

TEXAS LEGISLATURE ADOPTS RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF POW'S AND MIA'S OF VIETNAM

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 1971, the Texas State Legislature meeting in Austin, Tex., adopted a resolution calling on the President of the United States to do all in his power to arrange for the exchange or release of American prisoners of war. This resolution was adopted during the period of time the Texas Chapter of the National League of Families of Men Who Are Prisoners of War in Southeast Asia were holding their first statewide meeting in Austin. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include a copy of the resolution together with attendant news articles which appeared in the Austin American Statesman the following day:

H.S.R. No. 112

Whereas, There are 1500 American servicemen who are Prisoners of War who are held by the North Vietnamese or the forces of the National Liberation Front; and

Whereas, Over 400 of these servicemen have been in the hands of the enemy for four years or more; and

Whereas, The forces of North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front have not observed and do not today observe the provisions of the Geneva Convention with regard to the servicemen receiving correspondence, packages from the Red Cross and other services; and

Whereas, Good medical care and ordinary humane treatment are not being accorded these Prisoners of War; and

Whereas, There is every reason to believe that the Prisoners of War have been tortured and otherwise mistreated during their period of incarceration; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of Texas request that the President do all in his power to arrange for the exchange or release of the American Prisoners of War while our troops are still fighting for victory in South Vietnam.

MOTHERS, WIVES, SONS—ALL HAVE MISSING LOVED ONES

(By Connie Sherry)

They've come from all parts of Texas—from cities and small towns, representing three generations with a common sorrow. Mothers and fathers, wives, sons and daughters who have a loved one either missing in action or held as a prisoner of war in Southeast Asia.

The Texas chapter of the National League of Families of Men Who Are Prisoners or Missing in Southeast Asia is holding its first state-wide meeting in Austin. The sessions started Friday and will officially conclude Saturday, but when the members return to their homes Sunday, new friendships will have formed and they'll all take home "the consolation of knowing there are others in the same boat."

This may be the first and last state-wide league meeting, because the state of Texas is being divided into two districts to cut distances and make such gatherings easier to attend.

The league has settled on Waco as the point to divide Texas into a north and south district. Mrs. Samuel R. Johns, Plano, and Mrs. Donald M. Klem, Garland, are the nominees for coordinator of the north district. Mrs. Howard Hill, El Paso; Mrs. Darlene Sadler, Houston; and Charles E. R. Cameron, McAllen, have been nominated to serve as south district administrator. Results of the election will be announced Saturday morning at a brunch. Brig. Gen. Daniel James, deputy secretary of defense, will be the morning speaker.

Mrs. Barbara Singleton of Dallas has served as Texas coordinator since the league was organized. The league has called a press conference at 10:45 a.m. Saturday in the Ramada-Gondollar to announce its long range plans.

Mrs. Singleton said Friday that most of the time is being spent "visiting and exchanging information." Texas has 113 men who are either MIA or POWs. They were represented at the meeting by a group estimated at 125-135 relatives. Mrs. Joan Vinson of Alexandria, Va., national league coordinator, also is attending the Texas meeting.

Ross Perot, Dallas billionaire campaigning for POW release, praised the group's strength and courage when he spoke to a joint session of the legislature Friday afternoon, but he said, "They don't want to be this strong forever."

"Most of them feel that meetings such as they are attending this week will give them

renewed courage to be strong for as long as is necessary," added Perot.

FINISHED: PEROT WINDS UP TEXAS EFFORTS (By Connie Sherley)

H. Ross Perot told a Friday afternoon conference that he is "finished" in Texas with his efforts in behalf of Americans who are prisoners of war in Southeast Asia and will now concentrate his campaign in other states.

The Dallas computer millionaire said he feels the Texas effort has been picked up and passed on to the people—and this is where he thinks it must root if it is to be effective.

"I would weaken the effort," Perot said after he addressed a joint session of the Texas House and Senate and heard state political leaders vow to continue the campaign he started more than a year ago.

When asked if he would contribute financial support, Perot replied that he "would gladly write out a check for anything that is necessary but I predict that several thousand Texans would kick me out of the way."

Reporters asked Perot if he thought the current letter-writing campaigns were producing any results, and he answered that the "logic and thinking" behind the letter writing is designed to get Americans involved.

"Letter writing is a commitment with glue on it . . . It's what every American can do," Perot said.

Brig. Gen. Daniel "Chappy" James, deputy secretary of defense, also was present for the press conference. James called the statewide movements "efforts in addition to the government."

"We say what needs to be done and are asking someone else to do it for a change," Gen. James said.

Perot also asked that Americans "be intellectually honest" about the Vietnam War and "call it the way they see it across the board."

"The level of emotion is unrelated to the level of knowledge about this war," Perot said. "What's killing our men on the battlefield is apathy."

From Austin, Perot flew to Washington, D.C., Friday evening. He will speak at an organizational meeting in Mississippi next week.

STATEWIDE DELEGATION URGED

(By Hoyt Spurlock)

A joint session of the Texas Legislature and more than 125 members of Texas POW families heard Dallas computer millionaire H. Ross Perot issue a plea Friday afternoon for a statewide delegation of officials and citizens to "go where they have to go and do what they have to do" to gain release of war prisoners from the Lone Star State.

"If there's one state that's not going to let them down," Perot told the session and a packed House gallery, "it's the state of Texas."

The Dallas computer magnate, who last year led two efforts directed to Vietnam to generate support for the release of POWs, addressed the legislators along with Astronaut Alan Bean, Brig. Gen. Chappy James, deputy secretary of defense, and Maj. James Rowe, a former Viet Cong prisoner.

Wives, children and parents of Texas POWs were escorted into the joint session after witnessing an Air Force "missing man" formation of four jets that streaked over the Capitol at 2 p.m. Each of the honored guests wore a red carnation.

Perot told the group that "our challenge is purely and simply to get them (the prisoners) out," and the key to their release is an "aroused America."

Perot praised the united efforts of the POW wives in the past year and credited

them with being responsible for increased humane treatment of the prisoners.

"We must continue to give them help like water dripping on a rock," he said. "No longer can North Vietnam say we don't stand anywhere."

To Aid POW's

Perot urged Texans to "put together a delegation of several hundred people" from major cities throughout the state, led by state officials, that would "set an example" for other states in demanding the release of those men now being held.

After Perot's address, Lt. Gov. Ben Barnes assured him that "we accept your challenge today to make our voice heard. Texas will respond."

Barnes said Perot has set an example for free men everywhere" and has given each of us an immediate vehicle we can use to help."

House Speaker Gus Mutscher presented the diminutive millionaire with the Texas House Medal of Honor for his "sincere, imaginative and untiring efforts."

Maj. Rowe, a native of McAllen who spent 64 months in leg irons and arm irons, told the joint session of his life of "monotony, pain, anger, frustration and disease" while being held captive.

Rowe escaped from a Viet Cong prison shortly before he was scheduled to be executed.

Also attending the session was Maj. Fred Thompson, a Viet Cong prisoner for four and a half months who is now a special advisor to the Air Force on POW matters.

In a brief, but chilling statement, Gen. James spoke of Texas soldiers as "some of the toughest breed of cats" he ever met.

"I'm a fighter," James said to a loud ovation. "I know how to fight better than I know how to bargain. If we must bargain now, then I will. But when my country says to fight again, then by God, I'll fight whenever she says so."

Astronaut Alan Bean, the first Texan on the moon, said that only 50 of the almost 1,600 POWs and MIAs now reported as captive in enemy territory have been identified.

"We must continue to hope that our efforts will be successful," Bean said.

Mrs. Bonny Singleton, whose husband was shot down in 1965, asked those present at Friday's session to "please help us" in taking "what actions you're prepared to take," but she added, "Don't pity us."

Prior to the beginning of the session, an estimated 1,000 visitors had signed letters of concern placed in the Capitol Rotunda near a Viet Cong cage displayed by the "Austin Cares" office.

Office chairman Gene Ebersole said the barrage of Capitol letters upped the total figure now received at the 609 W. 6th Street headquarters to 2,495.

"Austin Cares" chairman Dan Crowley also announced Friday that 76 Austin area civic clubs and service groups have been invited to attend a Wednesday meeting aimed at generating additional support for the letter writing drive.

Crowley said the 4 p.m. session will be held in the auditorium of the Southern Union Gas Company at 5th Street and Congress.

Tom Johnson, head of the committee's organizational aspects, said the names of the 76 groups were provided by the Austin Chamber of Commerce.

"We're appealing to all service and civic clubs to attend," Johnson added. "If they're not listed with the Chamber, we hope they'll attend anyway."

LEGISLATURE GIVES PEROT "MEDAL OF HONOR" (By Ann Atterberry)

AUSTIN.—H. Ross Perot of Dallas Friday received the House Medal of Honor and told a joint session of the Legislature his new

plan for pressuring North Vietnam into releasing American prisoners of war.

Perot urged Texas to put together a delegation comprised of one representative from every town in the state and led by the state's elected officials "to go where you have to go and do what you have to do" to convince the Vietnamese that Texans care about America's prisoners of war.

The North Vietnamese think American people are their friends, Perot said, "but what they call friendship, I call apathy."

Perot said the North Vietnamese are counting on American friendship because they "are counting on us to help free North Vietnam from China," Perot said.

An aroused America is the key to freeing the estimated 1,500 men who are prisoners of war or missing in action in Southeast Asia, Perot said.

"I hope every citizen in Texas will get involved," Perot told a packed House chamber. "If there is one state in the union that's not going to let those men down, it's the state of Texas."

House Speaker Gus Mutscher presented Perot with the House Medal of Honor for Perot's "sincere, imaginative and untiring efforts" on behalf of prisoners of war.

Attending the ceremony were Gov. and Mrs. Preston Smith, Lt. Gov. Ben Barnes, members of the Texas House and Senate and former U.S. prisoners of war in Southeast Asia, Maj. Fred Thompson and Maj. James Rowe of McAllen, and Apollo 12 astronaut Allan Bean, who was born in Wheeler, Texas.

Maj. Rowe told the joint session of the Legislature that Perot has "led the nation, made a breakthrough and given hope" to prisoners of war, whose lives are filled with "monotony, pain, anguish, frustration, disease and starvation."

Brig. Gen. Chappie James, assistant U.S. secretary of defense, received a standing ovation when he said "I fight better than I bargain, but if my country says bargain then by God I'll bargain until they say it's time to fight again."

Brig. Gen. James called for unity, and said "we don't dare differ on the fate of these men who gave so much."

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, the Lithuanian people marked the 53d anniversary of the modern Republic of Lithuania. But it was not a time for rejoicing. For the last 30 years, Lithuania has been a captive nation behind the Iron Curtain. The recent attempted defection by a Lithuanian sailor, Simas Kudirka, was a tragic incident in itself. But I think beyond that, it pointed to a larger tragedy, which is the tragedy of modern Lithuania.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to include the entire text of an address I delivered before the Rockford, Ill., Lithuanian Club on Sunday, February 21. I would also like to include a letter and memorandum I have received from the Illinois Chapter of Citizens Concerned for Simas. The materials follow:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE JOHN B. ANDERSON

I consider it an honor to have this opportunity to address the Rockford Lithuanian

Club today, but I am especially honored to have this opportunity at a time of such great historical significance to the Lithuanian people. It is my understanding that the one-million Americans of Lithuanian descent are actually commemorating two very important anniversaries during this latter half of February. First, you are observing the 720th anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian State when Mindaugas the Great unified all Lithuanian principalities into one kingdom back in 1251 A.D. And secondly, you are marking the 53rd anniversary of the establishment of the modern Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918.

Normally, such significant dates in the history of a people are cause for great rejoicing and celebration. But such is not the case with the Lithuanian people today. Instead, these historic events will be observed in a somber and sorrowful manner, underlined with the grim accent of defeat and tragedy. For Lithuania today is a captive nation behind the Iron Curtain, and has lived under Soviet oppression for the last thirty years.

In reviewing the history of this proud little country, steeped in centuries of tradition, I had occasion to ask myself: How many Americans are really aware of the long and painful history of this nation whose language is the oldest in Europe today? How many Americans are even aware of the existence of Lithuania today, let alone the nature of that troubled and uneasy existence? I must confess that there were many things with which I was not familiar.

Someone has said that Lithuania has suffered for centuries from the "accident of geography," and I think the historical facts amply substantiate that claim. From the earliest times, Lithuania suffered the onslaughts from the west by the Teutonic knights, and from the east by the Russians. And so it has been in modern times. When the Nazis smashed into Poland in 1939, the Russians immediately moved troops into Lithuania, and annexed the republic in June of 1940. Then, in typical Soviet fashion, so-called "elections" were held under the barrels of Soviet guns, and, according to plan, the Soviets announced that the Lithuanians had voted for inclusion in the Soviet Empire.

What followed is ample testimony to the fraud of that election. Why would a people, supposedly so anxious to be included in the Soviet Empire, immediately revolt and successfully oust the Soviet occupiers in June of 1941? Freedom and independence was restored to Lithuania for more than six weeks, and then once again it was submerged by the Nazi and Russian crosscurrents of World War Two—once again it fell victim to that "accident of geography."

The fraud of the Soviet election is further reflected in the grim statistics of the period 1940 to 1952 when one-fourth of Lithuania's population was lost in one of the most brutal pogroms of all time. Hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians were crammed into boxcars bound for Siberia. Many died along the way; for the rest, the end of the line was just that—for their lives.

How many people realize that during that same period, the Lithuanian people waged a relentless guerrilla war against their occupiers, and that in that struggle, some 30,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters lost their lives?

Professor V. Stanley Vardys, writing in a recent issue of the *New York Times*, points out that:

"Lithuanian population losses due to Stalinist policies were so staggering that only in the late nineteen-sixties did the republic reach the approximate population figure it had in 1940."

About the time of Stalin's death, in 1953, Lithuania was pacified and Sovietized. The guerrilla struggle ended, but the dream of freedom, independence and national sov-

ereignty did not die, despite the destalinization policy under Khrushchev.

Funds were made available for the rapid industrial expansion of Lithuania and consequently, Lithuania today produces electric motors, cutting laces and appliances, and also builds ships and administers a sizable fishing fleet. In addition, Lithuania, along with Latvia and Estonia, is today the top dairy and meat producer in the Soviet Union and has the highest indices of productivity and consumer services.

Now there is evidence that a period of retrenchment began in 1969, initiated by a warning in *Pravda* about remnants of "Bourgeois Nationalism" which still exist in Lithuania. Several administrators of Lithuanian cultural institutions have been replaced by more dogmatic and conservative persons.

Despite improved relations with the Vatican, the Soviet regime reneged on a promise to make available in the vernacular new liturgical texts. And there are many other signs of evidence that the constitutional guarantees of religious worship are being trampled upon.

One of the most dramatic and tragic incidents took place just last year with the mysterious death of Dr. J. Kazlauskas, an internationally renowned professor of Baltic linguistics. He was scheduled to deliver a series of lectures at Penn State University, but then the Soviet Education Ministry informed the university that the professor was too busy to come. On October 8th Dr. Kazlauskas disappeared, and on November 17 his body was found in the Neris River which flows through the city of Vilnius. In typical fashion, the party press called it suicide. Private sources say they know better.

To compound the shock of his death, the chief of the security police was elevated to the position of Minister of Justice in Lithuania—surely an ominous sign in the eyes of the intellectuals.

I could cite other instances with which I am sure you are all familiar, including several aborted hijackings which were punished by executions. The point I am trying to make here, and one which should not be lost on the American people, or the people of the free world for that matter, is that there is a new wave of repression in the Soviet Union—almost what could be called a restalinization process.

It is something which should help to explain the attempted defection by Simas Kudirka last November. It may be that that one incident, more than anything else, served to remind the American people of Lithuania's tortured existence, though I suspect that more attention was focused on the individual and the circumstances surrounding the incident, than on the underlying causes for that defection and the country of origin. I think this is extremely unfortunate.

But there was a universal outpouring of outrage in this country at the news that we had refused to grant political asylum to a defector. Outrage from the White House down to the man on the street. Thousands of letters, telegrams and petitions poured into Washington—all of one voice: the voice of disbelief and disgust. I know most of you wrote letters to me, and I attempted to answer all of them. But perhaps most impressive to me, was the petition sent to me by Leonard Remencius—a petition with over 600 signatures, protesting our refusal to grant political asylum and demanding an immediate investigation and clarification of policy. What most impressed me, as I gazed through those names, was the fact that persons of all ethnic backgrounds had signed that petition. There were German names and Irish names, Swedish names and Italian names, in addition to the many Lithuanian names.

In response to those letters and telegrams and petitions, I repeated President Nixon's outrage and shock, and assurance that it would never happen again, and I promised

a full congressional investigation into the matter.

In fact, I think one of the tacit conditions for my appearance here today was that I didn't come empty handed, and that I be able to deliver on my promises. While I cannot claim credit for playing a direct role on the congressional investigation since I am not a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I can say, after reading the report, that it has my thorough endorsement. I would like to read to you, just briefly, from the introduction to the House report, because I think it presents both an excellent capsule summary of the incident and a critical analysis of the misguided policy which was applied on that fateful day:

"This is a report of one day in the life of one man, a Lithuanian seaman named Simas Kudirka. For him November 23, 1970, was a tragic day—possibly even a fatal day. At noon it offered the hope of freedom. Shortly after sundown he was doomed to a world of eternal darkness.

"For the American officials who contributed to the fate of Kudirka it was no less a tragic day—not so much in a personal sense as the manner in which it portrayed the ineptness and confusion of bureaucracy in motion going nowhere.

"The story is very simple. Kudirka, a crewman on a Soviet vessel moored to a Coast Guard cutter in U.S. territorial waters, attempted to defect. His return was requested by the Soviet captain and approved by Coast Guard officers. When he refused to return voluntarily, a Soviet party came aboard the U.S. vessel with Coast Guard acquiescence and forcibly returned him. The significant action and inaction leading up to the decision to return him did not take place on the U.S. vessel. The Coast Guard district office in Boston, Coast Guard Headquarters in Washington, and the Department of State contributed in varying degrees to this inglorious episode.

"The flagrant disregard of the long-established American principle of asylum came as a shock to the Nation. Newspapers took up the story and distraught citizens across the country poured letters and telegrams into congressional offices. The Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations was concerned that Coast Guard foreign policy had superseded U.S. foreign policy. The thought of foreigners boarding an American vessel—in our own waters no less—conjured up scenes of more than a century and a half ago. Accordingly the subcommittee held a series of hearings that extended over eight sessions.

"When the President learned about the incident from newspaper accounts several days later, he ordered an immediate report. Both the Department of State and the Department of Transportation of which the Coast Guard is a part submitted such reports. A week after the incident the Commandant of the Coast Guard appointed a Board of Investigation that met in Cambridge, Mass., and in Washington. The verbatim record, the exhibits introduced before the Board and the report of the Board comprise more than 900 pages. This report has drawn upon the materials developed during the subcommittee hearings and in the other investigations."

Both the official Coast Guard investigation and the House Committee investigation confirm the opinion that the fault lay not with the commander of the ship *Vigilant*, Commander Eustis, but with his superiors back in the Boston district headquarters, Admiral Ellis and Captain Brown. Both Ellis and Brown voluntarily retired rather than face the possibility of a court martial.

In addition, the following statement was issued by transportation Secretary Volpe at the conclusion of the investigation:

"I regret very deeply that a young man had to lose his chance for freedom in order to bring to light the deficiencies in Govern-

ment procedures for welcoming victims of oppression to American soil. Also, I regret that the proud history of the U.S. Coast Guard which has given shelter to hundreds of political refugees was not upheld in this tragic incident.

"But the errors in procedure have now been corrected. We can now give assurance to the world that an incident such as that which occurred on November 23 can never occur again and that America remains the haven for the oppressed."

Since I do not want to take your time in dwelling on the details of that incident, I am leaving with your chairman a copy of the House hearings and report, as well as the report and findings of the Coast Guard Board of Investigation. I'm sure he'd be happy to lend these to you if you are interested in reading them.

One question which these reports cannot answer is: Why did Simas Kudirka defect in the first place? We don't know the answer to that because no one bothered to ask him. But as one writer put it, "the brutality the Soviets used in his capture should serve as an illustration of the conditions from which he tried to escape."

That writer went on to say, and I quote: "The denial of freedom to one Balt off Martha's Vineyard calls attention to the denial of freedom to all Baltic people. By invading the Baltic States, the Russians denied not only national freedom, but also individual freedom. That there cannot be a personal freedom and justice without a national freedom and independence is recognized widely, but only privately, in the Soviet Union."

It seems to me that this is the real lesson of the *Vigilant* incident, a lesson which should be impressed upon all Americans who cherish freedom and independence, not only for themselves, but for all the peoples of the world. It is sad but true that perhaps only one in a thousand such incidents ever reach our attention because of the closed nature of Soviet society. When people begin to realize that such abuses of personal freedom are committed every day behind the Iron Curtain then I think there will be the type of universal outcry and pressure of world opinion which often can and does make a difference. We saw it with the commutation of death sentences for the Jewish hi-jackers in Russia, and we are seeing it now with Kudirka who is apparently living in a new apartment in the port city of Klaipeda. But knowing the Soviets, this is probably only temporary until the heat of the world spotlight is turned off. It seems to me that the answer is to keep that spotlight on and keep that heat on, whether it be through the forum of the United Nations, the world press, or voice of America. It has often been said that none of us will be truly free until we are all free. It seems to me that implies a commitment and a responsibility to encourage freedom for all mankind. If we ever forget that responsibility, we will be forfeiting our own freedom forever.

CITIZENS CONCERNED FOR SIMAS,
Braintree, Mass., February 12, 1971.
Hon. Congressman JOHN B. ANDERSON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: February 16 will mark the 53rd anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence. This year, as every year, U.S. Government and other public officials will greet the Lithuanian community and express their solidarity with Lithuanian aspirations of freedom for their country.

Yet recent international events involving Lithuanians have revealed certain ominous inconsistencies in United States policy toward the Baltic States. In the enclosed memorandum we would like to bring to your attention some of these inconsistencies and suggest ways in which they might be avoided in the future.

As residents of your state, we request that you, a Congressman of the United States, make your opinion known to the President and the Department of State and obtain from them a clear public statement of policy toward the Baltic States. We feel that this would be truly a worthwhile contribution in behalf of the Lithuanian people.

Sincerely yours,

VYTES PAUKISTZ,
Citizens Concerned for Simas,
Illinois Chapter.

MEMORANDUM TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Concerning the recent incident involving a would-be Lithuanian defector on board the U.S. Coast Guard cutter *Vigilant*, we would like to bring to your attention a number of facts having grave implications for U.S. foreign policy toward the Baltic states.

It was noted widely in the press that the name of the Soviet ship from which Simas Kudirka leaped to the *Vigilant* was *Sovetskaya Litva* (Soviet Lithuania) and that he himself was Lithuanian. But these facts were generally mentioned without attached any particular importance to them. Most newsmen and decision-making officials did not notice or did not want to see the specific political implications of the very term "Soviet Lithuanian".

The U.S. Government explicitly does not recognize the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union and does not give *de jure* recognition to Soviet Lithuania, nor does it enter into negotiations with the Soviet Union if they have a bearing on Lithuanian territory or Lithuanian citizens. All U.S. Secretaries of State have reaffirmed this policy of the United States at least three times a year for the last thirty years. But unfortunately, this reaffirmation is made only to the diplomatic representatives and exile leaders of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, and is seldom, if ever, mentioned publicly. The American press ignores this facet of U.S. policy and the U.S. public has almost completely forgotten it. At the same time the Soviet Union blatantly publicizes these countries as Soviet republics at home and abroad.

The name of the mother ship of the Soviet fishing fleet in Atlantic waters, *Sovetskaya Litva*, is an example of this propaganda effort and is an affront to U.S. policy toward the Baltic states. Had this policy been appropriately publicized by U.S. officials and not ignored by the U.S. press, then it would have been common knowledge not only to high State Department functionaries but also to all public officials involved in the aforementioned incident, from admirals to captains.

The name of the *Sovetskaya Litva* is not the only affront to U.S. policy. Although the ship is owned by the Soviet Union and is under its jurisdiction, it is registered in and its operations are based in Klaipeda, which is Lithuanian territory not recognized by the United States as part of the Soviet Union.

Simas Kudirka was not the only Lithuanian crew member of that ship. There are many Lithuanians on the fishing vessels which the Soviet Union operates out of the port of Klaipeda. According to U.S. Policy, these Lithuanians are subjects but not citizens of the Soviet Union.

The U.S. Government has promised to commit no acts which would explicitly or implicitly recognize Soviet annexation of the Baltic states. This being the case, the State Department should not have arranged negotiations under its aegis on a ship which by its name and method of operation violates a tenet of U.S. foreign policy.

It is a fact that the negotiations on that ship, undertaken with Coast Guard and State Department cooperation, are a sign that the State Department is not firmly committed to its declared policy concerning the Baltic states. The State Department does not give instructions to U.S. functionaries concerning

proper procedures in cases where this policy is affronted. It is not entirely clear exactly when and how the commander of the *Vigilant* discovered that the would-be defector on his ship was a Lithuanian. But it is all too tragically clear that this fact meant absolutely nothing to him and it is not certain whether he even transmitted this piece of information to his superiors. In all the communications between Coast Guard and State Department officials, it did not occur to anyone that the defector and his ship were from a country which the United States does not recognize as part of the Soviet Union.

As soon as it became clear that the man was Lithuanian, U.S. officials should have refused to enter into any discussions concerning his fate with Soviet authorities, because a Lithuanian refugee from the Soviet Union has full rights to Lithuanian citizenship, which the U.S. Government recognizes. The Lithuanian Legation in Washington should have been notified of the attempted defection before the man was returned.

But in this instance U.S. policy toward the Baltic states was forgotten, and the U.S. officials who were faced with making the decisions were ignorant of this policy and were unable to draw the proper conclusions as events unfolded and civilians on board the Coast Guard ship attempted to inform them. THEREFORE, IT IS IMPERATIVE THAT AT THE BALTIC STATES BE MADE CLEAR TO LEAST NOW U.S. POLICY CONCERNING EVERY SINGLE U.S. OFFICIAL FROM THE HIGHEST TO THE LOWEST RANK IN ALL AGENCIES HAVING ANY DEALINGS WITH THE SOVIET UNION DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY.

Guidelines giving instructions concerning political refugees in general are not enough. It is imperative to explain the specific political and legal implications of defection of nationals of the Baltic states. It should be stressed that a Lithuanian, Latvian, or Estonian defector should automatically be treated not as a Soviet citizen but as a refugee who is entitled to protection of Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian consulates in the free world. These instructions should be made known not only within the pertinent bureaucracies, but also publicly, so that the American public should be aware of the policies of its Government.

It is a fact that the information media have long ignored or underplayed the abnormal political status of the Baltic countries. But this is to a great extent the result of official silence on the subject. Because the State Department barely whispers about this particular policy, the information media, encyclopedias, almanacs, and the general public are increasingly coming to believe in Soviet allegations about the Baltic states.

A policy of silence on the Baltic states serves no U.S. interest and has been shown to violate grievously the rights of citizens of the Baltic nations. We request that you, a member of the Congress of the United States of America, make your opinion known to the President and the Department of State and obtain from them a clear public statement of policy toward the Baltic states.

CITIZENS CONCERNED FOR SIMAS,
FEBRUARY 8, 1971.

MESSAGE FROM AEGINA JAIL

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the island of Aegina lies in the Saronic Gulf, 20 miles from Athens. In ancient times, the naval forces of Aegina played a considerable part in the great

defeat of the Persians in the Battle of Salamis, part of which was fought in the strait between Aegina and the nearby island of Salamis. Now Aegina is a tourist attraction on the 1-day boat excursions from Athens. The island's chief attraction is the Temple of Aphaea, older by 50 years than the Parthenon. The Temple of Aphaea was built about 490 B.C. to commemorate the defeat of the Persians. Aegina is also known as a leading producer of pistachio nuts. Unfortunately, it is known for one further and unpleasant reason. It is the site of a dank, unhealthy prison which, I am told, was bad even in the best of times. It is in this Aegina jail that many political prisoners of the Greek military junta now spend their days. Recently, some brave inmates of Aegina prison smuggled a letter out to me. I submit it for the record both for the human tragedy it represents and for its deep insight into the fallacies which tempt America to betray its moral and political principles and to support "provisional" dictatorships such as the one in Greece. We must take heed.

DEAR SIR: In a few months time the military dictatorship in Greece will conclude its fourth year in power. During these four years the colonels' main concern has been to continue a series of innumerable frauds and ruses with the aim to deceive the public opinion on the real face and intention of their regime. Official propaganda and the regime's conditioned means of communication, after having attempted to persuade the Free World that the "real" interest of the West would be jeopardized unless democracy in Greece were suppressed and the Greeks were terrorized, activated consequently an unscrupulous mechanism of promises directed to foreign governments and international organizations, ascertaining that the abolition of all fundamental human and civil rights is but "provisional," and that the abnormality would give off to a real constitutional order.

This allegedly provisional situation and the so-called "new order," three years and seven months after its establishment, amount to the following: martial law is still in force and courts-martial continue to function; arbitrary arrests and police questioning in defiance of the fundamental civil rights consist an everyday practice against political opponents of the regime; parliament remains "out of law," and all political action is still banned, except, naturally, for the regime's brainwash activity; and last but not least, political prisoners are still held either in concentration camps, or exiled in remote villages, or detained under heavy penalties in prisons as hostages of the military government. Many of them will have spent their fourth consecutive Christmas Eve in prison.

Yet, these features of the Greek public life have been assessed recently by the official spokesman of the U.S. government (as) an encouraging "trend" towards a constitutional order, a trend which has been considered as a strong reason for resuming full military aid to the colonels.

We are now addressing to you this short message because we feel the need to congratulate you: We would like to express how deep we appreciate the sagacity, integrity and courage which led you to a stand by the side of our people. This stand has put you on the line of our people's history and tradition which is a continuous struggle against all forms of totalitarianism and oppression. We believe it to be of primary importance that the junta did not succeed in ensnaring you into the labyrinth of its lies and deceiving you by its alleged constitutional reforms and notorious timetables of rendering to the

Greeks the rights which they should have had by birth.

On this same occasion we would like to underline most strongly the huge mistake, expressed with mounting cynicism, which lies behind the doctrine of modern "provisional" dictatorships in the West. According to this doctrine, a number of free countries must undergo a stage of totalitarian rule, in order that the West can maintain its hold on allegedly precarious areas. On the basis of this doctrine an increasing number of reactionary dictatorships, and among them the Greek regime, are fostered semi-openly by the leading power of the West, under different pretexts. The doctrine is an obvious and tragic contradiction. Not a single people—and especially the Greek people—is prepared to accept, in any covered form whatsoever, the status of mercenary for defending others from faked dangers, nor would it undertake the role of forced guard of foreign interests.

We believe that freedom is the same indispensable to Americans, Europeans and Greeks as well. Only the defence of this common-to-all freedom could be a matter of common interest to all parties.

We thank you for keeping your clear voice in the air echoing the high principles for which we are being kept in prison and others in concentration camps.

We know that at the end these principles will prevail and we can assure you that we will not fall in this fight over a just cause which you have decided to support. We hope that more people will follow your example.

Yours sincerely,

Phoebus Ioannides, lawyer; George Sipitanos, businessman; N. Voulelis, student; Thomas Papoutsis, employee; Nikos Armenis, artisan; A. Tantis, student; Stellos Yannitopoulos, artisan.

Stellos Nestor, lawyer; Nondas Ochounos, student; Pavlos Zannas, director of the Salonika International Fair; Argyris Maltsidis, engineer; Antonio Goulas, student; Costas Sophoulis, economist; George Avramis, employee.

Nestor Hatjudis, engineer; Ch. Protopapas, lawyer; K. Kitsirites, lawyer; Nikos Chloros, student; John Vassiliou, economist; A. Politis, petty officer; Anestis Anastasiadis, tradesman.

ANTI-U.S. CARTOON DRAWS RETURN FIRE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the barrage of anti-U.S. propaganda that is continually being directed against us is very effectively answered by Orville Lifka, editor of the Suburban Life of La Grange Park, Ill., in his column in that publication on Thursday, February 18.

The article very effectively makes the point that many of the nations and people which criticize the United States do so while overlooking their own problems and by creating the false impression that such problems are greater in our land than any other.

ANTI-U.S. CARTOON DRAWS RETURN FIRE
(By Orv Lifka)

Taking his pitch from the fluted columns that characterize many government buildings in the United States, a Belgian cartoonist has portrayed them as bulging garbage cans decorated with American flags. They line an automobile jammed street where pedestrians couldn't be more nauseated if

they were on the windward side of a hamburger cheese sandwich.

As the elephant said when he stepped on the whipped cream cake, this makes quite an impression. Americans are known to be as wasteful as a moth in a yarn factory. Our garbage scows may not be as big as the Queen Elizabeth II, but they make more trips. The strike of Berwyn sanitation workers had burghers wishing for trash containers as big as those in the cartoon.

We have more automobiles than any other country and owe more money for them. After they've rolled their last mile we don't know what to do with them. Our lakes and rivers look like the bathroom sink after Junior's hard day on the mud pile. Our air pollution problem has us gasping.

Things must be different in Belgium if the cartoonist could see all the way to the United States. In addition to fancy lace and Brussels sprouts the country may export fresh air, hot or otherwise.

However, America has no monopoly on ways to foul up the ecology, any more than King Baudouin has on the royalty business. Although the atmosphere has been cleared of Hitler's cloudy thinking, many parts of Europe leave visitors with a dim view.

In Rotterdam the smog is so thick that freighters would sail right downtown if it weren't for the docks. Reinforced by industrial pollution, the port humidity is so high that seamen qualify for submarine pay.

Munich, where pollution of another complexion prevails during the Oktoberfest, made history of a sort last year when a traffic policeman passed out from monoxide poisoning. Most tourists believe these stalwarts wave their arms to keep vehicles moving, but they're merely trying to stir up some fresh air.

In Vienna, where narrow downtown streets collect pollution like a shopper accumulates packages, the cab drivers have threatened to wear gas masks. When visitors complain that the Danube isn't blue, residents reply, "Have a couple of liters of our wine; then take another look." But that does little for the pall that often envelops the city.

Now that coal burning has been reduced and Sherlock Holmes no longer stalks around town smoking his tuba-sized pipe, London is beginning to see a little daylight in its battle for clean air. Of course, government policies continue to leave many people in a fog.

Pollution is a problem that must be met face to face, if we can stand it. We can't give the brush to what the Belgian cartoonist portrays about us. But we can hope that his criticism, like charity, begins at home. Wonder if he's stopped smoking?

RESPONDING TO THE NEEDS OF OUR VETERANS

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, the great sacrifices which our veterans have made, have given us the freedom which we enjoy today. The American people must now respond to their sacrifices with the proper care and adequate facilities which they deserve.

The veterans in Florida are now asking for our help. We desperately need to construct a hospital to give them medical, surgical, and psychiatric care. We urge that this hospital be located in the area that can best respond to the needs of our veterans and we feel that the Daytona Beach-Halifax area will most adequately serve these needs.

The veteran population in this country is rising rapidly—and is now some 28 million in number. The Vietnam war alone has added over 750,000 veterans to this list. Florida, the fastest growing State, has a veteran population that ranks eighth in the Nation. The Halifax area has approximately 140,000 of these veterans and this hub area is spiraling in population.

Waiting lists for veterans needing hospitalization far outdistances other States and we must now correct this inequity. When a veteran from the Halifax area is finally authorized for admission to one of the hospitals in Florida, he must travel 97 miles to Gainesville, 126 miles to Lake City, 167 miles to St. Petersburg, or 254 miles to Miami. The nearest psychiatric treatment center is 400 miles away in Augusta, Ga. This situation stresses the need for a hospital in the Halifax area.

One of the greatest criticisms we have heard about existing veterans' hospitals is their lack of adequate staffing. The Daytona Beach-Halifax area has special circumstances that make it a particularly desirable location for the hospital.

First of all, this section is a highly desirable place to live—as witness its growth and tourism. It has excellent educational and recreational facilities, including one of the longest and most beautiful beaches in the world; offers extremely good airline services; is surrounded by a fine complex of interlinking highways and roads, and has many fine libraries and live theater groups. In other words, people love the area and are eager to move there because of its fine facilities. We anticipate no problem in attracting an adequate staff.

Secondly, existing medical facilities in the Halifax area will enhance staffing of the veterans' hospital. The Halifax District Hospital and the Ormond Beach Memorial Hospital, with their outstanding staffs and training programs, provide medical facilities and affiliations which are vital to a veterans' hospital. In addition, the executive director of the very excellent guidance center has offered the center's cooperation for additional training programs.

While many grandiose programs and plans for the benefit of all sorts of people are being put before Congress, not one is so compelling as this situation with our veterans. Had these men not sacrificed their time and their health to the cause of freedom, we would be unable to enjoy our liberty today—but they did make these sacrifices and it is time now for us to provide this hospital and care which they so justly deserve.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental

genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

"FREEDOM—PRIVILEGE OR OBLIGATION?"

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on February 17, I had the pleasure of attending the 1971 awards luncheon of the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge. On that occasion I had the particular pleasure and honor of visiting with one of my constituents, M. Sgt. Marvin W. Reid, U.S. Air Force, Hattiesburg, Miss., who was presented with \$100 and the George Washington Honor Medal in recognition of his award winning essay entitled "Freedom—Privilege or Obligation?"

I want to take this opportunity to share Sergeant Reid's well expressed and very timely comments with you and the other Members of the House of Representatives.

Sergeant Reid's essay follows:

"FREEDOM—PRIVILEGE OR OBLIGATION?"

Recently, a soldier just returned from Vietnam was confronted by a group of demonstrators as he walked in downtown Washington. He was a husband, a father, a mature man. He had not had to go to Vietnam, could have avoided it altogether, indeed, it had taken a determined effort on his part to get to Vietnam. And now, he was back to find a mob running in the streets protesting that he had been wrong to give a year of his life to the war.

"But," he said to himself, "that is why I fought, to safeguard even this expression of freedom." After all, this was a man in control of himself, a Green Beret, trained to follow logic and reason, not to explode in rage or race blindly into an explosive situation. Yes, he was prepared to walk away from the chanting, jibing mob, to avoid a confrontation even though their cutting remarks were explicitly designed to elicit a response from him.

But then something happened. One of the demonstrators unfurled the symbol of forces which the soldier had fought against, forces which had killed and wounded his comrades-in-arms, which could have very well killed him—the flag of the Viet Cong. He reached out, seized the flag and threw it to the ground. He was immediately arrested.

Now, we must ask ourselves some penetrating questions concerning this one man's actions: Were they irresponsible? Were they without regard for his training and experience? Were they the thoughtless actions of a man without respect for law and order?

I think not. The words he offered in defense afterwards clearly indicate that he fully realized that what he was about to do would make him liable for arrest and trial, that he expected to be arrested: "I had to pull that flag down. It was an obligation I owed to every soldier who has ever fought and died for this country."

An obligation, also, to freedom. Here was a man who had already shown his preparation to make the supreme sacrifice for freedom, the cost for grabbing that flag was insignificant in comparison. Both acts were, however, his way of meeting that obligation.

How many of us are prepared to sacrifice for freedom? How many of us recognize that freedom only comes for a price, that it is not an inherent right or privilege, that free-

dom carries with it an obligation to preserve freedom for ourselves and our children, and to secure it for the world's oppressed?

We all must acknowledge and meet this obligation to freedom as this one man did, perhaps not in the same manner, but with equal conviction and purpose. We all must be prepared to pay the cost of freedom. We all must be prepared to fight for freedom whether the struggle be waged on the battlefields of war or the ideological battlefields of the mind. Then, and only then, do we meet the obligation of freedom.

DR. RICARDO J. ALFARO: PANAMANIAN JURIST, SCHOLAR AND STATESMAN, 1882-1971

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the course of my studies of Panama Canal history, I have found that one of the most illustrious names of Panama is that of Dr. Ricardo J. Alfaro, whose public career spanned the period from the Panama Revolution of 1903 to his death on February 23, 1971, in Panama. He and Mrs. Alfaro recently celebrated their 68th wedding anniversary.

A jurist and scholar of outstanding ability, he served his country in important positions at home and abroad in the field of foreign relations with long service in Washington as the Panamanian envoy. He was a coauthor of the Hull-Alfaro Treaty of 1936, which was proclaimed on July 27, 1939, shortly before the outbreak of World War II.

In order that a record of this distinguished statesman may be suitably recorded in the permanent annals of the Congress, I insert an obituary notice appearing in a Washington paper:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Feb. 24, 1971]

RICARDO J. ALFARO DIES; EX-PRESIDENT OF PANAMA

(By Richard Slusser)

Ricardo J. Alfaro, 89, a former president of Panama, ambassador to the United States and vice president of the International Court of Justice, died yesterday after intestinal surgery in a Panama City hospital.

Mr. Alfaro was elected vice president of Panama in 1928 and became president in 1931 following one of his country's revolutions. He was the Panamanian envoy here in 1922-30 and 1933-36.

In 1946-47 he was Panama's minister of foreign relations. He was with the International Court of Justice from 1959 to 1964, the last three years as vice president.

U.S. RESIDENT

Mr. Alfaro lived here after retiring from diplomatic service, a career he began in 1905 as undersecretary for foreign affairs. He first was assigned here in 1912 as legal counselor of the Panamanian legation for the Panama-Costa Rica border dispute.

Mr. Alfaro was involved in settling many disputes arising from construction of the Panama Canal and from 1915 to 1918 was judge of a joint commission between Panama and the United States for settling claims in respect of expropriations for the construction of the canal.

He was involved in other negotiations on the canal in 1934-36 and 1953. In 1947 he resigned as foreign minister to protest a proposed bases agreement with the United States.

PROFESSOR IN PANAMA

He formerly was professor of civil law and also of international law in Panama colleges. He was a member of the subcommittee that drafted treaties and arbitration and conciliation for the Inter-American Conference on Conciliation and Arbitration here in 1929.

Mr. Alfaro was defeated in the 1940 presidential election in Panama. He returned here several weeks after the election and declared that "democratic government has ceased to exist in Panama." However, he continued to serve his country.

In 1944, he helped draft a new constitution of Panama and the next year headed the U.N. Relief and Recovery Administration mission to 10 Latin American republics. He also was Panama's delegate to the U.N. Conference on international organization in San Francisco and chairman of the special committee that drafted the Spanish text of the United Nations Charter in 1945.

WORKED ON TEXT

In 1949, Mr. Alfaro was chairman of the legal committee of the third session of the General Assembly of the United Nations that drew up the text of the Convention on Genocide.

He leaves his wife, Amelia Lyons, of Panama City; three sons, Dr. Victor R. of Washington, Ivan of Lima, Peru, and Rogelio of Panama City; two daughters, Mrs. Frank H. Weller of Potomac, Md., and Mrs. H. Cabell Maddux of McLean, Va. 12 grandchildren and four great-grandchildren. One of his grandchildren is singer Nancy Ames.

A state funeral was to be held this afternoon in Panama City.

A NATIONAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR THE ELDERLY

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with Congressman PEPPER in cosponsoring his bill to establish a national nutrition program for the elderly. Clearly, there is an urgent need to provide adequate meals at low-cost for older Americans on a widespread and continuing basis.

Testimony before congressional committees and Government studies have brought out shameful evidence that many of our elderly citizens have nutritionally inadequate diets. These poor diets put their health and well-being in serious jeopardy, with disastrous, wasteful consequences. Many elderly must be put into institutions, when the right kind of help in getting meals and other services might have enabled them to remain independent. Newspaper reports of deaths of elderly citizens from bad diets continually remind us that malnutrition is no stranger to the elderly.

The problems older people face in attempting to provide for food and other everyday needs have reached crisis proportions. It is extremely disheartening to note that the economic plight of older Americans seems to be worsening. The number of elderly people living in poverty actually increased between 1968 and 1969, while the number of poor in other age groups declined. Older people are twice as likely to be poor as younger people. At the same time, inflation and especially the rising cost of medical care has

taken an increasing share of the older person's meager funds. Frequently the elderly scrimp on food to buy expensive medicines and drugs.

Older people face added problems of limited mobility, poor health, and greater vulnerability to criminal assault—all of which severely curtail their ability to shop for food and cook their own meals. The district I represent in the Bronx includes a great many retired people living alone. Many, because of fear and the difficulties and dangers of transportation, have become virtual shut-ins, cut off from the rest of the community.

Senior citizen meal services provide a vital lifeline to those who feel alone and forgotten. These services offer not only good food but also relief from isolation and despair and a chance to get out and socialize. However, there have not been enough of these services to meet the need, and many of these programs funded through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are demonstration projects, scheduled to end soon. It does not make sense to let these valuable nutrition programs die now, when there is a crying need for expansion.

For example, a center in my district of the Bronx which daily serves lunch for 60 senior citizens, has to turn away as many as 20 people a day because they do not have the resources to feed them. To make sure of getting a meal served at noon, people line up outside the dining room by 11:30. This particular meal program manages to keep going with funds from local government and a nominal 25- to 35-cent charge to their customers. The directors tell me that for many it is their only meal of the day.

Certainly, if our Government can spend billions to land men on the moon and wage an endless war in Indochina, we can find the resources to help provide at least one decent meal a day for older Americans who need the service. There will likely be serious debate about whether it is wise to enact a new categorical grant program, while the Congress is considering the broader questions of revenue sharing and family assistance.

These are complex, far-reaching matters that are likely to require lengthy deliberation by the Congress. I strongly urge that we not ask older Americans to wait any longer for a sound nutrition program, which they need now. As one dedicated senior citizen center director wrote me recently:

The elderly should not go hungry while legislators discuss government philosophy, nor should the imperatives of present need be ignored because they complicate the law-making process.

FRANK CHASTEEN, POLICEMAN

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place into the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this moving tribute from the Greenville, S.C., News of February 22, 1971. Before coming to this House, during my well-spent years as a prosecut-

ing attorney in the Greenville area, I knew Frank Chasteen as a fine policeman and as a fine citizen of the community. As the editorial implies, there is no way to say just what his tragic death signifies, any more than we can ever write intelligently about that which is inexplicable. We can only say that our hearts go out to his family and those who have been hardest struck by this latest, needless death. And we pray that such deaths will cease, as our land strives to grow toward peace and friendship, once again.

The tribute follows:

FRANK CHASTEEN, POLICEMAN

The tragic death of Greenville Policeman W. F. Chasteen, killed in the line of duty early Sunday, brings home the fact that America's law enforcement officers are in constant, increasing danger every minute as they try to protect the rights of all citizens to what the Constitution calls the "domestic tranquility."

Frank Chasteen's death also focuses attention on a poignant point about the status of policemen and their families in the communities and among the people they serve and protect.

It so happens that the editors and several other staff members of this newspaper knew Frank Chasteen for many years, as we know and like most other members of the Greenville Police Department. Because we knew him as a friend, we leave to others, glowing tributes to his many fine qualities, deserved though they are.

Frank never was much for personal glory. He liked police work. He liked his fellow officers. He genuinely liked the people, black and white, of the communities he patrolled. He was liked in return. But he did not enjoy the limelight, having no need for personal recognition, and we aren't going to betray his friendship by heaping praise on him now.

The fact is that Frank Chasteen was about like most of the veteran Greenville policemen—good officers, good citizens, good family men.

That brings up the poignant point about the status of policemen, here and elsewhere—all too often they are not accepted by some individuals and certain elements of society just because they are cops. Members of their families sometimes feel the sting of undeserved social rejection.

How ironic that today Frank Chasteen is a fallen hero eulogized by the leaders of the community. On Saturday he was just another policeman whose family sometimes suffered slights simply because he was a cop.

Social justice?

We think not. So we refuse to eulogize Frank Chasteen. Instead we lament the loss of a friend. We offer sympathy to the family he loved and who loved him. To his fellow officers we renew a standing pledge of support and understanding.

Anybody who wants to can memorialize Frank Chasteen best simply by according to his fellow officers and members of their families personal acceptance and friendship based upon individual worth. Frank would like that.

U.S.S. "SCORPION" MEMORIAL

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified to learn of the continued strong support for the memorial dedicated to the memory of the men serving their

country aboard the ill-fated submarine U.S.S. *Scorpion*. The memorial is located at the Woodlawn Memorial Gardens, in Norfolk, Va. This is a proper site for the memorial. The *Scorpion* was home ported in Norfolk when she plunged to her death in the Atlantic taking the lives of 99 brave men.

The establishment of the memorial is largely due to the efforts of Mr. Charles H. Gaudreau, Vice Adm. E. P. Wilkinson, commander of the Atlantic Fleet Submarine Force, recently cited Mr. Gaudreau in an official proclamation, and I would like to share the recognition with my colleagues at this point in the RECORD:

CITATION: U.S. ATLANTIC FLEET SUBMARINE FORCE

The Commander Submarine Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet, takes pleasure in recognizing Mr. Charles H. Gaudreau and the Woodlawn Memorial Gardens as set forth in the following Citation:

"For efforts in the conduct of the memorial services in honor of the 99 gallant men who gave their lives in the service of their country while serving on board USS *Scorpion* (SSN589). Mr. Gaudreau spearheaded the effort that resulted in the memorial service and the establishment of a permanent memorial dedicated to the memory of the men of *Scorpion*. He personally arranged the multitude of details for erecting the memorial, as well as arranging for the families of *Scorpion* men to be present at the service and dedication of the memorial. The service was a memorable one, conducted with dignity, reverence and honor. Commander Submarine Force, Atlantic Fleet considers it an honor to have been part of the service and wishes to express sincere appreciation to Mr. Gaudreau and Woodlawn Memorial Gardens for their kindness and expression of sympathy in the establishment of the *Scorpion* memorial."

E. P. WILKINSON,
Vice Admiral, U.S. Navy.

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST WINNER IN MARYLAND

HON. PAUL S. SARBANES
OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, Miss Patricia Fowler, of Baltimore, who resides in the district which I have the honor to represent, has been awarded first place in the Voice of Democracy Contest for the State of Maryland.

This contest, which is sponsored each year by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, provides an excellent opportunity for the many fine young people in this country to step forward and express their views on the American system. This year over 400,000 students competed for scholarship prizes in the contest.

Miss Fowler has written a very thoughtful and moving essay. I offer her my warmest congratulations on this achievement and commend to my colleagues in the Congress this outstanding essay which I insert in the RECORD:

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE
(By Patricia Fowler)

Freedom is not merely a word. Men do not die for words alone. Words alone are not enough to inspire the mind of man and fire his soul with zeal.

Men die for dreams, for ideals. Men risk their lives for that intangible something that defies definition, but at the same time is an undeniable truth. Freedom is such a thing. The idea of freedom carries with it a great amount of hope, a great amount of faith—and yet, it holds a great amount of irony.

One ironic thing about freedom is that it is not free. It demands a dear price, to be paid in human hopes, human toil, and human lives.

In 1776, a determined group of men knew the cost of freedom and were prepared to pay it. Gathered in the city of Philadelphia in the hottest months of the year, plagued by an ever-present swarm of flies, dogged by discouraging reports from the newly-born Continental Army under General George Washington, and racked with doubts, nevertheless these men turned out a document that was to change the course of history. It held strong words, but this Declaration of Independence was written by strong men.

Young Thomas Jefferson, in his pamphlet, "On the Necessity of Taking Up Arms", written in 1775, had resolved to die a free man rather than to live a slave. In the House of Burgesses, in Virginia, Patrick Henry had openly declared that he would have liberty or he would have death—with no alternatives. Benjamin Franklin, a venerable 70 years of age, had openly admitted that if the people of the new nation failed to hang together, they would most assuredly hang separately. The list goes on and on—Robert Livingston, William Packer, Roger Sherman, Richard Henry Lee, John Hancock, Caesar Rodney, John Adams—men of different ages and of different backgrounds, who, in Congress, on July 4, 1776, together pledged for freedom's sake their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

The spirit of these men cannot be allowed to fade. Their lives cannot be permitted to lose their dimension. Their thoughts must not be relegated to the pages of history books, for infrequent reference by reluctant scholars. Their words must not be forgotten as long as freedom lives in our land. For these men live on, and their dream lives on. It is the dream of John Adams and John Fitzgerald Kennedy; a dream shared by Thomas Jefferson and Martin Luther King; a dream common to Benjamin Franklin and Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It is a dream shared by young and old, rich and poor, black and white. It is freedom—our way of life, and our heritage.

SOUTH DAKOTAN HONORED

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK
OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, Miss Barbara Kay Preston of Mitchell, S. Dak., one of the outstanding cities in the district which I am fortunate enough to represent, has recently earned a great honor for herself in winning the Voice of Democracy Contest for the State of South Dakota.

This contest, which is sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, gives American youth an opportunity to express themselves in an entirely wholesome way about how they feel about their country.

It is with a great deal of pleasure that I share Barbara's speech with you:

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

Responsibility—that is the key word. As tomorrow's citizens and leaders we must accept

the responsibility of maintaining our heritage—Freedom. This responsibility takes many different forms. Most of them really simple. They are things any value-conscious American would be proud to do. First of all, it is our responsibility to care. Americans need to become more concerned about the internal, as well as the external problems of this nation. Part of this deeper interest lies in being better informed. It is important that we have all the facts before making a decision. After all, this country and her laws can be no better than her citizens. We are America!

Even if Americans do become better informed and more capable of decision making, the effort will be wasted if we, as Americans, will not accept the responsibility of speaking out for America and for Freedom. That's the second point. We've got to become involved—to become active in campaigning for peace. It's important to take a stand, even at personal risk, but at least let other citizens know how you feel. Set an example.

If you find someone desecrating a flag and it disgusts you, do something. Tell that person how you feel about the symbol that he is abusing. Give him a list of the things that the flag has done for him. Ask him where else he would have had the "Freedom" to get away with such mockery. Inform him that if he has so little respect for our national emblem, that maybe he doesn't belong here.

The result might not be instantaneous, but you have made a step toward preserving freedom. You cared. You took action. The growing apathy and the "I don't care, let him do it" attitude must be conquered. Perhaps the new national motto should be the United Fund campaign slogan, "If you don't do it, it won't get done."

The final step is probably the most important. Take time to think about what America has given you. What you and your children have if she were overthrown? It is frightening. With this in mind, it seems almost ironic that so many people reject the idea of defending and dying for their country. But, without her, what purpose would life have?

There is nothing I value more than the privilege and freedom to be myself. America symbolizes this freedom. But—we are America. Therein lies our responsibility. If we as Americans continue to be actively concerned, if we contemplate the value of our liberty, then freedom will thrive. Think about America. Care for America. And become involved in America. Finally, preserve America and her ideals. Love and honor her. Begin now—defending our heritage—Freedom.

BIGNESS ALONE NOT UNLAWFUL

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a syndicated news column that appeared during the week of January 28, 1971, in several newspapers throughout the country. This column, written by Robert S. Allen and John A. Goldsmith, interested me, because it shed some important light on and insight into antitrust policies being pursued by the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department.

Over the years, antitrust enforcement has been effective in curbing monopoly, price fixing, and other business abuses. This has been due largely to the fact that Congress has legislated definitively in this field, spelling out certain precise prohibitions on business, but being care-

ful not to curtail or infringe upon legitimate business activity. For example, Congress has consistently rejected the proposition that size alone should be a test in antitrust proceedings: Congress has refused to so legislate and the courts have been equally adamant in rejecting the bigness alone argument. As the Allen and Goldsmith article states, Federal District Court Judge William Timbers recently held that to ask the court to so rule would be "tantamount to asking the the court to engage in judicial legislation. This the court most emphatically refuses to do."

Attacks on legitimate business activities simply because of bigness should be carefully reconsidered, because bigness alone is not unlawful.

The article follows:

[From the Northern Virginia Sun, Feb. 5, 1971]

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT MERGER FIGHT GETS SETBACK

(By Robert S. Allen and John A. Goldsmith)
WASHINGTON.—The Justice Department is continuing to make little headway in its crusade against mergers of big corporations.

It has lost another round in this fanfare drive.

That's the real significance of Federal District Judge William Timbers' decision upholding the acquisition by International Telephone & Telegraph Corp. of Grinnell Corp., manufacturer of automatic sprinkling devices and other equipment.

The Hartford, Conn., jurist flatly rejected the Anti-Trust Division's arguments against the merger.

The sweeping decree is particularly consequential because it erects a major legal barrier against the Justice Department's move to extend the intent of Section 7 of the Clayton Anti-Trust Act beyond its traditional meaning.

Judge Timbers did this by ruling out what he characterized as a "new twist to the government's economic concentration claim." It was this contention that was the principal basis of Assistant Attorney General Richard McLaren's attack on conglomerate mergers. In Timbers' decree he held:

"To ask the court to rule with respect to alleged anti-competitive consequences in undesignated lines of commerce is tantamount to asking the court to engage in judicial legislation. This the court most emphatically refuses to do."

In effect, the ruling upholds the argument that existing laws do not bar diversified mergers simply on the basis of bigness.

Last year, in testifying before a congressional committee, McLaren, head of the Anti-Trust Division, declared that if Section 7 of the Clayton Act does not apply to conglomerate mergers, he would seek legislation to that end. It is evident from the import of Judge Timbers' ruling that he felt McLaren was trying to burden the scope and authority of the law without legislation.

Whether he now will go to Congress to enlarge the range of Section 7 to strike at conglomerates remains to be seen.

It's doubtful that would be permitted by Attorney General Mitchell.

On the ropes—Meanwhile, McLaren's drive against conglomerate mergers is limping badly.

Of the five major anti-trust suits he has initiated, he has so far scored limited success in only one. This was the settlement of the LTV-Jones & Laughlin Steel case. In three suits, the government suffered setbacks, the latest being Timbers' verdict and another case is slated for trial later this year—before the same jurist.

Congressional critics of McLaren's policy are vigorously demanding he drop it on two grounds:

(1) The merger trend has markedly abated because of the decline in the economy, adverse business conditions, rising taxes and stringent accounting rules. These factors, it's held, leave little reason for McLaren to persist in his anti-business warring.

(2) His policy is having serious adverse effect on U.S. companies doing business in foreign markets. Congressional critics point out that while other countries are actively encouraging mergers, the Anti-Trust Division appears to be endeavoring to hamper American concerns in meeting this intensified competition.

This censorious view was vigorously expounded by former Assistant Attorney General Lee Loevinger, who headed the Anti-Trust Division in the Kennedy Administration.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S TOMB

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for reprinting in the RECORD an especially eloquent speech by Col. LaVon P. Linn, U.S. Army, retired. It was delivered under the auspices of the National Sojourners in an impressive wreath-laying ceremony at the tomb of George Washington at Mount Vernon by the chapters of Washington and Fort Belvoir:

ADDRESS OF COLONEL LINN AT GEORGE WASHINGTON'S TOMB, FEBRUARY 20

On a winter day between Christmas of 1799 and New Year's Day of 1800, President Adams and his Cabinet, the members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, the members of the Supreme Court, the Diplomatic Corps, senior military officers, and other national leaders gathered in the German Lutheran Church in Philadelphia to hear the more than two-and-one-half hour George Washington Funeral Oration delivered by Major General Light-Horse Harry Lee.

That day, for the second time in ten days, General Lee used the words "First in war first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen." The words were prophetic and they were true.

Many pictures flashed before the mind's eye of the heart-broken General Lee as he spoke. He remembered that a younger Washington was once honored by the Virginia House of Burgesses for heroic achievement, and when Washington rose to thank the gentlemen he was so overcome by emotion he was unable to utter a word. John Robinson, President of the Burgesses, said "Sit down, Mr. Washington. Your modesty is equal to your valor, and your valor surpasses the power of any language that we possess."

General Lee recognized that there were three major events in the last quarter of the 18th Century that were vital to the future of the United States of America. The first was the Revolutionary War, in which the services of George Washington were absolutely indispensable to American victory. The second was the Constitutional Convention of 1787 over which George Washington presided—held in the same room where the Declaration of Independence was signed—and in which Washington took the oath as Commander-in-Chief of the Continental Army. All through that sweltering Philadelphia summer of 1787, Washington kept the convention at work on their problems of political theory and practical politics until 17 September when they brought out our Constitution, which

Gladstone called the grandest document ever brought from the heart and brain of mortal man. The third event was the beginning of the United States of America under the new Constitution. George Washington served as President for the first eight years, steering a course through uncharted seas. Thomas A. Bailey devised 43 yardsticks for measuring Presidential performance, called Washington, "in a class by himself in several respects," said that "Washington's foot did not slip a single time."

General Lee died in his sleep in March of 1818 and he could not know the luster which the name of Washington ultimately achieved. In 1901, New York University established a Hall of Fame for Great Americans. In the election that year there was only one unanimous choice—and that was George Washington. In 1962, Professor Arthur Schlesinger formed a panel of leading historians, asked these men to rate our U.S. Presidents from the standpoint of greatness—and Washington and Lincoln led all the rest. There are scores of other examples.

It is the same in geography as in history. Only one of our fifty states has taken the name of a President—and that state is Washington. Thirty-three of our states have Washington Counties. One-hundred-twenty-one of our cities, towns, and villages, including the nation's capital, have the name of Washington in their title, and the same is true of scores of mountains, lakes, rivers, and streams.

In literature, as in history and geography, the accolades are many. From across the sea, here is the voice of Lord Byron:

THE FIRST—THE LAST—THE BEST

The Cincinnati of the West,
Whom envy dared not hate,
Bequeathed the name of Washington,
To make men blush there was but one.

From across the sea, comes the voice of our Brother, Rudyard Kipling. Kipling wrote a collection of stories called *Rewards and Fairies*. At the end of each story he placed an epilogue containing his evaluation of the principal character. One of these stories was about George Washington. Kipling called the story "Brother Squaretoes." As we read the epilogue to "Brother Squaretoes," we realize that Kipling was comparing each of us with George Washington:

If you can keep your head when all about you
Are losing theirs and blaming it on you;
If you can trust yourself when all men doubt
you,

But make allowance for their doubting too;
If you can wait and not be tired by waiting,
Or, being lied about, don't deal in lies,
Or, being hated, don't give way to hating,
And yet don't look too good, nor talk too
wise.

If you can dream—and not make dreams your
master;

If you can think—and not make thoughts
your aim;

If you can meet with triumph and disaster
And treat those two impostors just the
same;

If you can bear to hear the truth you've
spoken

Twisted by knaves to make a trap for fools,
Or watch the things you gave your life to
broken,

And stoop and build 'em up with worn-out
tools.

If you can make one heap of all your winnings
And risk it on one turn of pitch-and-toss,
And lose, and start again at your beginnings
And never breathe a word about your loss;
If you can force your heart and nerve and
sinew

To serve your turn long after they are
gone,

And so hold on when there is nothing in you
Except the Will which says to them:

"Hold on";

If you can talk with crowds and keep your virtue,
Or walk with kings—nor lose the common touch;
If neither foes nor loving friends can hurt you;
If all men count with you, but none too much;
If you can fill the unforgiving minute
With sixty seconds' worth of distance run—
Yours is the Earth and everything that's in it,
And—which is more—you'll be a Man,
my son!

To Kipling one man measured up and that was Brother Squaretoes.

Finally, at the Washington's Birthday ceremonies in Springfield, Illinois, on 22 February 1843, the speaker was a gangling prairie lawyer named Abe Lincoln. He said this:

"The name of Washington is the mightiest name on earth. Long since mightiest in civil liberties. Still mightiest in moral reformation. On such a name an eulogy is expected. However to add brilliance to the sun or glory to the name of Washington is alike impossible. Let none attempt it. In solemn awe pronounce that name, and in its naked, deathless splendor, leave it shining on."

Ladies and Gentlemen, this concludes the National Sojourner ceremonies in honor of Washington's Birthday. We appreciate your attendance and your attention. Thank you.

THE BIG THICKET NATIONAL MONUMENT

HON. EARLE CABELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to create the Big Thicket National Monument. The Big Thicket in southeast Texas is one of the country's last natural wilderness areas. This land of flowing streams, wildlife, and plants and trees of all varieties is a wonderland of nature at its best and where the Alabama-Coushatta Indians still reside. A startling example of the wonders of the Thicket is the sighting of the ivory-billed woodpecker. This bird, once believed extinct, has been found living here.

My bill specifies that the area within the monument shall not be less than 35,000 acres. Although I realize that this acreage is not a great enough amount to properly preserve the Big Thicket, I feel that if we can initially start with these boundaries, in the future we will be able to expand and improve upon this beginning.

It is vital that the Big Thicket Monument be created as soon as possible, for as the weeks and months go by our ecological balance in this area is being destroyed. The Big Thicket, which once spread across 3.5 million acres, is rapidly being diminished until today it contains only approximately 300,000 acres. In this age of technology and awareness of our environment, it seems incredible that we would let one of nature's bounties go unprotected.

Mr. Speaker, I call for swift establishment of the Big Thicket National Monument.

BERNADETTE DEVLIN'S CRUSADE FOR COMMUNISM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the young Communist member of the British Parliament, Bernadette Devlin, continues her U.S. fund-raising tour and praising a totalitarian collectivist system of government. Interestingly enough, Miss Devlin now denies that her revolutionary escapades are because of any religious crusade which was used to catapult her into any international prominence. She now admits that her activities are to destroy capitalism and unite the workers of the world.

It is not what Bernadette Devlin says that means anything, but rather how she is given a license to peddle her hate and her agitation for violence in our land and why she is given a podium to preach to our young people at taxpayer-supported institutions. Most Americans can understand how she received so much publicity, because the manipulated news media mainly concerns themselves with emphasizing the negative and glorifying the cultural outcasts.

Miss Devlin's readmission to the United States following her conviction and incarceration in her own country for doing just what she is now doing in our country must be laid directly at the feet of the State Department and the President of the United States. Since the State Department, long recognized as a refuge for pinks, Reds, and fellow travelers, is a division of the Executive Department and the President has direct control over the appointment of the Secretary, the ultimate responsibility for whatever turmoil provoked by Bernadette Devlin must rest in the hands of the President and his failure to fulfill his campaign promise to clean house in the State Department. In a campaign speech broadcast from Dallas, Tex. on October 13, 1968, Nixon said:

I want a secretary of state that will join me in cleaning house in the state department. It has never been done . . . It wasn't done even during the Eisenhower administration.

There are some good men in the state department and I know who they are. The routine men that have been the architects of the past, they will have other assignments and we are going to bring in new men with a fresh approach.

While in San Francisco, Miss Devlin even took time from her busy schedule to visit Angela Davis whom she is reported as describing as a "fellow comrade" and who she said was fighting "in the same struggle."

I include a column by Cam Montgom-

ery, who covered Miss Devlin's recent speech to the Oregon State University student body, and the UPI clipping of her meeting with Angela Davis in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Capital Journal, Feb. 22, 1971]

BERNADETTE REFUTES "RELIGIOUS" RIOTS THEORY

(By Cam Montgomery)

CORVALLIS.—Bernadette Devlin, in a red leather miniskirt, white leather boots and a brogue as deep as Galway Bay, came to Oregon State University last night bringing a message of worker revolution.

She was greeted with a hearty ovation from some 3,000 young people, many with fists clenched over their heads and shouting "Up the Irish."

Standing on a podium on the basketball floor of Gil Coliseum, her long brown hair parted in the middle and breaking over her shoulders, the 23-year-old member of Parliament told her listeners that someday it will be a workers' world.

Succinctly she stated her Marxist theme that 85 per cent of the wealth in capitalist countries is in the hands of 5 per cent of the people and this is intolerable to the other 95 per cent.

The turmoil in Northern Ireland the past four years, the diminutive revolutionary insisted, has not been over religious differences between the one million Protestants and half million Catholics, but is a result of unemployment and poverty.

Miss Devlin, who in 1969 served four months in prison for participating in the Londonderry uprising that year, cited unemployment figures that reach as high as 50 per cent in some cities of Northern Ireland.

"But these figures aren't very interesting to the capitalist press," she said. "It's much more convenient to tell people we're fighting over religious differences."

"We're not fighting over the virgin birth," she said, "we're fighting for our houses, for work, for more money, something neither the Protestants nor Catholics are getting."

"Women in Ireland are working in dress manufacturing shops for 50 cents an hour. You may say that the cost of living in Ireland is cheaper than in the United States. Well, it isn't that much cheaper and our stomachs are the same size as everyone else's."

"There's an awful lot of poverty going about," she said, "not only in Ireland but in the United States and Europe, too."

Her solution for an end to the poverty and fighting over jobs is for the "workers of the world to unite, to seize the means of production, and take the power and wealth out of the hands of the few and put it in the hands of the many."

Miss Devlin, who was elected to the House of Commons in 1969, also castigated United States firms for their intrusion into the Irish industrial picture.

"Goodyear, Lockheed and Dupont set up plants in Ireland from which they take all the profits while we have to pay 66 per cent of the cost of the buildings, 66 per cent of the cost of the machinery and give them seven years of tax concessions on top of that."

"After 10 years these companies and their stockholders have all their 36 per cent of investments returned and everything from then on is clear profit."

"I say that after 10 years we have paid for those factories with our labor and they belong to us. And some day we're going to take them, without benefit of a bill of sale."

She took the United States to task for the

war in Vietnam, claiming that it is only to the benefit of the 5 per cent of the people who own the wealth and power in the country and are "getting rich killing the Vietnamese people and their aspirations for freedom."

"For exactly the same reason the British soldiers are in Ireland."

"And for exactly the same reason both the British and the U.S. troops should get out of the countries they are in."

"We've lived under capitalism for several hundred years now," she said. "We know what it's done for us. It's made us cannon fodder for its wars and it has made us slaves for its factories. Our children have died of starvation."

"When we get pushed to the brink and get fed up with our lot and try to fight back the 5 per cent that owns the power comes down with the jack boot on our threats."

"But it doesn't matter how many of us they kill," she said. "Our movement is built on a principle, not just people, and you can't kill a principle."

"One of these days," she promised, "we'll kill capitalism. It's not a principle, it's only a system."

Following her speech Bernadette answered questions on such things as:

Women's Lib: "I'm part of it. Oppression of women is the most fundamental method of oppressing the working class." However, she said she wasn't concerning herself "with middle class women who complain about being oppressed by middle class men. I think they're an insult to women's lib."

Hard hats: "We've got them in Ireland, too. They're called the National Front. They are working class people who have been to the zoo too often. They think if they ape their master they'll be just like him. I never saw a monkey yet who got out of his cage."

A U.S. communications base in Northern Ireland: "It is defacing our mountain with barbed wire and all the other equipment you use in the international conspiracies you play with the Russians. We'd be grateful if you'd take your base the hell out of there. We've got enough trouble on our hands without getting caught between you and Russia."

Political prisoners: "The Soledad brothers are certainly political prisoners. Did you ever hear of anyone serving seven years for taking \$70 in a gas station holdup? Angela Davis is a political prisoner. It's alright for Mr. Nixon to buy guns with your taxes to kill the Vietnamese. But they're not holding Angela because she was supposed to have bought a gun that killed a judge. They're holding her because she's a black, militant communist."

What's going to happen to the 5 per cent who have all the power and wealth after the workers take it away from them?

"We'll teach them a good trade, and if they can't work we'll take better care of them than they took of us."

Miss Devlin is on a month-long visit in the U.S. to try to raise money for a socialist research center in Northern Ireland.

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Capital Journal, Feb. 22, 1971]

BERNADETTE VISITS ANGELA

SAN FRANCISCO.—Catholic minority leader Bernadette Devlin of Northern Ireland visited Angela Davis in the Marin County Jail and said both of the young women are fighting "in the same struggle."

Miss Devlin, who spent four months in jail herself for conspiring to riot conviction in Ireland last year, said it was "scandalous" that the 26-year-old black militant was being kept in isolation from other prisoners. She charged Miss Davis was being given poor food and is allowed to exercise only twice a week.

Miss Devlin, at 23 the youngest member of the British Parliament, said she went to Marin County to meet Miss Davis as a "fellow comrade."

POSITION OF GERMANY AS RELATED TO FOREIGN POLICY

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, at Georgetown University earlier this month Helmut Schmidt, the Federal Minister of Defense of the Federal Republic of Germany, presented some most interesting viewpoints on the position of Germany relating to foreign policy.

Drawing on a period of American history, Mr. Schmidt said almost 150 years ago an important cornerstone of American foreign policy was authored in the form of the Monroe Doctrine to call a new world into existence in order to restore the balance in the old one.

I ask unanimous consent that these remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POSITION OF GERMANY RELATED TO EAST-WEST DÉTENTE

(Address by the Honorable Helmut Schmidt, Federal Minister of Defense of the Federal Republic of Germany, at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., U.S.A., on February 9, 1971)

By his Farewell Address of 1796 George Washington gave to this nation a document reflecting his last will in the field of foreign policy. This document, which is still familiar to many Americans of the present day, has long since become a classic: It is no longer of any practical importance as regards the shaping of the foreign policy of the United States, which has meanwhile become a world power.

The olden days have long since passed when George Washington could say—and I quote:

"Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships and enmities."

And George Washington went on to ask his countrymen: "Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?"—and again Thomas Jefferson, a few years later, warned his nation: "No entangling alliances!"

But in fact: as the world power it is today, the United States is tied up in a network of international relations for which it might be an appropriate term to describe them as "entangling alliances". Particularly the "European controversies" are since 1917, 1939 and 1945 no longer felt to be "foreign to our concerns" in the United States. Americans as well as Europeans know: their common future will depend on the extent of close cooperation between them. Cooperation requires, and always will require, that partners are aware of each other's goals and intentions, dependences and interests.

The German question is one of the "European controversies" which have been the subject of political discussion in both America and Europe; and, as is to be expected, we Germans in particular are constantly trying to find answers to it. I, therefore, appreciate the opportunity of giving you an outline of the position of the Federal Re-

public of Germany and of some of the efforts the present German Federal Government is making. This is to say I am going to give you an idea of what we Germans ourselves are doing in the attempt to gradually overcome the "era of confrontation" and to arrive, through an "era of negotiation", in the end at an "era of cooperation" the way President Nixon indicated.

On January 28, Chancellor Brandt presented to the German Bundestag the Federal Government's 1971 Report on the State of the Nation. He made the following points:

(1) In the historical process, the right of self-determination as laid down in the Charter of the United Nations must apply also to the German people.

(2) The German nation remains a reality in spite of its division into different states and different social systems.

(3) The policy of the Federal Republic of Germany, which is firmly committed to the preservation of peace, also calls for arrangements governing her relations with the German Democratic Republic. In conducting negotiations to this effect, we shall continue to proceed from the principles and premises set forth in the 20 points formulated at Kassel, where Brandt met the East-German Prime Minister in May last year.

(4) The legal status of Berlin must not be impaired. The Federal Republic of Germany will, within the scope of her rights and responsibilities exercised with the concurrence of the Three Powers, make her contribution towards improving and assuring the viability of West Berlin in a more effective way than in the past.

(5) A satisfactory outcome of the four power negotiations concerning the improvement of the situation in and around Berlin will enable the Federal Government to submit the treaty with the Soviet Union, which was signed in Moscow on August 12, 1970, to the German legislative bodies for approval.

(6) Concurrently and in the same political context, the German legislative bodies will have to decide on the treaty with the People's Republic of Poland, which was concluded in Warsaw on December 7, 1970.

The communist leaders in East Berlin are currently striving not to ease the East-West antagonism but to aggravate it. In pursuing their particular interest they have adopted a policy aimed at widening the gulf between the two parts of Germany. The position of the East German government gives an idea of the difficulties we are faced with in seeking a dialogue. Yet nevertheless we are firmly resolved to carry on our initiative to come to a peaceful modus vivendi between the two German states with no side dominating the other.

The easing of the situation in and around Berlin has to be part of the relaxation of tension in the centre of Europe we are striving for. The Federal Government proceeds on the understanding that the quadripartite talks will lead to an accord that guarantees the close ties between the Federal Republic and West Berlin and secures unhindered access to West Berlin. Without such safeguards it will not be possible to put treaties on the renunciation of the use of force into effect. With gratification I may say that during the past three months the cooperation between Bonn and the three Western governments has assumed an intensity hardly ever experienced before, particularly with respect to the complex of Berlin. There is full agreement as to the criteria and substance a Berlin settlement should have in order to be acceptable to us and the Western powers. The governing mayor of Berlin plays a constructive part in all deliberations thus following in the footsteps of his famous predecessor Willy Brandt.

Let me now give you an outline of the interdependence and inseparability between our foreign policy, our probes toward the

East and our security efforts. All too often I find that critics of this policy discuss single elements separately thus painting a distorted picture of reality. I will, therefore, point out to you six cornerstones of our policy and discuss them in the light of the overall political context.

To anticipate the conclusion: I am convinced that neither on the side of our government nor on that of reasonable observers of our domestic opposition, neither in the East nor in the West—wherever cool judgment is applied—there is any doubt that our Foreign Policy, including what has come to be called Ostpolitik in public discussion, and our security policy are based on interlinked concepts and have a stable relationship to each other.

Our overall policy is realistic and sober. Therefore, it does not attempt to argue the requirements of security. Our policy is a coherent continuum, an integral concept, which does not threaten anyone, which does not jeopardize our freedom or the freedom of our partners, and which will consolidate peace if that concept leads to success.

For three years, namely since the adoption of the Harmel Report by the NATO-Council—which has, since then, not been stowed away into the Alliance's archives but is an integral part of its operational policy—it has been the common policy of the countries united in the North Atlantic Alliance to regard security and détente as the two pillars supporting their common policy, two pillars that are of equal importance and rank. Never before has this been made clearer than in 1970, in particular in May and December 1970, at the last two meetings of the NATO Council.

I regard this combination of security policy and a policy of détente which has been adopted by the Alliance to be the essential prerequisite for the present policies of any government. If the Alliance were not convinced of and had not decided upon this combination, we Germans could not—and would not—carry on our policy because Bonn is not capable of pursuing such a policy separately. This combination of security policy and a policy of détente is the essential prerequisite permitting us to seek to consolidate the state of peace, safeguarding at the same time our freedom, but not to forfeit our nation's chances of a peaceful achievement of self-determination. I expressed in the German Bundestag the other day that it would be unwise to pursue a policy of détente without security, and also vice versa: that a security policy without the will for détente would amount to nothing else but a continuation of the cold war.

In this context the attempt of détente is supplementing by other means the security policy of equilibrium, as I would vary Clausewitz, or, to be more accurate in citation: Our Strategy is the continuation of the strategy of balance under addition of other means. The aim is to increase the measure of both our security and of the West's common security, by new impulses emanating from a new impetus in our foreign policy. This process cannot result over night in a resounding success. This we know very well. Therefore we will not permit ourselves to be dragged into impatient actions.

Apparently, some find it difficult to part with obsolete patterns of thinking. Apparently it is particularly painful when, after so many years, now a somewhat modified political platform is used and some political weights are shifted in respect of new objectives.

But let me say this much. The balance between the two military pact systems in Europe, the counterweight NATO constitutes to the East's impressive military weight in order to establish a balance in the overall system—all this has been the vital condition for the preservation of peace in Europe during the past 20 years, and I do

not have the slightest doubt, that it needs to remain that way.

Let me now define six cornerstones of our policy. First. The Alliance is indispensable for our security and the security of our allies alike. It enables not only our partners in the Alliance but also us to attempt jointly to make some progress toward an improvement of East-West relations. The fact of the Alliance, the fact of its effectiveness and the fact of our own German contribution to this Alliance, a contribution that is indispensable for the balance which must be maintained by the Alliance, need to be lasting factors in everybody's calculations with regard to Europe.

Within the scope of these realities the foreign and security policies of the German federal government exploit to the full the margin of action open to the Federal Republic of Germany. Now, this fact is exactly what distinguishes us from the preceding governments headed by Dr. Kiesinger and Professor Erhard who partly did not use to the full, partly did not fully comprehend our range of maneuver within the aforementioned scope. The present Federal Government exploits it indeed right to the limits of our possibilities. This I do not want to hide from you.

Second. Treaties on the renunciation of force or non-aggression-pacts make in no way dispensable or superfluous the balance in Europe for which the Alliance is essential. This balance would therefore also not be made superfluous by the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Nor would it become superfluous if something were to evolve out of the SALT negotiations. It will as well not be made superfluous by the German-Soviet and the German-Polish treaties or a treaty with the GDR, which we desire but which seems to be rather remote at the moment.

Third. This balance—and this is the third cornerstone of our policy—cannot be maintained without the political and military presence of the United States in Europe. The military presence of the United States, undiminished in substance, benefits all those interested in a stable and peaceful Europe. West-European States are incapable of replacing the American forces either in military or in political or in psychological respect; this applies especially to the non-nuclear Federal Republic of Germany.

Fourth. Let me remind you of the late Federal Chancellor Adenauer. It was perhaps his good luck that he was the head of the German government during a period in which in our own nation as well as in the French nation trends developed which offered a fertile ground for reconciliation between the two nations after so many generations of what used to be called "hereditary enmity". But nobody will want to deny—at least I, for one, would not deny it—that the achievement of Franco-German reconciliation was to a great extent due to Herr Adenauer's personality. This reconciliation will certainly remain inseparable from his name—as it will remain inseparable from the name of Charles de Gaulle, at that, although we had many objections against General de Gaulle's policies in many fields. It is a vital necessity for peace in Central Europe that the German nation also seek reconciliation with our eastern neighbors, since my nation unlike any other in the world must live in peace with twelve neighboring nations—in modern history there has been no nation with such great a number of neighbors. I hope very much that in the same way as Adenauer and others succeeded in reconciling us with our French neighbor, and in the same way as this achievement will continue to be inseparable from his name, the day will come when it will be inseparably linked with the name of Willy Brandt that we, in our turn, succeeded in initiating slowly but steadily

our reconciliation with our Eastern neighbors as well.

Fifth. We Germans do not want to jeopardize our friendship with the Western nations which we won after two world wars. In fact, we need that friendship and instituted cooperation to achieve at least a normalization of our relations with the Eastern nations and ultimately our reconciliation with them.

Sixth. We start from the premise that our efforts to achieve the political unity of Western Europe, efforts which may some day also extend to the field of security, will not bar or obstruct the by far longer road of putting all of Europe together again. Nevertheless we have experienced that, as any additional achievement of Western European integration is concerned—and I do consider the entry of Great Britain and others into EEC as an addition which indispensably has to be achieved—tenacious pragmatism serves the political unification of Western Europe categorically better than verbal hunting for structural perfection.

Let me please mention at the end of this list of six cornerstones of our foreign political architecture that it is identical with what I pointed out to my own parliament 2 weeks ago—meeting with approval also from the benches of the opposition.

The twin concept of détente and security, pursued jointly and emphasized expressly at each of its semi-annual meetings, and implemented in concreto by the Alliance, is manifested, for instance, also by the bilateral SALT negotiations on which your administration not only keeps informed the allies, including us, but consults them carefully.

Other manifestations are the quadripartite talks on the sensitive Berlin problem, a problem fraught with risks; the negotiations and drafts between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet Union and Poland; the probes initiated by many Western allies with many Eastern countries concerning the questions of mutual balanced reductions not only of the expenditure for weapons but also of the numbers of tanks, troops and aircraft; the explorations of both sides as to the possibilities of bringing about a conference on European security and to the possibilities that could be exploited at such a conference; and also of course the American efforts and those of others concerning the stabilization of the Near East.

On the other hand, the twin concept is also manifested by the intensification of the defense effort by a defense improvement program for NATO agreed upon in Brussels in December last year by the European NATO countries—I repeat the European NATO countries: this is a point of particular importance, namely, that the European allies have achieved an addition to the joint defense posture just among themselves.

The twin concept, last but not least, is also manifested by the common thought that transition from confrontation to cooperation will hardly be possible unless the arms race is curbed and the weapons arsenals are ultimately reduced. This goal is of pre-eminent interest to my Government. For the time being, it is true: world-wide total disarmament is still a long way off. But projects of arms limitation and arms control designed to slow down the arms race and to subject it to agreed rules are more urgent, more realistic and also more useful than ever before.

Each of these points shows that on the one hand those concerned feel sufficiently secure to enter into negotiations, into talks, while on the other hand they are unable to imagine the achievement of results without continued security efforts, or—in other wording: without continued equilibrium.

All the examples mentioned here show clearly that the German foreign and security policies are an integral part of the whole. No allied government—neither in Paris nor in Rome, neither in London nor in Brussels,

neither in The Hague nor in Ottawa nor in Washington—sees things different from what I have just said.

To me, the most impressive feature about the NATO Council Meeting in Brussels in December 1970 was, that every point vis a vis the East—ranging from Berlin to MBFR—that was included into the NATO Council communiqué had been presented in the Council before being adopted and edited in detail, by one single foreign secretary, at the same time acting on behalf of the U.S. government, the French government, the government of the Federal Republic of Germany, and the UK government, namely by Sir Douglas Home. This was indeed impressive, seeing an agreed common position of four major powers of the West presented to that body item by item. Sure, some minor changes were made then, some editing on details was done, which is the usual procedure if the ideas of other people have to be accommodated also.

But let me refer to one important step taken at this NATO Council meeting that took place eight weeks ago. Quite a start was made by the West Europeans among themselves not only to the extent that the European NATO partners have mutually agreed on a substantial additional financial effort but also to the extent that this "European Defense Improvement Program" (EDIP) constitutes a promising political element of future European-American relations and, above all, a very promising element of European cooperation even without our big brother from this side of the Atlantic. The French have also commenced if only on a low scale to partially participate in that joint venture. And mentioning this I take the liberty to say that German cooperation with the French in the military field of security is today better and closer than it has been through many, many years before.

The European side thereby has established a decisive psychological prerequisites to enable the US administration to state in Brussels that the substance of US military presence in Europe will not be changed. We Germans do take a certain pride in the fact that this condition was brought about to a major degree by the political and diplomatic efforts of the German Federal Government. But I also must mention the very important role of the Dutch Government and its Defense Minister Wim den Toom and the fact that Denis Healey—then British Secretary of Defense—had the initial idea and started the whole thing shortly before the end of the Labour Government in London.

There is the argument that can be heard occasionally in my country that the Federal Republic of Germany, once it had concluded a treaty with the Soviet Union on the renunciation of the use of force, might withdraw from the Alliance, might scrap the Bundeswehr, or other simplicities and naïvetés along these lines. This, of course, is sheer nonsense. I can assure you that there is no party or group or person of importance in the Federal Republic which would heed such destructive ideas.

Finally I should like to refer to a few political spokesmen in your country. I can understand the view of some Senators who think, for various domestic reasons, that the US troop levels in Europe should be reduced. I am glad that the president has explicitly disagreed with such views and stated to the Alliance his will to substantially maintain the US forces in the Mediterranean and on the continental soil of Europe—with the important and welcomed exception that reductions could be brought about between West and East on a mutual and balanced basis.

If there is the argument that the German-Soviet treaty—once it will have been ratified, that is to say once a satisfactory

Berlin settlement will have been achieved, and once the treaty with the Poles will become effective—would make it superfluous for the US to play its role in Europe, then one has to know that this is just an argument but not the motivation. We all know that the motivations have not been caused by Brandt's Ostpolitik since they are much older and have been voiced over a long period of years. Among their promoters one finds important and respectable men whose ideas, however, we cannot accept in the interest of our own security and, as we believe also in the interest of the security of the United States itself.

The partners of our alliance agree upon a number of principles. Although this is true—and it will remain so—we all know that there are issues on which different opinions may arise. Common policies may, from time to time, be disturbed by differences regarding details. Let me give two examples. For instance: As the German Ostpolitik is being debated in this country and as some people have very critical views on it, on the other side people in my country as in other European countries discuss the American commitment and activities in South-East Asia.

To give another example: My friend Melvin Laird and officials in your country are debating the possibility of "zero draft". In this context, I should like to stress that we Germans and we Europeans have not in mind to come to anything like "zero draft". We do not think that any similar decision by a European government would be useful for European security. The German and European governments might have a hard time to meet their domestic public opinion in a situation like "zero draft" in the USA. Nevertheless we fully understand the trend in your country. Let me wind up my address by saying that in any case my Government will in its foreign and security policies obey the necessities. It will at the same time not underrate the opportunities and it will not let any chances go by without probing them.

When I quoted George Washington at the beginning you may have thought I intended to show off by demonstrating some knowledge of the historical basis of American foreign policy, but I did so to make it plain how vital the American/West European interdependencies are today—be it for the continued maintenance of our common security or be it for the continued attempt to ease East/West tension from such a basis.

America would cease to play its necessary role as a world power preserving world peace, if it ever should leave Europe in an unbalanced status vis-a-vis the capabilities, intentions and will of the other global power and vice versa: as America of our days—far away from the time of the Monroe Doctrine—is no longer invulnerable, the USA cannot preserve its own security without the cooperative efforts of Europe.

In conclusion, may I again draw on history. Almost one hundred and fifty years ago, an important cornerstone of American foreign policy was placed in the form of the Monroe Doctrine. Historians tell us, the real initiator of this doctrine was not an American but an Englishman: the then British foreign minister George Canning.

In order to establish the world political context of the Monroe Doctrine, Canning coined the nowadays famous sentence:

"I had to call a new world into existence in order to restore the balance in the old one."

We people of today need not create a new world: it is our will to dynamically maintain the existing balance and at the same time to make use of the existing opportunities—and to do this not separately but jointly.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION CHAIRMAN HAMPTON GIVEN GOOD MARKS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the popular columnist, Joseph Young of the Washington Star, an authority on career service in Government, in a recent column assessed the record of Chairman Robert Hampton of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. Young praises the work of Chairman Hampton, Commissioners Lud Andolsek and James Johnson, and the capable executive director, Nicholas Oganovic, for their work in modernizing the Government's personnel system and practices and the strengthening of employees' rights in Government.

During my service over many years on the Subcommittee on Independent Offices and Housing Appropriations, which included the Civil Service Commission, it was my privilege to know and evaluate the Chairmen of this Commission, and I want to say that Bob Hampton is one of the finest Chairmen of all times.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I insert this column in the RECORD:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION GIVEN GOOD MARKS DURING HAMPTON'S TENURE

(By Joseph Young)

At the 2-year mark, it seems a good time to assess the performance thus far of the Civil Service Commission under the Nixon administration.

All things considered, the CSC's performance under the fine leadership of Chairman Robert Hampton, ably assisted by Commissioners Lud Andolsek and James Johnson, has been surprisingly good.

Surprisingly because the CSC previously had been headed by another excellent chairman, John Macy, under whose shadow Hampton had served as the Republican member in the Democratic administrations of Presidents Kenney and Johnson.

QUESTION OF TOUGHNESS

When Hampton was named by Nixon to take over the chairmanship, there were people around town, including government union leaders, federal personnel officials and members of Congress, who privately wondered whether Hampton had the toughness and the leadership abilities to adequately take the place of Macy.

Hampton didn't take long to convince most people that he did.

The CSC under his leadership and that of the associate commissioners, plus the fine professional staff headed by executive director Nicholas Oganovic, has accomplished much these last two years in the way of modernizing the government's personnel system and practices as well as strengthening employees' rights and benefits.

The CSC has its faults, of course. What agency hasn't? But it generally has the respect and trust of government employee unions, members of Congress and federal personnel officials. The CSC sometimes may move too slowly for some and may appear to be overcautious on occasion, but its overall record is a good one.

Under Hampton's leadership, the CSC has played a major role in strengthening the government's labor-management relations program and further improvements soon will be announced.

The government's grievance and appeals system has been streamlined, with greater safeguards given employees to assure more impartial and expeditious hearings.

PAY COMPARABILITY

The CSC worked closely with Rep. Morris Udall, D-Ariz. and other members of the House and Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committees and congressional leaders to secure enactment of the new semi-automatic federal white-collar pay system in which salaries will be adjusted annually without having to be approved by Congress. It assures federal pay comparability with industry.

Liberalized retirement benefits were enacted into law, with the support of the CSC.

The government increased its contributions to federal health insurance premiums—to 40 percent from the previous 25 percent—as a result of a law approved by Congress with CSC support.

These laws could not have been enacted without the CSC's active support.

There have been rumblings of political clearances required for choice federal career jobs and this has happened in some instances. But these have been the exception to the rule and the CSC has succeeded in preventing any broad or centralized political assault on federal career positions.

Progress has been made in equal employment opportunity programs, although not as fast as minority group employees or the CSC itself would like. But if the progress is slow, the gains are steady.

With the commission's strong support, the financial stability of the civil service retirement system was assured when Congress approved the law providing for annual appropriations to prevent the fund from going bankrupt.

OFFICE FOR COMPLAINTS

The CSC also has set up a complaints office to which federal employees may take their complaints on agency personnel actions.

Another CSC accomplishment is a program to open up better career opportunities for lower-salaried employees by abolishing the use of federal service entrance exams (usually given college graduates) in making promotions.

Also, the CSC has expanded the government's occupational health program to provide on-the-job preventive and emergency health treatment to employees through clinics in various federal buildings.

While government employee union leaders have their share of differences with the commission, they nevertheless have the feeling that the CSC under Hampton usually is fair and sympathetic with their problems and has a generally progressive outlook on federal personnel policies and benefits.

SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING

HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, governmental financing is not a subject that is easily comprehended by the average citizen. One thing is clear, however, to most citizens—more and more money is paid in Federal taxes while the State and

city officials find it more and more difficult to find the tax sources to support their needs.

Last month we gained new hope when the President proposed a program for special revenue sharing. I am pleased that the President has selected the area of law enforcement as the subject of his first such program.

Of all the frustrations of governmental officials in all parts of the country, perhaps the greatest is the lack of ability to allocate adequate funds for the protection of citizens from criminal activity. The enactment of the proposal forwarded to us today will provide more Federal assistance in this critical area of governmental responsibility.

In enacting legislation to create the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration—LEAA—in 1968, the Congress recognized that "law enforcement efforts must be better coordinated, intensified, and made more effective at all levels of government." To achieve that goal, the legislation provided that States could receive Federal money for their law enforcement efforts if a plan was adopted by the State, approved by LEAA, and provided for the use of non-Federal funds for financing some percent of the projects to be carried out. The response by the States has been impressive, but if the aims of that program are to be achieved, then greater flexibility in planning and financing must be achieved. That is the purpose of the President's proposal.

Permitting the use of Federal revenues for 100 percent of the costs of many law enforcement efforts, and eliminating the need for LEAA approval of a State plan, this proposal can have a meaningful effect on the war against crime across the country. I give it my full support.

FARM PROGRAM

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, such discussions of the Nation's farm problems as that held on the floor of the House yesterday are of tremendous value in drawing the attention of the whole Congress and the Nation to these problems.

A healthy agriculture is an absolutely basic ingredient of a healthy economy. Unfortunately our farmers are not at present in a state of economic health. In actual fact they are in dire straits. I realize that urban areas also face serious problems. But it has always been true in our Nation that city dwellers benefit when farmers are doing well.

Fortunately we have in this body Members who understand this fact and who are intimately acquainted with all aspects of the farm problem. It has been and will continue to be my purpose to work with them in every way I can to achieve economic health for those who provide our food and fiber.

THE REGIONAL PLANNING ASSOCIATION

HON. MIKE GRAVEL

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, on February 16 the chairman of the board of the Chase Manhattan Bank, Mr. David Rockefeller, delivered what I consider to be an important speech before the Regional Planning Association in New York. In order to make this speech more widely available to my colleagues I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD.

The speech of David Rockefeller is important not only because of the source but also because of the substantive comment. It is particularly timely in that the Congress is now reassessing a whole series of regional development programs in order to determine what the outlines should be for any new legislation in this domestic field. I refer particularly to the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 as well as the Appalachian Commission and the Alaska Field Committee. In the course of this the Congress is looking for good ideas from every source and should surely entertain those of such a distinguished spokesman in the private sector.

The Rockefeller speech treats the whole question of what business and financial institutions might be appropriate to help solve urban problems with an eye toward the creation of new towns and new independent communities.

I commend this speech to all those who are interested in the general proposition of massive private sector participation in public sector problem solving.

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

ADDRESS BY DAVID ROCKEFELLER, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, THE CHASE MANHATTAN BANK, BEFORE REGIONAL PLAN ASSOCIATION, NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 16, 1971.

I appreciate enormously the generous recognition that has been given this evening to the things I've tried to do toward improving this city that we all love so much, even though it causes us anxiety.

To be singled out for acclaim by the Regional Plan Association is a heartening tribute, indeed, and I am most grateful to you, Rusty Crawford, and all your fine associates.

I should warn you, though, that you may be establishing a dangerous precedent at these annual dinners. My brother Nelson was the speaker at last year's affair, and I myself have that honor tonight. I just wonder whether you are aware that there are three more Rockefeller brothers.

Actually, father was a strong supporter of this association. At one time, he stipulated that funds he provided for land acquisition and an extension of the Palisades Interstate Park System, in the area north of the George Washington Bridge, be used in accordance with the First Regional Plan of 1929.

When Nelson originally ran for governor, I suspect he had occasion to feel sorry that father was so self-effacing. He found to his dismay that the name most frequently associated with Palisades Park was Harriman.

Seeing David Frost here this evening as

master-of-ceremonies reminds me that my place on the program had improved considerably since we last met. On that occasion, David invited me to appear on his TV show, and of course, I was happy to accept. I didn't mind so much waiting in the wings while he interviewed two famous Hollywood actors—but I did think David carried the "upstaging" bit a little too far when he then brought on the Prime Minister of Sweden.

As Rusty Crawford can testify, it is particularly reassuring these days for a banker to hear anybody say nice things about him because, frankly, in these inflationary times, we have been getting far more brickbats than bouquets.

From time to time, I am asked what I think about inflation, and I've never been able to improve upon Milton Berle's definition. Inflation, he said, is when people's money won't buy what it did during the depression when they didn't have much of it anyway.

Bankers have been forcefully reminded of inflation's impact by several recent developments, including the soaring cost of building and outfitting new branches—and you know how many of those are opening up all the time. One survey showed recently that our Avenue of the Americas now has more banks than bars.

Some people, I'm afraid, would not look upon that as a forward step in regional planning.

Some friends and I were discussing urban planning recently while watching the television coverage of Apollo 14. One of the group raised the question why, since we can put men on the moon, we cannot solve our urban problems which are so much closer at hand.

"The explanation is simple," said another. "We know where the moon is!"

In reflecting on this comment, I couldn't help feeling that it pretty well summed up the difficulty we have in coming to grips with that tangled complex of problems we call "The Urban Crisis."

As the Regional Plan Association found out early in its very useful life, the urban crisis is not just a single problem. Rather it is a kind of witches' brew blended from all the major ills of our time—inadequate educational systems, hard-core unemployment, poverty in the midst of plenty, antiquated transportation, shameful housing, insufficient public facilities, and all the rest.

This evening I'd like to touch briefly on some of the problems we face—problems that have been starkly delineated in the Association's recent and comprehensive second regional plan. Then I'd like to explore a concept of development and financing that seems to me to have application not only to our urban areas but also to the exciting development of "new towns" and "satellite cities."

I should tell you at the outset that I personally am not a devotee of the new fashion of urban pessimism. This is the dispirited and disillusioned cult that never ceases to predict an early end to all our cities. Such an attitude, in my judgment, does much less than justice to the thousands of dedicated civil servants, determined businessmen and concerned citizens who have opted for enterprise and ingenuity as their response to a troubled era. To me, it would be both impractical and unthinkable to surrender to frustration at a time when there is so much constructive work to be done.

I spoke earlier of how difficult it is for the average citizen to see the urban crisis in perspective. Perhaps it helps if we think of the United States as two broad geographical areas.

One is rural America, a region so huge that, if it were a separate country, it would rank in area as the world's ninth largest. Yet, at the same time, a region so low in income that, by itself, it would be the world's sixth largest underdeveloped nation.

This rural America contains the highest proportion of our poverty, the lowest average per capita income, the most inequitable distribution of educational opportunity, and the bulk of America's inadequate housing.

The second geographical element consists of six large urban-and-suburban sprawls: The Boston-Washington corridor down the Atlantic seaboard; from Buffalo along the Great Lakes beyond Chicago; the spill-out of Los Angeles engulfing over half the California Pacific; the Florida spread; the Atlanta-Piedmont crescent; and the Fort Worth-Dallas-Houston complex.

Statistics confirm the pattern that the nation's urban areas accommodate 70% of all Americans on about 10% of the land.

Thus, in our rural areas, we have more room than people—more than enough space to expand, together with a need for the advantages that business and industry can provide.

On the other hand, we have the urban areas with far more people than room. In these areas, we have seen haphazard growth in which social ills tend to multiply.

Given these disparities, it is only natural to ask: why don't we get people to move from congested metropolitan centers to sparsely settled rural areas?

In a regimented society that might be a good way to do it, but it is hardly the American way.

Though romantics may still dream of the glories of small-town life, thousands of Americans continue by preference to pour into our great urban regions to take advantage of the unparalleled opportunities they do, in fact, offer. To the country lover, it may seem surprising that nearly all the increase in our national population, over the past decade, took place in metropolitan areas—in some central cities and especially in the suburbs.

In view of this trend and because of the huge investment we have in our existing cities, it is the height of folly to think—as some do—that we can ignore the refurbishing of our present metropolitan areas in favor of creating new cities away from the congested corridors. Realistically, we have no choice but to do both.

Today we have a population of some 206 million. Projections show that we are likely to add as many as 75 million more people by the end of this century—less than 30 years away. While this represents a lower rate of population growth for the United States than in the past—and is substantially lower than that of the developing nations—it still means that we must assimilate vast additional numbers of people in our country. In short, our urban problems will grow, not diminish, in the remaining decades of the 20th century.

Seldom does a day pass that we don't hear the question: "What's the solution?"

But I wonder if a more realistic query wouldn't be: "What's the best approach to these problems?"

Experiences I have had in relation to Morningside Heights, Lower Manhattan and urban activities of our own bank in recent years suggest that the right approach is all-important.

I might add, parenthetically, that this lesson on the proper approach was reinforced, at least in my own mind, when I tried to convince some of my associates, at our friendly little loan company, to decorate their offices with contemporary art! That's a job that definitely calls for the right approach!

At any rate, in approaching urban problems, it is absolutely vital to gain the cooperation of three elements: private business, government, and the local citizenry. Unless these three can reach a broad consensus, even the finest plan will become nothing more than a blueprint for failure.

I believe that the basic task of urban rehabilitation is one for private enterprise. But it must be a cooperative venture. Govern-

ment must lend support through zoning, through supplying essential services, and through tax incentives. Furthermore, the goodwill of the local residents and their concurrence in the program is an indispensable ingredient.

Clearly, the business and financial community has a growing stake in the economic health of our cities. Good zoning, traffic control and adequate water supply are essential to the entire community but they also bear directly on the success of businesses located there. To attract and retain top talent willing to live and work in our cities, business needs progressive community leadership that is alert to the problems which exist and is prepared to do something about them.

Conversely, cities need the help of business if they are to expand job opportunities and generate an adequate tax base. During this decade of the Seventies, we must create jobs in the United States for about a million-and-a-half men and women who will be entering the labor force every year. Since most of these jobs must be in metropolitan areas, where the population is concentrated, a basic function of any city must be to encourage and support the business and commercial activities that provide its economic base.

It goes without saying that in performing its primary role of producing goods and services efficiently, business is accomplishing a vital function of great public importance. Beyond this, however, more and more businesses are coming to recognize that they have a responsibility to assume a larger share of the social burden, as well, hand-in-hand with government. A notable recent example of business initiative, which went beyond the conventional role of a strictly profit-oriented project, was the case of nine commercial banks which are cooperating with the City in providing nearly \$75 million for the construction of the Waterside housing development, to accommodate some 1,500 low- and moderate-income families, on a novel six-acre platform over the East River.

This is just one example of an expanding corporate trend toward direct participation in community improvement that is becoming nationwide in scope. I am not suggesting, of course, that business singlehandedly—without government assistance—can solve the problems of our cities. However, it can take—and is taking—a livelier interest and is playing a larger role. And I believe it will do even more as it becomes convinced that its efforts will receive encouragement and support from government and the community.

One promising area for future collaboration between public and private sectors is in the existing planning and development of "new towns" and "satellite cities."

I say exciting because this represents a dramatically new concept of urban building. Look at any of our present towns and cities and you can see unmistakable reflections of the way they were built—piecemeal.

How much better it would be to have an overall concept of the community which can shape the development right from the outset. That, in essence, is the new town idea. An imaginative builder comes in with a comprehensive plan and works out the details in cooperation with local government.

The location of the community center is carefully selected. You don't have the situation many of us are familiar with today where one municipality waits for its neighbor to provide the shopping and community facilities for both. Housing is planned to meet the needs of all those who will be working in the community. You don't run into situations where one municipality drags its feet, hoping the next town will provide the low- and middle-income housing, while it accommodates only the well-to-do.

In recent years, there have been about a dozen communities started which can be classified as "new towns"—that is, politically

new and independent units with a wide range of options for housing, employment, worship, education and recreation. Perhaps the outstanding example of a new town in this country is Columbia, Maryland, halfway between Baltimore and Washington. Because Chase Manhattan participated in its construction financing, I have followed this particular "new town" with special interest.

Columbia was started in 1963 and is expected to be completed by 1980. By that time the population—now about 10,000—should reach 110,000. Of its 14,000 acres, about half are for residential use. A quarter of the land is for open space, while another quarter is for commercial and industrial purposes.

A core community is surrounded by what ultimately will be a dozen tree-shaded villages. Each village has been subdivided into racially integrated neighborhoods of about 1,000 families, with homes in a variety of styles and prices, clustered around churches, shops and schools. There are transportation loops around the villages that connect with Columbia's central core. Industrial sites are situated on the outskirts but with easy access routes to residential and shopping areas. The city is designed to be a balanced community with recreational and social facilities to satisfy the human needs of urban living, in addition to the businesses which provide employment and the economic base.

Seeing Columbia evolve, one can readily understand the growing support for new towns which is springing up all across the country.

As an example, the National Committee on Urban Growth Policy has recommended the creation of 100 new communities the size of Columbia and, in addition, ten new cities of at least one million people each.

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 set up a Community Development Corporation to handle the financing of new communities, and provided some of the funds to get them started. These steps are very much in the right direction, but the funding presently available is still far below the waterline of adequacy to get the job done.

I have been giving considerable thought as to how the process of promoting new towns can be expedited. I have come to the conclusion that additional legislation will be required as well as added financial support. Specifically, it seems to me that two steps are needed.

One is a mechanism to help in acquiring land so that sufficiently large and contiguous tracts can be put together. In the case of Columbia, a few parcels could not be acquired and in the end the planners just had to design the city around them. If more parcels had been held out, or if they had been in more critical locations, this could have undercut the whole project. The chanciness related to land acquisition is much too great as things now stand.

The other need is for new sources of financing to provide the enormous sums required before new towns get underway and begin collecting revenue on their own.

To take care of both these needs, I would suggest the creation of two corporations nationwide in scope: one public, the other private or quasi-public.

To deal with the problem of land acquisition—and perhaps provide guidance in terms of national land-use planning—we need either a new federal agency or an existing agency supplied with special additional powers for planning and obtaining sites for new towns.

Such an agency might well require the power of eminent domain. But sufficient flexibility and safeguards should be built in so that the rights and desires of those already living in proposed sites would be protected, and so that there would be no improper infringement on states' rights. Whether it be an Executive branch mechanism or a creation of Congress should be a matter for sober reflection. But the plan would call for a fed-

eral agency with the ability to determine sites and projects in a manner consistent with the economic needs and goals of the communities involved as well as those of the nation. Thus, a single agency would handle land acquisition and site location.

The second agency, either private or quasi-public, would be organized on a non-profit basis, to provide the predevelopment financing. Possibly a new kind of bank could be devised which would seek its capital from commercial banks, insurance companies, industry and other sources. To do so, the new bank would need to offer long-term debentures with a modest interest return that would make possible full development of a new town, and yet be sufficiently remunerative so as to assure a continuing flow of capital for other new towns. If the new communities are well conceived, there is every reason why the bulk of the capital could come from private sources.

The two agencies would need to work in close cooperation to see that the site locations of new towns not only met the public standards desired for national growth but also to make sure that they would be attractive to residents and to industry.

Working together, these two agencies could create a whole series of new independent communities, providing adequate housing at reasonable cost and bringing together both the white and blue-collar work force required for industrial expansion.

Aside from the building of new towns, the plan I have outlined could readily direct investment into existing core cities where our national growth policy determined that programs of redevelopment or rehabilitation were desirable.

Perhaps the greatest benefit would be the harnessing of private financing sources, which up to now have not been attracted by urban investment, and directing them into responsible urban developments that are not only profitable but that enhance the environment as well.

Obviously, the building of new towns is an expensive venture. One recent study estimates that a community the size of Columbia might cost as much as \$50 million in predevelopment charges alone—in land acquisition, planning and management, and infrastructure such as streets and utilities.

These start-up costs are the very ones that the developer finds so burdensome under present conditions, and the ones that the proposed new financing agency would be designed to handle. As a new town project moves ahead, it can obtain funds in the conventional money market or—in the case of lower income housing—from various government programs or the new National Corporation for Housing Partnerships. But the predevelopment costs are the big roadblock.

If we use this \$50 million as a base figure, then the recommendation of the National Committee on Urban Growth Policy for 100 communities of Columbia's size, and ten of one million people each, could cost in the neighborhood of \$10 billion.

Standing by itself, this is an imposing figure, indeed. Yet it is less than half of what we have already spent on the man-in-space program. And as great as the benefits from that program have been, I believe that the advantages of new town development—certainly in human terms—could be incalculably greater.

In conclusion, I would like to suggest that in tackling urban problems, we should keep five points in mind:

First, that because these problems are so closely interrelated, they call for the establishment of overall national goals and guidance.

Second, that federal and state assistance must be closely coordinated to stimulate responsible local action and serve the best long-run interests of the overall community.

Third, that the amount of state and local

building and rebuilding required is so vast that it will make necessary the expenditure of a steadily increasing share of our total national income. Both private and public funds will be needed. Since states and municipalities are already straining their taxing powers, I believe the Federal Government will have to bear a larger share than in the past. That is why I personally applaud President Nixon's proposal for what he calls "general revenue sharing." The idea of giving local governments greater flexibility in spending a larger portion of federal tax revenues on urban development is eminently sound, and I would hope that the President's approach would eventually find the broadly-based support it deserves on Capitol Hill.

Fourth, that it is imperative for any new town or redevelopment project to include enough profitable activities, whether in housing, commercial development or industry to generate tax revenues sufficient to make the project viable with a minimum of public subsidy.

Fifth and finally, that the task of refurbishing our existing core cities and building new towns can best be accomplished if public and private efforts are creatively combined in such a way as to win the support of the community.

In shaping our cities of the future, we are limited only by the intensity of our concern, the reach of our inquiring minds, and the strength of our determination to provide a better life for all our citizens.

NEWSDAY COMMENDS HUMPHREY-REUSS REVENUE SHARING BILL

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, Long Island's Newsday, in a February 24, 1971, editorial discusses several features of the Humphrey-Reuss approach to revenue sharing. Notably, the editorial singles out for favorable comment the ideas of linking revenue sharing with State and local government reform, and of encouraging States without income taxes to adopt them. I and 16 other Members—Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. YATRON—have cosponsored H.R. 4617, the Humphrey-Reuss revenue sharing bill.

The text of the Newsday editorial follows:

A PLUS FOR REVENUE SHARING

Two years ago a federal commission recommended Washington pay all welfare costs and the states assume the burden of financing education. The report happily was not filed and forgotten.

It is reflected in some of the ideas on revenue sharing being advanced on the Hill by Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey (D-Minn.) and Rep. Henry S. Reuss (D-Wis.). Both men have testified before a joint congressional committee that they favor the gradual assumption of welfare costs by the federal government. And they have sponsored a revenue-sharing bill that would make it easier for states to relieve the local property tax of the cost of education.

Testifying before the same joint committee, an administration spokesman called the Humphrey-Reuss measure a "good bill."

The two Democrats, in turn, indicated they were open to compromise. Said Humphrey: "We cannot permit a stalemate between Congress and the administration on this issue." This aura of statesmanship may not long endure. But its very appearance is a sign that consciousness of the state and local tax crisis is being forced on both the executive and legislative branches.

New York's Republican lawmakers in Washington must not automatically fall in behind the administration's approach to revenue sharing, which would deliver money to the states with very few strings attached. For Humphrey and Reuss have demonstrated a great awareness of the burdens on a state, such as New York, that has tried to meet its responsibilities.

The Humphrey-Reuss bill would distribute federal money to the states under a formula that would count the income tax collected in a state twice to determine its share of federal funds. Thus a state with a high income tax would receive more federal aid than a state with no income tax or a low one. And New York certainly qualifies as a high income tax state.

This incentive could help nudge New York into the long overdue reform in the way education is financed in the state. The property tax was never meant to carry such a heavy burden. In addition, it is an unfair tax because it is almost blind in its ability to recognize ability to pay. The cost of a basic program of education should be paid by the state and the money raised through the income tax, which is far more equitable since it is graduated to reflect relative earning power.

Humphrey and Reuss take a clear-eyed view of the failings of many state governments. They have designed a very sophisticated program that would encourage much-needed reforms, such as annual legislative sessions (some state legislatures meet only once every two years) and tax revision such as the necessity changes in educational financing in New York. In advancing their bill—and especially their ideas—they have brightened the prospects for drafting good revenue-sharing legislation this year.

TRANSPORTATION PROGRESS WITH SECRETARY VOLPE

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, Secretary of Transportation Volpe has in the 2 years since taking office distinguished himself not only as an analyst of the Nation's transportation problems but also as a most effective problem solver in the area of transportation.

On February 4, 1971, Secretary Volpe spoke at the Transportation Association of America's annual meeting in Chicago. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts of his remarks on that occasion be printed in the Extension of Remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D.C.

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY U.S. SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION JOHN A. VOLPE

Let me—at the outset—bring you the greetings of the President. He sends his best wishes for a successful meeting. As you well know, he is keenly interested in transporta-

tion—perhaps more so than any other President in this century. He clearly demonstrated this interest and concern by submitting to Congress—and successfully achieving—major legislative programs for aviation, public transit, railroads and highways. He understands your needs and the peoples' needs; he recognizes the necessity for full-range, long-term planning if we are ever going to successfully match resources with demands.

And I must say that reflecting on that great State of the Union message, his understanding of our other many needs is clearly evident.

It is a bold new program, containing some monumental solutions to some of the problems now facing this country. Let me comment briefly on two aspects that relate to transportation. First—the proposed new system of sharing Federal revenues with state and local governments. This would be a financial transfusion that can save our Federal system and bring new strength to Government at the grassroots level. Government that you and I know is best qualified to judge and respond to the needs of the people.

Included in the proposal is \$11 billion in so-called "special revenue sharing" for specific areas such as transportation but without the narrow program restrictions that have applied in the past. The converting of some of our categorical grants to block grants is most definitely in line with our initiatives over the past two years in the direction of giving states and communities greater flexibility through a single transportation trust fund.

Closely related is the matter of Government re-organization. Some people—even the so-called "Bureaucrats" in my own shop—have gotten a little nervous over some of the reports about re-organization. But let me make my position crystal clear. Re-organization—as the President has outlined it—is simply another step toward integrating transportation into the basic fabric of our lives.

I do not see the President's proposal constraining what we are now doing. On the contrary, I think it will accelerate directions in which we are already moving.

And let me say, Gentlemen, we are moving! Last year, our Department had its best year ever! Five major transportation Bills were passed by the Congress. And most of them passed by overwhelming odds. Each of you, I am sure, is aware of at least a few of these measures. But let me list them for you, just to refresh your memory. We have the Airport-Airways Act, the Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act, the Rail Safety Bill, the Rail Passenger Service Bill, and—in the final days of the 91st Congress—the new Highway Bill.

Now these are all mighty important pieces of legislation, and I am deeply appreciative of the work everyone in the transportation fraternity did in getting them through. But, frankly, I see them only as a beginning. We still have a lot of hard work that is going to require the very best efforts of both industry and Government.

There is an immediate need, first of all, for better industry-labor relations throughout the transportation industries.

Yesterday at noon the President sent a special message to Congress proposing transportation labor legislation, the "Emergency Public Interest Protection Act."

The proposed legislation calls for establishment of a procedure by which both sides in a labor dispute would submit their best final offer to a neutral, three-member panel. The panel would then select, without alteration, what is deemed the most reasonable offer. This would become the final, binding settlement of the dispute.

This measure deserves your full support.

Another major job before us is our Transportation Needs Study, scheduled for completion in 1972 with an updating every

two years thereafter. This total Needs Study is far broader than the traditional "Highway Needs Studies" of past years. It will pinpoint transportation demand in detail for periods of 10 and 20 years ahead. It will not be simply a classical projection, by mode, of how heavy traffic will be in year "X". It will not be pegged exclusively to the modes as we know them. Our aim is to accommodate the doubling of freight and passenger loads in the next two decades—regardless of where the modal chips may fall. We want to know the general needs so we will be able to recommend specific responses. At the same time we are paying close attention to the environmental impact of transportation demand in the realms of safety, pollution, noise, land use, and conservation of human and natural resources. No true transportation system will fail to take close account of these once-hidden, but now obvious, social costs of mobility.

Relocation housing is a case in point. We have made it a firm policy, for instance, that no one will be thrown out on the street just so we can build more streets. Replacement housing is a factor in transportation development.

No national transportation policy or needs study can succeed without the input of citizens, state and local governments, regional planning bodies, and especially the industry itself. This is a national problem, and it must be solved in a national way.

Which brings me to another one of our immediate needs that is requiring—and receiving—the very best national expertise we have been able to find. I'm referring to our National Rail Passenger Service Corporation—(call it "Railpax" if you must; we are in the process of looking for a better name.)

Passage of this legislation, and creation of the well-publicized quasi-public operating corporation, is bringing two very important results. First, we are helping ease the railroads' financial pinch by relieving them of the burden of passenger service. Second, we are giving the American travelling public the chance to prove, once and for all, whether or not they will patronize fast, clean, efficient, courteous safe rail transportation.

Our initial demonstrations with the Turbo-Train and Metroliner indicate that people will ride modern rail passenger vehicles.

The Corporation is already in full operation. The incorporators have been meeting practically around the clock since their confirmation by the Senate last month. I, on my part, have designated a basic system of 21 city pairs between which the Corporation shall provide rail service. That was no easy task. I announced our first preliminary plans on November 30, calling for only 16 city pairs. This resulted in my receiving more than 3,000 letters—countless telephone calls and a parade of visiting dignitaries.

With vocal support such as that—and with harder facts following deeper research—we were delighted to be able to expand the system to a point where no region of the country is passed by.

The incorporators, meanwhile, are ready to begin negotiations with the railroads in operating contacts. They are shaping up a management team of top people; they are determined to make this Corporation work.

The new Corporation, I remind you, opens for business May first. We are working on a very tight deadline considering the scope of the operation.

I am certain that after initial "bugs" are eliminated, this country will have a true national system of rail passenger service.

I look upon this basic system, however, only as a beginning—as a base from which the Corporation can expand as demand for fast, clean, safe and efficient service between metropolitan centers increases.

I have spent my time—and yours—up to this point with a combination "progress report" and "re-statement of basic goals."

Progress is worth reviewing, and goals are worth remembering. In an "overview" sort of speech like this that is often the most one can be expected to do. But I would like to devote my remaining time to a somewhat narrower approach; and I trust that those of you for whom this is not immediately relevant will bear with me. For over the long run the relevance is very real and very dangerous, no matter what phase of transportation provides you a paycheck today.

There are two phases—two aspects—of transportation in America that pose definite threats. I use a word as strong as that only after two years of living with transportation day and night.

The first of these areas is the threat of urban congestion. Gentlemen, urban congestion is a threat to cities—large and small—in every state in this Nation.

Our obsession with the private car is destroying the quality of life in our urban areas.

I want one fact understood here. I fully appreciate the tremendous mobility and the subsequent tremendous independence the private automobile has given the average American family. I am also a firm believer in the value of our Interstate Highway System, and I am very proud that my first introduction to Federal Civil Service was as President Eisenhower's first Federal Highway Administrator. Notwithstanding all this, I fully recognize that excessive dependence on the auto is damaging transportation, damaging ourselves and damaging our urban areas.

The result of this total emphasis on private cars is that we have, in effect, deprived the inhabitants of our metropolitan areas any reasonable choices in the modes of transportation available to them. They have no alternatives. If they can't drive or don't own an automobile they are immobilized.

The increasing amounts of urban air pollution is another disastrous effect of this heavy auto traffic. A few weeks ago, Los Angeles found its air pollution had reached dangerous levels and had to call on its citizens to restrict driving. The advent of similar conditions in most of our major cities is only a matter of time.

Heavy auto traffic also represents inefficiency. It is an inefficient use of our highways and it impedes the pace of public transit. Heavy urban auto congestion is noisy and a potential safety threat to urban pedestrians. Finally, it involves all of us in a brutally vicious cycle: more people, with fewer alternatives, means more cars—which require more roads—which take more urban and suburban land off the tax rolls and away from housing, business, and recreation while bringing increased pollution and congestion. This—very simply—is a self-perpetuating disaster.

How do we fight this? New York City experimented with the closing of certain downtown areas to traffic and found that on the streets that were closed the carbon dioxide count fell by as much as 90 percent and the average noise level shrank from 78 to 58 decibels. In the financial district, a ban on private parking so opened the streets that it reduced bus and taxi trip time by an incredible 75 percent.

I shall this year, therefore, continue to urge mayors and other local officials to look to ways of both reducing urban auto driving and encouraging the use of public transit. I have stressed this point regularly to the League of Cities, to the Conference of Mayors, and I shall continue that appeal as long as the threat persists.

And, I shall be doing more than just urging and talking.

While details cannot be released at this time, I can say that we will shortly be taking a close look at the transportation situation in the Nation's Capital. This will be a comprehensive approach to the regional trans-

portation needs of the entire metropolitan Washington area. The knowledge we have already tells us innovations must be made. And innovations will be made. This comprehensive analysis will, hopefully, set a pace and a precedent for other major cities of the Nation.

We will cope with this threat that has brought us all too close to urban suicide in all too many metropolitan areas. We shall most definitely make 1971—as one of the trade papers termed it—"Year One of the Transit Revolution."

Now let me turn to the second area within which I—and my policy people—sense a distinct threat to national progress.

No nation of 200 million people that covers 3½ million square miles could possibly exist in this day and age without railroads.

I have already discussed the rail passenger problem, and our involvement there. What perhaps is not understood well enough by the general public is the impending crisis in rail freight. We have simply too much bulk freight, too great a flow of raw materials, too huge a gross national product to conceive of the death of our rail system. Yet we have allowed ourselves to come dangerously close to that fatal point. The fact that \$100 million of our \$125 million loan guarantee program was snapped up by one railroad the first week it was available is proof of that. Bankruptcies, near-bankruptcies, archaic equipment and outmoded regulatory practices are further indices of the problem. And we discovered—during the one-day shutdown in December—that with a nationwide cessation of rail service, the other modes would be hard put to carry even 15 percent of the traffic!

I see little value in going backwards or in assessing blame. Suffice to say, the deterioration of our railroads is a national tragedy. And this atrophy must end.

I shall, consequently, be initiating a series of programs and actions this year which will be designed to assist our railroads. These will cover the range from a series of new legislative proposals, new studies, and new research and development projects.

So—just as this will be "Year One of the Transit Revolution," this will also be the year in which the Federal Government moves in depth to get to the massive task of boosting rail freight up the priority rankings.

Gentlemen . . . there are other topics I could have touched on today. But I felt my time would be better spent in talking of the challenges and difficulties that lie ahead.

But in closing, I want one fact clearly understood and remembered. I have been at my desk in Washington for two years now, and I have come to know the people in the transportation industry. I have, consequently, a sizable measure of confidence in our future. We have come a long way in the last 200 years, and the future is alive with opportunities for service yet undreamed of.

With your help, with our priorities in proper order, with clear policies and a clear direction, transportation can become the cutting edge of social and environmental progress in this country.

SUPPORT BY THE GREAT RELIGIOUS FAITHS FOR VOLUNTARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, next week is the annual appeal by our good friends of all three great faiths—Catholic, Jew-

ish, and Protestant—seeking funds to aid those who cannot help themselves. Millions of Americans, each through his own faith, will make special contributions to support voluntary agency assistance programs for the world's homeless, hungry, and destitute beginning March 14 and ending March 21. The three appeals are:

Catholic—the Bishops' Overseas Fund Appeal, March 14-21 in Catholic churches;

Protestant—One Great Hour of Sharing, with special offerings, March 14-21 in participating Protestant churches;

Jewish—United Jewish Appeal, a continuing effort with special emphasis at this season.

Mr. President, the overseas relief programs of the religious faiths serve victims of war, natural disasters, and destitution with both emergency aid and with continuing programs of rehabilitation. All of these groups have done an outstanding job in helping those less fortunate around the world, and I urge all Senators to offer their assistance to the Catholic Relief Services, the Church World Service, and United Jewish Appeal in furthering their responsive efforts.

A TRIBUTE TO ASSEMBLYMAN LARRY TOWNSEND

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, certainly each of us, as Members of Congress, value our working relationships with the State legislators within our districts, but I rise today to pay tribute to a man who is more than a fellow public servant—he is a personal friend of long standing.

A Navy veteran and former union representative for the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Larry Townsend was first elected to the California Assembly in 1966 and is now serving his third term.

In his first term, he was instrumental in the passage of legislation authorizing the Southern California Regional Occupational Center, now in operation in Torrance. During the last session of the California Legislature, he worked diligently for an increase of State aid to senior citizens and approval of the Paramedics Act, which allows specially trained ambulance attendants and emergency services personnel to perform emergency treatment for heart attack victims which has already resulted in the saving of many lives.

In 1970, Assemblyman Townsend was chairman of the Health and Welfare Subcommittees on Child Health, and on Drug Abuse; vice chairman of the Governmental Administration Committee; and a member of the Commerce and Public Utilities Committee. With his advancement this year to membership on the important Assembly Rules Committee, he was also added to the Finance and Insurance Committee and serves on the

Wildlife Conservation Board for the State of California.

Since being elected to the assembly, Larry Townsend has forsaken any outside employment interests in order to devote his full time to representing the citizens of Torrance, Redondo Beach, Gardena, Hawthorne, Lawndale, Carson, and Compton.

However, he has continued his many community service activities, including the Boy Scouts, YMCA, Pop Warner Football, Little League Baseball, Lawndale Teen Council advisor. Among the many public service activities in which he was engaged prior to his election to the assembly included two terms as chairman of the Torrance Civil Service Commission; director of the Little Company of Mary Hospital; director of the Travelers Aid Society; a lecturer at UCLA, Los Angeles State College, and Valley State College; and membership in the Public Personnel Association. He is also an active member of the Lawndale Congregational Church.

Too often the well-deserved honors are paid to public servants such as Assemblyman Townsend while their wives and families fade into the background. However, I know that one of Larry's most valuable assets is his devoted and attractive wife, Shirley. They have three children, Lashir and Lauren, who are students at North High School in Torrance; and Dale, who is studying at El Camino College.

When Assemblyman Townsend first entered the legislature, he established a set of goals toward which he would work and has dedicatedly continued his efforts to further these ends. They include seeking equitable methods of property tax relief; assuring equal rights and opportunities to all citizens along with fair wages and better working conditions; providing effective rapid transit at low cost; advancing the standards of education; and providing all possible aid to law enforcement officials.

Those are certainly worthy goals which have made him the effective and influential legislator whom I wish to honor today.

VOLUNTARY MILITARY PROCUREMENT ACT OF 1971

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Voluntary Military Procurement Act of 1971. The purpose of this legislation is to provide the incentives necessary to increase the number of enlistments in the Armed Forces to a point where conscription will not be necessary to meet our military manpower needs.

In 1968, I first introduced a resolution to express the sense of Congress that the United States should convert to an all-volunteer military at the earliest practicable date. Since that time there has been increasing interest in an all-volunteer force. Interest reached a peak a

year ago when the President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force, the so-called Gates Commission, concluded that the draft could be practicably terminated. The legislation I am now introducing seeks to implement that Commission's recommendations.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, seeks to establish fair levels of compensation for military personnel. Provision is made for pay increases which average about 50 percent for first term enlisted men, and approximately 28 percent for junior officers. Increases are greater for the lower ranks than the higher ranks.

The legislation also incorporates the personnel management reforms recommended by the Gates Commission by directing the Secretary of Defense to:

Expand utilization of civilian personnel.

Improve and expand specialist education programs.

Improve and expand officer training programs.

Improve and expand recruiting programs.

Improve and expand educational opportunities, including associate degree programs and off duty courses.

Improve and expand housing opportunities.

Alleviate the problem of family separation for married members of the military services.

Formulate a plan for maximum use of civilian medical facilities, including a medical insurance program.

Formulate a new pay structure providing for salary schedules which combine basic pay and quarters and subsistence allowances and which involves cash contributions to a retirement system similar to that for Federal civilian employees.

The bill provides for an adequate number of officer candidates by providing for an increase in the number of Reserve Officer Training Corps scholarships, and an increase in the subsistence allowance for this group. Hostile fire pay is increased from \$65 to \$200. Special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians would be increased. Finally, to insure the national security in a time of emergency, draft registration would be continued even if the authority for induction expires. The draft could be reinstituted at the request of the President by a joint resolution of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion as to whether or not it is feasible to terminate the draft. Thoughtful people have been unable to agree; however, the most exhaustive study of the matter, that undertaken by the Gates Commission, concludes that it can be done. The Voluntary Military Procurement Act is an effort to test the Commission's conclusion. Because national security must be of paramount consideration, authority for a standby draft is included in the bill. Even if the incentives in the bill do not result in a draft call of zero, it should be enacted for other reasons.

Defense costs at any one point in time are constant. The question for the Government is how to allocate those costs. By underpaying our servicemen we are allo-

cating an unfair share of the cost of defending the country to those in uniform. By paying a fair wage, we would say that the costs of maintaining the military should be borne by the entire public in the same proportion as are other governmental expenditures. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it is time to end the tax in kind now being levied on America's military personnel.

At the present time, the total military compensation for a recruit comes to \$2,750 per year. By way of comparison, a person earning the minimum wage of \$1.60 per hour would receive an annual salary of \$3,300. The annual pay of a Job Corps graduate is \$3,900, and the common beginners' pay for unskilled blue collar work is \$6,000 per year. Irrespective of the practicality of ending conscription, the men and women of this Nation's Armed Forces should not be compensated at such a low starting salary.

Currently, over 50,000 military men qualify for some form of Federal relief according to Defense Department estimates. Food stamp usage is increasing in military commissaries. Fifteen thousand food stamp transactions occurred in commissaries during a recent 3-month period. Every soldier and sailor at or below the rank of E-3 is currently compensated at a rate under the federally established poverty level. Certainly the buying power of enlisted men is increased by several types of indirect compensation, but even so, the pay raises contained in the Voluntary Military Procurement Act are justified, regardless of the draft, as a means of removing the financial penalty now associated with military service.

There are two often heard fears expressed with respect to an all-voluntary military. One is that it would result in an Army of the poor and the black, and the other is that our society would become more militaristic. After careful study, I cannot accept either of these contentions.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the more affluent and better educated are already able to avoid military service in many cases. While implementation of the lottery has helped in this regard, it will be the rich who will continue to avoid service through their use of legal machinery and medical exemptions. The Gates Commission studied this question and concluded that a maximum of 14 percent of a conscripted force would be black and that a maximum of 15 percent of a volunteer force would be black. Finally, the broad support an all-volunteer military has received from black leaders in and out of Congress disputes the fear expressed by some that eliminating the draft would discriminate against the poor and the black.

The fear that a professional military would make our society more militaristic is also contrary to the facts. Over 2 million servicemen out of a current total of 2.7 million are already professional in that they enlisted for reasons other than draft pressure or have voluntarily reenlisted. The Gates Commission estimates, even under an all-volunteer force, considerable turnover in both enlisted and officer ranks. Furthermore,

the effect of short-term draftees on military policy is probably nonexistent. An all-volunteer force would in no way dilute the historic control civilian authorities have exercised over the military. Also, the bill, by upgrading the ROTC program, will assure a continued infusion of civilian oriented personnel into the officer, or policymaking, ranks.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, an all-volunteer military would lead to a calmer consideration of American foreign policy by both the President and the Congress. Under the Voluntary Military Procurement Act, the need for a large increase in forces would require full congressional debate. Under the existing law, draft calls may be dramatically increased without the prior consent of Congress, as they were in 1965. Under existing law, Congress' only effective control on the executive is the authority to cut off funds once troops are already in the field. The bill I am introducing would allow congressional involvement before massive troop commitments are made.

**CHATTANOOGA SERTOMA CLUB
GIVES FREEDOM AWARD TO MRS.
WAYNE FULLAM**

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, the Chattanooga Sertoma Club is to be commended for honoring Mrs. Wayne E. Fullam of Chattanooga, Tenn., with its 1971 Freedom Award.

Mrs. Fullam, whose husband, Maj. Wayne E. Fullam, has been missing in action since 1967, was selected for this year's award on the basis of her tireless and selfless efforts to gain freedom for all prisoners of war.

She was one of 58 wives who made the exhausting 21-hour trip to Paris and back on Christmas Day 1969, to confront the North Vietnamese delegation there and request information about the fate of their husbands. She was instrumental in the formation of the National League of Families of Missing Soldiers and Prisoners in Southeast Asia and is Tennessee coordinator for the league. In this capacity, Mrs. Fullam has been praised as the most outstanding and productive State coordinator in the Nation.

Mrs. Fullam has participated in two White House conferences to emphasize to President Nixon how he could assist families of the prisoners of war and those missing in action.

In accepting the Freedom Award, which consisted of framed bronze replicas of the Bill of Rights and the U.S. Constitution, Mrs. Fullam said:

This is a heartwarming occasion for me, even though half of me, half of my heart, and all of my love is with my husband, somewhere behind the bamboo curtain.

The Chattanooga Sertoma Club has chosen well in honoring Mrs. Wayne Fullam. Surely this will be an inspiration to all who have joined these families in advancing this humanitarian effort.

**AFL-CIO ENDORSES PUBLIC SERVICE
EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM FOR
RELIEF TO UNEMPLOYED**

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there is an alarming trend in our Nation today. Unemployment figures have risen steadily for 2 years and show no signs of decline in the coming months. Discussions by economists and Government officials that cyclical trends in the economy will eventually lessen unemployment are little consolation to the 5,033,000 Americans who are without a livelihood. These men and women are victims of economic forces that are largely out of their control.

It is for these reasons that I introduced H.R. 3613, to create a public service employment program. The Select Subcommittee on Labor which I chair is presently conducting hearings on this and similar proposals. The concept of public employment has been widely endorsed by Government officials, labor organizations, and specialists in the manpower field. Recently, the AFL-CIO executive council adopted a resolution describing the benefits that a program of job-creation would yield:

It would create useful jobs for the unemployed and seriously under-employed. It would also provide badly needed services in parks, schools, health care, recreational centers, libraries, public safety agencies, pollution control, conservation, public buildings, and similar institutions in the government and private nonprofit sectors of the economy.

I wish, therefore, to call to the attention of my colleagues the firm belief of the AFL-CIO that such a program would bring relief to the many unfortunate citizens who are willing and able to work, but find themselves without the opportunities. The text of the resolution follows:

**STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL**

A large-scale federal effort to create public service jobs is needed without delay to provide work for the unemployed, bolster the sagging economy and make available public services that would otherwise not be provided.

The AFL-CIO urges the Congress to immediately enact a nationwide public service employment program—with sufficient federal funds to state and local government agencies and private non-profit organizations to create at least 500,000 productive jobs this year, for the unemployed and seriously under-employed. This program should offer these public service employees a ladder for upgrading and job improvement.

Adoption of such legislation would help to meet two of America's pressing needs. It would create useful jobs for the unemployed and seriously under-employed. It would also provide badly needed services in parks, schools, health care, recreational centers, libraries, public safety agencies, pollution control, conservation, public buildings and similar institutions in the government and private non-private sectors of the economy.

Indeed, a job-creation program, along these general lines, could already be working, if it weren't for a presidential veto of the Man-

power-Public Service Employment Bill in the closing days of 1970.

The veto was outrageous. It represented a shocking disregard for the plight of the unemployed as well as a denial of the pressing problems of state and local governments in providing needed services.

Studies for the Urban Coalition and the tripartite National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress have documented the existence of a huge job potential—as great as 5 million—in providing needed public services. These services to the public are not now available, because the state and local government agencies lack sufficient funds.

People hired under such a program would not displace those presently employed. They would be filling job vacancies which would not otherwise be filled. They would be adding to the nation's total employed workforce and expanding the nation's investment in public services.

There can be no doubt about the urgent need for job creation. Over five million Americans are out of work—an increase of 2.3 million in two years. And the prospects for substantial improvement in the near future are not good.

In fact, the tragic unemployment situation is far greater and more serious in human terms and the government's monthly statistics indicate. According to the Labor Department, 11.7 million Americans were unemployed at some time during 1969, the most recent information on the unemployment impact on people. About 2.6 million were without work for 15 weeks or more. And during the past 12 months of increasing unemployment, the figures are certainly considerably greater.

The creation of 500,000 public service jobs this year will not, in itself, solve the country's unemployment problem. However, its beneficial effects would multiply. Newly-hired workers and their families would spend their earnings, adding to sales, production and employment.

The dollar-cost of such a program will be offset by savings in welfare costs, the tax payments of employed workers and the social benefits generated by the productive employment of otherwise idle workers in expanding needed services to the public.

The job-potential exists. The unemployed are ready to go to work. All that is lacking is a federal program, with adequate funds.

The facts demand immediate action.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE RAY VOSS

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, death has taken one of the finest outdoor writers of our time. Ray Voss, outdoor editor of the Grand Rapids, Mich., Press and the Booth Newspapers of Michigan, died of a heart attack last Thursday night.

It is appropriate that Ray was at a dinner in Lansing, Mich., paying tribute to Gerald E. Eddy, director of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, when death occurred.

Ray was a man who truly loved the outdoors and was capable of transmitting a love of nature to others through his writing. He was most able and truly dedicated—a great guy.

Ray was honored many times for his writing in the field of conservation and

also for his nature photography. He had long been recognized as a topflight outdoor writer.

Ray Voss attended the schools in Ludington, Mich., where he was born. He received a degree in journalism from Marquette University. For 4 years he worked at the Ludington Daily News and then went to the Grand Rapids Herald in 1937 as outdoor editor.

When the Grand Rapids Herald ceased publication in 1959, Ray Voss joined the Grand Rapids Press outdoor staff. He became the Press' outdoor editor in 1964.

Mr. Speaker, my wife Betty and I extend our condolences to Mrs. Voss and the Voss family. The world of journalism and all who support the cause of conservation are poorer because of Ray Voss's death.

THE PRESIDENT ON VIETNAM, CAMBODIA, LAOS

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I would like to insert one of the most comprehensive statements on the situation in Southeast Asia which has been issued to date by the President. In his state of the world message President Nixon clearly spells out many of the factors which should be taken into account when considering the protracted conflict on the Southeast Asian front.

The President points out the fact that the enemy is posing the unconditional withdrawal of all U.S. forces as a precondition for negotiations and that acceptance of this precondition would leave nothing to negotiate. This seems to have slipped the minds of some of the more flamboyant critics of allied success and enemy loss.

The President also points out that the enemy plan for a coalition government in which they get to nominate one-third of the government and have veto power over the other two-thirds is simply a formula for a guaranteed Communist political takeover. The arrogance of the North Vietnamese in putting forth proposals of this nature show that they may not take us very seriously.

The success of the allied thrust into enemy held areas of Cambodia is detailed by the President and shows conclusively that taking the war to the enemy, fighting the enemy in those areas which he wishes to reserve for supply and training, eliminating the enemy's ability to carry on protracted operations in areas of his own choosing, is the way in which to save allied lives. For all those who are not banking on a North Vietnamese Communist victory this type of operation also shortens the war as it reduces the enemy's ability to prolong it. Let us never forget that it is the North Vietnamese Communists who have been aggressing against their neighbors, and not the other way around.

The plight of the American men being held by the enemy is also brought to the fore and the President's call for an immediate and unconditional release of all prisoners of war by both parties, allowing them to return to the place of their choice, is repeated. Nothing could be fairer than that. The Communists continued refusal of this generous offer shows that their regard for the prisoners is no higher than their regard for the lives of the South Vietnamese or Cambodian people whom they send their armies south to conquer; or for that matter, no higher than their regard for their own people which are sent south to die.

The President also sets forth his reasons for not seeking a military victory. I am in definite disagreement with him on this matter but it is extremely heartening to see that the reasons for not winning are brought forward and can now be the subject of serious debate. For it is not enough that Americans debate just two approaches to ending the war and omit discussion of what, up until now, has been the unmentionable option.

It has been my experience that many people are astounded when one mentions victory over the enemy. Debate in Congress, confined as it has been on how to limit allied activity rather than how to limit enemy activity, has undoubtedly contributed to this attitude. Discussions dealing with how soon should the United States surrender can only give the enemy hope and increase his intransigence. The enemy must rejoice when he receives his copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The President's statement follows:

INDOCHINA

VIETNAM

"There are many nations involved in the fighting in Indochina. Tonight, all those nations, except one, announce their readiness to agree to a cease-fire. The time has come for the Government of North Vietnam to join its neighbors in a proposal to quit making war and to start making peace." Address to the Nation, October 7, 1970.

"The allied sweeps into the North Vietnamese and Vietcong base areas along the Cambodia-South Vietnamese border:

"Will save American and allied lives in the future;

"Will assure that the withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam can proceed on schedule;

"Will enable our program of Vietnamization to continue on its current timetable;

"Should enhance the prospects for a just peace." Report to the Nation, June 30, 1970.

These passages concern the two most important events of our Indochina policy during 1970. The first refers to our initiative for a ceasefire-in-place throughout Indochina, the centerpiece of the comprehensive peace proposals that I set forth on October 7. These proposals could end the war rapidly for all participants through negotiations.

The second describes the purposes of the allied operations last spring against enemy bases in Cambodia which helped to assure the progress of Vietnamization and our withdrawal program. These operations were crucial to our effort to reduce our involvement in the war in the absence of negotiations.

The Cambodian operations have borne immediate fruit while our Indochina peace proposals have not yet done so. These two events thus symbolize what has been true in Vietnam since this Administration took office: The South Vietnamese have made great

progress in assuming the burdens of the war, a process which is in their hands and ours, but we have made little progress toward a negotiated peace, a process which requires Hanoi's participation.

After two years of the mandate by the American electorate, we can look back with satisfaction on the great distance we have travelled. This is my tenth major report on Indochina to the American people. The overall trend is consistent and unmistakable.

What we found and where we are

Understanding our purposes in Vietnam must begin with a look at the situation we found when we took office and the situation today. Let us compare them in concrete terms.

Two years ago the authorized troop strength for Americans in Vietnam was 549,500. Troop levels had risen steadily for five years. On January 1, 1971, that authorized level was 344,000, and on May 1, 1971, there will be a new ceiling of 284,000. Troop levels have dropped at a steady rate. The process will continue.

Two years ago American combat deaths for the previous twelve months were 14,561 and averaged 278 weekly. In 1969 the figures were 9,367 and 180, respectively. In 1970 they were 4,183 and 80; and indeed in the last six months they were 1337 and 51. The decline has been constant.

Two years ago the enemy could launch major offensives in most parts of Vietnam. The pacification program was just beginning to recover from the setbacks of the 1968 Tet offensive. Now the enemy mounts very few significant operations and is particularly quiescent in Military Regions III and IV in southern South Vietnam which contain two-thirds of the population. Pacification has made steady progress throughout these two years.

Two years ago there was no comprehensive allied peace plan for ending the war. Now, as the result of several initiatives by the Republic of Vietnam and ourselves, we have laid out a comprehensive and flexible framework for a negotiated settlement.

Two years ago the additional demands of the Vietnam War were costing us approximately 22 billion dollars per year. Today they are costing us approximately half that.

Two years ago the ratio of South Vietnamese forces to American forces in Vietnam was less than 2 to 1. Today it is more than 3½ to 1.

Two years ago the ratio of South Vietnamese to American major engagements with the enemy was about 7 to 1. Now it is about 16 to 1.

Two years ago there was no assurance that the South Vietnamese could undertake large-scale military operations on their own. Now, they have proven their ability to do so.

Two years ago the South Vietnamese constitutional system was just beginning to take hold. Since then the National Assembly and the Supreme Court have played increasingly meaningful roles, and there has been a series of elections at the province, village, and hamlet levels. Today, the political focus in South Vietnam for almost all forces except the Communists is within the established system.

Two years ago large areas of South Vietnam were unsafe and many routes impassable. Now, while there are still many dangerous pockets, the vast bulk of the country is secure.

This progress has been made possible largely by the efforts of the South Vietnamese. It is they who have compensated for the reduced U.S. effort. It is they who now carry the major part of the burden and are progressively taking on more.

In short, with assistance from us and other allies, the South Vietnamese have made their country the most dramatic and concrete example of the partnership principle of the Nixon Doctrine.

Our choices and our objectives

These facts show substantial advance. But to confine discussion of Vietnam to a recital of statistics, however impressive, would be inadequate, even irresponsible. While figures reflect policies, they do not fully define purposes.

Thus, this brief record of achievements is not meant to ignore the serious difficulties that remain. We do not intend to add to a painful record of prematurely optimistic assessments on Vietnam; we will discuss the problems and uncertainties as well as the advances.

The above record does recall the situation we inherited two years ago. I will not dwell on events leading up to January, 1969, but rather on the choices we had in selecting our course.

The conflict had been costly and frustrating for Americans and many believed that this Administration should move to end immediately either the conflict or American involvement in it.

Some urged that we escalate in an attempt to impose a military solution on the battlefield. We ruled out this approach because of the nature of the conflict and of the enemy, the costs of such a policy, the risks of a wider war, and the deeply held convictions of many of our people. Increased military pressure could not alone win a struggle that was in part guerrilla war as well as conventional invasion, and included political as well as military aspects. It would have entailed a greatly increased toll in lives, treasure and diplomatic objectives. It would have heightened the prospects of direct intervention by Hanoi's allies. It would have split apart our own society.

Others urged that we liquidate our presence immediately, cut our losses, and leave the South Vietnamese on their own. I have repeatedly explained why I considered this a disastrous path: For the South Vietnamese people, who would have lost their collective political choice and countless individual lives. For other non-Communist countries, especially in Asia, among whom not a single leader recommended such a policy. For the global credibility of the U.S. word. For those Americans who had made such heavy sacrifices. And for integrity of American society in the post-Vietnam era.

Thus we rejected both of these routes. Yet we knew that we could not continue previous policies which offered no hope for either peace or reduced American involvement.

We chose instead what we considered the most responsible course left to us. We sought above all a rapid negotiated solution to the conflict by progressively defining the terms of a settlement that would accommodate the legitimate interests of both sides. And in the absence of a settlement we sought, through Vietnamization, to shift American responsibilities to the South Vietnamese.

In charting this course we recognized the following realities:

The way we treated the most painful vestige of the previous era was crucial for a successful transition to a new foreign policy for a new era.

The other side which had fought for two decades would agree to a negotiated settlement only if the terms were generous, and the battlefield looked less promising than the conference table.

Progressive turnover of the burden to the Vietnamese themselves, however uncertain, was the only policy available once we had rejected the status quo, escalation and capitulation.

The support of the American people during the remainder of the conflict required a diminishing U.S. involvement.

The health of the American society after the conflict called for a solution that would not mock the sacrifices that had been made.

There has been one guiding principle, one irreducible objective, for both our negotia-

tions and Vietnamization. I stated it on May 14, 1969 and consistently since: "We seek the opportunity for the South Vietnamese people to determine their own political future without outside interference."

In our search for a negotiated solution we have stretched our positions toward those of the other side. But we have not agreed to their demand that we impose a political future on the South Vietnamese at the conference table.

In Vietnamization we have withdrawn our forces as rapidly as the South Vietnamese could compensate for our presence. But we have not withdrawn them so as to allow the North Vietnamese to impose a political future on the battlefield.

A peaceful settlement will remain our overwhelming preference. We will not give up our search. But in the meantime we will not let down our friends.

Our policy has not satisfied—and cannot satisfy—either those who believe in a military solution or those who press for an immediate end to our involvement. For the vast majority of Americans who prefer a just peace to capitulation, there is, of course, still room for debate and criticism. But we ask these Americans to recall the situation we found two years ago, to judge the soundness of our purposes, and to measure the record to date against these purposes. They can be sure that we shall keep our promises in the future, as we have kept them in the past.

Negotiations

From the outset our constant primary goal has been a negotiated end to the war for all participants. We would take no satisfaction in the fact that after U.S. involvement and casualties were ended, Vietnamese continued to fight Vietnamese.

However, it takes two sides to negotiate and Hanoi's attitude has been consistently intransigent. No progress has been made despite the advancement in 1970 of the two elements which might make the North Vietnamese consider negotiations to be in their interest:

The creation of conditions which give them incentive to turn to negotiations rather than protracted war—the tremendous drain on their manpower and resources, the growing strength of the South Vietnamese military forces and political system, and the continuing support of the American people for our Indochina policy.

The elaboration of our various proposals which are designed to make clear to the other side that they will have a fair chance for political power to the extent desired by popular will.

Since 1968 the U.S. has done almost everything that various parties—including Hanoi—told us would kindle negotiations. We halted the bombing and other acts of force against North Vietnam. We agreed to NFL participation in the Paris talks. We agreed to the principle of withdrawal and made initial withdrawals of American troops. We made substantial withdrawals, soon to total 265,000. We agreed in principle to remove all our troops. We took a series of de-escalatory steps, such as cutting back our B-52 and tactical air sorties. And we appointed a new senior negotiator in Paris.

These steps, except for the bombing halt, were unilateral measures, designed not only to reduce our involvement, but also to open the door to negotiations. Each of them was urged by the other side as a constructive contribution. None of them has generated movement by the other side.

In an effort to make progress in Paris, we have offered broad proposals for a negotiated solution to the war. On May 14, 1969, I proposed a plan which would remove all outside forces from South Vietnam and allow the people freely to decide their political future through internationally supervised elections. On July 11, 1969, President Thieu

invited the other side to participate in the political life of South Vietnam.

These proposals laid out the framework for what we believed would be a resolution of the conflict equitable to all parties. We recognized, however, that a political settlement was the heart of the matter; it is what the fighting has been all about. And we knew that the other side suspected the electoral process and doubted that it would have a fair chance at political power.

We thus moved to define more precisely the political solution we envisaged. On April 20, 1970, I set forth the principles that we think should govern a fair political settlement in South Vietnam:

A political solution must reflect the will of the South Vietnamese people and allow them to determine their future without outside interference.

A fair political solution should reflect the existing relationship of political forces within South Vietnam.

We will abide by the outcome of the political process agreed upon.

Having defined our principles on the central political issue, we looked for a comprehensive approach that might provide both the structure and stimulus for genuine negotiations. During the Cambodian operations I ordered a thorough review within the government of all possible initiatives that might engage the other side in meaningful dialogue. After summer long studies and meetings, on October 7, 1970, I presented a broad five-point peace plan with the concurrence of the governments of South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia:

An internationally supervised ceasefire in place throughout Indochina, governed by principles which would make it acceptable and credible to both sides. This was designed to stop the fighting at once and hopefully create new conditions and avenues for a negotiated settlement.

An Indochina Peace Conference. This reflected the facts that North Vietnamese forces were in Laos and Cambodia as well as Vietnam and that a stable peace in one required a stable peace in all.

The withdrawal of all American forces from South Vietnam on a timetable to be negotiated as part of an overall settlement. This was to make clear that we were prepared to remove all American troops.

A political settlement in South Vietnam based on the political principles I had stated on April 20. This was to reaffirm to the other side our willingness to search for a political process that would meet their concerns.

The immediate and unconditional release of all prisoners of war, journalists and other innocent civilian victims held by both sides. This was to underline our view that the prisoner issue was strictly humanitarian and need not await resolution of other problems.

Months of analytical work had laid the groundwork for the ceasefire proposal. We projected for a year into the future the possible developments on the ground under different ceasefire conditions. We deliberately recognized the other side's essential conditions. And we rejected ceasefire proposals that looked more advantageous for our side in security terms in order to place the greatest possible emphasis on negotiability.

In making our formal proposals and throughout the last two years we have emphasized, both privately and publicly, that we and the Republic of Vietnam would be flexible and generous once serious negotiations were under way.

The other side's constant response has been to demand that we unconditionally withdraw all U.S. forces and replace the leaders of the Republic of Vietnam with a coalition government. Their position is unacceptable to us on several counts.

First, the substance of their demands. They say nothing about what they will do

about North Vietnamese forces, when we believe the South Vietnamese should be free of all outside intervention. They ask us to impose a future on South Vietnam, when we believe the people should choose that future.

Secondly, their view of the negotiating process. The Communists pose their demands as *preconditions* to negotiations. If we were to pay this price there would be nothing left to negotiate.

Thirdly, the incompatibility of their demands. Even if we were to agree to their first demand and pull out unilaterally, we would have absolutely no incentive to agree to their second demand of assuring their political victory in South Vietnam. This would be their problem, not ours. It would be up to them to compete with the growing strength of the South Vietnamese.

Lastly, the Communist definition of a coalition government. Their definition makes a mockery of the concept itself. They prescribe that one-third of the coalition government would be from the NLF, one-third from those people in the "Saigon Administration" who stand for "peace, independence and neutrality," and one-third from other forces who also stand for these principles.

Since the Communists reserve the right to define the principles of "peace, independence and neutrality" and to decide which people support these principles, their proposal for a coalition government boils down to a demand that they nominate one-third of the government without restrictions and have a veto power over the other two-thirds. It is a formula for a guaranteed political takeover.

Thus, the issue is not, as some would have it, a question of a few personalities in the Saigon government standing in the way of a peaceful solution. The Communists seek not only the removal of the elected leaders of the present Government but the disruption of all organized non-Communist forces.

The fundamental question in the negotiations, in short, is the means of allocating political power in South Vietnam. The other side wants to negotiate in Paris an allotment of power that would assure their dominance. Our proposals call for a fair competitive process that would consult the will of the South Vietnamese people and reflect the existing relationship of political forces.

We recognize that finding an appropriate and equitable means of expressing South Vietnamese political will is a complex task. There is little guidance to be drawn from Vietnamese history. Nevertheless, if our adversaries ever make a political decision to negotiate seriously, I believe we could find a way to reach a solution fair for all parties. We know that after we leave, the other side will still be there. We know that for a settlement to endure all parties must want it to endure.

We remain prepared to make a major effort in the shaping of such a settlement.

VIETNAMIZATION

Although committed to a maximum effort to reach a negotiated end to the war, we needed an alternative.

For negotiations were not entirely in our hands. North Vietnamese history and doctrine did not make for encouraging prospects. Their calculus of the situation in South Vietnam, and more particularly in the United States, probably made them believe that time was on their side. And even if a settlement did come through negotiations, it might take a long period.

At home we did not have the option of continuing as we had—and the enemy knew it. So we chose a policy that we believed would gain the sustained support of the American people and thus give us a chance both to fulfill our objectives in Vietnam and to demonstrate to the other side that time was not necessarily with them. Such a policy seemed the only chance of giving the

South Vietnamese a fair chance and the best hope of inducing the North Vietnamese to negotiate.

Thus the alternative, and hopefully the spur, to negotiations, is Vietnamization that I have described on several occasions.

This policy fulfills our objective of reducing American involvement. It cannot, except over a long period, end the war altogether. Still, if Vietnamization leads to perpetuating the war, it is not by our design but because the other side refuses to settle for anything less than a guaranteed takeover.

In last year's report I described the successes of this program during its first months, and attempted to determine the depth and durability of this progress. We posed four central uncertainties for the future:

The enemy's capability to mount sustained operations and undo our gains.

The actual improvement in allied capabilities, particularly Vietnamese leadership, logistics, tactics, and political sensitivity.

The alternative strategies open to the enemy, including protracted warfare, in which they could wait out our withdrawals and then with reinvigorated efforts, once again seize the initiative.

Most importantly, the attitudes of the Vietnamese people toward both sides and the likelihood that pacification gains would stick.

These issues certainly cannot be resolved in one year. However, on all there was encouraging progress during 1970:

The enemy, partly because of strategy, but in great measure due to limited capability, did not mount sustained large-scale operations. This was partly the result of the Cambodian operations.

A marked improvement in South Vietnamese performance was shown repeatedly in large-scale operations both in Vietnam and in Cambodia, and in their increasing tactical and logistic skills.

The enemy chose a protracted warfare strategy. We still face the question of whether he might regain the initiative once the bulk of our forces have left, but the growing capabilities of the South Vietnamese must give Hanoi pause.

The attitude of the Vietnamese people remains crucial and difficult to judge, but rural security grew and pacification gains were sustained.

During 1970, concrete results of Vietnamization punctuated these trends. Our withdrawal program proceeded on schedule with the April 20 announcement of the withdrawal of another 150,000 Americans below the authorized ceiling, bringing total reductions since the start of Vietnamization to 265,500 by May 1, 1971. The very fact that we could project our withdrawals a year in advance was a sign of major progress.

As we have moved ahead with this program we have continued to confer not only with the South Vietnamese but also the other allies who have sent troops to help South Vietnam—Australia, Korea, New Zealand and Thailand.

South Vietnamese forces showed themselves increasingly capable of providing security for their country. There are now 1.1 million men bearing arms for the Government—200,000 more than in 1968. The continued strengthening of local and territorial forces freed more and more South Vietnamese regular units for combat against regular North Vietnamese Army units. The South Vietnamese accounted for a growing bulk of combat engagements. They took over more of our bases. They completely assumed naval operational responsibilities inside the country. And they substantially stepped up the role of their air forces, flying almost half the sorties in South Vietnam. More intangible, but equally significant, were their greatly increased self-confidence and initiative.

The level of fighting dropped greatly, especially in the southern portions of South Vietnam. And American casualties continued

their steady decline, a result of lesser enemy activity, fewer Americans, and the increased share of the combat burden picked up by the South Vietnamese.

Pacification

American withdrawal is the primary reflection of Vietnamization while pacification is its primary goal.

Our withdrawal program poses two fundamental issues. First, at what pace can we take out our forces? We base our decisions on the above considerations backed up by various studies, such as a recently completed analysis of the large unit war situation in each of South Vietnam's four military regions.

Then, how do we protect those forces who remain? We are confident that the steadily growing strength of the South Vietnamese and the impact of the sanctuary sweeps are sufficient to handle possible threats. Nevertheless, North Vietnam might try to take advantage of our redeployments by building up its strength in the South and launching new attacks. In this case, I have made clear on a dozen occasions that I would take strong and effective measures to prevent the enemy from jeopardizing our remaining forces.

The other important aspect of Vietnamization is pacification, which in broadest terms concerns the situation in the countryside—physical security, popular allegiance, and the military, administrative and political effectiveness of both sides. As the enemy's main force units have been pushed farther away from population centers, the task of extending governmental presence has become progressively easier.

In order to assess the progress in the countryside we developed a new indicator to measure the portions of population under Government control, under the influence of both sides, and under the control of the other side. The basic criteria are whether a hamlet has adequate defense and a fully functioning Government official resident both at day and at night. We devised tough and realistic measures of these two criteria.

In mid-1969 the indicator showed roughly 40% of the rural population under South Vietnamese control, 50% under the influence of both sides and 10% under the control of the other side. Recently these proportions were respectively 65%, 30% and 5%. When South Vietnam's urban population of six million, all under government control, is added to the over seven million rural population in that category, roughly 80% of the total population of South Vietnam is controlled by the Government.

This indicator cannot tell us precisely what is going on in the countryside. It does give us a good grasp of trends—and the trends have been favorable. We are confident that real and substantial progress has been made.

Honest observers can differ on quantitative measures of success in pacification; it is even more difficult to appraise such intangible factors as rural attitudes toward the central government and confidence in its ability to guide the country's affairs. But today more South Vietnamese receive governmental protection and services than at any time in the past six years.

Pacification progress has been slower, however, in certain key provinces in the northern half of South Vietnam, closer to the enemy's staging areas in North Vietnam and Laos. The supply bases in southern Laos perform the function of the destroyed sanctuaries in Cambodia. In these northern provinces the ravages of war have been more severe and the Communist infrastructure has been deeply rooted for over 20 years. Here especially the South Vietnamese Government must increase its efforts to develop capable forces and implement programs to gain the support of the rural population.

Cambodian sanctuary operations

Much of this accelerated progress in Vietnamization was due to the now indisputable military success of the allied operations against the enemy sanctuaries in Cambodia last spring.

The March 18 deposition of Prince Sihanouk caught us, as well as everyone else, completely by surprise. The situation that had existed in Cambodia, with the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong occupying a series of enclaves along the border, represented a troublesome but not insuperable obstacle to our efforts in South Vietnam. Our first reaction to Prince Sihanouk's removal was to encourage the negotiations which the Cambodian government was seeking with the Communists. However, Hanoi flatly refused such a course and rapidly spread out its forces to link up its base areas and pose a growing threat to the neutral government in Phnom Penh.

As I pointed out in my final report on the Cambodian operations, enemy actions during April and captured enemy documents unmistakably show their intentions. We faced the prospect of one large enemy base camp 600 miles along South Vietnam's flank; a solid supply route from the port of Sihanoukville through which most of the war materiel for the southern half of South Vietnam had come in the previous six years; and a vast staging and sanctuary area from which to attack allied forces in Vietnam with impunity. This would have meant increased enemy attacks, higher casualties among our men and our allies, and a clear threat to Vietnamization, the withdrawal program and the security of South Vietnam.

Our choice, though difficult, seemed the more necessary the longer we pondered it. If we wished to pursue the policy of turning over responsibilities to the South Vietnamese and withdrawing our troops, we had to clear out the enemy sanctuaries. The alternative was to allow the enemy to build up this threat without challenge, to increase his attacks and to raise allied casualties. This would sooner or later have confronted us with the choice of either halting our withdrawals, or continuing them but jeopardizing the lives of those remaining behind.

I preferred to make a difficult decision in April rather than magnifying our dilemma by postponement.

The results of our joint two-month operations with the South Vietnamese, and the subsequent sweeps of the sanctuaries by South Vietnamese forces, removed this threat. There were as well these positive results:

Greatly reduced American casualties; in the six months before the sanctuary operations the average weekly casualties were 93, in the six months after they were 51.

Extensive materiel and manpower losses for the enemy which they are taking a long time to replace.

The ending of the concept of immune Cambodian sanctuaries.

The dislocation of enemy supply lines and strategy in the Saigon and Mekong Delta regions; as a result the main forces war substantially ended for the southern half of the country during 1970.

Precluded the enemy from reopening his route of supply by sea.

Separation of Communist main force and guerrilla unit and a boost to pacification efforts in the southern half of the Republic of Vietnam.

Insurance that our troop withdrawals would continue.

Increased time for the South Vietnamese to strengthen themselves.

A tremendous lift in the morale and self-confidence of the South Vietnamese.

My decision to send U.S. ground forces into Cambodia, though clearly required because of these factors, was nevertheless anguishing because of the domestic reaction.

At the time those who urged an immediate

American pullout from Vietnam were joined in protest by some who generally support our phased withdrawals but misread the Cambodian operations as a return to a policy of escalation. I believed then that the impact of these actions—reduced enemy activity, lowered U.S. casualties, and continued withdrawals—would ultimately persuade some of the latter of the wisdom of our decision.

While many Americans may still disagree with that decision, I think the facts since June 30 have conclusively demonstrated not only the tactical success of the operations but also their strategic purpose of reducing American involvement in Vietnam.

Political and economic issues

Vietnamization has political and economic dimensions in addition to military ones. They will become increasingly important as the war winds down.

Political development in any newly independent country is a challenging task. When that country is under fire from a determined enemy, the difficulties are multiplied. The government sees its first priority as providing security. Military considerations are likely to dominate the time of officials, the content of programs, and the freedom of political life.

Nevertheless, political development in a paramilitary conflict is a crucial ingredient of a government's effort. It is increasingly important in Vietnam as the military struggle subsides. Ultimately, the fate of Vietnam will turn on political factors—the motivation of the people during the conflict; the cohesion of non-Communist political forces in a possible electoral competition with the Communists; the solidity of the political institutions during and after the war.

There has been a steady political evolution in South Vietnam beginning with the election of a Constitutional Assembly in 1966 and of the President and National Assembly in 1967. In 1970 there were continued signs of a growing commitment to the political institutions established by the 1967 Constitution. Elections for hamlet chiefs and for Village, Municipal and Provincial Councils took place throughout the country. There were also elections for half the seats in the Upper House which attracted a wide spectrum of non-Communist political forces.

1970 saw enactment of Land-to-the-Tiller legislation, a sweeping land reform program which will give land to tenant farmers and could have significant political impact. It has our full support.

The Presidential and Lower House elections this year will further test the fabric of the constitutional system, the strengths of the various political factions and the allegiance of the people. 1971 will show the extent of political development in South Vietnam. Vietnamese people of all factions will judge the responsiveness of the political process and register their verdicts. The enemy will seek to exploit the political currents of an election year. But it will also be watching—and perhaps drawing conclusions from—the stability of the system.

The maintenance of a sound South Vietnamese economy is crucial for Vietnamization. This problem was of great concern in 1970 but the Government moved on it with some encouraging results.

Our extensive review of the economic situation in July, 1970, made it abundantly clear that the key Vietnamization goals of constructive political change and increased South Vietnamese military performance were intimately linked to the goal of a sound economy.

Prices rose by over fifty percent in the twelve months up to mid-1970. These increases were eroding the purchasing power of the already near-subsistence pay received by many soldiers and civil servants at the very time they were being tasked with the growing burdens of Vietnamization. Moreover, if inflation had continued, the eco-

nomic security of other major groups, such as farmers, veterans, and urban workers, could have been jeopardized.

In the fall of 1970 the South Vietnamese Government took strong fiscal and monetary actions, including an important reform of the exchange rate. These difficult steps, supplemented by a slight increase in our assistance to offset the increased budgetary costs of Vietnamization, dramatically arrested an accelerating inflation. The price level rose by only about four percent in the last half of the year, setting the stage for policies that can lead to more enduring economic stability.

There are two lessons to be drawn from these developments:

First, Vietnamization of the economy and the war cannot be accomplished at the same time without our economic assistance. As the South Vietnamese take on more of the fighting they divert more resources from internal production. Our assistance, by providing the external resources to help maintain internal levels of consumption for soldiers, farmers and workers, is a vital aspect of Vietnamization. We will provide external support commensurate with the military burden borne by the economy and people in this difficult period of transition.

Second, we can do no more for the Vietnamese economy than it does for itself. The enterprise and resourcefulness of the Vietnamese people are widely acknowledged. Thus, as demonstrated in 1970, the vital link between our assistance and a sound economy is the Vietnamese Government's economic policy. We will continue to expect the Government to take all reasonable self-help measures.

While we provide assistance to support Vietnamization, we are looking towards the time when the economy can become self-sufficient. The date depends not only on the course of the war but on the pace of economic development. The country's potential is great. For example, even as the war has continued, increasing domestic rice production will cause rice imports to decline from over 700,000 annual tons in the late 1960's to about 100,000 tons in 1971 and zero in 1972. Together with the South Vietnamese we are analyzing the development prospects and plan to begin discussions this year on measures, to include additional funding, that can be taken to hasten the process. We believe other countries will want to participate in this effort.

We look forward to the day when the peoples of Vietnam, South and North, can turn from the waste of war to the constructive tasks of peace.

Prisoners of war

We have the deepest concern for the plight of our prisoners of war in Indochina. Some 1600 Americans, including pilots and soldiers and some 40 civilians, are missing or held in North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Some have been held as long as six years, longer than for any other prisoners of war in our history.

The enemy violates specific requirements of the Geneva Prisoner of War Convention, by which they are bound. They violate common standards of decency as well.

They have not permitted impartial inspection of prison camps despite constant attempts to arrange such visits. They have refused to repatriate seriously sick and wounded prisoners. They have failed to identify all prisoners and to allow many of them to correspond with their families.

We and the South Vietnamese have made intensive efforts this past year to secure better treatment and the release of allied prisoners—through global diplomacy, through proposals in Paris and through the courageous raid at Son Tay. Congressional expressions have been valuable in underlining American public concern. The world increasingly condemned the other side's practices,

and the U.N. General Assembly passed a resolution this fall which underscored the international obligation to treat prisoners humanely.

I repeat my October 7 proposal for the immediate and unconditional release of all prisoners of war held by both sides. All prisoners, journalists and other civilian captives should be released now to return to the place of their choice. Such action would not only meet humanitarian concerns; it might also lead to progress on other aspects of a peace settlement.

As first steps, the Republic of Vietnam, with our support, has offered to repatriate all sick and wounded prisoners of war. It has unilaterally returned groups of such prisoners, despite North Vietnam's refusal to make orderly arrangements for their repatriation. And it has proposed the release of all North Vietnamese prisoners of war in return for all U.S. and allied prisoners in Indochina and any South Vietnamese prisoners held outside South Vietnam. We profoundly regret the other side's refusal to respond to these initiatives.

The treatment of prisoners of war anywhere is not a political or military issue, but a matter of simple humanity. As I said on October 7:

"War and imprisonment should be over for all these prisoners. They and their families have already suffered too much."

This government will continue to take all possible measures to secure the end of imprisonment as well as the end of the war.

No discussion of Vietnam would be complete without paying tribute to the brave Americans who have served there. Many have sacrificed years of their lives. Others have sacrificed life itself.

These Americans have fought in a war which differed from our previous experience. We have not sought a traditional military victory. The complex nature of this conflict posed unprecedented difficulties for those involved.

It is to their lasting credit that Americans in Vietnam have overcome these difficulties and conducted themselves in our best tradition.

Problems for the future

There are sobering problems still remaining in Vietnam:

Enemy Capabilities and Intentions. Despite heavy losses, the North Vietnamese have the manpower, the logistical network and the dedication to continue fighting if they wish. Although their main force units have been greatly reduced, they still pose a considerable threat, especially in Military Regions I and II in South Vietnam. Hanoi could instead use its buildup of forces in South Laos and Northeastern Cambodia to step up its pressures against the Cambodian government or to increase its hold on Cambodian territory. In any event, Communist terrorist activities, assassinations, and kidnappings continue to exact a tragic toll from the Vietnamese people.

The Vietnamization Process. Vietnamization made very encouraging advances during 1970. The fundamental question remains: can the South Vietnamese fully stand on their own against a determined enemy? We—and more importantly the South Vietnamese—are confident that they can. Substantial problems remain, however: improving the leadership of South Vietnamese forces at all levels enhancing their ability to take on support as well as combat functions; providing assistance to Cambodia and bettering Vietnamese-Cambodia understanding; rooting out the Viet Cong infrastructure in the countryside; assuring political stability in the cities; managing the strains on the Vietnamese economy as we continue to Vietnamize other aspects of the conflict; and moving against corruption which not only poisons the moral atmosphere but also carries potential political im-

pact. This is a formidable agenda, but South Vietnamese accomplishments to date demonstrate their capacity to deal with it.

The Negotiating Stalemate. Our intensive efforts in 1970 failed to yield progress in the Paris negotiations. We frankly expected that our elaboration of political principles, the appointment of Ambassador Bruce, and the October 7 peace initiative would produce some movement from the other side. We will not give up on negotiations, though the past year indicated that it will be extremely difficult to overcome the enemy's mix of doctrine, calculations and suspicion. There is the additional fact that as our forces decline, the role we can play on many aspects of a settlement is also bound to decline.

The substantial record of achievement in the first two years of this Administration cannot obscure one fundamental fact—the fighting continues.

If winding down the war is my greatest satisfaction in foreign policy, the failure to end it is my deepest disappointment. We will not be content until all conflict is stilled. This sentiment was the driving force behind our proposal for a cease fire. It is at the core of our policy, for as I said on April 20:

"The death of a single man in war, whether he is an American, a South Vietnamese, a Viet Cong, or a North Vietnamese, is a human tragedy. That is why we want to end this war and achieve a just peace. We call upon our adversaries to join us in working at the conference table toward that goal."

I once again ask the other side to work for a settlement that will stop the fighting, meet the concerns of all parties, and last because all want it to last.

LAOS AND CAMBODIA

"The war in Indochina has been proved to be of one piece; it cannot be cured by treating only one of its areas of outbreak."—Address by the President, October 7, 1970.

Enduring peace will come for Vietnam only when there is peace for its neighbors.

Hanoi has made the war an Indochina conflict. In South Vietnam there are some 100,000 North Vietnamese troops. In Laos there are about 90,000. In Cambodia there are over 50,000 North Vietnamese and Viet Cong. These troops challenge the legitimate governments of Laos and Cambodia, and they menace South Vietnam from within and without.

The situations in Laos and Cambodia are comparable:

Neither one poses any threat to North Vietnam.

North Vietnam, nevertheless, has for years been violating their neutrality and independence, guaranteed in international accords which Hanoi and its allies signed.

In both countries North Vietnamese regular troops strip away any pretense of civil war. In Laos indigenous Pathet Lao play an insignificant military role while in Cambodia only small numbers of Cambodians help the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong.

In both countries Hanoi has two aims. First, and primarily, to use them as infiltration routes, staging bases, and sanctuaries for attacks against South Vietnam. Secondly, to erode governmental control in order to aid their efforts in South Vietnam and perhaps take over Laos and Cambodia themselves.

U.S. policy

This canvas poses two fundamental questions for the United States:

What should be our policy toward Laos and Cambodia as countries under external attack?

How do we deal with the major implications for our policy in South Vietnam?

North Vietnam's aggression against Laos and Cambodia and its violation of the 1954 and 1962 Geneva Agreements are important. We care about the preservation of international agreements and the independence of

these nations. But our immediate concern is that North Vietnam uses them as springboards for assaults on a country where we have a firm commitment, have invested lives, treasure, and prestige, and have Americans to protect as we progressively withdraw. Furthermore, if Hanoi were to gain control of Laos and Cambodia, a large portion of the more than 140,000 Communist troops now engaged in these countries would be freed to fight in South Vietnam.

As we pursued our policy of Vietnamization and negotiation for Vietnam we could not ignore these unavoidable facts on its flank. Our basic choices for Laos and Cambodia became:

To seek diplomatic settlements for both countries, either as part of an all-Indochina arrangement or separately.

To provide military support both to Laos and Cambodia and to South Vietnamese defensive operations, without U.S. ground combat involvement.

We have always wished to stabilize the borders of South Vietnam and to insure the neutrality of its neighbors by diplomatic means. My October 7 peace initiative, supported by the three governments, proposed for all of Indochina:

A ceasefire to stop the fighting.

An international conference to seal the peace.

The immediate release of all prisoners of war.

This comprehensive approach came against a background of consistent efforts to reach diplomatic solutions. From the outset, this Administration has continued American support for the efforts of Prime Minister Souvanna Phouma to reconstitute the 1962 Geneva Agreements guaranteeing his country's neutrality, independence and territorial integrity. In Cambodia we long tolerated a difficult military situation and encouraged negotiations when Prince Sihanouk was removed.

Arguments for Military Victory

To date, Hanoi has rejected diplomacy and spread the conflict. The Lao government for many years, and the Cambodian government this year, have turned to us and others for assistance.

These developments left us with the choice between military options. After our one-time sweep against the Communist bases in Cambodia, we have ruled out American ground combat troops in either Laos or Cambodia for several reasons. Our fundamental Vietnam-related objectives are served by other means. In any event, we believe that the two governments can survive through their own efforts, our various kinds of assistance, and that of other friends. We look to them to shoulder the primary combat responsibilities for their own defense.

Moreover, the enemy has its own problems. Despite its ability and willingness to pour thousands of troops into all three countries, North Vietnam faces certain limits imposed by manpower drain and long supply lines. Lack of indigenous support in Laos and Cambodia severely hampers Communist troop movements. And we do not assume that Hanoi's allies want Laos and Cambodia removed from the map of Southeast Asia.

Thus we did not oppose Congressional restrictions this past year on the use of U.S. ground combat forces in those countries, even though we had strong reservations about the principle of circumscribing executive authority.

Instead of deploying our troops we have helped those countries help themselves. In Cambodia, South Vietnam's preemptive thrusts have been crucial for their mutual defense.

Three arguments are raised against these South Vietnamese operations outside their borders:

That they spread South Vietnamese forces thin. On the contrary, by striking against

the enemy's supply system and reducing the border threat, these actions contract the territory that the South Vietnamese army must defend. The alternative of inviolate enemy sanctuaries along a front of 600 miles would stretch South Vietnamese forces much more severely.

That South Vietnam is expanding the war. Its troops have gone only where the North Vietnamese have been entrenched and violating one country's territory to attack another. It is Hanoi which expanded the war years ago.

That our support of the South Vietnamese will draw us into wider war. If we are to reduce our involvement in Indochina, we must shield our withdrawals by backing these sweeps against potential threats. At a time when we are cutting our military presence in one country we are naturally reluctant to send troops into neighboring ones—on grounds both of strategy and American domestic support. It would make little sense for us, while withdrawing hundreds of thousands of ground combat troops from Vietnam, to reintroduce a few into Laos or Cambodia.

The arguments against South Vietnam's defensive actions suggest that Hanoi has the right—without provocation and with complete immunity—to send its forces into Laos and Cambodia, threaten their governments, and prepare to bring its full strength to bear on South Vietnam itself.

The choice for South Vietnam is not between limiting and expanding the war. It is between what it is doing in self-defense and passively watching the menace grow along its borders.

In time the combined populations of 28 million in South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, with assistance from their regional partners, should more than balance the resources of North Vietnam, with its population of 20 million. During this transition period, however, our own defensive supporting actions are important. Let me briefly review them.

CAMBODIA

In Cambodia we pursued the policy of the previous Administration until North Vietnamese actions after Prince Sihanouk was deposed made this impossible.

In the previous chapter on Vietnam I briefly recalled the background and results of the allied sweeps against the Communist sanctuaries which were so vital to Vietnamization. With the operations concluded, our policy for Cambodia took shape as follows:

No U.S. ground combat personnel in the country, and no U.S. advisors with Cambodian units.

Air missions against enemy supplies and personnel that pose a potential threat to South Vietnam or seek to establish base areas relevant to Vietnam.

Military assistance to the Cambodian Government in amounts and types suitable for their army.

Encourage other countries of the region to give diplomatic assistance.

Encourage and support the efforts of third countries who wish to furnish troops or material.

The loss of the use of Sihanoukville, as well as the base areas, was a serious setback for Hanoi. For many years almost all North Vietnamese supplies for Military Regions III and IV in South Vietnam passed through the port. Accordingly, during the latter part of 1970 the North Vietnamese stepped up their efforts to reestablish sanctuaries and their attacks on the Cambodian Government. They sought either to reopen their supply lines to southern South Vietnam or to install by force a government in Phnom Penh that would accomplish the same purpose. They failed to do either but they posed significant threats.

To deny them renewed use of these assets we helped the Cambodians defend themselves and we supported South Vietnamese operations. Substantially greater military and economic assistance was needed to support the Cambodian army, which was growing from some 40,000 to over 200,000 in a very short period of time. The quarter billion dollars that Congress appropriated as part of the foreign assistance supplemental recognized that Cambodia was facing outright aggression, that it was doing everything possible on its own, and that our assistance was appropriate for its self-defense and to aid Vietnamization and our withdrawals from South Vietnam.

This past year there were also encouraging signs of regional cooperation:

The South Vietnamese, at Cambodia's request, continued to sweep the sanctuary areas, conduct ground operations in support of Cambodian forces, and provide air and logistic support and training.

Other Asian countries, such as Thailand, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, and the Republic of China, supplied various forms of assistance.

Eleven Asian nations met on their own initiative at Djakarta last spring and sought through diplomatic means to preserve Cambodia's neutrality and independence.

Cambodia is, in short, a concrete illustration of Nixon Doctrine principles:

Assumption of primary responsibility for its own defense.

Help from regional friends.

Our support through military and economic assistance.

The objective of all our activities related to Cambodia remains constant: to bar the reestablishment of secure Communist base areas that could jeopardize allied forces in Vietnam. Together with the South Vietnamese, we are trying to prevent the enemy from building up their capabilities for major offensives. Our aim is to destroy their supplies and disrupt their planning for assaults on allied forces in South Vietnam. Communist movements may require fluctuations in the level of our air activities as well as our increased material assistance. They will not deflect us from our overall course of phased withdrawal from Indochina.

LAOS

On March 6, 1970, I gave the first comprehensive accounting of our activities in Laos that has ever been made to the American people. I traced the pattern of subversion and then invasion by North Vietnam. I reviewed U.S. efforts under previous administrations to help the legitimate government. When we took office, there had already been a U.S. military assistance program for six years and increasing U.S. air operations for four.

Since early 1963 the North Vietnamese have in effect conducted two wars in Laos. In the north they have kept up constant pressure against the neutralist government established in 1962 at their own urging. In the south they have occupied and fortified the Ho Chi Minh Trail area to attack South Vietnam.

In the face of these continuing North Vietnamese actions, we believed that the U.S. role we inherited remained important. Our material aid and air operations in the north were needed to support the Royal Lao Government and preserve the 1962 Geneva Agreements. In the south, Vietnamization called for continued air strikes against the enemy to protect allied forces. Since 1965 at least 630,000 North Vietnamese troops have streamed down the Trail. They have brought with them more than 400,000 weapons, over 100 million pounds of ammunition, and at least 200 million pounds of food.

Our defensive and supportive policy was outlined in the March 6 statement:

No American ground combat forces.

Minimum American presence.

Military assistance for regular and irregular Lao forces when requested by the Lao government.

Reconnaissance flights and air operations to interdict North Vietnamese troops and supplies on the Ho Chi Minh Trail.

Logistic and air support for Lao forces when requested by the government.

Within this framework we have maintained our military aid and air operations during the past year in response to increased North Vietnamese levels of infiltration and aggression.

Southern Laos became critical for Hanoi after the allied Cambodian operations deprived it of the port of Sihanoukville and the border sanctuaries. They swelled their forces in the area by more than 25,000, captured the towns of Saravane and Attapeu, and intensively built up their supplies and their logistics network. Whereas for years southern Laos had been central to Hanoi's operations in northern South Vietnam, at the end of 1970 it was becoming the hub and crossroads of Hanoi's campaigns throughout Indochina. Almost all of its men and supplies were now flowing through this area.

The strategic principles that applied to the enemy's bases in Cambodia were valid as well for southern Laos. Hanoi deepened the area's part in the Vietnam war, with direct implications for Vietnamization and our withdrawals.

The prospects

We do not underestimate the difficulties ahead for Laos and Cambodia. Hanoi has intensified the war on these fronts and its focus is likely to remain there in the coming months.

The Lao government has already demonstrated determination to preserve its independence in the face of overt aggression, diplomatically if possible, militarily if necessary. The Cambodians also have the essential ingredients for success—national unity, maximum self-help and the support of friends. The country's small, unprepared army is gaining both in size and ability, and the spirit of its people continues to inspire all observers. We can expect major testing of Cambodia over the coming months, but we believe that time is on its side.

Our future policy in Laos and Cambodia will follow the lines we have established. We face some very serious problems:

At the conference table. Even if Hanoi were to negotiate genuinely about Vietnam, difficult issues remain concerning its neighbors: the removal of North Vietnamese and Viet Cong troops, the securing of South Vietnam's borders, and the reestablishment of the Geneva Agreements.

On the battlefield. Enemy intentions and capabilities in Indochina will pose some hard choices about the deployment of allied troops as we pursue our own withdrawals. While North Vietnamese activities have subsided in South Vietnam, some of their 60,000 troops massed in southern Laos could move into South Vietnam, or into Cambodia or against northern Laos. In Cambodia we can expect sustained enemy thrusts against the government.

In the United States. We will have the continuing responsibility of explaining the purpose and extent of our activities in Laos and Cambodia. North Vietnamese actions could require high levels of American assistance and air operations in order to further Vietnamization and our withdrawals.

I will continue to do what is necessary to protect American men as they leave Vietnam. Throughout I will keep the American people and the Congress fully informed.

THE HEROIN PROBLEM

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 24, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I placed the summary of the plenary session and the panel sessions on protection and correction from the fifth annual Community Leadership Conference in the RECORD. The topic of the conference was, "Safe Streets: A Priority Goal." Certainly the problem of heroin is a major element of this whole discussion and I include in the RECORD at this point a summary of the two panels which addressed themselves to this topic:

PANEL IIA: THE HEROIN PROBLEM
INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS

Chairman: Dr. Lewis Hyde, the Provost of New York University, Heights Campus.

Panelists: Congressman Edward Koch; Hon. A. E. Karasapan, Counselor of the Turkish Embassy in Washington, D.C.; Mr. Harvey R. Wellman, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Narcotics Matters; and Hon. Daniel Hartwig, a representative of the French National Police working in the U.S. with narcotics officials (Mr. Hartwig could not attend the Conference, but he submitted a statement to be read during this panel discussion.)

Reporter: Miss Sheelagh Perry.

Dr. Hyde in introducing the panel noted that one of the key ingredients in effecting "safe streets" is to solve the drug problem and specifically heroin addiction. To solve this problem it is vital to consider the international aspects.

The first speaker was Congressman Edward Koch whose remarks are summarized in the following:

There is a failure of the major countries involved in the heroin problem to meet their responsibilities. The facts are clear enough. It is estimated that over 35,000 children in the U.S. high schools are addicts—up to 200,000 total addicts in the U.S. with an estimated 75,000 to 125,000 in New York City alone. It is a fact that heroin is not produced in the United States. We need to stop heroin from coming into this country. Where does it come from? It is reported that approximately 80% of the heroin sold in this country originates in the poppy fields of Turkey. It is then sent to France to be processed into heroin, after which it is smuggled into the U.S. According to Mr. John Ingersoll, Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs of the U.S. Justice Department, 90% of the heroin smuggled into this country arrives undetected. Turkey permits the legal growth of the poppy for medical reasons, but unfortunately a substantial part of the "legal" growth ends up in illicit markets.

Last year the Turkish Government had twenty-one provinces in which the poppy was allowed to grow. Under U.S. pressure this number was reduced to seven. I ask: Why should the government allow even this much to be produced? I was told that if the Turkish Government abolished poppy growing, then the Government might fall. My answer is "I really don't care." If this is the basis of the Turkish Government, then it deserves to fall.

I co-sponsored legislation introduced by Congressman Rodino to encourage governments to stop the illicit export of raw and processed heroin by threatening to cut off U.S. foreign aid to the countries involved unless they do everything they can to help eliminate this trade. The United States gives some \$40 million in foreign aid to Turkey, \$3 million in subsidies to Turkish farmers

not to grow the poppy. The Rodino proposal, which passed the House as an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act but failed in the Senate, would have forced governments like Turkey to really stop this illicit traffic.

France is not doing an adequate job in this regard either, but unfortunately the United States has no aid to cut off. Marseilles is the center of the processing and exporting of the illicit heroin. Some arrests are being made in France but not enough.

Of course the United States is not doing such a great job either. We all have read about corrupt police who engage in the selling of heroin and have connections with the Mafia. The difference is that our Government does not condone this activity. In France—yes! In Turkey—yes! Reports indicate that Narcotics Bureau Director Ingersoll fired thirty-eight members of the Narcotics squad for involvement in illegal heroin traffic and Governor Rockefeller had to fire four State troopers in the City of New York for the same thing.

Director Ingersoll, in a recent letter to me, talked of new French cooperation on the heroin problem and a material change in their attitude. They have added 100 new officers to their narcotics detail and are working closely with the United States. A protocol between the two nations is expected to be formulated early next year.

Mr. Harvey R. Wellman, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Narcotics Matters, was the next panelist to speak. Dr. Hyde, in introducing Mr. Wellman, noted that he is a career Foreign Service Officer serving in a position which didn't exist fifteen months ago. This points up the concern of the United States Government about the heroin problem. Dr. Hyde said, and its pledge to do everything possible to solve it. A summary of Mr. Wellman's remarks follows:

The heroin problem in the United States causes a great deal of suffering and our Government is gravely concerned about it.

What is our Government doing to bring the heroin problem under control? It is pertinent to recall at this point Congressman Bingham's remark that for complex problems (such as the heroin problem) there are no easy or simple solutions. "I endorse that." When we talk about fighting the drug abuse problem, we are talking about the whole problem including not only heroin but also other dangerous drugs such as cocaine, marijuana, hashish, amphetamines, barbiturates, L.S.D., etc. They all must be brought under control. Other countries are finding the psychotropics (L.S.D., "speed," "sleepers," etc.) more threatening to their population than the opiates.

The drug abuse problem is not only a national problem; it is an international one. The opium poppy has been grown from time immemorial from the Middle East through South Asia to Southeast Asia. Legal world opium production which is needed for medical purposes is about 1100 metric tons. This legal production is under effective international control. Illegal opium production is estimated at between 1200 and 1400 metric tons. This is the source we need to control or eliminate. The critical source for us is in the Middle East, but the poppy is also grown in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Southeast Asia, Burma, Laos, and Thailand. If the supply is cut off from the present greatest source of heroin for the U.S. market, namely Turkey, then the illegal traffic will turn to these other sources of supply.

Most of the U.S. supply of heroin is processed from opium gum into morphine base in the Middle East from where it is smuggled into Europe and converted into heroin in simple clandestine laboratories. The heroin is then smuggled into the United States through Canada, South America or Mexico. We can intercept only about one-

tenth of this heroin traffic. The better solution is to eliminate it at its source and at the same time to try to reduce demand by treatment of present addicts, and to prevent new addicts by education.

It is a tough problem to control internationally a commodity which is needed as well as abused. Medical science has as yet found no effective synthetic substitute for certain opium derivatives. There also is the problem that opium growing is traditional in certain cultures and in certain countries is outside government control. The heroin problem cries out for international cooperation.

What is our Government doing? We are working in the United States, bilaterally, with certain countries and internationally—using every possible channel—to bring the heroin problem under control. On the domestic scene, the Federal Government, under the new "Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970," is attacking the problem on all fronts: supply, demand and the underlying causes. We have a national responsibility to face up to the problem. Bilaterally and internationally we must work to intensify cooperation to intercept this illegal traffic. This cooperation is critical if we are to stop the supply. We have cooperation from the French, Mexican, and Canadian Governments and are working closely with the Turkish Government. We have established a cooperative understanding of our problem. The United States must also work within the framework of international control mechanisms under treaties and within international organizations. The drug abuse problem is a world problem and all countries need to move together. A case in point is the U.S. effort within the U.N. The U.S. initiated action for a Special U.N. Fund for Drug Abuse Control. The U.N. Economic and Social Council recently approved the establishment of the Special Fund as well as an intensified international drug control program to include immediate measures as well as a long term approach to get at the basic causes of drug abuse. The United States has pledged \$2 million to start that fund.

The next speaker was Hon. A. E. Karasapan, Counselor at the Turkish Embassy in Washington. A summary of his remarks follows:

Those of us in the Embassy in Washington recognize the addiction problem in the United States and the Turkish Government is trying to do something about it. Mr. Koch noted that last year, opium poppies were grown in twenty-one Turkish provinces. This is just not the fact. In the last two decades Turkey has gradually but steadily reduced the number of provinces where opium can legally be grown from over 40 to seven. The Turkish Government is fully aware of the seriousness of the problem and, to further stop the illegal export, has confined the legal growing to the interior provinces, away from the frontiers and from seaports. I would like to make it clear that the Turkish Government is doing this on its own, not because of any pressure from the Government of the United States. The Turkish Government has also submitted to the Parliament a new draft law requiring a license for opium cultivation which would assign quotas to farmers in accordance with area cultivated.

As Mr. Wellman of the State Department is aware, heroin abuse is not a simple problem. The crop can be grown anywhere in the East and the countries surrounding Turkey do grow the poppy although they refuse to admit it. The countries that grow it legally are Turkey, the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia and India. In Turkey some 90,000 people earn part of their living from opium growing and it has been growing on their land for six or seven centuries. In Turkey there is no problem of addiction. The poppy seed is used for cooking oil and the remaining plant is used for fodder. Not many plants can grow in the soil of the Turkish plateau. The opium poppy

grows easily. The Turkish Government admits that a large amount of what is grown is illegally exported, but controlling this is a matter of cooperation among nations. If you pressure a Government by threatening to cut off aid, the result will be negative feelings which will prevent cooperation.

Hon. Daniel Hartwig, a representative of the French National Police working in the United States, unable to attend the Conference had his statement read by Dr. Hyde. A summary follows:

The status of France and of Western Europe in the international drug traffic depends on the drug involved and its use on a world-wide scale. In speaking of heroin, France is one main route of traffic from the Middle East, specifically Turkey, to the United States. Opium production is officially controlled but a large amount of it is diverted to the illegal market by farmers. To be used by addicts, the raw opium must be processed first into morphine base and then processed and purified into heroin. This processing, though not a complex operation, requires good knowledge of chemistry, minimum apparatus, electric power and water supply. All of these items, if extensively used in an underdeveloped country, would draw the attention of authorities to the processors as well as the purchase of large amounts of necessary basic products in the processing such as acetic anhydride. One kilo of base morphine when processed gives one kilo of heroin. The clandestine labs are most of the time in rather isolated houses in the countryside in areas where the traffickers are settled.

If France is involved in these activities, it is because of her geographical situation: French harbours are at the end of the Mediterranean lines and at the head of the transatlantic lines. France is not the exclusive transit country. Almost any Western European country can be and sometimes is used, but unfortunately heroin processed in France is considered of excellent quality by both traffickers and addicts. Once processed, heroin is packed into half kilo plastic bags and shipped to the United States through conveyers who are most imaginative in finding the safest way to carry the merchandise. The various means of hiding heroin as well as the speed of transportation has made it extremely difficult for law enforcement agents to intercept it. The creation and improvement of new roads from the Near East to Western Europe complicates the problem.

France, realizing the dangers that the abuse of dangerous drugs, notably among young people, poses for our society and the urgent need to remedy this situation, supports all initiatives in this respect both for reasons of internal order and to assist in international cooperation. Drug addiction, which was not a serious problem in France until now, has recently appeared among our young people. Consequently, the Government has been obliged to take a number of measures since the summer of 1969 to intensify the fight against trafficking. In all major French cities, specialized groups have been set up at all police headquarters to deal with the suppression of addiction and to help in the fight against drug traffic. The police squads specializing in narcotics control have been considerably augmented. Various branches of the police have had special instruction to prepare them for more direct participation in the general effort—i.e. training in the detection and surveillance of addicts. Furthermore Parliament is now considering a bill which would double the penalties for traffickers and institute a system of care for addicts who are able to be treated.

France is not indifferent to the international traffic which, in part, crosses her territory. We have committed ourselves to participate on the international level in the fight against drug trafficking, especially by strengthening cooperation between the vari-

ous authorities responsible for international narcotics control.

After these opening remarks, were completed, there was a question and answer session among the panelists:

Dr. HYDE. I would like to know what the U.S. State Department's position was on the proposal passed by the House to cut off aid to those countries not doing enough to cut the heroin traffic.

Mr. WELLMAN's response. The Department of State while understanding the motivation for this proposal recommended against it because it was believed the international cooperation needed to stop the illegal heroin traffic would be damaged by threats to cut off aid. The Rodino amendment was not considered to be the best way to secure the cooperation required from other countries. The issue was one of tactics not objectives.

Mr. KOCH. Getting back to the opening remarks, I disagree with Mr. Karasapan. Pressure is needed on reluctant countries and the United States should use every means within its power to stop the drug traffic. Turkey knows a substantial part of the poppies grown in their country is used for illicit purposes. Why should this be tolerated? This illicit traffic is contributing to deaths in this country—deaths of our young people and 80% of the heroin is coming from Turkey! Why is it our problem what happens to the Turkish Government if opium growing is abolished? My problem is that people are dying because of the Turkish Government's slow pace at bringing the traffic under control and the U.S. is contributing to these deaths with its foreign aid. The United States has to use all the pressure it can to force the Turkish Government to stop the growing of opium.

Mr. KARASAPAN's response. I would like to say to Mr. Koch that what he has proposed to force the Turkish Government to move more quickly on this matter will not achieve the ends he seeks. I suspect Mr. Koch knows this and the tactic is designed to satisfy his constituents and not achieve the objective of heroin control.

Next, questions were invited from the audience for the panelists to answer:

Question. Isn't diplomacy in the area of drug control failing? For example, with regard to the recent comprehensive interception operation on the Mexican border, didn't we cut it short because Mexico complained it was hurting its tourist trade? Don't we need a club approach like the Koch proposal?

Answer. Mr. Wellman: International cooperation is needed and we must be aware of the problems of other countries involved. We must encourage them to do all they can to control illicit drug production and traffic without causing a breakdown in our relationships with them.

Question. Isn't what the Turkish Government does their business? We don't have any business dictating to them.

Answer. Mr. Karasapan: The Turkish Government is aware and is doing the best it can to cooperate.

Answer. Mr. Koch: I don't accept that. By our policy of granting aid to Turkey, we are encouraging the growth of the poppy.

Question. Hasn't it been shown in history that outlawing something doesn't stop its use? We need to legalize it and control it as well as try to deal with the root causes.

Answer. Mr. Koch: Do you mean legalize heroin? It won't work. It won't decrease the number of addicts. The English system has failed. The applications for free heroin have doubled. I am opposed to the legalization of heroin.

Question. How much has the new efforts to combat drug abuse meant in terms of increased personnel?

Answer. Mr. Wellman: The two Federal Bureaus involved in the effort: the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs and the Bureau of Customs have substantially in-

creased their staffs in the United States as well as personnel working abroad in cooperation with various countries.

Answer. Mr. Karasapan: We have 400 agents working on the problem and will increase this to 700 in the coming year. These men are being given specialized training in cooperation with the French and the Americans.

Question. How would the Turkish Government feel if the roles were reversed and the United States was exporting illegal products into Turkey that the Government opposed?

Answer. Mr. Wellman: The situation is different with the synthetic drugs such as the psychotropics (amphetamines, barbiturates, tranquilizers, LSD, etc.) which are mostly manufactured in the highly industrialized countries. We are trying to cope with this new control problem through the Comprehensive Drug Abuse and Control Act of 1970 and by exploring the possibility of regulation by international treaty.

Question. What about the Iron Curtain countries? Are they involved in the illicit traffic and how do we get them to cooperate?

Answer. Mr. Wellman: Fortunately, this is not a problem with the Iron Curtain countries. They appear to have effective control over their legal production and exports of narcotics. They have a social system in which it is easier to apply strict controls.

Question. Seven years ago I attended a conference on drugs and the same things being said now were said then. Why isn't there any progress?

Answer. Mr. Wellman: I understand your concern, but it's terribly hard to bring drug abuse under control; we can only continue to work at it in every practicable way.

Question. How will the amendment co-sponsored by Mr. Koch affect our strategic air bases in Turkey?

Answer. Mr. Koch: I am so outraged by Turkey's inability to control opium production that if there were a choice I would give up our air bases.

Mr. Karasapan responded to this: I would like to point out that Mr. Koch's proposal does nothing. The President already has the authority to cut off aid.

Mr. Koch responded further: In a sense you are right. We couldn't get it passed last year because the Administration opposed it, but we did this year and that means that the House now has expressed a policy clearly in favor of giving the President the power to cut off aid. He may be reluctant to accept such a clear mandate since if he did not use it he would have to face the people and explain why he didn't use it.

PANEL IIB THE HEROIN PROBLEM— ADDICTION

Chairman: Councilman Bertram Gelfand.

Panelists: Commissioner Graham Finney, N.Y.C. Addiction Services Agency; Dr. Judianne Densen-Gerber, Odyssey House; Hon. Howard Jones, Vice-Chairman, N.Y.C. Narcotics Addiction Control Commission; and Mr. Nat Satterfield, Morrisania Youth and Community Service Center, Inc.

Reporter: Miss Patricia Marley.

The following is a summary of Dr. Densen-Gerber's remarks:

She has travelled throughout the country to various schools. Addiction is now different. Public opinion must be changed as to what they think addiction is. There are basically three groups of addicts. The first type can be classified as the "old lady" addicts. These are in the age group of 25 to 53. They seek drugs because of an inability to function in society. They need psychiatric help as a rehabilitative measure. The methadone treatment for this group is questionable.

The second type of addicts can be classified in the 18 to 25 age group. They appear to be reacting to the system. They are turn-

ing anger inward and therefore using drugs. The trend seems to be however to turning their anger against society outward.

The third type of addicts can be classified in the 9 to 17 age group. This is the principal group which Odyssey House treats. There seems to be no pathology with this group. They seem to be using drugs to be accepted by their own peer group. To treat this group you must change the peer group with which they associate.

Drug addiction now crosses all racial and economic groups. It is estimated that 35,000 students are using hard drugs in the ninth through twelfth grades in New York City. The figure will probably increase. Drug addiction is highly contagious in this group. There is a strong peer group identification for this age bracket. Individual families cannot do anything about this. There are various things that can be blamed for the drug addiction. The "American Way of Life" and politicians can be blamed. Physicians can treat addiction and should get involved more with communities. We are dealing with an epidemic.

The following is a summary of Mr. Nat Satterfield's remarks (Mr. Nat Satterfield replaced Mr. William Satterfield on the panel):

Drugs are an effect. The causes lie within the social and economic structure of our society. Changes in these structures must occur. There are too many people who are apathetic and therefore doing nothing about the problem. There is action through the program at Morrisania. Social problems cannot be isolated. The home, school, and job are all inter-related. Each addict's case must be treated individually. The drug problem cannot be treated as a group phenomena. Morrisania has thirteen inter-related services. Among these services are housing, employment, education, recreation, welfare, day-care, and direct treatment of addiction. The social ills of the community must be rectified to solve the drug problem. This is why Morrisania is rendering these social services to the community.

The following is a summary of Commissioner Finney's remarks:

Mr. Finney is a newcomer to the field he is now in. He worked in the school system and in urban planning. The drug problem is an effect of other problems in our society. Dr. Densen-Gerber has said many pertinent things. We are in an epidemic. Represented at the panel are components for the attack on drug abuse. We forget sometimes the effort "pioneers" have made in the field (such as Dr. Densen-Gerber). At least, New York City admits to having the problem. In New York City, there are 100,000 heroin addicts. The city of Chicago does not even have funds for drug problems. The drug problem is everywhere. The highest toll is still in the ghettos where other social problems exist. We must think of the problem systematically—enforcement, prevention, and treatment. All components must work together.

The following is a summary of Commissioner Jones' remarks:

In 1950, the District Attorney of New York County, recognizing the alarming increase in the number of drug cases, established a special narcotics bureau in the District Attorney's office, and the Supreme Court authorized a special grand jury to handle the overload of drug cases. The alarm went unheeded at that time except by law enforcement agencies. The response of the public was to increase the punishment for narcotic related offenses. What is it that has spelled the difference now? Why has public opinion changed? In 1950, drug addiction was considered basically an inner city problem. In the 1950's, approximately 90% of drug-related convictions seemed to be from Black and Puerto Rican groups, as seen by the Commissioner, when he worked with law enforcement.

Today, however, now that the drug addiction problem has spread to suburbs and so-called "good kids" from the suburbs are now also using drugs and getting arrested, there is widespread concern that something be done to "save" these youngsters. It is regrettable that the same concern wasn't felt 20 years ago so that ghetto youngsters might also have been saved.

Now there are more enlightened views. The state commission (established three years ago) realized it cannot handle the problem itself. It needs the help of the communities. No one approach is the best approach to drug addiction. Each addict has individual problems. There is, as a result, state aid to various types of programs. Other Congressmen should have done twenty years ago what Congressman Bingham has done today—bring the community together to discuss drug problems and examine the causes in each individual community. There are seven major treatment approaches to drug addiction and the state funds all seven.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

Comment from the audience: We have to change the "quality of life" in America. We have to get to the social roots of the problem of drug addiction.

Dr. Densen-Gerber's Answer: Society needs certain moral commitments. A sense of brotherhood is needed. The youth are disillusioned with the false sense of values of adults. We must change this sense of values. A problem with our government is that it will not recognize its responsibility to deal with G.I. addicts who are being discharged from the Armed Services.

Mr. Satterfield's comment: How do you instill value in youngsters who are faced with daily problems of slums. At Morrisania, there is really only a "holding action" until there is some type of economic change in the system.

Question: Since there is a scarcity of money, what approach is used most effectively?

Mr. Finney's response: There is no one approach. The objective of the city agency is to work on many fronts.

Question: What priority is given to research?

Mr. Finney's response: The city agency has little money for research. Federal investment is needed in the entire field. At present, the Federal government is cutting back funds.

Dr. Densen-Gerber's response: We need people who are concerned with new methods. Programs are funded by how successful they are. We should be more concerned with the failures of programs, for this is where we can learn new methods of looking at things.

Question: What does the panel feel about legalizing heroin to get crime off the street?

Mr. Satterfield's response: It wouldn't reduce the crime rate that much and it would encourage more addiction.

Mr. Jones' response: History provides part of the answer. New York legalized hard core drugs in the 1920's. The program was abandoned within ten months.

Question: Addiction is hard to define. There are legal, medical, and social contradictions. Where do people turn who want help but do not fit into the narrow definition of addiction?

Mr. Jones' response: State tests do not accurately define addiction.

Dr. Densen-Gerber: We need a new concept for the protection of children. Their rights have to be protected. Old ways do not meet urbanized social problems.

Comment from Mr. Galfand: The Board of Education has not adequately recognized the problem of drug addiction in the schools. The present Board and chancellor have declined to support legislation permitting examination of students to determine drug use so that they may be referred to treatment

programs. Rapid detection of those infected by drugs is critical to meaningful rehabilitation.

Mr. Jones: We met with Mr. Scribner of the Board of Education to discuss addiction. The Board of Education wanted to know if they would be sued if they certified a child as an addict. This is a question which the state legislature should take up.

Question: What about the methadone program, is it a politician's excuse?

Dr. Densen-Gerber's response: I have recommended methadone in a minority of cases (perhaps 5 out of 2,000). Methadone is being used as an excuse. The mortality rate from methadone is 1.5% and the mortality rate from heroin is 1.0%. We must face up to the problem of addiction.

Mr. Finney's response: Methadone is one approach which is being tried. Methadone does not deal with the addict's total personality.

IMPORTANCE OF FORENSICS

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in a recent guest editorial in the Davenport Times-Democrat, Mr. Harold Keller, director of forensics at Davenport's West High School, discusses the importance of speech training to successful careers. Knowing of the deep and personal interest of my colleagues when it comes to speaking, I felt they would like to read Mr. Keller's editorial:

SPEECH STUDENTS OF TODAY

(NOTE.—The guest article today is by Harold C. Keller, 30, director of forensics at West High School, Davenport. Under his and others' tutelage, students at West have excelled in debate and other competitive speech for a number of years. Keller is in his fifth year at West. He got his bachelor's and master of arts degrees from Indiana State University, Terre Haute. He is a native of Lancaster, Ohio, and a graduate of Evansville (Ind.) North High School.)

The forensic program plays an important role in the total program of speech education in secondary schools. It provides the student-participant with a variety of practical educational experiences that few forms of education afford. It offers them an unparalleled opportunity to perfect the techniques of effective oral communication; in fact, interscholastic speaking is the most potent contemporary force outside the classroom in the speech education of thousands of students. The speech programs of the high schools contribute significantly to the intellectual, social and moral growth of participating students.

In most schools, the speech program consists of individual and group speaking performances that are organized as contests or tournaments with the goal of winning interscholastic honors. Prominent among these forms are debate, discussion, extemporaneous speaking, original oratory, oral interpretation, dramatic interpretation and student congress. In addition, there are more than two dozen variations of these forms that are used in the high school forensic program.

Sound educational philosophy dictates the development of classroom and course work for all students who desire increased speaking proficiency. The forensic program is only

part of a carefully organized and integrated program, the major part of which is class instruction. The extracurricular program best serves those who want additional training beyond classroom work. The program is designed for those students who have special interests and abilities in speech and who earnestly desire the special training that competitive forensics entails.

The paramount goal of the forensic program is the total growth of the student, reached through a variety of objectives. Thousands of former debaters attest to the benefits. Congressmen, lawyers, teachers and "prominent citizens" are some, among many, who have expressed their feelings on the values of forensics.

Freedom and Union, a magazine, surveyed leaders in politics, business and various professions in 1960 to find out how many of these leaders—who represented success in their field—had debated. One hundred of the 160 respondents had debated, and 90 of the 100 believed debate experience had been extremely valuable in their careers. Edmund E. Muskie, U.S. senator from Maine, says: "Dealing, as one must, with ever-changing opinion, one can hope to be successful in a career of leadership only to the extent that one practices effectively the art of debate." Dr. David D. Henry, president of the University of Illinois, emphasizes: "... My speech and debate experience and training ... was the most important single educational experience of my life." And Dr. Samuel S. Gould, president of Antioch College: "If I were to choose any single activity which had contributed most to my career, I would certainly choose debating." There are many other testimonials from many successful men and women whose fame may not be national in scope but who are prominent in their communities.

In the words of Woodrow Wilson, former President of the United States, "... Clearness, force and beauty of style are absolutely necessary to one who would draw men to his way of thinking; nay, to anyone who would induce the great mass of mankind to give so much as passing heed to what he has to say." Aristotle expressed the value of speech in these words: "If it is disgrace to a man when he cannot defend himself in a bodily way, it would be absurd not to think him disgraced when he cannot defend himself with reason in speaking."

It has been estimated that man spends approximately 45 per cent of his communication time in listening, 30 per cent in speaking, and 25 per cent in reading and writing. In short, three-fourths of man's communication time is spent in speaking and listening activities. This is what speech education is all about: Training students to become communicators, not only better speakers, but also better and more intelligent listeners. If America is to maintain a position of leadership, we must make ourselves understood—and understand—other people. Students must learn how to construct messages which will present the individual's position, messages that are consistent with the psychological, social and cultural systems of our masses. And in like manner, they must learn to understand messages and to critically evaluate the content of messages. All of this must be done in the context of people who are quite different from one another. The need for effective communicators is evident, for the future of man rests not in the Sputniks of science but rather in the heart of the man who communicates intelligently, sincerely and ethically with his fellowman.

Since the beginning of recorded civilization, the value and effect of the trained speaker has been recognized. To the relatively few students involved in our high school speech education program today, forensics becomes the incentive for the student to become an effective speaker and listener, and hence a more successful and more influential citizen. These students have the

tradition of being school leaders of today. They become members of the National Forensic League, a high school honorary speech fraternity, and share membership with leaders such as President Nixon, former Presidents Johnson and Truman and countless senators, representatives, many people in politics, heads of corporations, lawyers, and other leaders in America. These speech students of today will be the influential state leaders of tomorrow.

POLAND AT A CROSSROADS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the people of the free world are observing with great interest the recent developments in Poland under the regime of Edward Gierek.

The Christian Science Monitor and other reputable publications have reported some cautious improvements in living conditions for the people of Poland and I submit a few of these articles for my colleagues' attention.

It is our hope that all the people behind the Iron Curtain will one day be free to determine their own destiny. These first reports indicate that perhaps a small change is indeed taking place. Those of us who enjoy the blessings of a free society can only hope that these reports are correct.

Mr. Speaker, the articles follow:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 6, 1971]

EFFICIENT SOCIALISM—A POLISH YEARNING (By Charlotte Saikowski)

SZCZECIN, POLAND.—There's a revolutionary spirit in the air here, a fresh hope, a deep yearning for change.

It is above all a hope born of new party chief Edward Gierek's earnest assurances that the new Polish leadership will run the economy to the benefit of the working class.

Mr. Gierek, once a miner, has unquestionably won the hearts and support of the shipyard workers here and in other Baltic towns who less than two months ago plunged the nation into a political crisis that brought down the Gomulka government.

YOUTH SEEKS CHANGE

But the yearning is not just economic. It is political, and this is perhaps the most significant mood which this correspondent encountered in a 10-day tour throughout the country. It could have far-reaching importance.

The younger Communists want change and change that spells greater democratization—not, to be sure, of Poland's political system as the West understands the word, but of the Polish United Workers Party, as the Communist party here is called.

"We cannot imagine life without socialism, but we want a right socialism, a Polish socialism, which means it must represent not one person but all the people," said youthful Mieczyslaw Dopierała, newly elected head of the party organization at the giant Adolf Warski Shipyards here.

"There was nothing antisocialist, nothing anti-Soviet in our strikes, and the fact that I became first party secretary at the yards proves this."

SZCZECIN LEADER SPEAKS

Indeed, it was Mr. Dopierała, a 35-year-old technician at the shipyards, who led the

strike committee for the entire city of Szczecin, where at least 16 and probably many more Poles were killed in demonstrations in December.

I met with him and six other members of the shipyard party-executive committee after the spirited nine-hour election meeting last weekend and, as one might have expected, they were filled with the fervor of men who had wrought a political change.

"We respect our elders," said Mr. Dopierała vigorously, chopping the air with his hand. "They won freedom for us and rebuilt Szczecin. But man is born with egotistic traits and many leaders looked only to their personal advantage."

"We want now to change the style and method of work. There must be greater contact with the people, there must be individual responsibility for one's acts. And we demand rotation in office."

"We are not dogmatists," the dark-haired worker went on. "I did not finish a party school and none of us here has a political education. We got it in production, in our jobs."

Another committee member, a doctor at the shipyards, added:

"We must be honest about our mistakes and criticize those who were not honest. We are not going to interfere with management."

"We believe every worker, section chief, superintendent, director must be responsible for the execution of his job, and our task is to see to it that if there are no results they are thrown out. Before no one was responsible, no one took decisions. Now there must be accountability from bottom to top and top to bottom."

I suggested that hopes also ran high in 1956, when Wladyslaw Gomulka came to power and a spirit of "renewal," as it is called, was likewise abroad in the land.

"Ah!" exclaimed one committee member, a worker. "The situation cannot be repeated. I remember 1956. I was 23 years old. Now no one can blind me again. We have learned our lesson. There must be effective work and systematic responsibility within the party."

It was a theme I heard over and over again—in Krakaw, Katowice, Wroclaw. In Gdansk, which was the flashpoint of the labor unrest, Stanislaw Celichowski, a member of the province party committee and editor of the party newspaper Glos Wyrzeza told me:

"In the past the biggest accent was on discipline—without which the Communist movement cannot exist. But therein lies the problem. During the Stalinist period in Poland discipline led to centralism and now we must find our way out and develop Democracy within the party."

"One problem is that we were never allowed to delve into public opinion," said the 31-year-old editor. "Our jargon said 'the peasants believe such and such' or 'the workers think such and such.' But who knew? Four million Poles earned poverty wages for 15 years and no one treated this as a political problem! Political leaders, from top to bottom, must know."

Many nonparty Poles view the current surge of political analysis with cynicism. They believe too many older leaders are entrenched in office and that no less than a thorough housecleaning can change things.

Questioned on this point, Mr. Celichowski admitted that rejuvenation of the party is a big problem. "It's like trying to reform the Catholic church," he said with a quiet smile. "True, one needs to sweep out some people but not those who have worth. It's not a matter of changing cadres but policy—the party needs to be healed."

WARSAW UNDERESTIMATES

"The main thing is that everything be in the open. The inner life of the party died because anything said locally was underestimated in Warsaw."

"Moreover," he continued, "there should be restrictions on how long a man sits in office. Gierek told us here that he would be the first to show the nation how a leader should withdraw."

In the brawny industrial town of Katowice, Maciej Szczepanski, a 40-year-old candidate member of the important party Central Committee and editor of the local party newspaper Trybuna Robotnicza, discussed party failings with astonishing forthrightness. It might be added that Mr. Szczepanski is a close associate of Mr. Gierek whose voice carries considerable political weight.

"We have no alternative now," the blond, articulate Pole said. "The economy has been stifled in the past five years. The old leadership did not manage to utilize the people's potential. Now new instruments of economic management must be found."

"As for the party, it must now maintain a political distance between itself and the administration. The party holds the reins, inspires, controls, sets up cadres. But it cannot take the place of the administration. Gomulka simply did not understand the new era in which socialism must be built with computers."

Among Polish Communists there is thus discussion, debate, questioning, pondering, and, at the moment at least, determination to breathe freshness in the party.

Where they will ultimately lead, whether the new leaders can indeed revitalize the ossified party apparatus remains to be seen. So far there have been a few changes of personnel and with time others are expected.

But it is not at all certain that the old guard will be easy to budge—physically or in attitudes.

Meanwhile, the question that is never far from people's minds is how far the Soviet Union will permit Poland to go. Already the Szczecin party newspaper has warned against "political gamblers" who support Mr. Gierek only as a tactical move in order eventually to propel Poland in a different direction.

Conscious of the perils, Polish Communists vigorously insist that the events in Czechoslovakia in 1968 were of entirely different hue.

"In Czechoslovakia the party itself was under attack," said a prominent party official. "We will never let things go so far. This was a genuine, working-class strike within the Marxist framework and the party will remain dominant. What we want is a just, efficient socialism."

Whatever the future, the workers of Szczecin wear an unmistakable pride these days. They feel it was their action following the turbulent strikes in Gdansk and Gdynia which ushered in a change at the top. They also believe that Mr. Gierek's meeting with them will play an important role in the Politburo's future decisions.

As one local Pole ardently put it, "Szczecin made the revolution!"

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 8, 1971]

MOONLIGHTING, STEALING TO SURVIVE—POLISH WORKERS "HAD TO STRIKE"

(By Charlotte Salikowski)

SZCZECIN, POLAND.—Boleslaw Dudek, a 47-year-old welder at the Adolf Warski Shipyards, sat in the living room of his sturdy home and chatted quietly about the December strikes.

"The government changed our norms," he said. "A welding job that used to take 10 hours now was supposed to take six—and at the same pay. When it came to bonuses, the engineers and managers took everything and left nothing for the workers."

"Then came the price increases. Sausage went up to as much as 100 zlotys a kilogram (\$4.20 at the official rate of exchange)!"

"I can't complain about my life," Mr. Dudek said in soft tones, "but most workers have a very hard time. We had no choice but to strike."

Mr. Dudek, a welder for 20 years, and his family indeed are relatively well off—because four members hold jobs.

He himself nets about 4,000 zlotys (\$168) a month by working a 12-hour day six and sometimes seven days a week. His wife also works, at pay of 2,000 zlotys a month, and two sons, both shipyard workers, together bring home another 4,400 zlotys.

The Dudeks are also fortunate in that they acquired a four-room house when they settled in this former German city after World War II and they have managed to buy a small Syrena car.

If the Dudeks feel the strikes were justified, one can well imagine the pent-up resentment of thousands of Szczecin and other Polish workers struggling along on a good deal less.

Poland's new Premier, Piotr Jaroszewicz, recently disclosed that 4.2 million people out of a labor force of about 16 million earn less than 2,000 zlotys a month (about \$84).

"PEOPLE WANT MORE"

"It's very simple," said another shipbuilder and party member who was among the leaders of the Szczecin strike. "People want more. Housing is deplorable. At one stage television was a luxury and now it is daily bread."

"And demands will grow. Workers should have something to put aside but even millions who do earn a bit do not have anything to buy."

What, one asks, is the reason for the economic malaise that confronts Poland after 25 years of Communist rule?

Let it be said first that Poland is not an impoverished country. On the contrary, it has some enormous and visible achievements to its credit.

One travels to cities which after the war lay in ruins and now are entirely rebuilt. This energetic town, bristling with giant cranes, points to the eminence that the Polish shipbuilding industry, for one, has achieved.

HEAVY-HANDED PROGRESS

Everywhere—from Warsaw to Krakow to Poznan—handsome young women trip down the streets in stylish midi coats and pantsuits produced in Polish enterprises.

People complain about the quality of meat and occasional shortages, but the annual per capita consumption of meat in Poland is on a par with that of Sweden.

But, like other Communist states of Eastern Europe, Poland now wrestles with the ailments of a rigid command economy—overcentralized planning, low technological level, enormous waste, and lack of managerial initiative.

Of great concern is the attitude of the average Polish worker (sometimes only two or three years removed from the countryside), who is present on the job but does not put in a day's work. As the Poles say, "Whether he stands or sits, 2,000 zlotys he gets."

Perhaps most debilitating for the nation is the widespread demoralization which this state of affairs has induced. The average Pole in order to eke out a living has to moonlight, to have some gimmick on the side, often to hold three or four jobs. The Poles even have a word for it—"kombinowanie."

The driver illegally uses the office car as a taxi. The shop manager hides scarce commodities and sells them to clients at marked-up prices. The factory worker pilfers tools, screws, paint, either for his own use or for sale to privateers.

"Look at the road," complained a cab driver pointing to a rutted, uneven two-lane highway completed only four months ago. "It's sagging because 30 percent of the cement allocated for it went into the road and

70 percent into private hands. And that's the way with everything. People have to live."

Now the overriding question is—what solutions?

Poland's new leadership seems determined to put through economic reforms, many of which had been planned long before the upheavals in December.

These include some decentralization of the planning process, a new investment system to stimulate the most profitable enterprises, and reorganization of certain industries. Needless to say, the new incentive-wage system which helped ignite the industrial strikes, is being reworked.

It will probably be two years and longer, however, before any reforms can show results. Poles are therefore not jumping for joy although they seem to have accepted the leadership's plea for patience in the face of grave economic difficulties.

"We know there are no quick solutions," said a citizen of Gdansk. "We will have to pull in our belts. But if we must exist on a bowl of soup for the next few years, let it be the same bowl of soup for everyone."

Meanwhile, here in Szczecin, where worker demonstrations contributed to the downfall of the Warsaw government, life at the moment is back to normal. The burned party headquarters is under reconstruction.

The shipyard workers are back at work with what one describes as "renewed energy." They fulfilled the January production plan and are working overtime to "cover the higher prices now."

Store and office managers are reported working with more efficiency because they are afraid of losing their jobs.

CONFIDENCE IN GIEREK

There seems to be general confidence in party leader Edward Gierek, who gave away nothing during his visit here but made a palpably good impression on the workers.

"He's an honest man," said Mr. Dudek with feeling. "Not everything can be done at once. We can't expect a five-day week for several years. The most important thing is that the leaders with their hearts have started to think about the workers."

"A leader can't sit behind a desk," he went on. "He must go and talk with the people and Mr. Gierek told us he did not know we had such problems. We liked him and we don't think he will get spoiled."

Not all Poles are so sanguine and they argue, dispute, and philosophize with characteristic Polish exuberance.

"I doubt Gierek can change all this," commented a local resident. "The problem is that we are under Russia's thumb."

"Hungary made reforms, yes. Romania, yes, has a different foreign policy. But Poland is the largest country in Eastern Europe, and Moscow will not allow us any political luxuries. Otherwise we would no longer be under its control."

"No," said another Pole, a party member and member of the intelligentsia. "The Russians know us Poles. We have learned too much to make the same political mistakes as the Czechs. But if we do not bring about reforms in the economy and if within five or six months the situation does not look more promising, the workers will take to the streets again. They can no longer endure without seeing light at the end of the tunnel."

If such is the mood, it indeed poses a formidable challenge to the leaders in Warsaw.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 9, 1971]

NEW CHAIRS MUSICAL TO POLES

(By Charlotte Salikowski)

WARSAW.—Poland's new leadership has strengthened its hand by further political changes that are bound to win popular support.

Wladyslaw Gomulka has been suspended from the party Central Committee for "serious mistakes" in leadership and two of his close associates, economic specialist Boleslaw Jaszczuk and ideologist Zenon Kliszko, have been removed from that body. All three were ousted from the important Politburo last December following the worker disorders in Gdansk and other northern coastal towns.

Several other shifts will also be greeted with satisfaction by Baltic shipyard workers.

At its eighth plenum this past weekend the Central Committee accepted the resignations of Stanislaw Kociolek from the Politburo and Secretariat and of Ignacy Loga-Sowinski from the Politburo.

HARD LINE RANKLED

Mr. Kociolek, party chief in Gdansk until last summer, is a bright, 37-year-old sociologist who rose rapidly in the ranks of leadership. But he angered shipyard workers by his hard-line speeches following the price increases that touched off riots. From that time on demands for his removal grew.

Mr. Loga-Sowinski, for his part, was in charge of the trade unions 14 years and was ousted from that position in December. Among the grievances of the Baltic workers was the failure of the trade unions to look after their interests.

Antoni Walaszek, who stepped down from local leadership of the party in Szczecin, also has resigned from the Central Committee. It was Mr. Walaszek's refusal to see a worker delegation that led to violence in that port town.

Thus the political scores are being settled as the party seeks to convince a weary and often skeptical nation that it genuinely intends to bring about internal reform. Seven of the 12 members of the old Politburo now are gone. The present Politburo has 10 members, as no new appointments have been announced.

Significantly, party Secretary Edward Gierek, in a two-hour speech at the plenum analyzing the causes of the tragic riots, refrained from a sweeping attack on Mr. Gomulka and other ousted leaders, saying it would take time for a "just assessment." The former Polish leader was suspended and not removed from the Central Committee since he was unable, because of illness, to present a defense at the plenum.

Ordinary Poles, who are glad to see Mr. Gomulka fade from the scene, were nonetheless impressed with Mr. Gierek's restraint: Out of a sense of patriotism they do not like to see a leader shamefully disgraced.

TV CARRIES SPEECH

"All of us carry a share of responsibility for what happened, although it does not fall on each equally," said Mr. Gierek in solemn, emphatic tones.

His speech was later televised in full.

Commented a Pole the next day: "It was a fair, objective speech."

At the same time Mr. Gierek, an experienced administrator who made his mark in the coal region of Katowice, spelled out frankly the nature of Poland's political malaise. In recent years, he said, the role of the Politburo, Secretariat, and Central Committee had declined and had been replaced by a form of "narrow leadership" by a small group of people. At the time of the Baltic disorders, he told the plenum, the Politburo did not meet until Dec. 19, the sixth day of the crisis. And the old leadership chose to use force against the demonstrators without consulting the Central Committee.

FOOD-PRICE HIKES CITED

During the riots, he said, 45 persons were killed and 1,165 injured, including 564 civilians, 531 militarymen, and 70 soldiers and officers.

Mr. Gierek cited as the direct cause of the riots the increase in food prices, carried out without relief for the poorest families. But he added that the deeper reasons lay in dis-

content with the nation's social and economic policy and a weakening of ties between party and people that led to a crisis of confidence in the government.

In suspending Mr. Gomulka, the Central Committee charged that his mistakes in recent years had brought about incorrect development of the economy and finally an open political crisis. It also charged that Mr. Kliszko displayed a lack of feeling for reality during the riots and caused a sharpening of the conflict and Mr. Jaszczuk for acting in an autocratic way, interfering directly in the work of the government, and forcing through decisions that sparked the disorders.

BETTER LIVING PROMISED

Looking to the future, Mr. Gierek, as he has been doing in recent weeks, promised Poles a better life, stating the government would do everything to put more supplies of food and consumer goods on the market and to relieve the housing problem.

But he warned against expecting immediate results. Hard work, tighter discipline, and modernization of the economy and management, he said, are the route to better living conditions.

Not surprisingly, one result of the plenum was a decision to speed the calling of the sixth party congress, not due until 1972. Preparations for the congress are expected to entail more political changes and housecleaning at a local level.

Meanwhile, the Central Committee elected four new full members. These include Lt. Gen. Jozef Urbanowicz, political head of the Army, and Franciszek Wisniewski, a shipyard electrician from Gdansk.

It also approved Mr. Gierek's assessment of the December events and called on the government to push ahead more vigorously with revision of the 1971 economic plan as well as the plan for 1971-75.

Many Poles watched Mr. Gierek on television with interest. And the mood now seems to be, as one Pole remarked, "They have said their bit. Now we'll see what they do."

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 10, 1971]

POLAND'S KATOWICE BEARS GIEREK STAMP (By Charlotte Salikowski)

KATOWICE, POLAND.—This is Gierek country.

Brash, bleak, boisterous, Katowice is the Silesian mining region where Polish leader Edward Gierek ruled for some 14 years. And it bears the stamp of his pragmatic style communism.

At every level—from rugged workers to sophisticated intellectuals—one hears words of praise for the tall Pole who was once a coal miner, fought in the Belgian underground, and later became party head in Poland's most important industrial region.

"Gierek's prima!" exclaimed a Silesian worker.

"He's a man of hard labor rooted in the working class," commented a prominent writer. "If he were not a Marxist politician he would belong to the Salvation Army because he has sympathy for people."

PRIORITY ATTENTION

"Said another resident: 'Gierek knew that Poles have to have more than 'We are marching to communism, hurrah hurrah!' He mingled with the workers and he gave them something.'"

People generally seem to feel that Mr. Gierek can do something for the whole country—if, as one local citizen put it, "they don't eat him alive in Warsaw!"

Mr. Gierek's record in Katowice is indeed impressive. It should be added, of course, that because of the region's economic importance the ruling party Politburo (of which Mr. Gierek was even then a member) gave it priority attention. Accounting for 11 per-

cent of Poland's total population, Katowice Province produces 21 percent of its industrial output and 90 percent of its coal.

Nonetheless, it is widely agreed that Mr. Gierek and his associates administered their "fiefdom" well.

NEW BUILDINGS

I recall Katowice 3 years ago, a gloomy, gray city with virtually nothing to commend it. Today, although still darkly stained by smoke, it is a lively metropolis spruced up with gleaming high-rise office and apartment buildings, a broad main thoroughfare, a handsome new stadium and, at a central crossroads, a modern underground passageway lined with intimate coffee shops, attractive stores, and a movie theater.

The industrial heart of the province, stripped of its natural verdure decades ago, is still a dreary region of mines and factories where trees stand black from coal grit. But much has been done to beautify and purify it.

A welcome boon to the 2.5 million people of the area is a 1,200-acre park built near the town of Chorzow. Workers and their families flock to this "green lungs" oasis, as it is called, with its swimming pools (one with an artificially produced ocean wave), restaurants, planetarium, zoo, rose garden, and other attractions. Currently the provincial government is also planting a forest and recreational belt around the industrial core.

MODERN HOUSING

Most important to the Silesian worker, Mr. Gierek went to bat to improve his wages and living conditions. Whereas the average annual factory wage in Poland is 2,500 zlotys (\$625), the coal miners earn between 3,000 and 6,600 zlotys (\$738 and \$1,428).

They also have more housing. In outlying towns, such as Tychy, one comes on blocks upon blocks of modern residential districts—complete with new Roman Catholic churches. At Rybnik, a developing coal-mining area, authorities are encouraging private home building with long-term, low-interest loans, and the town literally bristles with two-story villas. The countryside, too, is studded with sturdy brick houses built by peasants-turned-workers.

Other achievements of the Gierek administration here include a vastly expanded educational network and such social amenities as worker resort homes in the mountains and at the seashore.

AUTOMATED MINE

The present party First Secretary also won a reputation as an efficient industrial organizer. Many of the enterprises in Katowice region are managed by bright, young engineers and technocrats. About 80 percent of the mines are mechanized, and work and safety conditions in them are good.

At the famous Jan Coal Mine, said to be the most automated mine in the world, director Andrzej Marcinkiewicz, a boyish-looking engineer, talks with quiet intensity of introducing Jan's advanced technology in other Polish mines. (Jan is the brainchild of Minister of Mining Jan Mitrega, now a Deputy Premier of Poland.)

As a result of competent administration, the economy of the region has performed well. While Poland, within its present borders, produced 69 million tons of coal a year in 1938, its output last year reached 140 million tons, making it the fifth largest coal producer in the world.

SHOCK WAVES

However, even dynamic Katowice Province has acute problems, a fact local leaders unflinchingly admit. When the worker demonstrations exploded in Gdansk and other Baltic coastal towns in December, the shock waves reached Katowice as well. There were no street demonstrations here but some plants and factories organized short sit-down strikes.

Mr. Gierk flew back to Katowice from Warsaw after the official announcement of price increases, which were to touch off the riots, and met with workers in plants and mines as he had often done in the past to hear out grievances and where possible straighten out conflicts.

"It wasn't quiet here," mused Maciej Szczepanski, editor of the mass-circulation party newspaper Trybuna Robotnicza and a candidate member of the important Central Committee. "We experienced the December events as a deep tragedy. But the worst is behind us and now we have lots of work ahead."

TRANSPORT DIFFICULTIES

The bow-tied Marxist, whose newspaper launched the first direct attack on dismissed national leaders Boleslaw Jaszczuk and Zenon Kliszko, cited the continuing hardships which Katowice workers face. Prices are high and salaries still too low. Housing is in short supply—only every third person has moved into a new dwelling since the war. The water supply is poor.

Transport is in a woeful state, said the party official. Fast roads are needed to link Silesia's towns. Problems remain formidable. Labor productivity is low and computers are sorely needed to modernize and automate enterprises.

"We need entirely new economic strategies to meet the demands of a new age," stressed Mr. Szczepanski. "For a while we will have to do without many things because we simply can't do everything at once."

"But," he added with conviction, "we will concentrate on the areas that give the quickest returns. And Poles know how to work well when they have the conditions for this. The important thing is that we have enlightened leaders again."

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
Feb. 13, 1971]

LIBERALIZATION SOUGHT—POLES HOPE FOR CULTURAL GAINS

(By Charlotte Salkowski)

WARSAW.—In the wake of a worker rebellion, Poland's intellectuals look for a breakthrough on the nation's cultural front.

It was the proletariat, the working class, which exploded in protest against economic injustice and brought down the old Gomulka regime. The intelligentsia stood aside—just as the Polish workers did in 1968 at the time of the violent student disturbances.

But the political upheaval wrought by the Baltic shipyard workers has now kindled cautious expectations among the writers, artists, educators, scientists. Throughout the country this correspondent found Poles voicing hopes for a cultural and intellectual rejuvenation.

"Gomulka mistrusted the intelligentsia and although Poland made some contribution in music and art, literature was repressed," one of the nation's leading publicists told me in Katowice. "We hope the doors on the world—and on the West—will open wider now."

INDEPENDENCE STRESSED

"We don't expect miracles," said a writer in the historic city of Krakow. "But our hope now is that writers will have more independence."

Commented a prominent theater director in Wroclaw:

"The new leadership has a reasonable and realistic view. We must expose and learn from our errors. The intelligentsia feels the cultural situation will improve."

And, echoing a frequently heard view these days, a Wroclaw editor said: "Gierek is a man of pragmatic bent but he has scope. He was a miner but he earned an engineering degree and he established a university in Katowice. He is thus well rounded." (He

was referring to the new Communist Party leader Edward Gierek.)

Poland's cultural life has suffered some grievous setbacks in a quarter century of Communist rule. During the dark Stalinist period to the mid-1950's the arts were smothered by "zdanowszczyzna," the Polish term describing the reign of Stalin's cultural tsar.

When Wlasylaw Gomulka came to power in 1956 hopes for liberalization ran high but the orthodox Marxist had little interest in the arts and ultimately alienated the intelligentsia by his stifling cultural policies and aloofness.

PROGRESS REPRESSED

After the university student revolt in 1968 still another gloomy period of harsh repression and fear of innovation set in.

Now Poles freely tell you that cultural and scientific life—The Polish Academy of Sciences, the writers' and artists unions, the higher schools—were in the hands of a few people in the Politburo, all under the overall control of ideologist Zenon Kliszko, ousted in the December shakeup. "Nothing got done," remarked a journalist. "Everything was under the thumb of the party."

Literature in particular has been in limbo in the past few years, with many good writers producing primarily for the desk drawer. Whether their works now will be published remains to be seen. One practical problem, which the new leaders promise to tackle, is the acute shortages of paper and printing facilities.

On the theater front, there already has been some movement toward greater freedom in the past year. The play "Kurdesz" by Ernest Bryll, for instance, was quickly closed when it opened in Krakow in 1969 because of its criticisms of present-day society. Last year it opened successfully in Warsaw and is still running.

WORKS WIN RECOGNITION

Meanwhile, artists have been free to experiment in every conceivable genre, including abstractionism and pop art. Much of their copious output is inferior in quality but the best works have won worldwide recognition—and much-needed hard currency for the Polish Government.

The question asked today is how far liberalization will go in other fields. Wilhelm Szewczyk, urbane, articulate editor of the cultural magazine Poglady, published in Katowice, is optimistic.

"Socialist realism is a legend now," he said with surprising candor, referring to the literary dogma that was supposed to guide the creative artist. "There should be no restrictions on the writer. He should write on contemporary themes that interest us and be free to criticize. We should have greater cultural freedom as well as economic abundance."

CAUTIOUS MOVEMENT

There is, of course, a line beyond which Poles know they cannot go. Just as they know that their government would not allow publication of the works of Soviet writer Alexander Solzhenitsyn because this would be a provocative act against the Soviet Union. Indeed the new Polish leadership, mindful of the Soviet crunch in Czechoslovakia in 1968, must tread wisely and cautiously in this whole sensitive field.

Jerzy Krasowski, director of the Teatr Polski in Wroclaw, commented on the playwright's social and political obligation in these words:

"It's not true that we are under a political oppression of sorts. In terms of techniques we can do anything we want. Where content is concerned, we of course cannot serve the state's enemies and indeed do not want to. But we raise deep social questions which the viewer must answer."

"The creative artist must have a feeling of responsibility for the future of the coun-

try and the people," he added. "He must be aware that his work has a public meaning and so he must be responsible for what he tells people."

ENCOURAGING STEPS

Poles seem to be encouraged by the new leadership's early steps.

While making it firmly clear that information and culture must serve socialism, party leader Edward Gierek at the recent eighth plenum of the Central Committee stated that the news media should be the forum for a "confrontation of opinions" on various issues and should deal with negative features of Polish society. He added the leadership is aware of the necessity of creating a "climate of confidence" conducive to cultural endeavors.

As a sign of the times, perhaps, the satiric magazine Szpilki recently ran a good-natured caricature of Mr. Gierek.

There is thus inkling of change in the broad cultural arena since the turbulent worker demonstrations in December. How deep the change, how far it will go—this the future alone will tell.

DISENCHANTED POLISH YOUTH STOP SHORT OF REBELLION

(By Charlotte Salkowski)

WROCLAW, POLAND.—A lanky young lad in short, flared coat leaned against a building chatting with a friend.

"Who knows about Gierek?" he mumbled with a shrug of his shoulders. "All he's done so far is go to Moscow and back."

His comment was not meant derogatorily but it hinted at the mood of cynicism and disengagement that affects Poland's younger generation.

When the worker demonstrations broke out in the north in December, a wave of intense discussion spilled through the corridors of schools and universities—and a few organized attempts were made at sympathy strikes—but the students did not, as they did in 1968, take to the streets.

Here in the graceful Silesian town of Wroclaw, the shakeup of the government in Warsaw drew some typically wry reaction from students. "The king is dead. Long live the king!" some said in the privacy of their dormitory rooms.

A father told me that his 15-year-old son returned home from school one day with a copy of a satirical ballad about deposed leaders Wladyslaw Gomulka and Zenon Kliszko and new Politburo members Edward Gierek and Mieczyslaw Moczar. "It made my hair stand on end," he exclaimed, "and I took it away from him."

Poland's new leadership, as it seeks to restore a nation's confidence, thus faces among its many other problems the grim dilemma that after 25 years of socialism its youth are not convinced the system works.

Sophisticated, knowledgeable about the West, they are bored with Marxist ideology, disappointed in economic results and, at least until now, unimpressed with their leaders. Some, in fact have been more influenced by the church and their parents than by the school or the party.

Commented the 17-year-old son of a Polish intellectual:

"We don't respect the party or our youth organizations because of the opportunists in them. Only those belong who seek some personal advantage."

Since 1968 the climate among university youth seems to have changed. Then the students made revolutionary demands for such idealistic goals as freedom of expression and information. Now they know from experience they cannot change much politically and they tend to avoid discussion of burning political issues. They are more materially inclined and their wants are largely economic.

Above all they yearn for a more modern—

and more motorized—life. And the outlook is dreary.

It is high impossible, for instance, for young people to marry and start families before they are 31 because they must wait 5 to 10 years at least for a new apartment. "What kind of life would it be if we lived with my parents one week and my wife's parents the next?" asked a Warsaw University graduate.

Others complain they cannot expect a decent salary after graduation. Consequently many stretch out their studies in order to avoid getting a job that brings them only \$83 a month.

YOUTH MORE IMPATIENT

"Youth are impatient with our inefficiencies," commented the editor of Wroclaw's news weekly *Wladomosci*. "There may be differences between what youth in San Francisco and in Wroclaw think, but essentially they want to organize the world better than did their elders. And they are right. They want things to be run logically."

Indeed today there are thousands of bright, well-educated young members of the technical intelligentsia who, if they are not satisfied with socialism, at least are not so "unrealistic" as to think any other political system is possible. But they do want good industrial organization and up-to-date technology. As a 31-year-old economist in Gdansk, scene of the first worker disorders, put it:

"Poland's geographical position is such that we must make a friend of the Soviet Union. The Germans always have an appetite for Polish lands. So we have no choice. Socialism is here to stay and the point now is to make it efficient."

"The first thing is that the party not intrude itself everywhere," the dark-haired youth went on. "Let those who know rule the economy—it's ridiculous, for instance, to hold such a dogmatic concept that prices need not reflect costs."

And he added reflectively, "I don't want the government to tell me what I can and cannot do. If I want to leave Poland for 10 years I should be able to. I want to be free."

It is significant, of course, that many of the shipyard and dock workers who went on strike in Gdansk and other Baltic towns—and forced a political change—were of the younger, postwar generation. In Gdansk I was told that the most eloquent speaker at the grassroots talk-out with party leader Gierk in the shipyards in January was a 30-year-old worker.

"HOOLIGANISM" DENIED

In Szczecin one of the strike leaders was a 35-year-old shipyard technician. Asked why he thought the strikes broke out precisely in the northwest of Poland, he suggested it was partly because one half the population of Szczecin, for one, was born after World War II.

"We are a young society," he told me. "There are many young workers and young intelligentsia here. This generation wants to live better—refrigerators are not enough for us."

He and others at the shipyards stressed, however, that it was not responsible workers who burned the party headquarters and looted stores in Szczecin. The "hooligans," he said, were young Poles who had delinquency records and had been assigned to work in the yards for retraining and reform purposes.

This phenomenon, too, points up an added problem of youth delinquents, many of whom have migrated to the cities from the villages where they have nothing to entertain them.

The new leadership in Warsaw seems sensitively aware of the need to win over and engage the younger generation. Mr. Gierk raised this "key issue" at the recent eighth party plenum, saying that youth is

"searching for perspectives in life." He called for training schemes that would enable young people to advance into responsible positions and that promised changes in the educational system.

"We must draft such a development program . . . as would show youth new horizons and satisfy its material, cultural, and intellectual aspirations," he declared.

"We'll see," said a 21-year-old.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 17, 1971]

CLIMATE OF CONCILIATION—POLAND'S NEW LEADERS OFFER OLIVE BRANCH TO THE CHURCH (By Charlotte Saikowski)

KRAKOW, POLAND.—The Roman Catholic Church and the Polish Communist state stand poised for a new dialogue.

Poland's new leaders are holding out an olive branch to the church, and the church appears ready to accept it. As a sign of the times, an episcopal letter read in all Catholic churches Sunday called on congregations to pray for the new Communist rulers and to forgive their predecessors for precipitating the worker rebellion last December.

It also urged Polish Catholics to cooperate with the "children of God of the whole country" and stressed the need now for internal order and peace.

Politically, the Polish church today poses no threat to Communist rule. When former party leader Wladyslaw Gomułka assumed power in 1956, he moved to eliminate the tensions between church and state and established a *modus vivendi* with the church to keep popular loyalty. Since then there has been a kind of gentleman's peace agreement between the two—as long as the church kept its place.

95 PERCENT ALLEGIANCE CLAIMED

Though the church has lost ground on several issues, it claims the allegiance of more than 95 percent of the Polish population and hence remains a force with which the regime must reckon, especially in the countryside. Moreover, now that the party, emphasizing that the former rulers were out of touch with the people, seeks to reestablish credibility with the nation as a whole, it seems logical that it try to open lines of communication with the church.

"The fact that people are believers does not stop the functioning of socialism," a high-ranking party official told me. "Socialism and religion cannot unite, but they can cooperate."

As a first act, the government has announced it will change the status of properties rented by the church in the former German territories. Considered state property until now, these buildings and lands will be handed over to the church, as elsewhere in Poland.

BUILDING PROGRAM SOUGHT

The Roman Catholic hierarchy has other demands on its agenda. For instance, it would like to build more churches. Hundreds of churches have been rebuilt since World War II, but Catholics complain there are no churches in the new residential districts springing up in Polish cities.

Present state restrictions on the publication of diocesan newspapers and on priestly and liturgical activities also are matters of contention.

How much Stefan Cardinal Wyszyński, the traditionalist, hard-line Primate who rules the Polish church, will demand and how far party First Secretary Edward Gierk and other leaders are willing to go remain to be seen.

At the turn of the year the Cardinal, responding to Mr. Gierk's first overtures, called for greater across-the-board freedoms in Poland. Some party leaders interpreted his declaration as a rebuff, but the leadership refrained from a counterattack and the situation appears to be improving.

Poland's moderate Catholics are particularly heartened by the regime's move toward better relations.

"If there is now a chance of getting on talking-terms with the government, we should take it even if the talks prove fruitless," commented Dr. Jacek Wozniakowski, director of the *Znak* Publishing Institute here. "What other position can there be if you want a dialogue?"

Dr. Wozniakowski and his associates, known as the "Znak Group," represented the moderate wing of Catholic opinion in Poland. The *Znak* Institute, which publishes a weekly newspaper, a monthly, and a dozen or so books a year, is the only independent Catholic organization in the country.

Self-financed, it has a large measure of independence. At the same time it maintains ties with the church through direct contact with Karol Cardinal Wojtyła of Krakow. It also has the support of five Catholic deputies in the Polish Parliament, or Sejm.

WORKING WITHIN ADVOCATED

Often taking issue with Cardinal Wyszyński, the *Znak* Group holds that the Catholic Church can work within the Communist framework without tainting its own religious goals.

"We try to look at the situation realistically," said Dr. Wozniakowski, a tall, intense-eyed art historian who teaches at the Catholic University in Lublin. "We cannot go back to prewar times. We have to reckon with a powerful eastern neighbor and we must remain Communist. But we want to be governed in as law-abiding and democratic a manner as possible. We think this is the Vatican line as well."

The church should not make undue demands on the government, stressed the publisher. In his words: "What it should seek is more openness from the government, more equal treatment of citizens according to merit and not organization. But it would be indecent for the church to ask for special rights outside the general framework of life in Poland."

It is apparently the hope of the Warsaw regime now that Cardinal Wojtyła and other moderates in the clergy and laity can bring pressure to bear on Cardinal Wyszyński for a more accommodating stance vis-à-vis the state.

BREADTH OF APPEAL UNCERTAIN

How much support the *Znak* circle has among Polish Catholics is difficult to know. Dr. Wozniakowski says *Znak*'s weekly newspaper appeals mainly to the intelligentsia but that many workers and peasants support *Znak*.

"I think we represent a big fraction of Catholics, possibly even the majority," he stated. "The older people and priests of course are to the right and think we go too far in trying to find a *modus vivendi* with the state. But the young priests are with us."

"Of course," he added, "the young priests do not make policy, which is in the hands of Cardinal Wyszyński."

According to Dr. Wozniakowski, only a small percentage of Poles are to the left and favor the state-sponsored Catholic organization called PAX, which the regime has tried to use to split the church. PAX, which has extensive publishing facilities, is strongly opposed by Cardinal Wyszyński.

REFORM PARALLEL SEEN

Asked about changes within the church itself, Dr. Wozniakowski said that young Polish priests and many laymen have the same reformist attitudes as Catholics in the West. When the *Znak* newspaper, for instance, wrote on the need for internal church reform, it received a flood of letters from readers approving its stand. Polish translations of books by Western Catholic theologians are quickly sold out.

"But the external signs of reform are less conspicuous in Poland than in Europe," he

added. "Out of internal solidarity Catholics here do not want to make things difficult for the hierarchy."

Meanwhile, the Catholic man in the street seems to favor the current winds of change in church-state relations. When the bishops designated all church collections on Sunday for the families of victims of the December upheavals in the north, the act met with wide approval.

"We hope this all means a new era between the church and state," said a well-educated Pole—who, it might be added, is not only a Roman Catholic but a member of the party.

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
Feb. 18, 1971]

POLISH WORKERS TWISTING RED TAIL
(By Paul Wohl)

The effect of the entire Soviet bloc of the successful strikes in Poland's Baltic cities might prove to be that of a charge of dynamite.

Now, the recent sit-down strike in the old industrial city of Lodz in central Poland has added to the charge. It was on the textile workers' barricades in Lodz in 1830 that for the first time in history a red flag was unfurled.

The Polish labor unrest is said to have prompted Czechoslovakia's first secretary Gustav Husak's recent visit to Moscow. The Hungarian central committee also is reported to have dealt with developments in Poland. Even in distant Pyongyang, North Korea, the Polish workers' uprising set off tremors, wrote the Economist of London.

In the western territories of the U.S.S.R. where not only Western and Polish broadcasts but also television programs come through, the Soviet Communist Party has opened a full-fledged campaign to improve the food supply of the population.

Even more disturbing must be the reports about what the Polish workers were able to obtain, which are being relayed by "hooligan radio stations" as the Soviet authorities call the illegal amateur transmitters being increasingly operated by Soviet citizens within Soviet frontiers.

The latest strike in Lodz, involving some 10,000 persons, has virtually brought Poland's textile industry to a halt.

On Feb. 14, a Politburo delegation headed by Premier Piotr Jaroszewicz flew to Lodz to plead with the workers. The Premier was accompanied by four more Politburo members, a Cabinet minister, and the new trade-union president.

For 18 hours this formidable array of party brass negotiated and argued with the workers—apparently in vain. In the meanwhile reports of strikes in other big factories have come in.

In an effort to appease labor unrest, the Premier, on his return to Warsaw on Feb. 15, announced that the December decree which had raised food prices by about 30 percent would be revoked as of March 1.

This is the new Polish leadership's third major retreat before the workers. The first retreat came in January, when first secretary Edward Gierek flew to Szczecin and Gdansk to talk with the strikers after having turned down their invitation and suggesting that they send a delegation to Warsaw.

The leadership's second retreat was Mr. Gierek's promise to the workers that henceforth party and government would deal with democratically elected factory committees.

The latest retreat was the revocation of the controversial price decree of Dec. 12, which had sparked the demonstrations in the Baltic cities.

BORBA CITES CONCERNS

While a majority of the central committee approved the first secretary's cautious approach, an influential minority felt that little had been achieved and that Mr. Gierek's

pleading with the workers had established "an unwelcome precedent." Strikes henceforth would be a "legalized institution which would make for political and social insecurity."

This was also the line taken in East Berlin and Prague, where the Communist establishments, according to Yugoslavia's Borba of Feb. 12, felt that the Polish developments might have "extreme consequences which could influence certain norms governing internal political relations in these countries." These norms do not provide for an open dialogue between top leaders and strikers.

Behind this concern lies the self-evident fact that the Polish workers' unrest is increasingly taking on more of a political than an economic character.

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
Feb. 18, 1971]

GOMULKA FAILURE RECALLED—PEASANTRY STILL KEEP POLAND FED
(By Charlotte Saikowski)

KOBYLANKA, POLAND.—Michal Piasecki is a 61-year-old Pole whose ruddy, weather-lined face quickly marks him as a man of the soil. He has 22 acres of land which he acquired when he settled in these former German territories 25 years ago; two horses, three cows, and a solid two-story brick house.

He also has three sons—one married and living in nearby Szczecin, another a Catholic priest, and a third who works in a local factory.

Independent, proud, deeply attached to the land, Mr. Piasecki is typical of Poland's peasantry, which has gained more economically and socially under Communist rule than perhaps any other segment of the population.

And, as the nation's new leaders now seek to rescue a deteriorating economy, Mr. Piasecki remains calmly confident of one thing: The regime politically cannot afford to touch Poland's private farms, which account for 85 percent of the total farmland.

COLLECTIVIZATION BID FAILED

When former ruler Wladyslaw Gomulka in 1956 tried to collectivize the Polish peasants, the effort ended in shambles. Today, say Polish officials, collectivization does not make economic sense nor would the peasant permit it. As farmer Piasecki commented drily as we sat chatting in his wife's spotless kitchen:

"Collective farms are good for those who don't want to work. I'm used to managing myself. A man has only so much but he's his own lord."

Basically Poland's agriculture, with its average private farm only 12 acres in size, is not efficient. Yields are higher than in the Soviet Union, where almost all the land is under collective farms, but they are lower than in East Germany, where the farms also are collectivized but managed by far fewer people.

Poland, however, has its own brand of problems.

FARMS SMALL AND INEFFICIENT

The soil, by and large sandy, is not good, and weather conditions are erratic. The land is fragmented into hundreds of small holdings cultivated in the main by horse—and some 2.5 million horses consume a lot of grain.

The farms, moreover, are often run inefficiently by the old and by women as the young people, like Mr. Piasecki's sons, head for the modern lights of the cities. The exodus notwithstanding, 37 percent of Poland's entire work force is still on the land.

Given these factors, say agricultural experts, Poland's farm output has been relatively good. The drop in livestock and grain production in the past two years was due largely to disastrous weather.

Polish and Western economists agree that large-scale amalgamation of farms and mechanization are not the immediate answer for Poland's intensive agriculture. The tractor makes work easier, boosts labor productivity, and enriches the farmer personally, but it also consumes costly oil and gas, which Poland must import.

HORSE STILL CHEAPER

"The horse at this stage is cheaper for us, although we have to import grain," said Dr. Jan Stelmach, assistant director of Warsaw's Institute of Agricultural Economics. "The main thing is to use more fertilizers and to find better substitutes for wheat, since we do not have enough wheat land."

As for collectivization, Dr. Stelmach said the government has not abandoned the concept ideologically but sees no rationale for it now.

For one thing, big farms require a lot of machinery and capital, and the government has no funds. It already has gone beyond its capacity with investments in industry and must now concentrate on increasing wages.

Second, there is no need for collective farms because of the surplus of labor in the countryside. Poland's labor force generally is swelling because of the postwar baby boom and the cities, staggering under the desperate demands for housing and other facilities, simply cannot absorb people off the land.

"There's no point in supplanting cheap farm labor with expensive machines," stated Dr. Stelmach. "Furthermore, what would we do with the people in the cities?"

In several years' time, he said, the population curve should level off and industry will begin to experience a need for labor. Then a drainage from the land will be encouraged and with time—"gradually not suddenly"—the state will organize farm co-operatives, as collective farms here are called. Some experts believe it will be 10 years or so before such a point is reached.

For the time being the government is trying to develop the nation's state farms and cooperatives into efficient units—many already obtain better results than the private farmsteads—and to influence the private sector by marketing and other policies.

It is also encouraging the sale of private land to the state. Mr. Piasecki, for instance, expects to turn over his acreage to the government in five years' time in return for an old-age pension. "My sons don't want the farm," he said laconically.

FOOD PRICES TO DROP

Meanwhile, in another concession to low-earning Poles, the government has announced that with the aid of Soviet credits it will reduce food prices as of March 1 to the level before Dec. 13—when price increases, especially of meat, led to industrial unrest and a political upheaval.

In order to make up the loss this means for the economy, the government is importing Poland's farmers to produce more food. Toward this end, it has raised purchase prices for livestock and this year plans to import about 2.5 million tons of grain, some 500,000 tons more than in the past. This, too, puts a strain on the economy and whether livestock prices are now high enough to get a real breakthrough from the farmers remains to be seen.

On the agricultural front, the leadership thus sits tight, hoping the indomitable Polish peasant will help a troubled nation out of its difficulties.

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
Feb. 25, 1971]

POLISH GAINS STR EAST EUROPEANS
(By Eric Bourne)

VIENNA.—The fallout from what Polish workers have gained in their struggle with the Communist Party leadership over the

past two months now is evident all over Eastern Europe.

Press and other media in European Communist capitals are focusing attention on issues like housing and automobiles—the long-awaited family car for the little man—in a way they have not been spotlighted through years of regime complacency.

Polish workers have won immediate reliefs on their worst grievances. They forced a change in the top leadership of the trade unions, formed their own militant work committees, and got withdrawal of a wage-payment system which would have inflicted new hardships.

The more recent wave of strikes in Poland's great textile city of Lodz was halted only by the government's cancellation of the price rises which were the actual spark for the initial December explosion.

Stirred by these happenings, Communist Party leaders elsewhere in Eastern Europe now talk of the trade unions being allowed a "genuine" role at last in looking after their members' interests. Plans are announced for speeding up the supply of automobiles and housing.

MORE GOODS PROMISED

Even the Soviet Union seems to have felt its effects. The Soviets' 1971-75 economic plan was delayed in publication by apparent differences in the leadership between those advocating more emphasis on consumer needs and the "conservatives" still bent on heavy industrial priorities.

The plan was, it is believed, virtually completed at a Central Committee meeting shortly before the Polish "December." But it was not made public until two months after these events. It is more than likely that its final outline—with its unprecedented stress on an upsurge in living standards—was clinched by the lessons visible in all that had happened in Poland.

It was, it seemed, a victory for the newly consumer-minded elements concerned in Soviet planning.

East Europeans—always sharply tuned to trends on the wind from the Soviet Union, and especially watchful now on the eve of the Soviet Party Congress—are reading it that way anyhow.

They are relieved by Russia's apparent awareness of the acuteness now of consumer dissatisfaction and the decision to do something about it because, they say, this means a setback for the political hard-liners.

The Soviet plan promises a near 50 percent increase in goods of every kind in the shops by 1975. At the other end of the scale, Romania—one of the laggards in domestic reform in the area—is promised something similar.

From December on, Bucharest's shops have carried an increasing flow and variety of goods. Though consumers will still take second place to output of means of industrial production, increases of up to 40 percent in foodstuffs are promised for 1971.

"This year" exulted one of the Romanian provincial city radios "customers will be presented with the latest fashions—from mini to maxi and midi—and shoes with trapezoidal heels, square toes, and metal trimmings also will be on sale."

One of the first assurances given the rebellious Poles was for rapid motorization through production of a new small-engine automobile at a price within working class budgets.

Poland (population 30 million) has a half-million privately owned cars—where the United States stood in 1913 and West European countries in the mid-'30's.

Compared with other East European states today, the lag is still more pronounced.

In Czechoslovakia and East Germany, there is a private car for approximately every 20 inhabitants. Even Hungary—which makes no

automobiles itself—has a car for every 54 people, while Poland's ratio is 1 to 67.

HIGH PRIORITY

The private auto now is set as high as housing on the consumer needs to which almost general bloc unrest has compelled Communist regimes to give more heed.

Hungary has the advantage of stability through a promising reform, already in its third year, which Poland and others well may endeavor to emulate.

Even so, Hungary's new five-year plan includes importation of 300,000 cars to bring private ownership to a half-million—1 for every 20 Hungarians—by the end of 1975.

Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany together are studying a vast joint project for a plant in Slovakia with an ultimate capacity of 400,000 cars yearly.

Under the reform, trade unions in Hungary have already gained considerable voice. They now are pressing for still more.

So the ripples from Poland widen and widen. If a liberalized regime is, in fact, achieved in Warsaw, it can only be on the basis of a new equilibrium and understanding between the workers—now fully awake again to their power—and the party.

Following Hungary's example, it could be an irresistible encouragement to the workers in all other East European countries.

CSC GIVEN GOOD MARKS DURING HAMPTON'S TENURE

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Washington Star:

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 15, 1971]
CSC GIVEN GOOD MARKS DURING HAMPTON'S TENURE

(By Joseph Young)

At the 2-year mark, it seems a good time to assess the performance thus far of the Civil Service Commission under the Nixon administration.

All things considered, the CSC's performance under the fine leadership of Chairman Robert Hampton, ably assisted by Commissioners Lud Andolsek and James Johnson, has been surprisingly good.

Surprisingly because the CSC previously had been headed by another excellent chairman, John Macy, under whose shadow Hampton had served as the Republican member in the Democratic administrations of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

QUESTION OF TOUGHNESS

When Hampton was named by Nixon to take over the chairmanship, there were people around town, including government union leaders, federal personnel officials and members of Congress, who privately wondered whether Hampton had the toughness and the leadership abilities to adequately take the place of Macy.

Hampton didn't take long to convince most people that he did.

The CSC under his leadership and that of the associate commissioners, plus the fine professional staff headed by executive director Nicholas Oganovic, has accomplished much these last two years in the way of modernizing the government's personnel system and practices as well as strengthening employees' rights and benefits.

The CSC has its faults, of course. What

agency hasn't? But it generally has the respect and trust of government employee unions, members of Congress and federal personnel officials. The CSC sometimes may move too slowly for some and may appear to be overcautious on occasion, but its over-all record is a good one.

Under Hampton's leadership, the CSC has played a major role in strengthening the government's labor-management relations program and further improvements soon will be announced.

The government's grievance and appeals system has been streamlined, with greater safeguards given employees to assure more impartial and expeditious hearings.

PAY COMPARABILITY

The CSC worked closely with Rep. Morris Udall, D-Ariz. and other members of the House and Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committees and congressional leaders to secure enactment of the new semi-automatic federal white-collar pay system in which salaries will be adjusted annually without having to be approved by Congress. It assures federal pay comparability with industry.

Liberalized retirement benefits were enacted into law, with the support of the CSC.

The government increased its contributions to federal health insurance premiums—to 40 percent from the previous 25 percent—as a result of a law approved by Congress with CSC support.

These laws could not have been enacted without the CSC's active support.

There have been rumblings of political clearances required for choice federal career jobs and this has happened in some instances. But these have been the exception to the rule and the CSC has succeeded in preventing any broad or centralized political assault on federal career positions.

Progress has been made in equal employment opportunity programs, although not as fast as minority group employees or the CSC itself would like. But if the progress is slow, the gains are steady.

With the commission's strong support, the financial stability of the civil service retirement system was assured when Congress approved the law providing for annual appropriations to prevent the fund from going bankrupt.

OFFICE FOR COMPLAINTS

The CSC also has set up a complaints office to which federal employees may take their complaints on agency personnel actions.

Another CSC accomplishment is a program to open up better career opportunities for lower-salaried employees by abolishing the use of federal service entrance exams (usually given college graduates) in making promotions.

Also, the CSC has expanded the government's occupational health program to provide on-the-job preventive and emergency health treatment to employees through clinics in various federal buildings.

While government employee union leaders have their share of differences with the commission, they nevertheless have the feeling that the CSC under Hampton usually is fair and sympathetic with their problems and has a generally progressive outlook on federal personnel policies and benefits.

THEY SHOOT PEOPLE, DON'T THEY?

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, there is much rhetoric in the land about law and order. Those who must work with law and

order every day, and those who have been given responsibility for recommending concrete steps to achieve it, have recognized the urgent need for controlling the arsenal of guns in the hands of private citizens. Innumerable law enforcement officials, and every Presidential commission in recent years which has studied the problems of reducing violent crime in America, have recommended strict gun control legislation. Yet the Congress has failed to act to stop this societal game of Russian roulette. Is it because the Members are not sufficiently aware of the well-established relationship between easy access to guns and the level of violent crime, or because they have abandoned their responsibilities in the face of the well-financed lobby of gun enthusiasts? I would prefer to believe that it is the former. In that regard, I commend to my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of February 25, 1971, entitled "Straight Shooting":

STRAIGHT SHOOTING

According to the Associated Press, six policemen were killed in week-end shootings, not including a 22-year-old District police officer whose life apparently was taken by a bullet from the pistol of a Montgomery County police officer whom he had joined in a chase following an attempted armed hold-up in the District. It goes to show that the firearms products so widely offered for sale all over the United States are reliable and effective instruments for human slaughter.

These unfortunate incidents afford an interesting backdrop for a bill introduced in the Senate last week by Senator Edward M. Kennedy—a bill which he has called "the Personal Safety Firearms Act of 1971." The act would do three things: It would require the registration of every civilian owned gun in this country; it would require the licensing of all persons who own guns; and it would ban the domestic output of hand-held firearms that are not suitable for sporting or protective purposes.

The aim of this legislation, obviously, is to curtail the use of guns by criminals for criminal and violent purposes and to curtail also the tragic fatalities that result from the careless handling of guns by incompetents. It would not deprive any responsible, law-abiding adult of the pleasure of owning sporting weapons for the hunting of wild game or target shooting in appropriate circumstances. The registration and licensing entailed in the bill would be no more onerous than the registration and licensing of a hunting dog or of the automobile which the hunter might use to take himself to the woods.

"Today," said Senator Kennedy, "it is the misuse and abuse of firearms that taunt the quietude of our family life. We pay an enormous price for our heritage of guns. Over 200,000 gun crimes are committed in one year. Sixty-five per cent of the murders in 1969 involved guns. And at least 71,000 aggravated assaults occurred with guns; while 113,000 robberies took place at gun point." And the Senator added some interesting comparative statistics. The rate of murders by gunfire in the United States, he reported was ten times the rate in Belgium, 21 times the rate in Denmark, 54 times the rate in Great Britain and 90 times the rate in the Netherlands—all countries where the possession of firearms is strictly regulated by law.

It is a kind of national dementia that allows the frenzy of the gun lobby in this country to put the convenience and amusement of gun enthusiasts ahead of the welfare and safety of the American people. The killing of policemen alone—86 of them were shot to death in 1969—should suffice to bring

about strict control of pistols. Policemen ought to demand such control as a condition of carrying on their vital and dangerous duties. An effective remedy for human slaughter by gunfire is readily available to the people of this country—and without injustice or serious infringement of any lawful interest.

GRAEME C. BANNERMAN—A EULOGY

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, to those of us in Congress who knew Jim Bannerman through the years as a dedicated public servant and good friend, news of his death was unexpected and saddening. Our sense of loss is not only personal but public. Jim Bannerman's experience in defense procurement and the conduct of public business was broad and deep and valuable to his country. His cheerful good nature, his unfailing helpfulness to Members of Congress beset with complex problems, and his competence and candor will be sorely missed and always remembered.

A brief but eloquent tribute to Jim Bannerman is the following eulogy presented by John M. Malloy, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense—Procurement—on February 4, 1971:

To all who knew him, Graeme C. Bannerman—known as Jim to one and all—will always be remembered as a giant of a man and a true public servant. The Government's records—the documentation—will show that he spent 31 years in the service of his country. His more recent experience in the field of higher education was a fitting climax to his Government career. Regrettably, the records cannot show the human warmth, the understanding, and the integrity of the man himself.

I was fortunate to have had the privilege of observing Jim Bannerman in the conduct of his public life and, from time to time, of sharing many moments of his private life.

He made a mark during his lifetime. He made a mark on his profession, on his business associates, on his friends and on his family. His is a legacy of public service that will be a guide for years to come.

If I were to ask each of you what single trait best typified this man, I am positive you would answer: his great personal integrity. He was a man of positive views but these views were always on display. He never hid behind a superior when the going got tough. He spent his working life in endeavors that offered temptation on every side. But never was his honesty or integrity questioned in any way. Recently a Regent of the University of California went out of his way to remark on the great candor exhibited by this man. Candor and integrity go hand in hand.

The enormous problems that Government officials face daily in getting "the system" to adopt new solutions to old problems was a challenge to his temperament. He approached each problem with an organized pattern for success—for excellence—a determined will to prevail.

He truly made a reputation during his Federal service—culminating in the three years that he served as the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Installations and Logistics. His appointment by President Johnson to this position was the natural achievement of this great man. It was an achievement of which he was most proud. This was, in his mind, a

recognition of the talent residing in the civilian work force of the Government. He was proud and happy to be the symbol of this recognition. He came up from the ranks—and he preferred it this way.

This man left us with a legacy of values. His infectious smile and fierce competitive spirit would often give him more strokes on the first tee than he was entitled to. His will to live—and to enjoy life to the fullest—despite physical adversity—was an inspiration for everyone who knew him and it is testimony to the strength of his character. He mastered the lawyer's highest art, the art of the relevant. I will always remember his ability to persuade with affection and understanding.

Jim Bannerman was a family man. He was proud of his two daughters and with good reason. He loved to pass on to friends the current activities of his girls. Although a tower of strength in his own right, he made no secret of his great reliance on his wife, Ruth. Our hearts go out to this family in their hour of sorrow.

I followed in the footsteps and in the shadow of Graeme C. Bannerman and I am a better man for it. Many others shared my experience. They, too, were enriched by reason of this association.

A SOUTHEAST ASIA ANALYSIS

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the South Vietnamese incursion into Laos—with American air support—is aimed at cutting the Ho Chi Minh Trail which has been used by the Communists throughout the war to supply men and materiel to the North Vietnamese troops and the Viet Cong fighting in South Vietnam and Cambodia. The operation in southern Laos has prompted renewed debate over the President's policy of permitting our Air Force to support military actions outside South Vietnam as a means of increasing the security and protection of remaining U.S. troops in South Vietnam as they are withdrawn from the war.

During the past 2 weeks the casualty rates for both South Vietnamese soldiers and American fliers have been higher than in recent weeks and there have been some setbacks in the fighting by some South Vietnamese units. Naturally, Americans had hoped that no such actions would be necessary, but that if required, such strikes could be carried out without the allied losses that have occurred.

We cannot overlook the fact, however, that the "ground" action in Laos is being carried out solely by the South Vietnamese within the framework of President Nixon's Vietnamization policy and the restrictions laid down by Congress in the Cooper-Church amendment. It is a test that will go far in determining the future of Vietnamization and, therefore, the withdrawal rates of the remaining American ground forces in South Vietnam. As the South Vietnamese undergo that test, Americans should keep in perspective the full meaning of the move and the hoped for end result—that "overall" success will decrease the num-

bers of Americans needed to back up the South Vietnamese.

As the Laotian incursion began, Dan Rather, White House correspondent for CBS News, commented on the current U.S. role in Southeast Asia under the Vietnamization program. What he had to say then is pertinent to the situation today. He pointed up the changing role of American forces in the war, but cautioned that there are still tests of that policy to be met. For the benefit of my colleagues who may not have had an opportunity to hear reporter Rather's comments, I wish to insert a transcript in the RECORD at this point:

FIRST LINE REPORT

(By Dan Rather)

FEBRUARY 3, 1971.

Good Morning!

Widening the war to wind it down . . . some thoughts after this: (COMCL.) In a public relations sense, this is turning out to be one of the most curious weeks ever in the Vietnam War. So much secrecy about whatever is happening on the South Vietnamese Laotian border . . . secrecy for the American public. It will be interesting to see how it all turns out, in terms of the war itself, and in terms of public support for President Nixon's war policy.

While awaiting the result, consider the report of Ernie L.—not giving his name you understand, just his initial. Ernie L. is one of the best reporters I know—fifty years old, thirty years a journalist, graduate of the University of Chicago, first-rate combat reporter in World War II, lived around and wrote extensively from Europe in the cold war era, distinguished himself covering the Hungarian uprising, wide experience in the Congo, the Middle East, Latin America and Asia. All of that by way of backgrounding you to the fact that this fellow has been around . . . he is no ordinary reporter. When Ernie L. talks, other reporters listen.

He is just back from Indochina, his, let's see, must be ninth tour—Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos. This is what he says: "President Nixon is doing what he claims he is doing in Indochina, withdrawing the United States from ground combat. Large U.S. army units," says Ernie, "are no longer involved in combat anywhere. For that matter, neither are middle-sized units. For all practical purposes, U.S. ground forces are out of the combat business. Special forces type still lead tribesmen in Vietnam and Laos . . . some evidence, no hard information, that they may be doing the same just to cross the Vietnam-Cambodian border. U.S. advisers are still active with South Vietnamese units, but U.S. ground force units as such are not fighting and are being phased out.

"The Marines already are out. That leaves," says Ernie L., "the South Vietnamese pretty much on their own. They are on their own now much more than the American public seems to know." How good are they? Damn good and getting better comes the answer, which doesn't necessarily mean they will be over the long pull good enough to prevent an eventual Communist victory militarily. The impression you get from Ernie is that he believes they are, but he always hastens to add that the final decision on whether South Vietnam goes Communist or not will depend less on military factors than on politics and economics.

Politically, the Saigon government seems to be getting stronger; economically, weak and getting weaker. This it should be noted at a time when North Vietnam's economy is reported by most sources East and West as strong and getting stronger.

But back to the military assessment—what about air power? The U.S. Air Force is doing less in South Vietnam says this correspondent. The South Vietnamese are doing

much more of their own air combat. U.S. air strikes in South Vietnam down significantly, down about at least twenty-five, perhaps as much as forty per cent. U.S. air strikes in Cambodia and Laos are up, way up, and likely will remain high for the foreseeable future. This amounts to massive air cover for the basic U.S. withdrawals. Outside of North Vietnam, most North Vietnamese troops are now in Laos and Cambodia, so that's where the air strikes go.

But what about Laos and Cambodia? Aren't we widening the war both places? The air war, yes . . . On the ground it is the North Vietnamese who are widening the combat in Laos. In Cambodia, the situation is too confused, too obtuse and wide to make much sense out of who is doing what to whom.

Summary from a tough-minded, dovishly inclined reporter who has been there—President Nixon is trying to do in South Vietnam what was done in South Korea, with the chances of it working fifty-fifty or better. The North Vietnamese have most of Laos and can take the rest whenever they please. Their potential for doing the same in Cambodia excellent but by no means certain.

Now, please this message: (COMCL.) Dan Rather, CBS NEWS, the White House. Thank you for joining us. This has been "First Line Report" on CBS Radio.

A DECADE OF HEALTH BENEFITS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, 1970, 1 million births after the implementation of Public Law 86-382—the Federal employees' health benefits program observed its 10th anniversary.

These million new babies were born to parents enrolled in the Government employees' program and arrived almost entirely prepaid at an average cost of \$291.

The significance of these new lives is neither in their number nor the \$291 million price tag alone, but in the fact that their births occurred under conditions which provided the best possible odds for survival and a healthy start in this world.

Of equal importance with the well-being of these new lives is the security given to their parents and other members of the family, and to all of the employees, retirees, and dependents of the program.

BENEFITS INCREASED FOURFOLD

During the same decade an additional \$4½ billion was expended in benefits for enrollees and their families. Benefit payments approximating one-quarter billion dollars in the first year's operation increased fourfold by 1970, and is estimated to attain \$1.2 billion during the calendar year 1971.

Aside from the fact that participation in the program has prevented financial disaster, especially where the covered individual's illness or injury has been serious and/or prolonged, it also has contributed importantly to enrollees' welfare in another way—it has improved their health habits.

The assistance provided toward the payment of medical care expenses has made them less reluctant to seek treatment. Particularly is this so in the case of the prepayment group plans which

practice preventive care as well as sick care.

Upon its inception the Federal employees' health benefits program became the largest voluntary plan of its kind, not only in the Nation, but in the world, covering about 1.8 million employees and 3.2 million dependents.

LARGEST VOLUNTARY PLAN

It is still the largest, covering roughly 8.2 million persons of whom 2.3 million are employees, 0.4 million are annuitants, and 5.5 million are dependents.

These statistics, while somewhat impressive, do not tell the whole story. From the beginning, the participating plans—now numbering 40—have broadened their coverage substantially.

The influence of the program now extends beyond its own sphere of operation, being frequently cited as the "bellwether" in the health insurance field in providing comprehensive hospital and medical care on a voluntary basis.

Great, indeed, is the value of the Federal system's experience to non-Federal employers who are already operating or contemplating the establishment of similar health benefit programs.

EXPERIENCE HELPS OTHERS

This invaluable experience offers guidelines as to the kinds and extent of benefit levels which might be prescribed and the premium charges required to support the payment of such benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks a letter from the Honorable Robert E. Hampton, Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, on the highlights of the Federal employees' health benefits program's first decade of operation.

While I share Chairman Hampton's feeling that our Federal program is second to none with respect to its levels of protection, it is my own belief that it falls far short of attaining the stature of a "model" employer program insofar as the employer-employee premium sharing ratio is concerned.

Following is the text of Chairman Hampton's letter to me:

FEBRUARY 17, 1971.

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and
Civil Service, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Because of the current national interest in health care and health insurance and your personal interest in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program enacted by the Congress in 1959, I thought you might be interested in this report on the Program.

On June 30, 1970, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program completed ten years of operation. It is still the largest voluntary employer-sponsored health insurance program in the world. The protection it provides against both small and large medical bills is, I believe, as good as is found in the best employer-sponsored plans and better than most. It gives employees a uniquely wide range of choice among the different types of plans—service benefits, indemnity benefits, group-practice prepayment, and individual-practice prepayment—and among levels of protection. It is still a pace-setter in the health insurance field and is often cited in the literature as an example of what can be done in providing good health insurance on a voluntary basis.

Here are a few interesting statistics about the Program:

There are 40 plans participating, many offering a choice between high and low options (i.e., levels of protection) at commensurate premiums.

Benefits provided are currently valued at more than \$1 billion annually.

Over eight million employees and retirees and their family members are protected.

About one-third of those protected receive covered medical care and benefits annually.

Over the ten-year existence of the Program, one million children were born to protected families.

The Federal Employees Health Benefits Program has experienced at least two of the problems that, especially in the last five years, have become problems for the nation. These are the spiralling cost of health care and the method of financing this cost. The first of these is uniquely a national problem about which the Civil Service Commission, in its role of representing the employer of the Federal work force, can do very little. The second problem, that of financing the cost of health insurance, has been, in my opinion, satisfactorily solved, at least for the next few years.

The solution I refer to is provided for in Public Law 91-418, recently enacted by the Congress and approved by the President on September 25, 1970. This law provides that the Government, as employer, will contribute approximately 40 percent of premium costs and employees 60 percent, effective in January 1971, with annual adjustments to maintain this cost-sharing ratio.

Before enactment of this law, the Government contribution, expressed as a percentage of total premium, had deteriorated from a high of 38 percent in 1966 to a low of 24 percent in 1970. Since the maximum Government contribution was fixed by law, employees had to bear the full cost of the substantial premium increases that occurred annually.

To illustrate the effect of Public Law 91-418, consider a typical employee with family coverage in the high option of the plan with the largest enrollment. In 1970 the monthly premium for this coverage was \$38.33 of which the employee paid \$29.45 and the Government contributed \$8.88. For 1971, the premium had to be increased to \$47.91; had Public Law 91-418 not been enacted, the Government would still have contributed only \$8.88 and the employee would have had to pay the difference (\$39.03), an increase in direct cost to the employee of \$9.58 a month. Under the 40%/60% sharing arrangement specified in Public Law 91-418, the Government now contributes \$18.72 and the employee \$29.19. The net effect of Public Law 91-418 on this employee is that instead of his take-home pay being reduced by \$9.58 a month to meet the increased cost of health care, the Government contribution has met the higher cost and his take-home pay is increased very slightly (by 26¢).

Stated in terms of total premium cost for the Program, the Government will contribute, for 1971, about \$480 million of the \$1.18 billion premium and the employee will pay about \$700 million. Had not Public Law 91-418 been enacted, the fixed Government contribution, as a percentage of total premium would have further deteriorated from 24 percent in 1970 to 20 percent in 1971; the Government would have contributed \$237 million of the \$1.18 billion premium and the employees would have paid the balance of \$941 million.

Although Public Law 91-418 has considerably increased the Government's cost, I believe the 40%/60% cost-sharing ratio is eminently fair and reasonable and was very timely enacted. Had enactment been delayed, it is very probable that the 1971 premium increases would have made the cost of coverage under the Program prohibitive for many employees and caused them to cancel, or reduce the level of, their protection.

Although the Commission tries to avoid increases in premium, and, where they are necessary, to minimize them, I believe substantial annual premium increases are inevitable until the rate of increase in the cost of health care can be slowed. One of the best features of Public Law 91-418 is that future premium increases will be shared by the Government and its employees in the 40%/60% ratio, instead of being borne entirely by employees, as heretofore.

In short, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program has been a model one for the first decade of its existence. It has been of considerable value in helping Government to maintain a competitive position in attracting able people to, and retaining them in, the Federal workforce. Public Law 91-418 was enacted just in time to meet a financial crisis which could conceivably have resulted in the Program losing its effectiveness and its pre-eminent position among health insurance plans.

I can report to you that the Program is now equitably financed and that it continues to provide excellent protection against the costs of health care. This is not to say, however, that there are no problems. I expect that the rapidly rising costs of medical care will generate new pressures for a further increase in the Government's contribution, as well as for new and expensive kinds of coverages in such areas as dental care, vision care, nursing home care, and custodial care. Hopefully, though, if the President's goal, as contained in his State of the Union Message, of "improving America's health care and making it available more fairly to more people" is implemented, it will help ease the health care problems affecting employees and annuitants under our Program.

Attached for your further information is a more detailed report of highlights of the first decade of operation of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. HAMPTON,
Chairman.

EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS IN EDUCATION

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, a good constituent of mine in the Fourth District of Kentucky, R. Marcus "Jack" Crume, has written an article expressing his views on experimental programs in the field of education. I feel many of my colleagues may have similar programs in their districts and will find Mr. Crume's comments germane to their situations.

Mr. Crume is a Louisvillian and a product of its elementary and secondary schools. He has done graduate work in economics at Indiana University, and holds bachelor and master's degrees from Howard University and the University of Michigan. He taught in Louisville secondary schools for more than 30 years before retiring last September.

The article appeared in the Louisville Times on Tuesday, February 2, and the text of it follows:

SCHOOL INNOVATIONS ARE ENSLAVING THE MINDS OF NEGROES WHEN THEY NEED SOLID EDUCATION

(By R. Marcus Crume)

One hundred years after the freeing of their bodies, Negroes are going back into slavery—not the degrading servitude of chat-

tels, but allowing their minds to be enslaved by neglect.

Thomas Jefferson once said that no nation, no people, can be free and ignorant at the same time; an extension of that idea suggests that to be half-educated is to be half-slave. A permissive educational philosophy of the past 30-odd years has negated academic excellence and changed freedom to license of almost anarchistic proportions.

It has harmed middle-class white society, with its built-in drives and motivations, leaving it rudderless in a sea of discarded standards, Christian virtues and acceptable social goals, all of which give life its fullest meaning.

But it has done the greatest damage to black children whose backgrounds lack the inherent disciplines of the factory system, of a highly competitive society, of the lure of affluence.

Forty years of being involved, of learning and practicing my craft as a teacher, have heightened my critical perception of progressive education and deepened my convictions:

That the permissive type of education, which has characterized public-school training since the early '30s, leaves much to be desired in providing children skills in basic language and in computation, in teaching them adequate behavior and in inspiring them to rise above mediocrity.

That Impact and Focus, the current programs being conducted in the city schools, are but another modus operandi of this educational philosophy.

Progressive education swept the country in the early '30s. I, as a young teacher, was caught up in what was almost a religious fervor for this new education, which embraced such lofty maxims as:

1. A child will learn if sufficiently motivated;
2. A child needs to learn the end or goal sought before accepting the learning challenge;
3. A child busy with learning experiences will be disciplined by those experiences (obviating the age-old practices of discipline and correction);
4. Failures (nonpromotions) were an anomaly in the educative process.

While the practical application of these maxims somehow went awry, the philosophy itself enabled the great American public and school boards to "have their cake and eat it." Faced with an ever-increasing school population and constantly mounting costs, boards may have, and understandably so, avidly embraced those tenets that allowed easy promotions, with practically no failures (obviating the need for additional classrooms and teachers for repeaters of any grade).

RESULTS OF PERMISSIVENESS

Let us examine the results, which have eroded the world's most expensive, and what could be the world's best schools.

Discipline—or more accurately, the lack of discipline—is the wellspring of the schools' most serious problems. Discipline may take many forms, but whatever the form, the end product is control, the kind of control that suggests a choice: to do or not to do, with the incumbent consequences.

Today, the child has no set of choices; he does not have to choose between being good or bad, because there are no consequences to being bad; he makes no choice as to performance or nonperformance because promotion is assured if he stays alive; and if he is alive and bad, promotion is doubly assured.

But discipline is the handmaiden of learning, and without it learning languishes. A case in point: A child in the early stages of developing language skills is given, say, five words to "make his own"—that is, to spell, to sound, to use. When he returns without having mastered his assignment, what can the teacher do but compound the felony by

giving him five more words, and five more! She cannot keep him after school, because he will miss his bus; she cannot scold, for fear of damaging his psyche; she cannot use physical chastisement, because in progressive education physical correction for nonperformance is unconscionable.

What CAN she do? Give him five more words!

Should it be surprising that he reaches the ninth grade and still reads on the fourth- or fifth-grade level? Could this explain all the remedial classes cluttering up school curricula? Would they be needed for the host of normal children if those children could have been held to the task the first time around? When all else fails, what is so wrong with corporal chastisement for nonperformance? Most of its use in the family is for nonperformance of some sort. Corporal pleasure and corporal displeasure are experiences common to all, and it is only in the schools that corporal correction conjures up wild visions of blood-letting floggings.

IMPACT AND FOCUS

The philosophy behind Impact and Focus goes beyond the idea of the child-centered approach, popular since the '30s, to the concept of the "whole child"; not alone his mind, but his feelings, his attitudes, his recognition in others of the "trust of the human organism."

Some of its tenets, as I am able to understand them, suggest: that when a child perceives a realness, a genuineness, a lack of facade in the facilitator (under Impact-Focus the teacher does not teach, she "facilitates learning"), the facilitator can be most effective; and that if the child senses acceptance, IF there is an atmosphere void of repressions, IF curricula, grades, tests, etc., are removed or made incidental, then learning is best accomplished.

I have no disposition to joust with these theories; as a matter of fact, the claim for the retention of dropouts is probably valid: Why drop out when it is so pleasurable to drop in?

But as a practical method for having children learn, Impact-Focus is indeed an "iffy" proposition. In application, everything seems to be directed toward doing what the child wants, toward making him happy! We seem to be trimming our sails to fit the whims of adolescents.

Why abdicate to the child? Does the doctor allow the accident patient to choose the physical therapy, or the lawyer permit the client to determine the legal presentation?

Teachers and administrators are mature and professional; children are neither. Impact-Focus no more provides for better control, which is the girding for any educational structure, than what we have had for more than three decades.

Supporters of Impact-Focus are asking that it be given a three-year trial; to accede to such a request the black community, in particular, might well be committing itself to a luxury it can ill afford: three more squandered years for children already trailing scholastically.

Impact-Focus pins its hopes on self-initiated learning when, factually, learning is much more routinized, much more externally motivated. I reject its advocacy of freedom that borders on license. Freedom is not a substitute for orderly control, nor is education by happenstance a worthy replacement for structured educational regimen.

I question that children, given these optimum conditions promised by Impact-Focus, will self-initiate worthwhile learning in large numbers, and large numbers is what we deal with in public schools.

I question that the project will beget rapaciously curious students, or that it will give us anything but what we have now: second-rate performers, void of standards or

goals, and without a commitment to excellence.

Advocates of Impact-Focus would claim a special efficacy for it in the inner-city schools, where the so-called underprivileged are. Only in the most racially bigoted sense can Negroes en masse be considered underprivileged, yet Impact-Focus programs are in some all-black schools but in no all-white schools, and always in schools predominantly black.

If Impact-Focus can, as it claims, bring about improvement in scholastic achievement and shore up character development, why deprive white children of these "goodies"? To give blacks this exclusivity is to retreat to that old bromide about blacks needing a special kind of education. The Supreme Court in its desegregation ruling of 1954 viewed separate schools as demeaning; are separate curricula for blacks any less demeaning?

If black children are any different as school children, it is only in their lessened drives and motivations. This is the result of more than half a century of disillusionment. Education has not held out the promise for black youth that it has for whites. The Negro could drive the same elevator, sweep the same floors, hop the same bells without an education that he could with one; therefore, he looked at it circumspectly.

Conditions are not the same in 1970: opportunities are opening up, thanks to a concerned government. What black children need for a productive adult life in America is the same exacting educational fare all children need, served up on a rough-hewn platter of orderliness and compliance.

The black families—indeed, the black community—are not without culpability; they should demand that the educational regimen be as hard and uncompromising as life itself; they should insist that the youth approach these schools with a passion for knowledge.

The hue and cry of the community should be to get knowledge, for the salvation of the black youth lies in enlightenment. Pulpits should enunciate it, and parents should make a fetish of it.

Black parents must direct their children away from the beads, the ornaments, etc., which at best are but shibboleths of racial and cultural pride.

Pride is a feeling, a feeling of representing oneself and one's people well. Pride asks no quarters, no dispensation, no patronizing. Pride, speaking through a youth, says give me the same examination the whites take for the job, face me with the same high standards of college entrance, give me no special considerations, merely equal opportunities.

Jackie Robinson asked no relaxing of team rules, he sought no protection against insults and racial slurs, he asked only for the opportunity to measure his skills against others. His pride made him prepare himself, his pride made him competitive, his pride became our pride.

SCHOOLS REFLECT CONCERN

The schools transmit the cultural heritage of a people, for the benefit of that people, and if those people are concerned and vocal, the schools will surely reflect that concern.

The Negro community needs to focus on what kind of product it wants the schools to turn out:

If the "focus" is on a hard-hitting, demanding educative system, where the only "impact" is the exploding and crashing of ideas, if the black community wants such schools as will turn out good citizens rather than a cult of law-breakers, if it wants such schools as will make productive members of the world of work rather than marginal laborers, if it wants such schools as will fashion a society of thinkers rather than individuals running up and down the streets

of other people's minds, then such schools can be theirs for the demanding.

The true mission of the schools is the transmission of the cultural heritage. This cannot be realized through education by happenstance. Inarticulateness in the mother tongue, deficiencies in computational skills, inadequacies in the physical and human sciences, suggest that learning has been relegated to the ashheap.

The approach now is to make the child happy; if allowing the child to decide what he wants to do and when he wants to do it, makes him happy, so be it. Have we forgotten that education is a hard, painstaking series of experiences, sometimes even boring; that the joy comes only after mastery?

We must soon forsake this system that makes education a game of musical chairs, a system that turns the "little red schoolhouse"—formerly the citadel of learning—into a teen-age spa, where youth can loll and play until age 16, for already we seem to be developing a cult of mediocrity.

Let us bequeath the great cultural heritage of our fathers to our children, not surrender it to them.

NO DIME NECESSARY

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, I addressed the Members of the House of Representatives on an issue of importance to all of us living here in the Metropolitan Washington area. The issue was the implementation of the emergency number "911" throughout the metropolitan area in place of the various seven-digit emergency numbers.

The news is encouraging on the cooperation evidenced in this area to bring about this result, and I am hopeful that we will soon enjoy the use of that simple, three-digit, easily remembered number here in the Washington area.

Along with the single, simple number for reporting emergencies, there is another telephone communications innovation that can be equally important in times of emergency. Three years ago, when I was discussing the issue of the three-digit number with A.T. & T., I also noted the importance of having telephones, outdoors in particular, which were equipped with "dial-tone" first equipment. In other words, persons experiencing emergencies, could use these phones without coins. Many times emergencies occur when you have no change and searching for a dime can extend the time consumed before the appropriate emergency relief arrives.

I am delighted to report today, that the whole Washington metropolitan area, outdoor telephone booths and booths located in transportation areas have dial-tone first. This includes the District of Columbia, and parts of both Virginia and Maryland. What this means is that the distraught citizen, caught up in an emergency, whether crime or fire or health, can stop at any outdoor telephone and immediately dial the operator for assistance. When "911" becomes the emergency number used throughout this

area, it should then be possible to dial that number without a coin.

I wish to congratulate American Telephone & Telegraph for making this important facility available in this area. This is one example of how improved technology can be used to assist the American citizen.

I also include in the RECORD, a very interesting "fantasy" produced for the Today Show 3 years ago. It concerns what emergencies might possibly happen and how they would be met in a city with multiple emergency phone numbers. Although facetious, the incidents described point out the real need for uniformity in emergency telephone numbers.

Suppose a madman breaks into your home and shoots you in the leg. Now this startles you and you drop your cigarette on the sofa, setting it afire. Calmly, you call an ambulance for yourself, the fire department for the burning sofa, and the police to take away the madman. But wait, in the excitement, your dog runs into the street and is killed by a car. The car goes out of control, knocks over several trash cans and a fire hydrant. The trash clogs the sewer entrance and the water begins backing up into your cellar. Groggy but game, you call the animal collection people to take away the dog, the Water Department to fix that hydrant, and the Sewer Department to unclog that sewer. Now you are undecided as to who will take care of the overturned trash cans, so to be on the safe side, you call both the trash and the garbage people and the street cleaners. And oh, yes, you'd better call another ambulance for the people in that car.

Now, things are so bad that the madman is more depressed than you are and he threatens to kill himself. So still holding on to the tourniquet on your wounded leg, you dial the emergency Mental Health Service and you ask them to come to talk him out of it. But he won't listen; he takes poison. Now you have to call the Poison Control Center. The whole thing has just been too much for your old aunt who chooses this moment to have a very bad asthma attack. That means calling the Health Emergency Information Service and maybe another ambulance because the two you already called are getting pretty crowded by this time.

But you can now relax because you have run out of emergency numbers and nothing more can happen to you.

I am convinced that in the near future, such situations will not be able to occur in this Washington metropolitan area.

CITIZENS AGAINST THE WAR

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Emergency Committee Against Escalation of the War, an organization in Palo Alto, Calif., I would like to enter in the RECORD their protest against the present course being pursued by the administration in Indochina. The advertisement in which those views were expressed appeared recently in the Washington Post. I agree with my colleague on the other side of the aisle (Mr. McCloskey) that this war will be ended only when the Amer-

ican people demand that it be ended. I offer the Palo Alto message as an example of one way ordinary citizens can get together and get the message across to an administration which seems to be getting progressively more hard of hearing on the war issue. The advertisement follows in the form of an open letter to Mr. Nixon and Mr. Laird:

TO PRESIDENT NIXON AND SECRETARY LAIRD
FROM 1,324 CITIZENS OF PALO ALTO: CONTINUE TO BOMB AND OUR COUNTRY MAY NEVER HAVE PEACE AGAIN

When we stopped bombing North Vietnam in 1968, there was hope for peace. But now you have started bombing again.

And you continue to bomb Laos and Cambodia.

We have held some hope for peace. But the bombing means we have given up.

It means we think we must use force.

It means we believe that escalation works, that preventive warfare works, that bombing women and children works.

They have never worked before.

If we try to make them work again we believe our country may never be at peace again, with itself or with the world.

We petition you to stop the bombing now.

We petition our countrymen to join us.

(Signed in Behalf of 1,324 Citizens of Palo Alto, Emergency Committee against escalation, 325 Barclay Court, Palo Alto, California.)

CZECHOSLOVAKIA'S SAD ANNIVERSARY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday was the 23d anniversary of the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia. It was on February 25, 1948, that President Eduard Benes, acting under extreme pressure, bowed to the inevitable and permitted the formation of a new government in which Communists predominated.

Klement Gottwald, the Communist who had been Prime Minister in a coalition cabinet since July 2, 1946, became President on June 14, 1948, Benes having resigned 7 days earlier. In the meantime, the Parliament, the political parties, the press, and the universities had all been purged.

New nationalization laws covering 90 percent of Czechoslovakia's industrial capacity were enacted by the Communist-dominated Parliament on April 28. On May 9 a new constitution, based on that of the Soviet Union, was promulgated. New elections were held on May 30, as a result of which the single government list of candidates received 90 percent of the votes in the Czech areas and 86 percent in Slovakia. By means of such farcical expressions of support the Soviets claimed to have a mandate over their tiny neighbor.

During the more than two decades that have elapsed since the Communist takeover, the people of Czechoslovakia, who now number 14,418,000, have learned all about peaceful coexistence, relaxation of tensions, and mellowing international communism. Their diffi-

culties, already great, were compounded in 1968 when the Soviet Union dispatched a total of 650,000 Russian, East German, Polish, Hungarian, and Bulgarian troops into its satellite in order to crush attempts to ameliorate the conditions that existed as a result of 20 years of brutal totalitarian dictatorship. Czechoslovakia is just as much an occupied country today as it was from 1938 to 1945, when it was ruled by the National Socialists of Adolf Hitler.

Mr. Speaker, there will be time enough for Americans to talk about increased trade behind the Iron Curtain, building bridges of friendship with the Communist world, and setting up cultural exchanges with the Soviet and its satellites after Czechoslovakia and its sister satellites have been emancipated from bondage. Before agreeing to sit down with the tyrants of the Kremlin to discuss such matters as trade, friendship, and culture, let us insist that they wash the blood of Czechoslovakia from their hands.

A PROPOSAL FOR CABINET-LEVEL DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH AFFAIRS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, although Mr. Nixon repeatedly claims to be concerned about the alienation of young Americans and about the deteriorating condition of the environment, I am somewhat confused by the efforts Mr. Nixon is making to remedy those conditions. On the one hand, Mr. Nixon suggests or alludes to possible solutions to the problems, and on the other hand he ignores positive legislative proposals before Congress that put into legislative language what Mr. Nixon himself has only expressed in vague, generalized rhetoric.

Specifically, I find it both surprising and discomforting when Mr. Nixon ignores legislation designed to ease the tension between generations and to channel the enthusiasm and energy of young Americans into productive, meaningful activities in our best national interest, that is, protection and preserving the environment. I refer to H.R. 1368—a bill to establish a cabinet level Department of Youth Affairs.

Mr. Nixon in his state of the Union address proposed a sweeping reorganization of the Federal Government in order to make Government more responsive to the needs of all the people. Mr. Nixon acknowledged that "millions of frustrated young Americans today are crying out," asking for the opportunity to serve their country, our country. Mr. Nixon declared that we must give them the chance; "we hear you and we will give you a chance—a chance to participate in government." I could not agree more, but what can we do about it?

Congress proposed a solution to this

problem over a year ago, and Mr. Nixon has yet to recognize the bill still pending which incorporates his own proposals and gives them effective meaning. Last February my distinguished colleague the Honorable CLAUDE PEPPER of Florida, introduced H.R. 6259, now H.R. 1358, and then reintroduced it with my support and many others in March. H.R. 1358 now has over 45 cosponsors, but unfortunately not the support of the President.

If the goals Mr. Nixon has established for his administration are to be achieved, cooperation with Congress must be a high priority. If the order of priorities Mr. Nixon gave in his state of the Union address are to be honored, Mr. Nixon's own first priority is the unfinished business of the 91st Congress. H.R. 1358 is a matter of unfinished business that should receive the prompt and favorable consideration of Mr. Nixon and the entire Congress.

A COMPREHENSIVE REPORT ON THE WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, some of the mail which I receive from my younger constituents reflects a disturbing lack of knowledge about the conflict in Southeast Asia. It would appear that there are some groups which are engaging in massive historical distortion in order to rally support for the North Vietnamese Communists. This is an unfortunate situation and must be corrected.

Toward this end I am inserting in the RECORD the prologue from the comprehensive report on the war compiled by our former Commander in Chief Pacific, Adm. U. S. G. Sharp and Gen. William C. Westmoreland, former commander U.S. Military Assistance Command Vietnam, entitled "Report on the War in Vietnam." This excellent publication, which should be in every school library, covers U.S. military operations in Vietnam from June 1964 through July 1968.

It is of real importance that the young people have a good grasp of the situation which led up to our commitment in Vietnam, our actions in the theater, and the importance of defeating the North Vietnamese enemy.

The prologue follows:

PROLOGUE

Every war has its own distinctive features. The Vietnam War has been characterized by an invading army that denied its own existence, by guerrilla fighters who lived among the people they threatened, by the employment of highly sophisticated modern Communist weapons systems, and by carefully controlled limitations on the activities of American field commanders imposed less by the capabilities of their own forces and weapons than by considerations of international politics.

For over 20 years South Vietnam has fought to preserve its freedom against unremitting, ruthless aggression. The aggression has been no less real for the fact that it has been by Vietnamese against Vietnam-

ese and by techniques of subversion, infiltration, terror, and attack rather than overt invasion on the classic pattern. The military effort which we and our allies have mounted in assistance to our Vietnamese ally has been one of constant innovation in resistance to a form of attack new in our experience.

In one way this war has not differed from others. The tests of battle have been met by our fighting men with unsurpassed dedication and courage, upholding the finest traditions of our military services.

The Vietnam War has had the most intense press coverage and has been the most thoroughly documented, most centrally controlled, most computerized, and most statistically analyzed in history. This was due in part to the necessity to measure the progress of a war in which there were no clearly drawn battle lines—no front, no safe rear. Because so much has been publicized about the war, this report contains no accounts that have not been reported before, nor revelations not previously expressed. Our goals, our efforts to meet them, our achievements, and our reversals are all part of the public record.

The weapons in this war have ranged from sharpened bamboo sticks through the entire spectrum of modern conventional weapons. Through an evolutionary growth reaching astounding proportions, the war has had one underlying theme—North Vietnam, supported by world Communist interests, has maintained a fierce determination to take over the government and people of South Vietnam, at whatever cost in lives or material. The Communists initially attempted to gain control by subversive methods—simple terrorism and assassination. When those techniques met strong resistance, Hanoi applied all of its resources and all of the aid it could accommodate from its allies, resorting to overt aggression. This report will sketch the profile of this Communist aggression and outline what we have done to counter it.

The United States had no desire to become involved in a war in Asia. One reason we did not send troops to Indochina at the end of World War II to support the French effort to regain control was that we did not want to help reinstate a colonial authority. The indigenous anti-French resistance, which began in late 1946, was not just a nationalist movement, although it sometimes took that guise. The Viet Minh had been organized in 1941 as a coalition of various groups—Democrats, Socialists, Communists, and other less well-defined sections of the independence movement. Its organization was dominated by the Communists, led by Ho Chi Minh who had been trained in Moscow. The war in Korea later proved to the world the seriousness of the threat of Asian Communism and in the early 1950's, after the Viet Minh had revealed itself as an instrument of communism, the United States, therefore, started sending more military aid to France for use against the Communist Viet Minh.

GENEVA—1954

Despite this aid, France's attempt to reinstate colonial rule in Indochina was already falling when the United States, Great Britain, the USSR, and France met in Geneva in 1954. They sought a political settlement in Korea and a truce in Indochina. In May while the conference was in progress, General Vo Nguyen Giap and his Viet Minh forces defeated the besieged French forces at Dien Bien Phu and with this defeat the French decided to leave Indochina.

At Geneva, agreement was reached to partition Vietnam near the 17th Parallel with a provisional demarcation line cushioned by a demilitarized zone. Neither North nor South Vietnam was to interfere with the internal affairs of the other. Elections to reunify the two parts were to be held within two years of the signing.

Of great importance was the agreement

banning the introduction of new troops and weapons or the establishment of new military bases. The manpower and materiel already in Vietnam could be replaced but not augmented, according to the treaty. Neighboring Laos and Cambodia were barred from military alliances, and foreign bases in either country were prohibited. All Viet Minh and French troops were to be withdrawn from both countries. To enforce the terms of the armistice, a three-country International Control Commission was created.

The United States and Vietnam did not sign the Geneva Accords, but endorsed them in principle and adhered to them in action until Communist violations had emptied them of meaning and rendered the International Control Commission powerless.

President Eisenhower, speaking for the United States, on 10 October 1954 offered "to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means" in the hope "that such aid, combined with ... continuing efforts, will contribute effectively toward an independent Vietnam endowed with a strong government." Our involvement stems from this commitment.

DETERIORATION OF THE SITUATION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

North Vietnam hoped that the newly formed South Vietnamese Government would, if given enough time, fall of its own accord. The Hanoi leaders were ready to step into the resulting political void and reap a cheap victory. Such was not to be the case, however, for in the years immediately following the cessation of hostilities the Republic of Vietnam, beset though it was with problems, made steady if unspectacular progress.

The Geneva Accords called for national elections in both parts of Vietnam. But in 1956 the Saigon government refused to hold elections in South Vietnam on the grounds that elections in North Vietnam under the Communists would not guarantee the voters a free choice.

Hanoi had not anticipated this and now set about to gain control of the South by other means. The Viet Minh had left many cadres in the South in 1954. Under Hanoi's orders, they were organized into a political-paramilitary organization.

In 1960 the Central Committee of the Lao Dong Party, the Communist Party of North Vietnam, passed a resolution that South Vietnam was to be "liberated" and that North and South Vietnam were to be unified under a "progressive socialist" administration.

The Hanoi radio then announced the formation in South Vietnam of the National Front for the Liberation of South Vietnam, a front which Hanoi claimed was made up of several political parties of South Vietnamese. Subsequent Hanoi broadcasts identified a "People's Revolutionary Party" as the leading party in this so-called front. It is significant that no announcement of this came out of South Vietnam, and no nationally-known South Vietnamese figure was ever identified with any of the political parties, which were on paper only, mentioned by the Hanoi radio.

Now the insurgent effort was infused with new cadres from the North—South Vietnamese who went, or were taken, North after the 1954 armistice.

The new organization, referred to as the Viet Cong, talked of land reform, a benevolent socialism, freedom from taxes, and the evils of American capitalistic influence. In some areas the Viet Cong were accepted by the people and the organization established local councils. Where the people rejected the Viet Cong, terrorism and armed attack were applied.

All the while, the Viet Cong were strengthening their organization, acquiring arms and

experience. A cold-blooded campaign of elimination of local and national government officials, doctors, school teachers, and public health workers was instituted. This campaign, and the turbulent situation within the Saigon government left the country weakened.

The overthrow and assassination of the country's first President, Ngo Dinh Diem, in late 1963 was the prelude to a series of rapidly changing governments. Internal ethnic and religious differences were exacerbated—often by the Communists—and plagued the country during these years. One consistent factor, however, was that all leaders of the various governments asked for increasing military assistance from the United States, for they knew that without it their country could not survive against the determined efforts of North Vietnam to take over South Vietnam.

The Communists exploited the confusion in South Vietnam whenever they could. Still, the insurgents in the South, despite their support from the North, were not able to gain full control of the country. In 1964 Hanoi decided that the introduction of battle-ready North Vietnamese Army Regulars was needed to bring about the defeat of the South.

The troops left their North Vietnamese training bases for what was often a clandestine journey of many months along the trails through Laos and Cambodia (a trail system named for their President, Ho Chi Minh) or infiltrated the zone which had been "demilitarized" at Geneva. They often remained in areas across the South Vietnamese border, where they were safe from South Vietnamese forces, until they were ready to invade. Although the Geneva Accords prohibited the presence of foreign troops in Laos or Cambodia, this did not inhibit the Communists.

Arrivals of United States advisors requested by the government of South Vietnam were announced on the front pages of the world's newspapers. Movement of the Communist forces was made secretly under cover of night and the jungle. The arrival of the Communists and their increasingly advanced weapons often could not be detected until they were met in battle.

For this reason, facts regarding troop escalation lagged behind the estimates. We were able to estimate rates of infiltration, however, and found continuing increases. Until mid-1964 the majority of the infiltrates were ethnic South Vietnamese members of the Viet Minh who had regrouped to the North after the 1954 cease-fire. In late 1964 the number of infiltrators began to increase greatly as regular North Vietnamese soldiers began to be introduced. By the end of 1964 a minimum of 12,000 North Vietnamese had been infiltrated, including the first North Vietnamese Army regiment to come as a unit. In the ensuing years large unit infiltrations have been the rule. As of June 1968 we estimate that more than 300,000 North Vietnamese troops have entered South Vietnam.

THE COMMUNIST AID PROGRAM

North Vietnam could not have supported such a military effort alone. During the period 1954 through 1967, assistance to North Vietnam from other Communist countries totaled some \$2.9 billion, most of which came from the USSR. Annual aid agreements with the USSR, Communist China, North Korea, Mongolia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Cuba have underscored Hanoi's heavy dependence on this outside aid, both to maintain essential production and services and to support the war in South Vietnam.

Russia has equipped North Vietnam with about 35 surface-to-air missile battalions and has supplied a sophisticated communications and radar network, numerous aircraft (including IL-28 jet light bombers and MIG-15, MIG-17, and MIG-21 fighter planes), and large quantities of antiaircraft weapons. All

of these weapons contributed to establishing the most sophisticated air defense system ever faced by any force in combat. In addition, the USSR has supplied North Vietnam with modern ground force equipment such as 122- and 140-mm rockets, 120-mm mortars, and 130-mm field guns.

Priority attention has been given to North Vietnam's transportation system. The USSR has supplied not only a large portion of the vehicles needed to move supplies south, but also the road construction equipment needed to keep existing roads serviceable and to build new military roads in North Vietnam, Laos, and Viet Cong controlled areas of South Vietnam. In addition, the USSR has supplied railroad equipment, barges, bridge equipment, and petroleum for North Vietnam's transportation system.

Communist China's percentage of total aid has declined steadily since 1965. Such aid was significant, however, and has included the rehabilitation and development of North Vietnam's railways, highways, and communications facilities, reconstruction and improvement of irrigation systems, and construction of heavy and light industrial facilities. In 1966 it was reported that 40,000 Chinese were being used in North Vietnam for road and rail maintenance and other repair work. By early 1968 this figure had grown to 50,000. Some personnel were also believed to be in antiaircraft units. Military equipment from China continues to be mostly small arms, ammunition, and light antiaircraft artillery; but some MIG-17 jet fighters have been provided.

In the early stages of the war the enemy was handicapped by weapons and ammunition shortages and he relied often on home-made and captured items. Today there is an abundance of the latest models from the Communist conventional weapons arsenals.

SOUTH VIETNAM REQUESTS OUTSIDE ASSISTANCE

South Vietnam has also relied on massive external aid, from the United States and many other countries. In December 1961 South Vietnam sent an urgent appeal to President Kennedy for immediate further help. The President agreed to increase our military assistance. The political and military situation, however, continued to deteriorate. North Vietnam became emboldened by the eroding situation and misjudged American determination. American naval ships on patrol in the Gulf of Tonkin were involved in clashes with North Vietnamese torpedo boats on 2 and 4 August 1964, which led to approval of the Joint Congressional Resolution of 7 August 1964—the Tonkin Resolution—which not only approved retaliatory attacks but also stated that:

"The Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander-in-Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression. . . . The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security of Southeast Asia. Consonant with the Constitution and the Charter of the United Nations, and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom."

UNITED STATES COMMITMENT OF FORCES

During January and February 1965 the general situation in South Vietnam continued to worsen, the military threat increased, political tensions in Saigon deepened, and morale plummeted. It became increasingly apparent that the existing levels of United States aid could not prevent the collapse of South Vietnam. Even as deliberations on how best to

deal with the situation were in progress within our government, the Viet Cong launched a series of attacks on American installations in South Vietnam. These attacks indicated that North Vietnam was moving in for the kill. It appeared that they would succeed, perhaps in a matter of months, as things were developing. Acting on the request of the South Vietnamese government, the decision was made to commit as soon as possible 125,000 United States troops to prevent the Communist takeover. At the same time President Johnson indicated that additional forces would be sent as requested by the Republic of Vietnam and the Commander of the United States Military Assistance Command, Vietnam.

As the need increased and as North Vietnam moved in more of its own troops, requests for additional United States troops followed. By December 1965 we had about 184,000 troops in Vietnam. The year of greatest buildup was 1966, when our strength more than doubled. Increases have since been at a slower rate but have continued.

SOUTHEAST ASIA TREATY ORGANIZATION REACTION

The SEATO Council and the Military Advisers, at each of their regular meetings since April 1964, condemned the Communist aggression and Hanoi-directed subversion of South Vietnam. The communiques following these meetings have become progressively stronger in this regard. Each of the meetings was an occasion for the council to express its appreciation for the contributions from Free World nations assisting the South Vietnamese. The council further evinced its interest and growing concern, as well as support, for South Vietnam, a SEATO Protocol State, by encouraging increasing participation in its meetings by the South Vietnamese observer.

Each of the troop-contributing member nations of SEATO declared publicly that its support of South Vietnam was as a result of, and in accordance with, its obligations under the SEATO Treaty. The United Kingdom and France, though not contributing troops, contributed money, medical aid, technical assistance, and other forms of help.

The government of South Vietnam did not make a formal request for assistance from the Organization per se. Rather, such requests were made directly to each member nation individually. Significantly, all SEATO member nations, in one way or another and in varying degrees, assisted the South Vietnamese in their defense against Communist terrorism and aggression.

FREE WORLD ASSISTANCE TO SOUTH VIETNAM

In April 1964 President Johnson urged all the nations of the Free World to come to the assistance of South Vietnam. South Vietnam itself made formal requests to certain nations for assistance.

In response, nonmilitary assistance from 39 countries other than the United States totaled \$55 million from April 1964 to June 1968. Most of those nations preferred to provide civic action and medical assistance rather than active military participation.

Prior to April 1964 Australia was the only nation other than the United States to supply military assistance. In 1962 Australia furnished a 30-man Army training team and in August 1964 augmented this team with an aviation detachment. In May 1965 Australia agreed to send a task force to South Vietnam and Australian forces there now total about 7,500 men.

In July 1964 New Zealand furnished a military engineer team and in May 1965 decided to replace this detachment with a combat force. New Zealand forces in 1968 totaled over 500.

Other than the United States the nation supplying the greatest assistance to the Republic of Vietnam is the Republic of Korea. By the end of 1965, 20,620 Korean troops

were in South Vietnam and those forces now total approximately 50,000.

By the end of 1965 Thailand and the Republics of the Philippines and China also had given aid in the form of noncombatant personnel to act in either advisory or civic action roles. In addition, Canada, Japan, the Netherlands, the Federal Republic of Germany, and many other nations were contributing economic and technical assistance to South Vietnam, including many nonmilitary advisors and technicians.

In December 1966 a Royal Thai Government decision to assist in the ground war in Vietnam received enthusiastic support from the Thai people. The first element of the Royal Thai Army Volunteer Regiment arrived in Vietnam in July 1967 and the main body of approximately 2,500 men followed in September. Later in the year Thailand decided to send a division, with a total strength of over 11,000 men, to replace the Royal Thai Regiment. This division is scheduled to arrive in Vietnam in two increments, the first by August 1968. The second will follow upon completion of outfitting and training.

THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM'S ARMED FORCES

The Armed Forces of the Republic of Vietnam have been fighting without respite for many years. They have carried the heaviest load of casualties and the greatest personal hardships. Most Vietnamese soldiers have served their country gallantly, faithfully, and responsibly throughout the years. With the help and training of their allies they have acquired knowledge of modern military tactics and techniques, which they have applied effectively.

STRATEGY FOR THE CONDUCT OF THE WAR

Our basic objective in South Vietnam has been to establish a safe environment within which the people of South Vietnam could form a government that was independent, stable, and freely elected—one that would deserve and receive popular support. Such a government could not be created in an environment dominated by Communist terrorism. The Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese Army occupied large parts of the country and subjected large areas to armed attacks and acts of terrorism and assassination. These acts were most often directed at the representatives of government in provinces, villages, and hamlets throughout the countryside, the government officials most closely associated with the people.

The United States' military goal was to provide a secure environment in which the citizens could live and in which all levels of legal government could function without enemy exploitation, pressure, or violence. Our strategy to achieve this goal consisted of three interdependent elements—the ground and air campaign in South Vietnam, the nation building effort in South Vietnam, and our air and naval offensive against North Vietnam. Through these integrated efforts we have sought to convince the Hanoi regime that its aggression could not succeed and that such aggression would be too costly to sustain.

To this end United States, South Vietnamese, and other Free World forces went into battle to defeat the Communists and their organizations in South Vietnam. When the enemy was driven out of an area, United States and other Free World forces assisted the Vietnamese people in that area with projects such as building construction, sanitation, and medical care. Skills in these and other specialties were supplied by our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines in their changing roles as both fighting men and workers in civic action.

But before major civic action programs could proceed, the enemy had to be blocked in his aggression. Efforts to defeat enemy aggression in South Vietnam will be detailed in another portion of this report.

As almost all of his war-making material came from or through North Vietnam, we took the war to the enemy by a vigorous and unremitting—but highly selective—application of our air and naval power. Aircraft from land bases in South Vietnam and Thailand and from our aircraft carriers at sea applied this power. We attacked the enemy's military installations and power plants, petroleum products storage areas and industrial facilities which supported the war effort, and the vehicles and roads by which war material moved south—his means of provisioning the aggression. The bombing has been the most precise in history with less damage to nontargets and noncombatants than was ever experienced in previous wars. Communist support of the war was made extremely costly in terms of goods and facilities destroyed.

Our naval forces curbed the movement of men and their food and war-making material as they attempted to infiltrate by sea or by the great river systems of Southeast Asia. Naval gunfire assisted in coastal operations with marked effectiveness.

From a military standpoint, both air and naval programs were inhibited by restrictions growing out of the limited nature of our conduct of the war. The key port of Haiphong in North Vietnam, for example, through which 85 percent of North Vietnam's imports flowed, and at which ships of many nations called, has been a prohibited target. Our planes could not bomb it. Nor was mining of that harbor permitted. Materials shipped from Haiphong were sought out later and bombed on their journey south, when they could be found. The primitive road and trail networks of Southeast Asia and the frequently heavy tree cover made such moving targets and sheltered small storage areas very difficult to find, even with our sophisticated weapons and equipment.

Despite these difficulties, strikes on railroad lines, roads, and waterways greatly impeded the flow of war material. These attacks created additional management, distribution, and manpower problems for North Vietnam.

The bombing of North Vietnam was unilaterally stopped by the United States a number of times, for varying periods of time, in the hope that the enemy would respond by stopping his aggressive activities and reducing the scope and level of conflict. In every case the Communists used the bombing pause to rush troops and supplies to reinforce their army in South Vietnam. Such unilateral truce efforts, while judged politically desirable, accrued some temporary military disadvantages to successful prosecution of the war.

SUMMARY OF PROGRESS—1965 TO 1968

By mid-March 1965 United States forces were exerting pressure on Communist forces in South Vietnam and the United States logistic capability was expanding. In 1966 we commenced deployment of a balanced and effective combat force. Successful spoiling operations during that year prevented a Communist military takeover and forced the enemy to revert to defensive employment of his main force units. A capable and resourceful enemy continued overt warfare, however. He had developed a strong logistic base, much of it in neighboring Laos and Cambodia. The enemy maintained the capability to deploy substantial additional North Vietnamese Army Regulars.

While our air operations over North Vietnam attrited but did not prevent the introduction of external assistance into North Vietnam, substantial progress was made in destroying war supporting industries and resources. Emphasis was directed toward harassing, disrupting, and impeding the movement of men and material to South Vietnam. Such movement was made costly and the enemy was forced to exert a prodigious effort to continue it. He adjusted to our at-

tacks by ingeniously hiding and dispersing his logistics activity, however, and his recuperative capability along the routes of movement was remarkable.

In 1966 we were able to take the initiative against Communist main force units in South Vietnam. However, the enemy was able to disengage many units and to seek refuge in sanctuaries in Laos, Cambodia, and North Vietnam, where our ground forces were not permitted to strike him. This permitted him to establish the pace of the ground war to his advantage. Although it would be erroneous to suggest that the enemy at this stage had reverted purely to guerrilla actions as his primary mode of operations, he realized that he could not defeat and eject United States and Free World military forces by large unit operations. He was sufficiently flexible to hit at times and places of his choosing and under circumstances that offered a good probability of success. In 1966 the enemy's unit integrity had not been destroyed, nor had his logistic capabilities fallen below those needed to continue the war.

The Communists avoided major contact, using their sanctuaries, fighting defensively when forced to do so, and attempting to rebuild and reinforce for operations at an opportune time. Tactical guerrilla warfare was intensified without fragmenting main force units or discarding plans for their buildup and use. Hanoi continued the high rate of infiltration of Regular troops to replace losses and to augment units in the field. Enemy strategy hinged on continuing the war in the hope of outlasting our determination.

Another element of the Communists' basic strategy was a propaganda campaign directed at increasing both domestic and international pressure on the United States Government to stop the bombing of North Vietnam and to settle on terms favorable to the enemy.

By mid-1967 the combination of military operations against the enemy in all areas forced him to reassess his situation in light of his deteriorating military position. He was no longer capable of military victory. There were significant increases in the strength and capabilities of Allied forces in South Vietnam and combat operations were expanded accordingly. Our operations, supported by close air support and B-52 bomber strikes, increasingly neutralized enemy base areas, located and destroyed the supplies on which the enemy depended, and drove him into sparsely populated regions where food was scarce. The overall military trend in 1967 in enemy losses—those killed, wounded, and captured—was favorable to the allies, as was the overall trend in enemy defections. The number of persons and areas under Communist control declined slowly and the number of South Vietnamese impressed into Viet Cong service declined significantly. Consequently, the troop replacement burden fell increasingly on the North Vietnamese. There was evidence of manpower problems in North Vietnam, resulting in wider use of women in the labor force to free men badly needed for military replacements. Shortages of food, material, and medical supplies were taking their toll. Morale and combat effectiveness deteriorated in some of their units, especially those in isolated areas.

In 1967 the enemy did not win a major battle in South Vietnam. Many of his main force units had been driven to positions across the Laos and Cambodia borders where they took advantage of sanctuaries for protection and supply, in much the same way they had operated in 1966 when hard pressed by our combat forces.

The Communist strategy continued to reflect an effort to draw Allied forces into remote areas, especially those areas adjacent to border sanctuaries, leaving populated areas unprotected. This enabled enemy local

and guerrilla forces to harass, attack, and generally impede government efforts. Through these means the Viet Cong continued to exert a significant influence over large portions of the population. Although enemy capabilities were at times formidable in local areas, they were never overpowering. Through careful exploitation of the enemy's vulnerabilities and the application of our superior firepower and mobility, we were able to prevent him from making any spectacular gain in South Vietnam in 1967.

During 1967 the air and naval campaign against North Vietnam continued to be an element of our strategy in which we had the initiative. We continued to press this advantage. There was no doubt that our past efforts had hurt North Vietnam and that continued support of the war in South Vietnam was causing severe hardships. From a purely military view, additional operational latitude for air and naval forces would have enabled the execution of campaigns against North Vietnam which would have brought about a more rapid deterioration of the enemy's total war-supporting structure. If more effective curtailment of the Communist war effort had been achieved by drains on their resources, the result would have been a steady reduction of insurgency and aggression in South Vietnam.

In coordination with our military operations, the task of nation building in South Vietnam, the ultimate goal of our struggle, received its full share of attention. True, progress often was interrupted by enemy attacks or harassment, but the demonstration of government concern and aid for every village and hamlet in South Vietnam remained the aim. Efforts in this regard were not new. The French attempted *agrovilles* in the 1950's and the Diem regime tried a program of "strategic hamlets." These all failed for many reasons, not the least of which were failure to base goals on capabilities, to plan realistically, and to take into account the interests and aspirations of the people.

Subsequent efforts at nation building were more attuned to the needs of the people, but in 1966 growth was still slow and painstaking. Although the Vietnamese Armed Forces had the primary mission of supporting pacification, United States forces reinforced their efforts by direct support. Vietnamese Army units were redeployed and retrained to support these programs, but providing the motivation was difficult and progress in orienting those forces was slow.

In 1967, a new constitution was promulgated and the citizens of South Vietnam went to the polls and elected a new national government. Similarly, for the first time since the early days of the Diem regime, representative government was initiated at the village and hamlet level. There were fragmentary but nevertheless encouraging signs that the National Assembly was becoming constituent oriented.

Additionally, during 1967 there was a reorganization and consolidation of United States support of the pacification program. As a result the program was buttressed with added resources, increased military support, and unified civil-military staffing, thus creating a single, forcefully directed, United States pacification support effort.

Progress in the war from 1 January to 20 June 1968 can best be viewed in the context of the enemy's goals for his 1967-68 winter-spring campaign. Sometime in mid-1967 he revised his strategy in order to generate widespread internal uprisings, cause wholesale desertions from the ranks of South Vietnam's Army, and lay the groundwork for a political effort, including negotiations, along with his military effort to attain victory. The United States, the Communists hoped, faced with a collapsing ally, would lose the determination to pursue the war.

To carry out this new strategy, even larger

numbers of North Vietnamese Regular Army troops and a heavier volume of supplies and equipment were infiltrated into South Vietnam. With the approach of *Tet*, the Vietnamese New Year season, the Communists felt that the time was ripe to go all out. They chose the first day of the *Tet* holidays for opening the offensive. Contrary to their expectations, the people of South Vietnam did not swing over to their side and there were few defections from the Vietnamese Army. Despite the surprise attack in violation of the Communists' own truce, the Vietnamese Army fought extremely well in throwing back the enemy while bearing the brunt of the assault. By coming out in the open, enemy troops were more vulnerable to our superior firepower, mobility, and flexibility. The result for the enemy was extremely high personnel losses. However, the tempo of the war was intensified. The enemy used new Soviet supplied rockets to initiate assaults on urban centers, notably Hue and Saigon, which were heretofore relatively free from attack.

During the first three months of 1968, the air campaign against North Vietnam was hampered by the rainy monsoon weather. As a result, most attack sorties were conducted against supply routes and military installations in southern North Vietnam.

On 1 April in a further attempt to get Hanoi to the peace conference table, the President of the United States stopped bombing attacks over the principal populated and food-producing areas of North Vietnam, except in the area north of the Demilitarized Zone where enemy actions directly threatened United States and other Free World forces in South Vietnam. Militarily, this action resulted in further concentration of attack sorties in southernmost North Vietnam, primarily directed at traffic on roads and trails, to try to keep reinforcements and supplies from reaching South Vietnam where they would be brought into battle against our forces. Politically, the President's action brought the response from the North Vietnamese that they would come to the conference table.

The enemy continued his countrywide attacks in an attempt to give the South Vietnamese and the world public an impression of North Vietnamese strength while exaggerating the human and material costs of the war to the Allied side. Our tactical aircraft and B-52 bombers continued their support of ground operations in South Vietnam with B-52 effort concentrating primarily on truck parks, storage areas, and troop concentrations. The air effort further compounded the enemy's difficulties in getting supplies and equipment down the infiltration routes.

In early May the Communists mounted further harassing attacks throughout South Vietnam with primary emphasis on the Saigon area and in the northern part of the country. Because of their earlier *Tet* losses, these attacks were not nearly as fierce or well coordinated as the *Tet* offensive. The results, however, were essentially the same— heavy losses for the enemy, a broadening of the war into urban areas, and a quantum jump in civilian casualties. Still, the enemy continued to reconstitute and reposition his forces for further attacks.

Then in late May and early June 1968 the enemy launched new assaults, particularly on the city of Saigon. American military installations and Vietnamese government headquarters seemed to be the initial objectives, although again the enemy showed complete disregard for the lives of innocent South Vietnamese civilians. When these attacks were blunted, the enemy commenced a series of indiscriminate rocket attacks against the civilian populace of Saigon, creating widespread destruction, heavy civilian casualties, and increasing numbers of refugees. These

assaults on Saigon obviously were designed to influence the talks that had begun on 13 May in Paris, where Hanoi showed no disposition to modify its hardline stand.

As of 30 June our estimate is that the enemy does not possess the means of achieving military victory in South Vietnam but he does retain a dangerous capability to mount serious attacks. There is no indication that he has abandoned his goal of a unified Communist Vietnam. Against the backdrop of the Paris talks, a major victory would loom large. The enemy no doubt remembers how well a combined military and political strategy worked for him in Geneva 14 years ago.

ACTION URGED ON BEHALF OF PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the problem of the treatment of our men who are prisoners of war or missing in action in Southeast Asia has been one of grave concern to all Americans. Many organizations and individuals have aided in the effort to secure humane consideration for the more than 1,500 U.S. citizens who are held captive.

One of these active organizations is the American Legion, and on March 7, 1971, the Essex County, N.J., chapter of this group will sponsor a day of remembrance for the American prisoners of war and those men missing in action. This action of concern is one deserving of commendation and one which I hope many Americans will pursue.

In an effort to convince those peoples of Southeast Asia who have taken captive many American troops to respect the provisions of the Geneva Convention, I have joined in sponsoring in the House of Representatives a resolution calling upon the people of the United States to sponsor and participate in appropriate ceremonies and activities calling for improved treatment of our men. This resolution authorizes and requests the President to issue a proclamation designating the period of March 21-27, 1971 as "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action."

I wish to include at this point the American Legion Prisoner of War Prayer and ask all to consider it and then take appropriate action in an effort to relieve the suffering of these Americans and their families:

"Lord, shelter the prisoners of war in Southeast Asia. Open the hearts and minds of their captors that they may be restored to their homes and loved ones.

"Each has carried the burden of battle. Each has discharged an obligation to his country. Each has been subjected to hazard, pain, and imprisonment beyond the lot of the soldier.

"O Lord, these gallant men who bear so great a burden must not be forsaken. God of Justice to whom we pray, thy compassion we beseech: Lift their burden, give them strength and strike the shackles that deny them freedom. Another great burden is upon the families of these men. Give the wives, children and parents the comfort of love in these anxious days. Amen."

AMPHETAMINE: A CHRISTMAS PACKAGE WITH A TIME BOMB INSIDE

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, like every other Member of the Congress, I have long been concerned with the rising rate of drug abuse in the United States. I have especially focused on amphetamines, and similar central nervous system stimulants such as Ritalin, since I discovered they were being given in massive numbers to grammar school children to modify behavior. Among the points I made during the House Privacy Subcommittee hearing into this issue on September 29, 1970, was that encouraging children to find their salvation in "speed" was providing new recruits for the drug culture in the United States.

My able colleague, Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER, has discovered that there are 8 million amphetamines produced in the United States when their logical and valid use would call for the production of only a tiny fraction of that amount. A United Nations sponsored international conference on psychotropic drugs has just called for strict controls in this area. Yet, it is unfortunate that these drugs continue to be dispensed with little or no control: A fact made especially distressing when the Department of Justice has stated it is unable to account for the distribution of 38 percent of the production of amphetamines.

If further proof is needed that amphetamines and similar central nervous system stimulants must be subjected to rigid controls, it is an article in New York magazine of February 8, 1971, "Doctor Feelgood, Are You Sure It's All Right?" by Susan Wood dramatizes in frightening detail the unethical practices of a handful of licensed medical personnel in using these drugs to pander to the self-indulgent desires of their often unsuspecting clients. Miss Wood's truly terrifying personal experiences disclose yet again that these drugs are a national threat and very probably a national disaster.

Mr. Speaker, a method to alleviate some of this agony exists under the Drug Abuse Act of 1970. I call again on the Department of Justice to raise amphetamines from schedule 3 to schedule 2 and thus permit America to make a substantial step toward eliminating the abuse of these drugs. I insert Miss Wood's harrowing description of one aspect of the drug culture into the RECORD at this point and I also insert my letter to John Ingersoll, Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs:

DOCTOR FEELGOOD, ARE YOU SURE IT'S ALL RIGHT?

(By Susan Wood)

The first Dr. Feelgoods practiced in Europe in the 1930s and left their imprint in the annals of dubious medical practice by injecting amphetamines into the veins of the leaders of the Third Reich. Their disciples have since spread throughout the world.

Nobody can say exactly how many Dr.

Feelgoods now practice in New York City. Fashionable people—that is, those who get their names in the papers from time to time—seem to go to just four or five of them, including one who is said by his admiring patients to have attended President Kennedy and some of the nation's best-known politicians, businessmen and entertainers.

Regardless of which Dr. Feelgood has the most prominence at the moment—fashions change—each patient, aglow with the incredible zap of his latest shot, is sure his doctor alone is the real Dr. Feelgood. But each Dr. Feelgood has at least two things in common with the next—a persuasive personality and a lucrative practice.

Their offices tend to be located conveniently close to where the bulk of their patients live—near, if not on, Park and Fifth Avenues from the Fifties to the Nineties. One Dr. Feelgood, not unlike Elizabeth Arden and Saks, ran a summer branch in the Hamptons for a while. Another currently in vogue also fixes teeth.

With injections in veins or buttocks, Dr. Feelgood can cure everything: the common cold, pimples, infectious hepatitis, impotence, alcoholism, heroin addiction . . . his followers swear. They firmly believe their doctor can delay aging. One Dr. Feelgood claims dramatic results in cases of arthritis and multiple sclerosis.

Unfortunately, Dr. Feelgood doesn't publish the kind of research papers that enable scientists to verify his work. Ordinary doctors and scientists working to find cures on grants from, say, the Multiple Sclerosis Foundation or the Arthritis Foundation are not impressed with Dr. Feelgood's approach and continue their research along other lines.

The majority of his practice flock to him not for the sake of research but to find relief from what one observer calls "environmental and executive diseases." The symptoms range from low-grade malaise to intense anxiety. The patient goes to him in response to an inner call. Some go daily. Most go three times a week. Appointments are not necessary; the patient need only show up during office hours, which tend to be long. One Dr. Feelgood has a 6 a.m. to 10 a.m. session for the early birds. Another, who caters to a show-biz crowd, has been known to be in his office after midnight.

His patients are for the most part intelligent, educated, talented, affluent achievers. But their very intelligence and income seem to deny them the protection less fortunate souls get from our medical watchdogs. Many public health officials think Dr. Feelgood's practice is questionable, even dangerous, but they don't appear to regard it as an urgent problem. As one public health doctor put it: "It only affects a small segment of our population—the very rich. We can only do so much. Our priorities start with protecting those who don't know better, like slum kids eating paint peelings."

But Dr. Feelgood's patients regard him as an altruist . . . a Dr. Schweitzer of the urban jungle.

I began to look into the Dr. Feelgood phenomenon several years ago because I thought he and his patients added up to a good story about a special New York scene. To get into that scene I would become a patient—for a few visits anyway. I realized that this would involve letting a doctor and chemicals play with my psyche and my health. A few years earlier I might have regarded this as a violation. A few years later I would surely regard it as a risk. But at the time, I had no special concern about making myself a guinea pig. I saw taking Dr. Feelgood's shots as not only essential to the story but as a chance to get a better notion of the drug generation, an opportunity at least, laggard that I was, to have a drug experience safely—with a doctor in charge. Also, I had a lot of time to try new things; my marriage had just come apart.

New York Magazine underwrote the expense of several visits to three practitioners I had heard about through friends and gossip. Not long after I began the story, arrangements were made with the then brand-new narcotics laboratory of the New York County Medical Examiner's office to run tests on me after I received the shots.

My first encounter was with a doctor whom I shall call Doctor A. I was taken by a friend, a regular patient, who assured me that Doctor A's shots were harmless and would merely initiate me into the modern world and good life of the hip, the rich, and the beautiful. The only reason other doctors don't mete out similar shots, my friend told me, is that conventional medical men are too puritanical to dispense drugs that simply make you feel good.

Doctor A's office occupies about half of the ground floor of an old mansion. On the street near his door, when I arrived, were a pair of double-parked Cadillacs. One had M.D. plates and was, I later learned, the doctor's. The other had a stack of parking tickets piled visibly on the dashboard inside the car. A policeman was placing yet another ticket between the wiper and the windshield. The scowling Cadillac, it turned out, belonged to one of Doctor A's patients, a 22-year-old oil heir who was then in the doctor's waiting room. He looked like a nervous little frog decked out in a superbly tailored suit. He and a half-dozen sartorially splendid young men formed a golden circle of rich kids around a low table. In that group, too, were two girls, one a former fashion editor, the other the youthful star of a then-current Broadway musical. They were the other halves of couples who "took together."

Beyond the fringes of that golden circle were a half-dozen other patients scattered on various chairs who looked quite different. Huddled into herself was an utterly blank-faced girl, the picture of alienation, who, my friend told me, was a Playboy Club bunny. In a corner two aging women wearing identical black leather jackets out of a 42nd Street rough-trade store, chino slacks, and Keds sat on a bench holding hands. There was also a freaky mulatto man of indeterminate age who upon entering pranced about the waiting room striking dueling poses with a cane until a nurse appeared and shouted at him. He responded by instantly sitting down, like a dog who had just heard his master's command. For beautiful people, Doctor A's patients seemed a mixed bag.

Perhaps four other patients were being treated in the examining rooms, I learned, while about a dozen of us waited. After almost an hour's wait, a crisp nurse in starched white, who directed the flow from room to room, finally waved the oil heir, my friend, and me into one of the treatment rooms. We perched on a long examining table, our legs dangling, like three kids on a country fence. That seemed the proper spirit.

"Well, well, my children . . ." I heard Doctor A before I saw him. My eyes had been fixed on the other of two doors at opposite ends of the examining room, and when I turned around, there before me was a Slenderella Santa Claus, a cheerful, well-proportioned man with white hair, merry eyes, and an avuncular manner. "Are you about to go off for a nice weekend?" he said. And for me, after being introduced, there was a gentle hug.

I followed him into a large office carefully done in Airport Modern. There he registered no surprise when, although I wasn't fat in the least, I said that I had come because I wanted to lose some weight. (My friend had suggested I say this.) He waved me to a scale and noted my weight.

He then had me take a chair next to his desk. He drew up another chair to take my pulse, blood pressure, listen to my heart, and ask about my racial origins. Doctor A had some interesting notions about blood. To

have European blood is good, he said. Eastern European blood may be all right, but not so good as German and French. A Celtic strain is fraught with physiological peril—a weakness for alcohol, the real killer. Did I drink, and how much?

Doctor A then filled a large syringe with a liquid mixture assembled from bottles clearly labeled as various vitamins and minerals. We sat very close, my knees between his. He gripped my arm below the elbow with one hand and with the other found a vein instantly. I saw my own blood float into the pink fluid in the syringe. Ever so slowly, he pushed the whole mixture into my bloodstream.

His large warm eyes looked deep into mine. His voice was gentle. I remember his saying what a nice fellow the guy who brought me was. The rest was lost to me in the incredible warmth that suffused me, glowed within me, and billowed against the limits of my skin and beyond. Click! Muscles bunched at the top of my neck loosened, and now I was dropping 30 floors in the Pan Am elevator and spinning on in an undulating thrill marked not by fear but by a kind of orgasm. By all physical signs I was, as Masters and Johnson describe it, "on the final plateau of arousal."

The syringe was empty, Doctor A slowly withdrew it, and I almost dropped in a slow-moving heap in his arms. Gently, gently, he applied a small Band-Aid to the puncture in my arm and retreated behind his desk.

"Losing weight is mostly a matter of diet," he purred, "but this does help a bit." He looked at me knowingly, as if waiting for me to say something. It all seemed—the whole meaning of the shot—brilliantly clear. My heart raced.

"Reward principle," I said, feeling sure he knew what I meant, "very clever. But my heart! Are you sure it's all right?"

"Yes, yes," he replied. "You're just a little excited."

As I got ready to leave, I blurted out something that had been gathering in my mind: "Are you sure you are doing the right thing for all those neurotic kids out there?" Never had I felt so sure of an insight, so intelligent. I felt like Superman, as if I were ripping off my timid-girl disguise to reveal the real, powerful me. "Shouldn't they be getting analyzed instead of a shot in the arm?" Hardly stopping for breath, I went on about how great it feels and began mumbling something about in the long run, and . . . and . . . I was, in fact, running off at the mouth.

Doctor A cut me off, saying, "Trust. Trust Papa. He knows what he's doing. If there's a physical symptom, there's a physical condition—and a medicine to deal with it." He gave me a paternal kiss on the cheek and a final word. "Don't worry about all this," he said. "Have fun and I'll see you when you get back."

Time remained elusive throughout the rest of the day. Floating sensations alternated with moments of unprecedented decisiveness and confidence. Relaxed, happy, I went on a buying spree at Gucci. Money meant practically nothing. I was absolutely sure I could pick up extra free-lance jobs to pay for anything I wanted to buy.

The sensual kick of the shot lasted only about six hours. But my euphoria extended through the weekend. I went to Fire Island. Late Sunday night the only adverse reactions I was aware of were neck glands a bit tender and a slight feeling of fatigue. But that could have been the late hours I had kept and the rigors of a Sunday night drive from Long Island to Manhattan in summer traffic.

On Monday, I found myself seated once more on a chair facing Doctor A. He looked into my eyes and asked how I felt.

"Terrific," I said.

"Well, then, you don't need anything," he

replied evenly. I had the uneasy feeling that he could read my mind. He seemed to sense that I was ambivalent about continuing. He seemed to want me to express more eagerness before he would suggest doing anything more. I wanted more, but I also liked the idea of just dropping the whole thing. I suppose I just looked slightly dumfounded.

"I see people who drink a lot and exhaust themselves," he said, without any further prompting. "Some are alcoholics, some have been drug addicts, some over-eat. Most over-indulge in many ways and all abuse their bodies."

"All this," he went on, with a casual wave, almost a salute, to his office, "helps them, but I do more than simply help medically. I'm like a conscience for my patients. I scold them. I make them adhere to at least one discipline—coming here within the prescribed hours. I talk to them and listen to their troubles. One patient was punishing himself for being a homosexual and I encouraged him to admit to it and value himself anyway. I'm not like Doctor—[another Feelgood], who is evil. He addicts his patients to things. I don't."

I was puzzled. I said, "Are you saying you don't use . . ."

"I give amphetamines when I think it necessary," he interjected smoothly, "but not all the time." He seemed suddenly to remember all the patients in his waiting room. With the impatience one might show with naughty children pestering for ice cream, he blurted: "Oh, it's always one thing or another. First it was pot they wanted, and now it's meth. This fuss over it is a lot of nonsense. All it does is make them feel a little stimulated."

As he talked, he was ushering me out of his office. He clearly had no intention of giving me another shot. He had sensed my wariness. A good patient, I began to think, wouldn't have felt terrific by Monday.

I began speaking to friends about the shots. I was astonished to learn how many not only had heard about them, but had actually experienced them.

There seemed to be two groups. One was composed of middle-aged, old-guard intellectuals, who said they had gone to a Dr. Feelgood for their work, to get more work out of their brains. Few of them seemed aware, or would admit that the shots were a turn-on.

But the second group, an under-30 crowd, thought of their doctors mainly as a legal source for zappo highs—the top of a mountain where establishment and hip meet. Their elders talked mainly of the vitamin ingredients of the shots that promoted health, work and other virtues. The younger speedsters talked mainly, excitedly, about the amphetamine content of each syringe. The vitamin or other content mattered, if it mattered at all, only as they speculated on its ability to provide new kicks. Regardless of age, they all saw the shots as tomorrow's medicine here today and a mind-expanding extravaganza that had to be good, for it was medicine.

I decided to go on with the reporting. This wasn't just a story about some rich-kid speed freaks getting legal jolts. It was about some of New York's most attractive and accomplished people developing a habit. If I was to return to Doctor A and get to others, however, my editors and I decided that for my own protection, for reasons of both health and law, some tests should be run to determine what I was getting in my shots. If I were to report that there was amphetamine in a shot I had received, I had better be able to prove it. The drug had only recently been placed on the Food and Drug Administration's dangerous drug list. Tests for vitamin and hormone levels, it turned out, were staggeringly expensive and not especially reliable. However, reliable tests to determine the presence of narcotics, barbiturates and

amphetamines were available. Therefore, urine specimens were analyzed from time to time at the Medical Examiner's toxicology lab on First Avenue and 31st Street, considered one of the best in the country.

"Of course I'll take care of you," Doctor A said with fatherly warmth when I saw him again. "I thought you didn't want me." This time when the needle pierced my flesh I momentarily feared that I was starting something I might never want to stop but . . . Oh! there was that fantastic warmth spreading through me again.

I had planned to stop in two weeks. But I had a sudden bout of intestinal trouble that could be cured, Doctor A told me, by daily shots during a two-week period. There were other odds and ends of medical problems that I ordinarily might have brought to my own doctor, but I would think, "What the hell, for the same price I can feel great immediately."

There were days, including one gloomy Sunday, when I felt down. A few drinks might have been the conventional recourse, but it was just as easy to hop into a cab and visit Doctor A and have him take care of it. All told, through a 90-day period, I had 22 injections.

During those three months, I never knew exactly what went into each injection cocktail. But the injectables were clearly labeled and stacked in large supply in each of Doctor A's examining and treatment rooms. Massed and ready for use on all the work tables were hormones, vitamin B complexes, vitamin C, iron, calcium gluconate, procaine hydrochloride, the anti-depressant Tofranil, Benadryl, and methamphetamine. A toxicologist I later consulted told me that methamphetamine, calcium gluconate, and procaine hydrochloride are valued in some quarters for their ability to create sensations of euphoria.

Of six shots I had tested in the three months, two proved positive for amphetamine, another showed an indication of it, and three showed none present. (The tests on barbiturate and narcotic content were negative.) The fact that no meth showed up in a test did not preclude the possibility that there was some in that shot. Toxicologists say there is a 15 per cent chance of error in such tests. Moreover, the body can metabolize enough of the drug to prevent detection of small amounts.

Doctor A was not a cold clinician. We would exchange confidences all the time, the doctor and me. He would tell me of small burdens and minor irritations, or of petty betrayals and his transient losses of faith in people. I had the same kind of problems and found him utterly sympathetic.

When I was sloppy, he would suggest tenderly that I tidy up—such a pity for a pretty girl not to look her best. He would tell stories and jokes whose moral was that life should be enjoyed. The perfect, permissive father.

And I came to sample the ebb and flow of patients—the early morning people in the 6 to 10 a.m. session, the lunch-time crowd between 11 a.m. and 2, and the sunset ones from 6 to 8 p.m.

The early crowd was older, more dour. Except for the occasional jet-set type getting an eye-opener, it could be any doctor's waiting room. The early faces were tense, middle-aged, New York-gray. Lunch-time patients were a mixed bag, dominated by those rich kids I met on my first visit—though I began to note an occasional mink-coated middle-aged weight-loser and an occasional fat kid.

But, ah, the sunset people! Here was the velvet underground swathed in mind-blowing pajama suits, thrift-shop wonderments, big-knife ties, antique shoes, the hairdo of the moment. "If this creep doesn't hurry," one impatient velvet undergrounder once muttered to another, "we're going to miss the next one." On with it, on with it, the undergrounders would wish mightily, appar-

ently rushing from one office to the next to double and triple the ante, rushing, rushing.

Providing a sympathetic ear, some encouraging words, a place to go at just the right time, Dr. Feelgood has probably saved some lonely soul from suicide or at least the painful thoughts of it, I began to think. I would not be surprised if Doctor A in particular had saved some foolish patients from inadvertent suicide—an accidental overdose of a self-administered drug.

If Doctor A finds in his work any special reward, apart from money, it may well be the knowledge that he does help where, perhaps, no one else will. Most conventional doctors, I think, would regard his kind of patient as a nuisance. As a further reward, there may be pleasure in having an interesting group of patients, even same with social cachet. Toward these latter Doctor A seemed to feel a special closeness. Even if he didn't know them personally, Doctor A seemed to regard any old-line rich family as part of his flock. Their black sheep were his special care. He often referred to the Times society page. "If only they had sent him to me I could have saved him," Doctor A said one day, commenting on one wealthy young man who got involved in a messy death caused by a drug overdose.

My only problem—which I certainly didn't notice at the time—was that I was happily floating along doing nothing about some real problems. There was a divorce I had meant to get months ago. I was keyed up with energy, full of smiles and laughter, which would give way to feelings of depression. But my happiness, sadness, and even my occasional periods of intense activity were unfocused states of being. I could swing a broom or focus my camera with the same zeal. I seemed to drift. A rude awakening came with the bill. I had already spent far more at his office than I had expected to spend to research all three doctors. And that line at the top—"period of treatment covered"—that was the first time I realized I had been going to Doctor A for three months.

I got the divorce. I became grimly determined to get on to the other two doctors on my list with a maximum of three visits each. I really wanted to chuck the whole thing, but finishing this story became a matter of honor, a test of professionalism.

Picture a gallery of modern art in some fashionable quarter. Bamboo benches elegantly upholstered in bright orange. Beatles and Bach and Beach Boys and Scarlatti on tapes. And, oh yes, a half-dozen paintings. Enormous canvases, they were—Pilgrim fathers among riotous nudes, splashes of black and white colliding with flesh pink, authority enmeshed in sensuality. The people in the waiting room of the physician I shall call Doctor B might debate the meaning of these paintings with as much ease and interest as they might an Allen Ginsberg poem, the politics of Carter Burden, the value of smoking pot, or their identities. Doctor B told me his offices had evolved into a forum for the exchange of ideas. These paintings were one of many changing exhibits. Often, Doctor B would invite a guitarist to play in the waiting room. The doctor was creating "a new medical environment," a sort of pilot model for what he hoped to develop into a preventive medicine center.

But when I entered that office there were only a couple of thin young men in shooting goggles, an obviously rich (Hermès and Gucci everything) but very fat young girl, and an undistinguished photographer's model—to be expected, as I knew one leading model agency sent some skinny girls here to get skinnier still.

My appointment was for 2 p.m., and I was on time. After a mere half hour, zip service compared to the usual wait at Doctor A's, I was ushered into Doctor B's office, a cool

gray, white, and glass room, super-mod a *Playboy* version of a bachelor study. The doctor, a short puckish ash-blond with blue eyes, made me take a chair facing him across the Parsons table that served as his desk. Leaning back in his chair, lighting a cigarette, he bluntly asked who had sent me. I named a fashion model, a friend of mine.

"Ah yes," he said "then you know about the shots."

"Well, not fully," I said. Would they make me smarter, sexier, more dynamic?

"You'll feel your body more, of course, but the rest depends on where your head is."

He spoke in that plain undramatic way a personnel director of a large corporation might in explaining a routine job to a trainee.

"One patient," he continued smoothly, "tells me he sees people with greater clarity. He says he sees right through their heads. Shots won't make you particularly happier or sadder but just intensify whatever mood you're in. They will help you organize your thinking. The treatment for you would run for three weeks, three times a week. [Treatment for what?] I almost blurted out.] There's also a weight-losing program, but that's a little different."

Leaning over the waist-high book shelves along one wall, my bottom exposed, I accepted a fast intramuscular injection. It was a small needle, injected matter-of-factly. He had not taken a blood sample, had not taken my blood pressure, had not listened to my heartbeat, or anything else. He was hip. We both knew I was not there for my yearly check-up. Because the shot was intramuscular, I had no immediate reaction. Just a quick heart beat in anticipation of wonders to come.

His receptionist told me I had to pay before leaving: \$90 for the three-week program. Couldn't I be billed? No. Then could I pay in installments? Sure. Ten dollars, please.

As I wrote a check, a lanky young man was walking out. I caught up to him at the door and asked chummily: "How do you like the shots?"

"I don't take them anymore," he said. "I'm here because of an allergy."

"Oh? Is he good on that?"

"Do you think I'd come here if there was something wrong?" he said. "I just came to get the name of a specialist."

For stimulating intellectual productivity, Doctor B's shots hadn't worked any better, or worse, than Doctor A's. But the crash-down was definitely worse than anything I had known before. Tense, irritable, I crashed into a fit of melancholia and found myself crying over inconsequential problems. But within a day or so I was back to my old self and, in fact, feeling quite relaxed and cheerful.

I had pretty much forgotten about the crash period when I went back about a week later. This time the nurse, not the doctor, wielded the needle. I wondered whether I could influence the dosage. "The first shot didn't energize me enough," I said. Could she alter the formula?

She warned that it wasn't a good idea to put too much of the "adrenal stimulant" in the cocktail, but she said she would add a bit more. I paid the \$10.

It was now about 11:30 a.m. and I had a lunch appointment with an attractive man. As lunch progressed, I felt a new wave of on-rushing sensuality. But was it the shot or was it the man? Would the sensation be the same in the company of this man even without the shot? In the confusion, I felt my research experiment toppling. I didn't return for my third shot. Tests on the two shots I had taken showed: Barbiturates—negative; narcotics—negative; methamphetamine—positive.

That small taste of Doctor B's medicine seemed to be all the research I could stand

at his hands.* I was now ready to visit the most celebrated—indeed, fabled—Dr. Feelgood of them all, the one reputed to have treated Presidents, a princess, a congressman, and even Eddie Fisher.

Doctor C, as I shall call him, doesn't see just anybody. To be accepted as a patient, those in the know said, I would have to offer credentials and prove my sincerity. I sent him letters of recommendation, tear sheets of my best work as a photographer, and a fawning letter expressing my admiration for the great work I had heard he had done. I pursued him for three months. Finally, I was granted an appointment.

Doctor C's small waiting room: A pay phone on the wall, a desk cluttered with papers and a tray of gummy brown injectables in sealed bottles, a badly groomed receptionist who turned out to be an unemployed actress. No Eddie Fisher, no international royalty in sight. Just a kid in a wheelchair who really looked sick, some menopausal ladies, and several pot-bellied intellectual-looking men in their middle years. The atmosphere was homey, one big, aging family offering to get sandwiches for one another, drop dimes in parking meters, or comfort one poor lady retching into her handkerchief.

After a two-hour wait, I was led by a nurse to a small examining room where she took a blood sample and my blood pressure. (Several weeks earlier I had forwarded, at Doctor C's request, a rather full medical history.) She then brought me into the doctor's office-examining room-laboratory. A beam of ultra-violet light shot through a chunk of quartz formed strange wavy patterns on the ceiling. Tall piles of dog-eared papers everywhere. Odd bits of what appeared to be magnetic sculptures, with pieces of dark metal clinging together. Thick objects wrapped in velvet, tied with string. Bottles and vials rising to the ceiling on long shelves.

In the midst of the clutter sat a man in a rumpled white shirt, hunched over something, his back toward me. "Sit," he said, without turning around, and he pointed to a small stool. Then he wheeled his chair around. His shoes were cracked. His worn blue trousers, with faded patches from knees to pockets, looked as if he habitually wiped them with hands smeared with chemicals. His shirt was open at the neck, the sleeves casually rolled to the elbows. One rolled sleeve had a large fresh blot of what appeared to be blood on it where it touched his skin. From wrists to elbows, where his sleeves cut off the view, the skin of both inner forearms was marked by what appeared to be needle tracks—tiny scabs, very close together.

"Look!" he said, peering at me as he gathered up a pile of snapshots from a work table. "Look!" he repeated, reaching for a

*Some months later, the story not yet finished, I thought I would check some points with another visit to Doctor B. But he was nowhere to be found. His New York number was, as the girls at the phone company say, temporarily disconnected, and there was no longer a listing for his office in the Hamptons. Some people said he was dead. I recently learned, however, that he is alive and well. I called on him, not as a patient, but as a journalist. He told me he had given up his practice and his hope of creating a "new medical environment." He discovered, he said, that he couldn't trust his patients. "They had no responsibility." But he still believes in his injections. He said the next thing he'd like to work on is a "bio-chemical approach to sex" with "carefully selected, responsible patients."

velvet-wrapped club of some sort. A twisted piece of rusted metal dangled from the velvet head, apparently held by magnetism. When he tried to pull the bit off, it fell out of his grasp and clanged to the floor. I picked it up for him and he shoved it on the table. "Look!" he said again, and he began rubbing an ordinary color snapshot.

The photograph showed Doctor C and a middle-aged lady sitting on a terrace in what appeared to be a vacation spot. In front of them were some half-eaten papayas. Behind them was a clutter of palm trees and, in the far background, an overexposed body of pale green water. Rub, rub, rub, rub.

"Look now!" he said excitedly. "Three dimensions!" He looked expectantly at me as I stared at the photograph. The color might have become a bit richer, if one wanted to be friendly about it, but it didn't seem to be three dimensional at all.

"My," I said, "the colors certainly do seem a bit richer." I wasn't ready to lie, but I wasn't ready to fail any sincerity test either.

"Yes, I can bring the color out," he said. "You bring your bad photos to me. I can fix." He rubbed now over a pinkish flower and it certainly appeared to get redder. He began rubbing another snapshot.

"Now do you see three dimensions?" he demanded. Well, frankly, no, I said. Helpfully, I told him that I had often rubbed color Polaroids just after they were developed and the heat did bring out the more slowly developing tones.

"Look again," he demanded impatiently. This time he took a picture of an atomic explosion out of a magazine and he began rub-rubbing again. He can't get anything out of a magazine photo, I thought. "Look!" he said, holding it up. "Well? Well?" he demanded.

"Well," I said, "it does bring things out a bit."

His heavy, lined face relaxed a bit.

"All right," he said. "Why are you here?" "Well, I heard a lot about you and I'm, well, interested in your approach to medicine."

"Yes, yes. You wanted to see the great man. What else?"

"Well, I'm tired a lot and feel depressed, and since my divorce I don't have much interest in things."

"Your 'wells' tell me more than everything else you've said. Do you have a boy friend?"

"Not really."

"Why not? You should. Do you drink?"

"Well, yes."

"You're a drunk, aren't you?"

"No, I drink, but . . ."

"I think you drink too much. No, you can't drink and come to me. You must stop. Have you ever been to a psychoanalyst?"

"Yes."

"No, it doesn't work. Have you ever been to a doctor who gave you shots?"

"Yes."

"Why didn't you continue?"

"It was in Europe," I lied.

"Who?"

I named someone in England I'd heard about.

"Yes, I've heard about him. Did you like it?"

"Yes."

"You look sneaky. You keep things back. You're not telling me everything. You don't tell yourself everything."

There was a long pause. His eyes seemed to be penetrating my mind. Should I leave quietly?

"All right," he said at last. "If you come to me, you stop drinking. If not, I don't see you. You cannot drink with these shots. You come to me for a while, then I teach you to give them to yourself."

I was soon lying on the examining table watching him, still sitting in his office chair, wheel himself to the racks of injectables in

small vials. He would rub his jowls, hold a vial up to the light. I would see a brilliant flash of green or purple light reflecting off precious stones that were in the vials. He seized one vial, then another, extracting some liquid each time into a small disposable syringe. In the process, he knocked a bottle to the floor and simply left it there.

"Why do you wear glasses?" he demanded. "Take them off and you'll be able to see." He was standing over me with a small syringe. "Take off your glasses and roll on your side." He gave my bottom an intramuscular shot. "Don't you do it i.v.?" I asked, surprised he didn't use a vein. "That's the other—I'm not so sure I believe in them any more. Give me your arm." He found a vein easily and gave me another shot. It was like that first time with Doctor A.

"What do you feel?"

"Like I've just made love."

"Some people say they feel that," he said, smiling. Then he abruptly pushed an eye chart up close to my nose, much too close for me to read it. "Take it," he ordered. "Read! Read!" He seemed to speak mainly in the imperative mood.

"Read!" he said, guiding the chart by pulling my hands about two feet away from my eyes.

"I can't. It's upside down." We turned it right and, yes, I could read it without glasses. A slight improvement, maybe.

"Your vision will improve," he said. Then he stared at me, quietly, and it seemed a most relaxing way to pass the time. "You're embarrassed about something," he said after a long pause. "You're hiding something." Another long pause. Then he picked up some bars that had bits of metal clinging to them. "Stand and hold," he said, indicating the eye chart. He passed the bars back and forth over my head, and he asked me to say when my vision was clearest. But I perceived no visual changes.

He rang his nurse and she brought in a bottle of thick yellow liquid. I was instructed to rub the liquid between my palms, cup my hands over my nose and inhale the fumes. It made me feel dizzy, but I was to use the stuff twice a day for three weeks. "Call tomorrow," he said, and turning his back, dismissed me.

"That's \$25 for the visit, \$10 for the blood test and \$5 for the medication," the receptionist said.

"Please bill me."

"You pay now. We don't bill."

I wrote out a check and headed for the lab to get an analysis done. (The test indicated the presence of methamphetamine.) The trees, the kids, the sun, the dogs—New York looked loving, loved, lovable. "Life is like a fountain." What a great first line for a magazine article, I thought, after I had settled into a taxicab. "The time of the apocalypse is now." Another great article was writing itself in my all-encompassing mind.

Doctor C looked much more together on my next visit, one month later. Trousers clean and pressed, hair combed, shoes gleaming, freshly tanned, the sleeves of his natty turtleneck pullover rolled down to his wrists—he looked positively with it. Once we got past another demonstration of his 3-D photo process, and after the magnets, the conversation went well, too.

I told him I liked the shot, all right, but the ointment didn't do much for me. Didn't do much for him either, he confided. As he turned to the syringes, he asked how I wanted to feel: "Relaxed? Conversational? Brilliant?"

"Relaxed and brilliant will do," I said. "I don't feel like talking at all."

My mood changed as he withdrew the needle with a cool smile. "Can this harm me in any way? Can it addict me?" I asked.

The doctor apparently didn't feel like talking much either. He offered some perfunctory assurances—"After all, what's wrong with continuing something good?" The main

ingredient, he said, is the enzymes, highly cell-building. "How old is your father?" he asked as I was leaving. "You should send him to me."

I couldn't find the receptionist and simply walked out. The bill arrived within three days: \$25. The doctor's rates apparently varied, for, earlier that evening, as I waited for the shot, I met a fortyish lady artist, a prototype for Raphael Soyder's downtrodden beauties used and abused by the capitalist system, who told me she paid only \$5.

It had been a long wait that night, but not so long as the wait in store for me on my next visit, one afternoon a week later: three hours. At the end of the third hour, I walked out without the shot. Twice more I came for shots and twice more I walked out because of the endless wait—and because of the time it gave me to question the wisdom of pursuing this story another minute.

In time, word got around that I was writing an article about these doctors. I began to get calls from friends and friends of friends to inform me of assorted disasters or cures that they or their friends attributed to one Dr. Feelgood or another, or to tell me incredible tales involving an unbelievable list of celebrities. There was and *Iliad* and *Odyssey* of Doctor C stories.

Among the calls was one from a distinguished artist. He offered to help. He knew more about the subject and about Doctor C he said, than anyone else. I knew of him by reputation, of course, but I had never met him. I thought he'd make a good interview.

The interview was arranged the very day I first spoke with him. He picked me up at my studio and took me to his studio where, he said, we could talk freely and where he had at hand various documents on the doctor's work.

There was a catch: he wanted to edit my manuscript. If I let him do that, he would tell me about the doctor's most arcane work, about secret government experiments, about the doctor's contribution to space medicine, about super-secret reports that would astonish me. I refused the deal, basing my position on journalistic ethics.

"What a dumb and old-fashioned idea," he said. Then, his manner changed. He turned tough. "Doctor C is connected with some very powerful and influential people," the artist said, "so powerful they can see you never work for a magazine again. Influences in government, like the CIA, can see that what you write is never printed. There are ways."

Then he produced some documents and said they would reveal to me the importance of Doctor C's work. They were mine to see if I would let him edit this article.

The drama was getting me and I made a little statement: I don't have any knowledge of secret government work and don't want to know about it. If you're afraid about my talking about the "speed" content of the shots, don't. Doctors have the right to prescribe it.

Electrical connection!

Through an unbearably long pause, he stared coldly at me. Then, slowly, firmly, he said, "There is no amphetamine in his shots!"

For the first time I was really afraid to be alone with him. But he soon broke off staring. "If there was amphetamine as an ingredient in the formula," he said more softly, "mixed with other ingredients it becomes something else, something that is essentially what they put in high-energy breakfast cereals."

"So why not just eat Wheaties?" The bad joke broke the tension. He wasn't scary anymore. He became a friendly guy showing me his latest injection site—the fleshy part of his thumb. He proposed lunch with an "important man from Wall Street" and a lawyer who, he said, was connected with the CIA.

The idea was to "talk more about the article" and "straighten things out."

At lunch, it turned out that the Wall Street man was a patient of Doctor C and the lawyer was Doctor C's lawyer. They were all very sweet. The lawyer cautioned that I might be open to libel actions, while the artist and the Wall Street man tried to persuade me of the value of the doctor's work. At last, they hit on an idea: why not let an associate of Doctor C be spokesman for their position? Why not, indeed?

A few weeks and many phone calls later, brochures, it seemed to me—came to me by some literature—essentially fund-raising mail. I recognized them as the "secret reports" that the artist had dangled before me in his studio.

I finally had an interview with Doctor C's associate—at 7 a.m. at his office. He starts working at 6 a.m., he explained, and he considers 7 a.m. a perfectly normal hour for an appointment. Yes, he takes Doctor C's shots and thus, being in the pink of health, needs little sleep. The doctor is misunderstood, he said. Doctor C is totally devoted to his work, is a real humanitarian, isn't concerned at all with money, and is, in fact, poor. Of the doctor's patients, 65 per cent pay partial fees and 25 per cent pay none at all. A famous Hollywood director, I was told, had tried to set up a fund for the doctor's research, but, ironically, he died before this dream was realized—and before paying up \$38,000 to the doctor for his own medical bills. All Doctor C is interested in, his associate said, is curing people and carrying on his research.

I asked him to explain the point of Doctor C's research. The brochures, I confessed, didn't make much sense to me. The doctor's experimentation is far-reaching, I was told. He is seeking the key to all illnesses—the universal cure—something you can take that rebuilds damaged cells and defends healthy cells against invaders.

I asked what, exactly, Doctor C's shots did for patients suffering from multiple sclerosis, one of the diseases he was working on.

The doctor's medications give organisms more vitality, more alertness, more ability to fight diseases and meet stresses of modern life, his associate said. And since every organism derives its energy from cosmic rays and transforms them into life, physical changes are but changes in energy levels and therefore a mechanism that increased an organism's ability to do that would be highly beneficial.

Maybe if the doctor himself could see me, I suggested, I could understand all this better.

The doctor is a genius, I was told, and so involved in his work that he doesn't link up with the minds of persons he talks to. Ordinary people who don't have the scientific background cannot follow him. But if I should see him as a patient, his associate suggested, perhaps I could discover the value of his work for myself. He would be happy to arrange that. Apparently no one connected with Doctor C—neither the artist, nor the lawyer, nor the Wall Street man—knew that I had been a patient. I declined with thanks and quietly said that I had already seen the doctor several times.

This was a big step for me. I find it hard to close doors on things, and I assumed that this would terminate all contact with the doctor. It did. I called Doctor C directly a number of times thereafter. I was repeatedly told the doctor was out of town indefinitely.

I had a hard time finishing this story. I personally liked many of the people who took Dr. Feelgood's shots. I liked their style, charm, talent. And I disliked the idea of presuming to judge them. I stalled and avoided the story. I accepted an offer of a staff job from a British magazine. I'll finish the story there, I promised myself. But I let it slide.

Yet I continued to stay in touch with the

Dr. Feelgood scene. In London, as in New York, it's almost unavoidable in some circles. Like a defrocked member of a secret society, I'd recognize the rhetoric of anyone who was in it. "Got a vitamin shot today," a Londoner connected with the theater would say, adding an elated "Whooooo!" Within days of my arrival I had the names of London's most fashionable Dr. Feelgoods. From my New York experience, I could tell most of the time whether a person's charm belonged to him or to his latest shot.

About a year later I returned to New York. Motivated by doggedness and shame, I picked up the Dr. Feelgood story again. More interviews, library work, a refresher visit to Doctor A. Bad trip. My jaw muscles ached. I felt as if my teeth were loose. I couldn't chew for a week. I had felt again the physical symptoms of arousal, but where the turn-on really counts—in the head—I merely felt drugged and tense at the same time. Whatever appeal the shots once held was gone. Totally gone.

A postscript: Not long after my return I learned of the death of the artist who had offered to "help" with Doctor C. He was only 47. The obituary I read gave the cause of death as heart attack. But the official death certificate told a different story.

He had died suddenly, on a Sunday. As in all sudden deaths in New York unattended by a physician, the coroner's office was informed. His body was brought to the morgue. An autopsy was put off until Monday. By then, a report arrived from the office of his physician, Doctor C, stating that the dead man had a history of rheumatic heart disease. Medical examiners found, however, that both arms, from his thumbs to his elbows, were tracked with pinpoint lesions and recent injection marks.

After a thorough autopsy, heart attack was ruled out as a possible cause of death. There was no swelling of the larynx, which might have indicated an anaphylactic drug reaction. The only unusual finding was the presence of methamphetamine in the liver and other organs. Noted in the autopsy report was a "history of self-administered intravenous injections of vitamin B complexes and sometimes amphetamines for twenty years. . . ."

The death certificate concluded: "Cause of death: acute and chronic intravenous amphetamine poisoning."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 2, 1971.

Mr. JOHN E. INGERSOLL,
Director, Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous
Drugs, Department of Justice, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. INGERSOLL: I write to you today to express again my belief that amphetamines and other Central Nervous System stimulants such as Ritalin should be raised from Schedule 3 to Schedule 2 on the list provided for under the Drug Abuse Act of 1970.

We know all too well of the widespread abuse of these drugs; many authorities state that they represent a greater hazard than the so-called "hard" drugs. We have seen information developed by the Congress that 8 million amphetamines are produced yearly when there is only a valid need for a tiny percentage of that number. The Department of Justice has itself testified that it cannot account for the distribution of 38% of the amount now produced. The Food and Drug Administration has warned against depending on these drugs for more than a few weeks in weight control programs and they have also found that narcolepsy is so rare that most doctors say they have never diagnosed a case.

My special concern with these drugs is in modifying the behavior of hyperactive grammar school children which, up until my Privacy Subcommittee hearing of Sept. 29, 1970, represented the only area where effec-

tiveness was widely claimed. Now, even that usage is the subject to a "blue ribbon" panel at the Office of Child Development in HEW which was announced just one short week after the Privacy Subcommittee hearing. One particularly surprising fact we learned during our hearing was that no one is able to say exactly how many children are now receiving this sort of treatment; estimates range from 150,000 to 300,000. The increased record-keeping procedures mandated under Schedule 2 would, at the very least, allow us to understand how extensive is this treatment modality.

For these and many additional reasons, I urge the Department of Justice to raise amphetamines and other CNS stimulant drugs from Schedule 3 to Schedule 2.

Sincerely,

CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESSMEN DO WORK

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following: A few days ago, the Danville Commercial News paid tribute to our colleague, LES ARENDS, in its issue of February 21, 1971. I am sure that all of my friends will want to read what one of his own large newspapers in the District had to say about his ability and devotion to duty:

CONGRESSMEN DO WORK

Within reason, we have a right to expect a city council, a board of supervisors, a state legislature and the Congress to get things done. This is what the members are elected to do, what they are paid for and what they have promised us, their fellow citizens, when campaigning for office.

But the business of government bodies often seems exasperatingly slow. Hence, we become impatient and tend to be more critical than we should.

We confess that there have been times when we were perhaps too quick to assail Congress for dragging its feet on important legislation. Much of its work must be done in committee—and the sheer volume of it is staggering.

Rep. Leslie C. Arends, congressman from this, the 17th Illinois District, is ranking minority member of the important House Armed Services Committee. It is a big one, with 25 Democrats and 16 Republicans. The workload is big, too.

For example, in the last Congress, there were 495 committee meetings, 110 involving the full membership. Eighty-three bills were reported to the House and 60 became public law. Action was completed on two House resolutions and one House Concurrent Resolution. Twenty bills were left pending in the Senate.

In the 91st Congress, some 33 special subcommittees of the Armed Services Committee held 329 meetings on such subjects as: Racial disturbances on military bases; the alleged My Lai massacre; the alleged drug abuse among servicemen; the meningitis outbreak at Ft. Leonard Wood, Mo., during late fall and winter of 1969; the Pueblo affair; military construction costs, and the military airlift.

We still expect to prod Congress when we feel it is justified and needed. But we believe that a better public understanding of congressional problems would result if more representatives and senators would tell the folks at home—as Rep. Arends has done—how much time must be spent in the nuts and bolt committee work behind the scenes.

THE POWER TO MAKE WAR

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today legislation to delineate clearly the warmaking powers of the Congress and the President. This is, I feel, one of the great questions facing our country, and I am pleased to sponsor in the House this legislation which was developed by Senator EAGLETON and introduced in the other body yesterday.

As you know, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am pleased to be one of the senior members, has conducted hearings in the past on the respective powers of the Congress and the President in this vital area of peace and war. I believe the legislation I have introduced today is an appropriate vehicle for a definitive determination of this question, uncolored by the passions which have been developed by our tragic involvement in Indochina.

It is for this reason that the concluding section of this joint resolution exempts from its provision the hostilities commenced before the enactment of the resolution. This is not to be interpreted by the present administration or anyone else as a resignation on my part or on the part of the Congress to events which are unfolding like a continuing nightmare in Indochina. We are simply seeking to avoid the sort of vitriolic debate over the Vietnam war which might prevent the broader issue of Presidential authority to wage undeclared wars from being thoroughly and thoughtfully debated.

The resolution I have introduced sets forth the boundaries of congressional and executive powers in both declared and undeclared wars. On the specific issue of the Vietnam conflict, I will continue to demand the immediate cessation of hostilities and the subsequent withdrawal of all U.S. forces. But the debate I wish to evoke with this resolution—on which I will seek early hearings in the Committee on Foreign Affairs—is on the substantive issues set forth in the following summary and text of the resolution:

SUMMARY OF RESOLUTION

Section 1 recognizes that no treaty shall be construed as authorizing or requiring the armed forces of the United States to engage in hostilities without Congressional authorization.

Section 2 authorizes "hot pursuit" of enemy forces when hostilities are legitimately authorized and a clear and present danger exists of imminent attack on the United States or its forces.

Section 3 recognizes the responsibility of the President as Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces to repel an attack on the United States or its forces and to rescue its citizens endangered in foreign countries.

Section 4 provides that if hostilities are initiated unilaterally by the President without specific Congressional authorization, the President must report to Congress the circumstances. Congress will decide, in not more than 30 days, whether to continue such hostilities.

Section 5 provides for periodic reports to Congress by the President while authorized hostilities are in progress.

Section 6 defines "hostilities" to include the deployment of U.S. forces outside the United States under circumstances where an imminent involvement in combat activities is a reasonable possibility. It also includes assignment of U.S. soldiers to "accompany, command, coordinate, or participate" in the movement of troops of any foreign country engaged in any form of combat.

Section 7 is the exemption clause.

TEXT OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Joint resolution regarding the powers of the Congress and the President to commit the Armed Forces of the United States to hostilities

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Whereas the Framers of the Constitution of the United States intended the separation of powers doctrine to apply to the initiation of hostilities as a means for ensuring collective judgment, whenever possible, before the Armed Forces of the United States were committed to such hostilities; and

Whereas the power to declare war was assigned to the Congress to initiate, define, and limit the scope of hostilities involving the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas the power to make rules regulating and governing the Armed Forces of the United States was assigned to the Congress, and this power authorizes the Congress to enact laws respecting the raising and use of such Armed Forces including their deployment in any foreign country; and

Whereas the power to appropriate moneys to support the Armed Forces of the United States was also assigned to the Congress, and this power authorizes the Congress to allocate funds so as to circumscribe the overall scope of hostilities and the uses of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas the Commander-in-Chief and Chief Executive powers were assigned to the President and these powers authorize the President to conduct hostilities initiated by the Congress and to respond to, and repel, attacks on the United States (including its territories and possessions), its Armed Forces, and, under certain circumstances, to rescue endangered citizens of the United States located in foreign countries: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled that:

"SEC. 1. Except as authorized in Section 2 or Section 3 of this Resolution, the President shall not commit the Armed Forces of the United States to hostilities. No treaty previously or hereafter entered into by the United States shall be construed as authorizing or requiring the Armed Forces of the United States to engage in hostilities without further congressional authorization. It is specifically recognized that such treaties as the Charter of the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty, and the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty do not authorize or require the President to commit the Armed Forces of the United States to engage in hostilities without a further authorization from both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

"SEC. 2. The President may commit the Armed Forces of the United States to hostilities to the extent authorized by Congress through a declaration of war, statute, or joint resolution, but authorization to commit the Armed Forces of the United States to hostilities may not be inferred from legislative enactments, including appropriation bills, which do not specifically include such authorization. The Congress recognizes that during such authorized hostilities against an enemy country or enemy forces, the President's powers as Commander-in-Chief and Chief Executive provide him with the further

authority, regardless of the limitations contained in the specific declaration of war or other authorizing statute or resolution, to order the Armed Forces of the United States to deliberately enter, invade, or intrude upon the territory or airspace of a country with which the United States is not then engaged in hostilities:

(a) when in hot pursuit of fleeing enemy forces who have attacked, or engaged in battle with, the Armed Forces of the United States and then retreated to the territory or airspace of such country, to the extent necessary to repel such attack or complete such battle, or

(b) when a clear and present danger exists of an imminent attack on the United States of the Armed Forces of the United States by enemy troops located in such country, to the extent necessary to eliminate such danger.

"SEC. 3. In the absence of a governing congressional authorization described in Section 2, the President may commit the Armed Forces of the United States to hostilities, to the extent reasonably necessary to:

(a) repel an attack on the United States by military forces with whom the United States is not engaged in hostilities at the time of such attack and to eliminate or reduce the effectiveness of any future attacks by such military forces which are committing the attack being repelled; and

(b) repel an attack on the Armed Forces of the United States by military forces with whom the United States is not engaged in hostilities at the time of such attack and concurrently to eliminate or reduce any clear and present danger of future attacks by the military forces which are committing the attack being repelled; and

(c) withdraw citizens of the United States, as rapidly as possible, from any country in which such citizens, there due to their own volition and with the express or tacit consent of the government of such country, are being subjected to an imminent threat to their lives, either sponsored by such government or beyond the power of such government to control: *Provided*, That the President shall make every effort to terminate such a threat without using the Armed Forces of the United States: *And provided further*, That the President shall, where possible, obtain the consent of the government of such country before using the Armed Forces of the United States.

"SEC. 4. The commitment of the Armed Forces of the United States to hostilities pursuant to Section 3 of this Resolution shall be reported promptly by the President to the Congress, together with a full account of the circumstances under which such hostilities were initiated, the estimated scope of such hostilities, and the consistency of such hostilities with the provisions of Section 3. The question of continuing or terminating any such hostilities shall be decided upon by the Congress as soon as possible and not more than thirty (30) days from the day on which hostilities were initiated, under the following procedures:

(a) any bill or resolution, authorizing the continuance or termination of military hostilities if sponsored or cosponsored by one-third of the Members of the House of Congress in which it originates, shall be considered reported to the floor of such House no later than one day following its introduction, unless the Members of such House otherwise determined by yeas and nays; and any such bill or resolution referred to a committee after having passed one House of Congress shall be considered reported from such committee within three days after it is referred to such committee, unless the Members of the House referring it to committee shall otherwise determine by yeas and nays; and

(b) any bill or resolution reported pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall

immediately become the pending business of the House to which it is reported, and shall be voted upon within three days after such report, unless such House shall otherwise determine by yeas and nays.

"Sec. 5. In any case where the Armed Forces of the United States have been committed to authorized hostilities, the President shall, while such hostilities are in progress, report to the Congress periodically on the status of such hostilities, as well as on the estimated scope and length of such hostilities.

"Sec. 6. For purposes of this resolution, the term 'hostilities' includes land, air, or naval actions taken by the Armed Forces of the United States against other armed forces or the civilian population of any other nation, the deployment of the Armed Forces of the United States outside of the United States under circumstances where an imminent involvement in combat activities with other armed forces is a reasonable possibility, or the assignment of members of the Armed Forces of the United States to accompany, command, coordinate, or participate in the movement of regular or irregular armed forces of any foreign country when such foreign armed forces are engaged in any form of combat activities.

"Sec. 7. This resolution shall not apply to hostilities commenced before the enactment of the resolution."

COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORTS FOR JANUARY 1971

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, section 234 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, which became effective on January 3, 1971, directs the Comptroller General to prepare and transmit each month to the Congress, its committees and Members a list of the previous month's reports of the General Accounting Office.

The first such list was transmitted on February 4, 1971, listing the January reports. Each Member and each committee has received a copy but, to make the list readily available to all congressional staff members, executive branch agencies, and the public at large, I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D.C., February 4, 1971

PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE, AND SPEAKER OF
THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Public Law 91-510, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, directs the Comptroller General, in Section 234, to prepare and transmit each month to the Congress, its committees, and Members a list of reports of the General Accounting Office of the previous month.

Accordingly, the attached list of General Accounting Office report issued or released in January 1971 is submitted.

Part I lists reports to the Congress, its committees and Members by the same classifications contained in the Federal budget.

Part II lists reports issued to the heads of departments and agencies. These reports normally contain findings and recommendations of concern chiefly to these officials and are not distributed to the Congress except on request.

The title of each report, date of issuance,

file number and agencies reviewed or affected are provided.

Copies may be obtained from GAO's Report Distribution Section, Room 6417. Tel: code 129-3784 or 386-3784.

ELMER B. STAATS,

Comptroller General of the United States.

I. REPORTS TO CONGRESS, COMMITTEES, OR MEMBERS

AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Program objectives not attained by inclusion of nonagricultural land in the feed grain program. Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture. January 12; B-114824.

Substantial payments were being made to withhold land from the production of feed grain. Some of the land was being used for purposes other than agricultural—housing and commercial development, recreation, country estates, sod nurseries, garbage dumps, and gravel pits. The program has been difficult to administer because of changes in land use due to urban development.

Audit of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, fiscal year 1970. Department of Agriculture. January 13; B-114834.

In the opinion of the General Accounting Office, the Corporation's financial statements were fairly stated and in conformity with applicable Federal laws.

Audit of Commodity Credit Corporation, fiscal year 1970. Department of Agriculture. January 15; B-114824.

In view of the character and scope of CCC's operations—particularly commodity inventories and loan collateral—GAO was unable to reach an opinion regarding the Corporation's financial statements. GAO recommended changes with respect to rice export subsidies, acreage-diversion payments, price-support regulations, controls over sight drafts, and contract documentation.

Procedures and practices should be tightened for use of independent auditors by Farmers Home Administration. Department of Agriculture. January 22; B-170874.

The Farmers Home Administration needs to strengthen its procedures and practices for using independent auditors in administering the FHA loan program. The loans finance water and sewer facilities, recreation facilities, rural housing projects and similar undertakings.

COMMERCE AND TRANSPORTATION

Airport safety inspection program needed to improve flight safety of civil aircraft. Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation. January 15; B-164497(1).

Conditions at airports seriously influence flight safety, but the FAA did not have a program specifically designed to evaluate the safety of public airports. It relied on inspections under programs which did not have safety as a primary objective. The Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 solved this problem partly as the report explains.

Examination of financial statements of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., fiscal year 1970. Department of Justice. January 19; B-114826.

The Government Corporation Control Act requires that the Comptroller General make and annual audit of Federal Prison Industries and submit a report directly to the Congress. GAO believes the corporation's financial position is fairly presented.

Administration of Metroliner and Turbo-Train projects. Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation. January 27; B-164497(5).

Significant delays were encountered in the Federal Railroad Administration's introduction and demonstration of high-speed intercity trains between Washington, New York and Boston. GAO reviewed the planning and administration of the programs and recom-

mended that more use be made of prototypes to develop equipment that is technically satisfactory before new equipment is purchased in large volume and placed in service.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING

Tighter control needed on occupancy of federally-subsidized housing. Department of Housing and Urban Development. January 20; B-114860.

Procedures and practices of HUD and housing project owners were not adequate to ensure that federally-subsidized housing was provided to families that were intended to be served. In many cases current income information was not obtained, and some HUD insuring offices had not made certain that eligibility procedures were being followed.

HEALTH

Opportunities to reduce medicare costs by consolidating claims-processing activities. Railroad Retirement Board, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. January 21; B-164031(4).

The present arrangement through which The Travelers Insurance Company, as an agent of the Government, pays Medicare claims on behalf of railroad workers and annuitants of the Railroad Retirement Board—a relatively small, special group of beneficiaries—is not the most efficient nor effective arrangement for making Medicare payments.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND FINANCE

Opportunities for better use of United States-owned excess foreign currency in India. Office of Management and Budget; Agency for International Development, Department of State; and Department of the Treasury. January 29; B-146749.

Indian rupees available for U.S. expenditure in India as of June 30, 1969, amounted to the equivalent of \$678 million—enough to last 19 years at current rates of spending. Political, economic and legal factors limit the amount of rupees that the U.S. can spend in India. Administrative difficulties in the U.S. government have also restrained useful spending. Even so, considerably greater amounts than are now being spent could be beneficially used within the limit.

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Need to strengthen management control over the basic research program administered by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research. January 29; B-170801.

The Office of Scientific Research supported projects which had little relevance to the Air Force mission. Research projects were not supervised adequately, reports of the projects' findings were not always obtained by the Air Force, and some reports were not distributed to users of the knowledge.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Opportunities for improving results of tire-rebuilding programs in Europe. Department of Defense. January 8; B-159200.

About \$1 million could have been saved in Europe in one year if the Army and Air Force had used rebuilt tires as much as possible. Both were selling rebuildable tires to scrap dealers at nominal prices, and neither kept track of its tire rebuilding program.

Opportunities to reduce costs and improve the capability of aircraft through prompt processing of engineering change proposals. Department of Defense. January 20; B-152600.

Engineering changes to improve military aircraft safety, performance, reliability, or maintenance frequently are made after production of the aircraft begins. Delays in processing change proposals can increase the number of unchanged aircraft delivered to operating forces and deny the advantages of the change to users, for a long time or even permanently. Making changes after production is generally more expensive. DoD installed new procedures, as a result of GAO recommendations, to speed up processing.

Need to improve management of tactical vehicles development program. Department of the Army. January 27; B-133256.

This follow-up review showed continuing problems in the Army Tank-Automotive command management of development and procurement of tactical wheeled and tracked vehicles.

Fair prices paid for small purchases by Department of Defense. January 29; B-162-313.

This is a follow-up to a similar report in 1968 when DoD appeared to be paying too much for many of its small purchases. GAO's subsequent audit showed that small purchases generally were fairly priced.

VETERANS BENEFITS AND SERVICES

Audit of financial statements of the Veterans Canteen Service for fiscal year 1970. Veterans Administration. January 7; B-114-818.

The financial statements of the Veterans Canteen Service, in GAO's opinion, present fairly the financial position of the Veterans Canteen Service.

II. REPORTS TO HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Possible need for changing the postal money order system. (To the Postmaster General.) January 12; B-114874.

The Department should consider curtailing the Postal Money Order system, particularly in metropolitan areas.

Opportunities for savings in personnel cost in the fleet ballistic submarine program. (To the Secretary of Defense.) January 27; B-171681.

The Navy should improve the organization and management of training for submarine crew-members.

AN END TO WAR

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, an end to the conflict in Vietnam is but the first step in that wider goal we seek to make this a world free from the sorrow and suffering brought about by war.

It is in the broad context of an end to armed conflict that the Honorable Raymond Wise, former municipal judge and city councilman of Surfside, Fla., addressed himself in a brief article entitled "How to End the Vietnam War."

It has been my pleasure to know Judge Wise for some years and I am impressed with his dedication and devotion to world peace through law. The following article is the essence of Order Please, a book authored by Judge Wise and published this year by Central Book Co., Inc., of New York. It is preceded by an article about Judge Wise which appeared in The Miami Beach Sun of February 1, 1971:

"PEACE FIGHTER" 54 YEARS, JUDGE WISE AN AUTHOR

(By Lloyd Beeker)

In 1917 Raymond Wise interrupted his college education and enlisted in the U.S. Army "to help restore peace."

He was 22 then and thought peace possible. In 1971 Raymond Wise is still fighting for peace in the world—a task grown far more difficult.

"World politics has diminished common

sense, and instead of making life better, the big powers continue to make more bullets and less butter," Wise said from his home in Surfside, where he has lived for the past 17 years and where he just finished a book on peace.

In his years in Surfside he's been a city councilman and municipal judge and has been a practicing attorney for 52 years.

For the last three years he has been writing his book, "with a new and fresh approach of ending the war in Vietnam," entitled, "Order Please."

"I'm no diplomat or statesman, but those so-called experts have been goofing off for 2,000 years, and what have they accomplished?" Wise said. "Who would have thought twenty years ago, a man walking on the moon. We need only the desire, and co-operation to achieve the desire," Wise said. The first step, he says, to end the war in Vietnam is to end all war.

Point one:

"Convene a meeting of all 137 nations as a World Order Commission to find a global answer to the global problem of abolishing war."

Point two:

"The United Nations cannot end war because the ten nations with 98 per cent of the military power in the world will not surrender it to the control of the majority of nations. These differences must be settled and then compel the rest of the world to settle their disputes in the same manner."

A difficult task, but who would have thought men walking on the moon, he reiterated.

Judge Wise says the benefits to every nation of a world in order are incalculable.

To name a few: "Reduction in armament cost; more funds for domestic needs; increase to trade; development of the use of the atom in industry; joint use of the richest in the oceans; and countless more."

Sovereignty, he says, can be used for good as well as for evil.

HOW TO END THE VIETNAM WAR

The surest way to end the war in Vietnam is to end all war.

The first step is to convene a meeting of all 137 nations as a World Order Commission to find a global answer to the global problem of abolishing war.

President John F. Kennedy said "Mankind must put an end to war or war will put an end to mankind."

Impossible? Twenty years ago it was impossible to walk on the moon. We need only the desire and co-operation to achieve the goal.

All 137 nations express an official desire to end all war. The trouble is no one is doing anything about it. We must create the lacking co-operation.

World War III has been deferred so far by a "balance of terror." No nuclear war can be won. But what an immoral way to try to keep order: by threatening to burn alive millions of men, women and children.

The methods of ending war suggested up to now are all impractical. The United Nations cannot end war because the 10 nations with 98% of the military power in the world will not surrender it to be at the disposition of the majority of nations.

Similarly, the leaders of the 10 powerful nations will not surrender their power to a world government. And finally, they will not give it up through universal total disarmament.

The only way we will have world order is when the 10 nations with 98% of the power agree to settle their differences by orderly means and agree to compel every other nation to settle their disputes in the same manner.

It will happen ultimately—why not now?

It will happen, because there is no longer any profit in war for any nation, and because there is far more profit in maintaining an orderly world than in waging war.

There are 2½ billion people living on \$100 a year. If, by co-operation, possible only in a world in order, this is raised to only \$500 a year, a new trillion dollar market is created for world trade. Both capitalism and communism would profit.

To get a World Order Commission convened, we must take a leaf out of the book of big business and lobby for it. If there are 10 men of real influence and position in the 137 nations, there are 1370 men to influence by lobbying.

Difficult, perhaps, but possible.

The benefits to every nation of a world in order are incalculable. To name a few: reduction in armament cost; more funds for domestic needs; increase of trade; development of the use of the atom in industry; joint use of the riches in the oceans; and countless more.

Sovereignty can be used for good as well as for evil.

RAYMOND L. WISE.

CAPITOL BOMBING CONDEMNED

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, for 6 years, since my election to Congress, I have labored long and hard to bring the war in Indochina to an end. I have made speeches, I have participated in peaceful demonstrations, I have voted, whenever the issue was presented, in opposition to this gross error in national policy. But, Mr. Speaker, I have never participated in or condoned violence.

While all the evidence is not in, there are indications that opponents of the Vietnam war may have been the perpetrators of yesterday's bombing of the Capitol. As a longstanding opponent of this war, I must condemn this outrage for what it is: an act which cannot be justified by any form of reason and which can only serve to cast discredit upon those of us who are attempting to bring the war to an end.

Mr. Speaker, violence will not end the war. It will not even bring the end closer. Violence will at best have no effect and at worst will only serve to strengthen the hands of those who wish it to continue.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, allow me to add my voice to those of other Members of Congress: let us not permit this incident to diminish the access of the public to the Capitol. Those who perpetrated this act would desire nothing more. Their ultimate goal is to turn the United States into a truly repressive country, hoping thereby to force those they accuse of "fence sitting" into their form of radicalism. Repressive measures must be avoided. Restricting access to the Capitol would fit well into their scheme—a furthering of the goal of alienating the people from their Government. This must not be permitted to occur. The Capitol is where the people govern; it must be kept open.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT INCREASE NEEDED NOW

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I insert in the RECORD, part X of the article entitled: "Private and Public Retirement Pensions: Findings From the 1968 Survey of the Aged," by Walter W. Kolodrubetz:

SOURCES OF INCOME OF THE RETIRED

Differing patterns of sources of other income emerge for persons with two pensions and for those with one or no pension. Private pensioners, as has been pointed out, were among the select of the aged OASDHI population in 1967. As a result, in contrast to persons receiving only OASDHI pensions, they were unlikely to be receiving public assistance and contributions from relatives, less likely to be working, and more likely to have income from assets and from other sources. As table 12 shows, for the 1 million married OASDHI beneficiary units reporting private pension income, almost three-fourths had asset income, almost a third had income from earnings, and negligible numbers received public assistance and contributions from relatives.

For the 3.4 million couples receiving only OASDHI benefits in retirement income, 7 percent had need for public assistance, 46 percent reported income from earnings, and 55 percent had asset income. About the same proportion of private pensioners and of those with only OASDHI benefits reported veterans' payments.

When sources of income for the 6.4 million nonmarried persons with no pension income except OASDHI are compared with the 600,000 nonmarried private pensioners, a pattern similar to that for married couples emerges. The 1.5 million nonmarried men without private pensions more often had income from earnings, veterans' benefits, and public assistance and less often had asset income than the men with such pensions. The same general comparisons were true for women with and without private pension income.

The pattern of sources of income for OASDHI beneficiary couples receiving other public pensions was almost identical with the pattern of private pensioners, except that the former were more likely to receive veterans' benefits. Among beneficiary couples with other public pensions, one-fifth re-

ported veterans' payments. Among the nonmarried receiving two public retirement benefits, the proportion with earnings and more pensions was sharply higher than it was among nonmarried private-plan pensioners. The disparity in the receipt of veterans' benefits apparently reflects the higher proportion of veterans in government service as a result of preferential hiring and, ultimately, the greater likelihood that government retirees would be drawing veterans' benefits, especially those paid without regard to other income. Married and nonmarried OASDHI beneficiaries with another public pension were unlikely to need public assistance and outside contributions, and asset income was a frequent source for these units.

For public pensioners with OASDHI benefits (as for private pensioners), sources of income differed greatly from those for persons receiving only OASDHI benefits (table 12). One major difference for the couples was that those receiving dual public pensions were more likely to receive veterans' benefits than those without a supplementary pension, for reasons previously stated. Among the nonmarried, about equal proportions of dual public pensioners and those receiving only OASDHI benefits had veterans' benefits.

Units not receiving OASDHI benefits but having other public pensions constitute a large enough group for comparison of sources of income with other selected groups in the aged population. Generally, assets were less frequent for couples without OASDHI benefits but with other public pension income than they were for dual pensioners (OASDHI plus private or another public benefit). For nonmarried persons with only public pensions other than OASDHI, the pattern of sources of income was, in general, similar to those receiving both OASDHI and another public or private pension.

When the comparison is between aged units with only OASDHI benefits and units receiving only government and railroad retirement pensions, some sharp differences in income sources emerge. Neither married couples nor nonmarried persons having only public pensions other than OASDHI reported earnings and public assistance as often as units with only OASDHI benefits in retirement benefit income.

It is also useful to compare sources of income for those who receive retirement benefits with those who did not receive such benefits. About 80 percent of the 525,000 couples without retirement pensions reported employment income; the proportion ranged from 30 percent to 45 percent for those with one or more pensions. Fifty-five percent of the couples without retirement benefits reported asset income—about the same proportion as that for couples with

only OASDHI or only a public pension other than OASDHI but substantially lower than the proportion for those who reported two or more pensions. Fourteen percent of the couples without retirement benefits had to resort to public assistance—a much higher percentage than that for comparable units with some type of retirement benefit.

For the nonmarried the picture was very different. Earnings were reported by only 21 percent of the men and 14 percent of the women without retirement benefits. For those nonmarried persons with OASDHI benefits only or with OASDHI and another public plan, the proportions reporting earnings were not much different. These proportions, however, were substantially higher than they were for nonmarried persons with private pension benefits and for those who were receiving only railroad or government pensions.

Income from assets were reported by a fourth of the nonmarried persons without retirement benefits—a much lower proportion than that for persons with retirement benefits. More than half the nonmarried who had no retirement benefits were receiving public assistance; a considerably smaller proportion of those with retirement benefits were on the assistance rolls.

Data on retirement benefits for various other subgroups of the aged population round out the picture of supplementary pensions in 1967. It has been assumed, for example, that persons reaching age 65 today are much more likely to have private pension income than older persons. In 1967, however, there was no significant difference in frequency of receipt between those aged 65-72 and those aged 73 and over (table 13). One underlying reason that the difference was not greater is that the maturing of the private pension rolls is just gaining impetus and the full effect on the total aged population will not be visible for a number of years. Similarly, the proportions of younger and older age groups with public pensions other than OASDHI did not differ greatly.

In 1967, white aged units were much more likely to receive private pensions than units of other races, as table 13 shows. This racial pattern reflects, in large part, differences in previous industry attachment, job changing, and occupational attainment. Other public pensions for OASDHI beneficiaries were received by roughly the same proportion of couples among the two groups—8 percent of white units and 6 percent of those of other races—because of a heavy concentration of units belonging to Negro and other races who received railroad retirement pensions. Among the nonmarried beneficiaries, however, the proportions of those receiving other public pensions and of those receiving private pensions were substantially higher for white units than for those of other races.

TABLE 12.—SOURCE OF INCOME BY TYPE OF RETIREMENT BENEFIT FOR OASDHI BENEFICIARIES¹ AND NONBENEFICIARIES²: PERCENT OF AGED UNITS WITH MONEY INCOME FROM SPECIFIED SOURCES, BY RECEIPT OF RETIREMENT BENEFITS, 1967

Source of money income	OASDHI benefits and—			Public pension other than OASDHI	
	Private group pension	Other public pension	No other pension	OASDHI	No retirement benefit
MARRIED COUPLES					
Number (in thousands).....	1,009	392	3,438	166	525
Percent of units with:					
Earnings.....	31	32	46	29	80
Wages and salaries.....	26	25	34	28	53
Self-employment.....	7	10	18	1	26
Public retirement benefits.....	100	100	100	100	—
OASDHI benefits.....	100	100	100	—	—
Other public pensions.....	5	100	—	100	—
Railroad retirement.....	2	26	—	69	—
Government employee.....	3	76	—	33	—
Private group pensions.....	100	—	—	—	—
Veterans' benefits.....	11	20	13	15	5
Unemployment insurance.....	2	1	2	—	2
Public assistance.....	1	1	7	4	14
Income from assets.....	73	69	55	58	55
Personal contributions.....	1	(*)	2	2	—
Private individual annuities.....	3	2	2	4	1
Other.....	4	2	4	4	4
NONMARRIED PERSONS, TOTAL					
Number (in thousands).....	605	476	6,353	343	1,025
Percent of units with:					
Earnings.....	10	19	17	6	15
Wages and salaries.....	9	17	13	5	12
Self-employment.....	(*)	2	4	1	3
Public retirement benefits.....	100	100	100	100	—
OASDHI benefits.....	100	100	100	—	—
Other public pensions.....	2	100	—	100	—
Railroad retirement.....	1	22	—	60	—
Government employee.....	1	77	—	41	—
Private group pensions.....	100	—	—	—	—
Veterans' benefits.....	2	8	10	10	7
Unemployment insurance.....	1	(*)	1	—	1
Public assistance.....	2	2	12	4	54
Income from assets.....	61	61	44	51	24
Personal contributions.....	2	2	5	2	5
Private individual annuities.....	4	4	2	5	1
Other.....	2	4	5	4	5

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 12.—SOURCE OF INCOME BY TYPE OF RETIREMENT BENEFIT FOR OASDHI BENEFICIARIES¹ AND NONBENEFICIARIES²; PERCENT OF AGED UNITS WITH MONEY INCOME FROM SPECIFIED SOURCES, BY RECEIPT OF RETIREMENT BENEFITS, 1967—Continued

Source of money income	OASDHI benefits and—			Public pension other than OASDHI	No retirement benefit		Source of money income	OASDHI benefits and—			Public pension other than OASDHI	No retirement benefit	
	Private group pension	Other public pension	No other pension					Private group pension	Other public pension	No other pension			
MEN							WOMEN						
Number (in thousands)	287	128	1,476	109	172		Number (in thousands)	317	348	4,876	234	853	
Percent of units with:							Percent of units with:						
Earnings	13	23	20	11	21		Earnings	7	18	16	3	14	
Wages and salaries	12	23	14	8	12		Wages and salaries	7	15	13	3	12	
Self-employment	1	1	7	2	8		Self-employment	3	3	3	2	2	
Public retirement benefits	100	100	100	100	100		Public retirement benefits	100	100	100	100	100	
OASDHI benefits	100	100	100	100	100		OASDHI benefits	100	100	100	100	100	
Other public pensions	1	100	100	100	100		Other public pensions	2	100	100	100	100	
Railroad retirement	1	25	66	66	66		Railroad retirement	1	21	56	56	56	
Government employee	1	73	33	33	33		Government employee	1	78	44	44	44	
Private group pensions	100						Private group pensions	100					
Veterans' benefits	2	13	14	11	7		Veterans' benefits	2	6	9	10	7	
Unemployment insurance	1	2	1	1	2		Unemployment insurance	1	1	1	1	1	
Public assistance	1	1	14	3	54		Public assistance	3	2	12	4	55	
Income from assets	55	54	41	51	27		Income from assets	68	64	45	51	23	
Personal contributions	1	2	2	1	1		Personal contributions	2	3	5	2	6	
Private individual annuities	1	2	1	6	2		Private individual annuities	7	5	2	4	1	
Other			2	5	4		Other	4	6	5	4	5	

¹ Excludes beneficiaries who received their first benefit in February 1967 or later, the transitionally insured, and special "age-72" beneficiaries; also excludes a small number of units reporting private pensions but no OASDHI benefits, as well as some who did not report on private pension receipt.

² Excludes a small number of units who did not report on private pension receipt.
³ 0.5 percent or less.

13.—SOURCE OF RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR OASDHI BENEFICIARIES¹ AND NONBENEFICIARIES²; PERCENT OF AGED UNITS WITH MONEY SOME FROM SPECIFIED RETIREMENT BENEFITS, 1967

Characteristics	Married couples with—			Total with—			Nonmarried persons			Women with—		
	OASDHI benefits and—		Public pension other than OASDHI	ASDHI benefits and—		Public pension other than OASDHI	OASDHI benefits and—		Public pension other than OASDHI	OASDHI benefits and—		Public pension other than OASDHI
	Private group pension ³	Other public pension		Private group pension ³	Other public pension		Private group pension ³	Other public pension		Private group pension ³	Other public pension	
Age:												
65 to 72.....	18	7	3	7	6	3	13	6	5	6	6	2
73 and over.....	17	9	3	6	5	5	13	6	5	4	5	5
Race:												
White.....	19	8	3	7	6	3	13	6	5	5	6	4
Other.....	10	6	4	4	2	3	9	3	3	1	2	3
Education:												
0-8 grades.....	17	6	2	6	3	3	13	5	4	3	3	3
9-12 grades.....	19	10	5	8	7	4	12	9	7	7	6	3
1 year or more of college.....	22	12	3	7	13	8	16	8	10	5	14	7
Homeownership:												
Owner.....	18	8	3	6	6	4	16	6	5	3	7	3
Encumbered.....	19	9	3	7	6	4	16	5	6	4	6	4
Unencumbered.....	16	7	2	5	9	2	15	9	(1)	2	9	2
Nonowner.....	18	6	3	7	5	4	12	7	5	6	5	3
Region:												
Northeast.....	25	6	2	11	5	3	20	7	4	8	4	3
North Central.....	19	7	3	6	5	5	14	5	6	3	5	4
South.....	12	8	3	4	6	3	7	5	3	3	6	3
West.....	16	12	5	5	7	5	9	11	8	4	5	4

¹ Excludes beneficiaries who received their first benefit in February 1967 or later, the transitionally insured, and special "age-72" beneficiaries; also excludes a small number of units reporting private pensions but no OASDHI benefits, as well as some who did not report on private pension receipt.

² Excludes a small number of units who did not report on private pension receipt.
³ Includes a small number of units reporting both a private and another public pension.
⁴ Not shown where base is less than 100,000.

Private pensions also were somewhat more likely to be received by persons with higher education. For nonmarried women, the pattern was inconsistent, however, probably in large part because of a concentration of private pension plans in some manufacturing industries and trades characterized by low wages and skill levels and employing large numbers of women.

A slightly different pattern emerged for public pensioners with respect to education. Among OASDHI beneficiaries with another public pension, persons who attended college were more likely to have a pension, particularly nonmarried women, than those with less education. For nonbeneficiary couples with a government or railroad pension, educational attainment was not as important, because of the heavy concentration of railroad retirees with less than a college education. On the other hand, higher education

was an important factor among the non-married, especially for women.

Another interesting finding was that homeownership was not a distinguishing characteristic found for persons reporting two pensions, despite the fact that they were likely to have accumulated other assets. They were about as likely to be homeowners as the rest of the aged.

Dual pensioners were concentrated in certain geographic regions. A higher proportion of couples and nonmarried persons in the Northeast and North Central regions were receiving private pensions than in the South or the West—a reflection presumably of the concentration in those areas of manufacturing industries with greater likelihood of pension coverage. The regional distribution of public pension recipients was considerably different. Generally, a higher proportion of the aged population received such pensions in the West than in other areas.

STRIVING FOR BETTER WORLD WITH HELP OF GOD

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. William M. Komanetsky, M.D., was recently installed as the president of the St. Louis, Mo., Academy of General Practice.

In his acceptance speech, Dr. Komanetsky offered a stirring rebuttal to the oft-times hysterical critics, who attempt to lay the blame for the morass of this Nation's health-care problems at the doorstep of the medical profession.

I offer the speech, with an introduction

written by my friend, Dr. Barney W. Finkel, M.D. chairman of the MAGP publications committee, for those who are interested in a view of the other side, from one who has been there.

The speech follows:

STRIVING FOR BETTER WORLD . . . WITH HELP OF GOD

(By Barney W. Finkel, M.D., Chairman MAGP Publications Committee)

"Woe unto them that call evil good and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; and put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter." . . . Isaiah V, 20.

The above words were written sometime before the year 700 B.C. Inability to tell good from evil is the greatest worry of man's life. Isn't this amazing? The erosion of government continues throughout the life of its formation, because there are among us those individuals who have no moral and ethical code. Trousseau said that "morality, when vigorously alive sees further than intellect." Morality to me means the body of manners and customs, the mores of a people or of a civilization. I belong to that group of citizens who believe that our moral codes are basically a distillation of all of man's previously acquired wisdom and experience. I feel that our ancestors, over many long ages, learned slowly and laboriously, after many setbacks in their climb toward a more noble and human civilization. It was from this that the "Ten Commandments", the "Sermon on the Mount", and the "Golden Rule" developed. To me, as I have said often, these rules, as I see them, were God given to us. To me, as I write this, one either owes his obligation to God and man, or to the state without God. I therefore stand for a better world with God's help. It is with this in mind that I present the address of Dr. William M. Komarnetsky to the St. Louis Academy of General Practice on his accepting the presidency of the St. Louis Academy. It is as follows:

Honored guests, colleagues, ladies and gentlemen: I can't really express in words the honor that the St. Louis Academy has placed in my trust. I regret dampening the gay mood of the evening—but please, shed no tears while I am expressing some of my opinions on private medicine's plight. The climate of our times reminds me of the peril that faced England during Dunkirk—but keep in mind that Dunkirk ended up being a victory since the enemy waited too long and was 'too confident.' This in turn solidified the British both in spirit and determination and led them to final victory. I am confident that we, the medical profession, will prevail for the betterment of medical care for all our citizens.

"As of now we are at the mercy of attacks from all sides. We are accused of incompetence and we are accused of inability to deliver medical care to our population, in our way. The attacks to discredit our competence, our honor and our veracity comes not from our patients (where such attacks should arise) but from outsiders—from the Fabian politicians. The verbal onslaught is in full force. The poor result and expense of Medicare and the idiotic procedures of Medicaid are blamed on us—not on the short sighted planning of their authors.

"In the government periodical of February 1970 entitled, 'Medicare and Medicaid Problems, Issues and Alternatives,' the introduction begins: 'The Medicare and Medicaid programs are in serious financial trouble. The two programs are also adversely affecting health care costs and financing for the general population.' It proceeds to place the blame on the private sector of medicine. Herein are listed some of the future plans for the private medical profession—all sorts of directives—paramount of which is the 'Watch Dog System'. Under the so-called Watch Dog System are: (1) Standard set-

ting. (2) Surveillance. (3) Enforcement. (a) Direct interview with the professional to handle specific problems. (b) Use of professional medical society for administration and peer review. (c) Temporary suspension and fines. (d) Formal administration hearings—with resultant appropriate judgment. (e) Elimination from participation in the program.' These were written in February 1970 and are not new in the Bennett Amendment. This book is available from the Government Printing Office for \$2.00.

"The onslaught goes on according to plan. These dreams are not new. This portfolio of dreams was on the shelf since the Murray-Dingle Bill of F.D.R. and even then, do you know who was waiting in the wings?—Wilbur Cohen—just waiting for his Right Man—yes—the 'Great Society Man.' It was our former president who said, 'Why anyone would want to deny a person the opportunity of putting in \$1.00 a month along with his employer to insure himself through Social Security against the staggering costs of hospitalization simply amazes me.' My friends, that \$1.00 has already risen to \$5.30. The deductible has gone from \$40 to \$50, and will go to \$84 or more in 1974.

"We are living in an age of contradictions—(1) There is a shrill cry for more medical care from the politician but not from the patient. (2) The politician tries to practice medicine but ignores blundering inflationary policies in the country which are devastating primarily to our senior citizens. (3) Unions trying to run businesses. (4) Students dictating to college presidents. (5) Politicians directing generals in war. (6) Children—instilling fear in their parents. (7) 'Stamp out the mutilation of Rubella vs. Permitting abortion on demand. (8) The Natural Law vs. God is Dead. (9) Eliminate individual responsibility and promote community responsibility. (10) Ignore the experience in medicine in England, Sweden and Russia and try to emulate their blunders. (11) Medicaid and Medicare are too expensive and a failure, therefore try the same scheme on the whole population.

"David Brinkley (NBC news correspondent) was in town several weeks ago. Some of his statements I believe are monumental. I quote: 'In some 25 years of working in Washington and watching government at close range, I have concluded that it does not do its job. It does not serve our needs but its own. It does not initiate change—it resists it. It never asks what we want. It tells us what we're going to get. It is a massive array of bureaucrats taking our money in arrogant and unfair ways and giving answers to questions nobody asks.' His opinion is that there is only one thing this Federal Bureau does efficiently and that is the handling of the Department of Fish and Wildlife, Forestry and Park Service—and the Space Agency—and these agencies deal with fish, forests, flowers and the moon—not the ordinary affairs of people.

"Dr. Egeberg, assistant secretary of H.E.W. on scientific affairs, was in town on November 20, and some of his statements of note were: (1) In Watts (California) before the riot they had health clinics, etc., but if more serious medical attention was necessary the patient was told to go to L.A. General Hospital. But he said, 'no busses stopped at Watts.' Is transportation now a medical problem? (2) Some people, he said are weak, have poor nutrition and cannot nor have the desire to work.—Again, I ask is the cause of poverty and hunger now a medical problem? (3) Thirteen and 14-year-old pregnant children receive very poor prenatal care. Infant mortality and maternal mortality are high. Is this a medical problem? Or is it a social, moral, economic problem? (4) He also made the comment at St. John's Hospital breakfast meeting on Nov. 21 'that 5-6 percent of doctors are crooks.' Where he obtained his figures he did not say. It appar-

ently was a blanket statement to discredit our profession. (5) He just came back from Russia and England and said, 'Where they have a system, the doctor works fewer hours.' In Russia he works 36 hours per week and in England 42 hours per week—65 hours per week in U.S.A. Was he inferring that Russia and England were better?

"All the foregoing reminds me of the story of an El Italia flight out of New York. The pilot made an announcement: 'This is your pilot. I have some good news and I have some bad news.—First, I will give you the bad news—We are lost! And now for the good news—We are making good time.' So it is with our politicians—they are lost—but they are making great time. I think it is too late to use the forum of writing to our representatives and senators. We are only 300,000 strong. When the time for the involuntary servitude that the lawmakers have planned for you and me arrives, I for one will say 'no.' I will only listen to reason, the dictates of my conscience and our recently formed 'Council of Medical Staffs' for guidance. We together can and will save the greatest medical system in the world, and thereby stop socialism in our great country. I have found that adherence to the message on a plaque hanging in my office waiting room has been satisfactory to both myself and my patients. I would like to read it:

"To all my patients: I will continue to care for you as a private patient as I have always done. I will expect you to pay for my medical services as you have always done. If you are unable to pay, please confide in me and I will treat you without charge as is my custom. Medicare and Medicaid are socialized medicine. It is bad for both you and me because it will prevent me from doing for you what you and I decide is best for you. I will not participate in Medicare and Medicaid because I am ethically and morally bound to protect you from inferior care. I will not sign federal forms and I will not accept federal fees. If you need to go to the hospital I will ask the hospital to admit you in the same manner as I have always done. If the hospital refuses your admittance because it requires that I sign a federal form and agree to government control (Which I will not do), it may be necessary for you to find a physician who practices socialized medicine. I hope you will understand my position and agree with me that my non-participation action in Medicare and Medicaid is the only honorable course I can pursue to safeguard your access to the best medical care.

"The Academy has been policing its own members since 1947 and strives: (1) To promote and maintain highest standards of General Practice. (2) To encourage medical students to become qualified family physicians. (3) To preserve the general practitioner's right to practice medicine to the full extent of his ability. (4) To provide post-graduate training opportunities for the Family Doctor. (5) To advance the science of medicine and the nation's health and welfare and to preserve the right of free choice of the physician to the patient.

"This year, 1970, marks a milestone in our endeavors—the examination for Certification of the American Board of Family Practice has been given. I had the honor and opportunity to take the examination, the 'luck' to pass it, and, of course the privilege to pay for it. Passing the examination I found was in great part due to post-graduate study hours accumulated while in the Academy. I encourage all Family Doctors—seasoned, new and future—to consider taking the examination. It is only fair to say that our Academy had the monumental task of initiating this move. Recertification will be (as is should be in all other specialty groups) held every seven years."

I believe in the above, do you? If you do, then you better study in depth the real

meaning of Peer Review, PSRO, National Health Insurance, the Constitution for a United Republics of America, and various other state-controlled proposals. They are all old programs that were tried in the history of our world and rejected as total failures. Remember, where people lost their moral code, history does repeat itself. That is why if you want to live under a Republic, you must fight for freedom every day.

REPEALING FEDERAL GUN CONTROL

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when the Gun Control Act of 1968 was considered by the House, I argued vehemently against it, and I cast my vote against it. At the time I thought the act to be ill-conceived, and nothing that has happened since it was enacted has changed my opinion one iota.

In the 90th Congress and again in the 91st I introduced legislation to repeal the Gun Control Act. As an interim measure, I also introduced legislation repealing the recordkeeping requirements for shotgun and rifle ammunition. I took this latter approach, because I thought that even if the general membership would not be disposed toward repealing the act in its entirety, perhaps the voice of reason would compel them to at least repeal that portion of the act which has proved particularly burdensome to dealers in and users of sporting ammunition.

Despite my frustration over the fact that Congress has not, to date, acted to remove the Gun Control Act from the law books, I was gratified when, during the last Congress, both the House and Senate agreed to exempt shotgun and rifle ammunition from the act. In addition, I greeted with enthusiasm the House action which also freed .22-caliber rimfire ammunition from Federal regulation; but, I confess I was rather dismayed when the measure was stalled in the other body and died at the close of the 91st Congress.

So now, Mr. Speaker, the legislative process must be commenced all over again. For the third time, I introduce legislation to repeal the Gun Control Act of 1968. Once again I implore my colleagues to face reality. I urge them to consider and accept the fundamental fact that guns and ammunition do not kill people—people kill people. And as long as criminals think they can profit from crimes involving the use of guns, criminals will use guns to commit crimes.

I believe the implications of this basic fact are as compelling as they are obvious. What is needed to control armed violence and crime is not Federal gun control, what is needed is upgrading and better equipping State and local police forces, enacting tougher laws to deter potential criminals and to severely punish convicted felons, streamlining the criminal justice system, and reforming the penal system. These are the things that will help restore order with justice

to our society. Federal gun control is obviously not the answer.

I am also introducing legislation to remove the remaining Federal regulations on the sale of .22-caliber rimfire ammunition, and I urge my colleagues to act swiftly on this proposal. As I mentioned earlier, the House membership approved similar legislation in the last Congress, but it was not acted upon by the other body. In this Congress we must give the other body ample time to take action.

The Federal restrictions on the sale of .22-caliber rimfire ammunition must, by any standards, be removed. Such removal merits the support of even the most ardent supporter of Federal gun control. I say this because in addition to being ill-conceived and excessively burdensome to buyers and sellers of sporting ammunition, existing Federal regulations have proved to be of no real use in preventing or solving crime. This fact has been publicly documented by the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department. Based on the first 2 years of experience in administering the Gun Control Act, both agencies have reported there is not a single instance where any of the record-keeping requirements for sporting ammunition has proved helpful in law enforcement or has led to the successful investigation and prosecution of a criminal offense.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to give these two proposals their most careful attention. Repealing the Gun Control Act of 1968 would rid the American people of the burdens of a law that never should have been passed in the first place. Repealing the remaining restrictions on the sale of .22-caliber rimfire ammunition would remove perhaps what to thousands and thousands of freedom-loving and law-abiding sportsmen and merchants, is the most aggravating single feature of the act itself, a feature that has been conclusively shown to have absolutely no bearing on crime prevention and crime control.

RAISE IN SOCIAL SECURITY CEILING

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, today I am again reintroducing a bill designed to increase the amount of outside earnings social security recipients may receive without suffering a reduction in benefits. My bill would raise the ceiling to \$2,400 per year.

The ceiling has been increased in the last few years in the recognition that those on social security often needed outside earnings to make financial ends meet. In the 90th Congress the level was raised from \$1,500 per year to \$1,680. In the 91st Congress the House approved raising the ceiling to approximately \$2,000 per year. This increase was contained in the social security amendments. Unfortunately, time ran out before the House and Senate could reconcile their

difference on the social security bill. The social security bill which the Ways and Means Committee is presently considering, H.R. 1, contains the \$2,000 ceiling. While raising the ceiling to close to \$2,000 would certainly be a help, I do not think it would be enough.

With the cost-of-living rates going up at such a rapid rate, it is difficult for fixed-income individuals and couples to maintain any kind of financial stability. Yet, under the present arrangement if they seek substantial outside employment to make up any shortages which arise, they are confronted squarely with the proposition that if their income goes over \$1,680 per year, their social security benefits are correspondingly reduced.

This situation needs relief, and I am hopeful that the Ways and Means Committee will give this point its closest scrutiny in its present consideration of H.R. 1.

There are some who feel that there should be no limits at all on outside income, and that if an individual has obtained eligibility for social security payments, then he has a vested interest in having them at whatever level his past earnings warrant.

While there is certain logic to this approach, there are several strong reasons why it cannot prevail. The main reason is that unless there were a limit on the income, there would be a tremendous load on the social security fund. Presently, there is already in the works proposals to increase the withholding tax, removing the limit altogether would simply be prohibitively expensive.

There are public policy reasons for providing that those with the lowest outside income receive top priority in the handling of the social security fund. If the benefits are distributed too widely—including to those who may have very large incomes from other sources and do not really need the social security payment—then the results would be that the man who does need it worse is not helped as much as he might be.

Although the social security check may not be completely sufficient to maintain a comfortable living standard, I believe it is a good way to provide a sound basis for the retirement years. At least the program elevates everyone to a certain floor from which the rest of his needs are within striking distance.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that the increase is needed and I hope that it is given a good hard look.

THREE MILLION MORE

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union are suffering growing repression. They are not allowed either to assimilate or to live a full Jewish life or to emigrate to a place where they might live freely. Because of their birthright, they are being denied the most basic of human rights.

Miss Meryl Handelsman, a resident of

my congressional district in Brooklyn, has written an extremely moving article on the plight of the Soviet Jews. Miss Handelsman, age 15, attends Abraham Lincoln High School, and her article, "Three Million More," first appeared in the Lincoln Log, the school's newspaper.

I believe the article should be read by as many people as possible, and hope that it will inspire all people to speak out against the treatment of the Soviet Jews.

The article follows:

THREE MILLION MORE
(By Meryl Handelsman)

"A long queue has formed outside a butcher's shop; several hours pass but nothing happens. Then suddenly the comrade butcher shows up only to announce: 'The meat deliveries have turned out to be far less than expected; we are having to divert a considerable part of our output to the assistance of our Arab brethren, victims of Zionist-imperialist aggression. Will all Jews kindly leave the queue. . . .'" This is just one of the anecdotes which is going around Moscow today. Is it startling, shocking? Does it bring tears to your eyes, or are you one of the many Americans who sat around while six million men, women, and children were exterminated thirty years ago, or one of those who plan to do the same today while three million are traveling down the same road.

"I hear it again and again. It's the same old story." In fact, it is, and it's about time the world realized that Anti-Semitism is a classic phenomena deeply rooted in Russia. It dates back to Czarist times and unfortunately continues today, for since Communism has failed to "solve the Jewish problem," the Soviet administration feels the answer lies in the exploitation of Jew-hatred in the domestic struggle for power. Obviously, the Russians feel that not all men are "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness."

The "crime" that the Jews have committed is that they want to be what they are. If they cannot be granted this, then they wish to emigrate. The Soviet government refuses to grant emigration, and claims that the Jews have nothing to complain about. Why should they complain that no edition of the Bible in Hebrew has been published since 1917; that religious calendars are non-existent; that not a single edition of the Siddur (prayer book) appeared from 1917-1958 (in 1958 a single issue of 3,000 copies was printed); that the production of ritual objects including prayer shawls and phylacteries is in fact, if not in principle, forbidden; that one synagogue and one rabbi for every 25,000 worshippers exist, that one single fictitious yeshiva exists with four students? What right have they to complain?

The most recent "Soviet propaganda" which led Jews to protest was the phony alleged Leningrad Hijack plot. A secret police agent provocateur was able to convince a group of twelve persons from Riga, including nine Jews desperate to leave for Israel, that he could fly them from the U.S.S.R. This tactic seems similar to the one used by the Soviet secret police to entrap Vilna Jews in 1945. When these twelve arrived at the Leningrad Smolny Airport they were arrested and charged with treason. Within an hour, a pre-planned series of arrests and searches began throughout the cities of Russia. Hebrew textbooks were seized as "tools of crime." The senseless brutality of the verdict, originally the death sentence, is apparent from the fact that no hijacking actually took place and the conspirators were arrested before they ever boarded the plane. The verdict which was just changed to imprisonment in labor camps for fifteen years obvi-

ously brings to light the fact that the court wishes to dispose of the case as quickly as possible and reflects the uneasiness over the severity of the sentences against the group, whose Jewish members had sought unsuccessfully to emigrate to Israel.

This trial which has received world attention was not an ordinary criminal proceeding. On the contrary, it was one of the most important political trials in the Soviet Union since World War II. The defendants were not only those accused, but the tens of thousands of Jews who have demanded the right to obtain religious freedom. In addition to this, the real purpose of the harsh sentences was to terrorize Soviet Jews. Jews are presently being accused of "treason" for various "crimes" including the possession of religious books as well as the attempt to teach their history. Their punishment for this is long prison terms in Soviet labor camps.

They long to retain their five-thousand year old culture and refuse to allow their everlasting faith, which has greatly contributed to our social values, be destroyed. Victor Boguslavsky, one of the men arrested declared: "Their only guilt was that they were born Jews and longed to remain Jews . . . that they wanted to live in their historical homeland, their own national state, amongst their own people."

"So what? Why bother me with something that is not going on here?" Why bother you? Because the fact that the Soviets are encouraging the slow death of a people's culture should open your eyes to a long-lasting evil which must be eradicated. The Jewish people have not been granted their "civil rights" and by all laws of Nature, deserve them. It is impossible to believe any human being could actually agree that the heritage of any group be destroyed. Don't sit around and wait until the day comes when a book can be written entitled, "While Three Million Died."

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, Miss Kathleen Anne Davis, a talented young 17-year-old, now living in the Canal Zone but a resident of Georgia, submitted an excellent speech to the Veterans of Foreign Wars' Voice of Democracy Contest. Now, as winner from Georgia, Miss Davis will be privileged to represent the State at the final judging here in Washington in March.

Writing under the contest theme of "Freedom—Our Heritage," Miss Davis expresses a love and pride in her country, which has given her freedom, that is not often openly shown by our young people today.

This speech was forwarded to me by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and I wish to share it with you at this time:

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

A promise. We, the American people would be free. Liberty was won. We had truly become America—"land of the Pilgrims' pride, land where our fathers died." Today, almost two centuries later, we are still a proud, freedom loving nation. However, what many people fail to realize, is that freedom must be preserved and cherished if it is to be inherited. The generation after us has the right to receive the same unblemished freedom that we have. It is our responsibility to ensure them their inheritance—their free-

dom. Daniel Webster once said: "God grants liberty only to those who love it and are ready to guard and defend it." I think of freedom like a tree. A tall strong tree must have sunshine, rain and little care. Without all this the tree would wilt, become weak and die.

Freedom needs our support if it is to live and be strong. The government is the roots, we are the tree. Both are necessary—each needs the other. To some people it may seem that today's "liberal" youth do not support or appreciate this gift that they have been given. Thomas Jefferson, John Adams and George Washington were all considered unreasonable liberals searching for an impossible dream. Because these men had the courage to speak up and fight, their dream—the United States of America—was found.

Yes, freedom is our heritage—but only because there were people before us that cherished and preserved it. Freedom must be won with desire and hard work by every generation. Freedom also requires pride. Unfortunately, though, the pride is often hidden from public view. "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America." This pledge, like freedom, is one of our great heritages.

When I was a child, we always began the day with the Pledge and a rousing patriotic song. Those days taught me about America and her worth and although I was young, it didn't take me long to realize what a great advantage I had over many of the other children in the world. Since that time, I am rarely given the opportunity to publicly pledge myself. "And the Star Spangled Banner in triumph shall wave." Never before, in the history of our country, has the flag been so abused by America's own people. To see the flag used as a knee patch or a door mat can only be showing disrespect. What has happened to the awe we used to hold for this symbol of peace? And when was the last time you sang our National Anthem? The song that people wanted changed because they couldn't "reach the high notes."

As the years go by we seem to be hearing and seeing less of these symbolic inheritances. Not because we aren't proud but because we often forget the blessing we have. People need to be reminded of their inheritance. Patriotism—the love of one's own country—must be shown. Stand when you see the flag or hear our National Anthem. Live, fight and die for your country. Don't just say that you care—show it.

Unfortunately, America and her promise are often taken for granted—except by those who have known neither. Between the years 1791 and 1921, the ocean brought forth 40 million Europeans to America's welcome shores. But why? Life in the new country was hard. The land was wild and unsettled. Jobs in the cities paid low. Nothing was handed out on a silver platter and it didn't take long to discover that the streets weren't really paved with gold. But these people were after more than physical comfort. They had found a land where a common man could be himself.

A land they were willing to fight and die for. These people had to have faith in themselves, their leaders, and most of all, the new country. Abraham Lincoln once said: "You can't build character by taking away man's initiative and Independence." Americans are often known as the most stubborn and proud people there are. This is because they have inherited and used the right to think and to act as they see fit. The American spirit was born to be free. Edmund Burke said: "Depend upon it that the lovers of freedom will be free." Only a true American can and will cherish, preserve, and inherit freedom. That was the promise given to us: We, the American people, would be free.

INDIANA PRESS PAYS TRIBUTE
TO "RED" MACKEY

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, last week I offered a small, humble tribute to one of my finest friends and one of Indiana's most distinguished citizens, Guy "Red" Mackey, the long-time athletic director at Purdue University, upon the sad occasion of his death.

Since his death, numerous Indiana newsmen and sportswriters, far more skilled than I in the use of the language, have also honored "Red" Mackey in print. I insert some of these stories, editorials, and columns at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Lafayette (Ind.) Journal & Courier, Feb. 23, 1971]

RED MACKEY DIES; SERVED PURDUE SPORTS
FOR 46 OF HIS 65 YEARS

(By Bruce Ramey)

Purdue University's Guy J. "Red" Mackey, dean of Big Ten athletic directors, died at 7:49 p.m. Monday at Home Hospital, ending a career of service and devotion to Purdue that covered almost 46 years.

Mackey had been ill since he suffered a stroke early Nov. 8, the day following the Purdue-at-Michigan State football game. While recovering from that stroke, he developed a circulatory problem in early December that required immediate surgery.

On Dec. 6 he was moved to the Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn., where his right leg was amputated at mid-thigh on Dec. 8. He suffered a second and more serious stroke Dec. 20, and was moved back to Home Hospital Jan. 5.

Since then his condition slowly deteriorated and he spent the last few weeks of his life in a semi coma, with only brief periods when he was able to completely recognize his family and friends.

Funeral services will be at 2 p.m. Thursday at Central Presbyterian Church, with the Rev. Dr. J. Dayton McCormick officiating. Interment will be in Grand View Cemetery, West Lafayette.

Mackey, 65 years old Dec. 14, 1970, had been athletic director at Purdue since 1942. An intense, dynamic individual, he was "Mr. Purdue" to his many friends and associates over the country, and a strong leader in intercollegiate athletic circles.

In the Big Ten he was a member of the committee which directed the financial operations of the Western Conference office and served on numerous conference and NCAA committees, including a recent stint on the television committees of both groups.

FIRST LOVE

From the time he entered Purdue as a freshman in the fall of 1925 until he died his first love was Purdue athletics and his major goal in life was to make Purdue best in the university's chosen fields.

A fiercely loyal man, he demanded the same loyalty from his coaching staffs and Purdue players.

Under Mackey's leadership Purdue became a power in collegiate football and basketball circles, and the fulfillment of a Mackey dream came in 1966 when the Boilermakers won the right to represent the Big Ten in the Rose Bowl in Pasadena. (Purdue defeated Southern California in the Rose Bowl on Jan. 2, 1967, 14-13).

Mackey was a solid administrator and businessman. Taking over as head of the athletic department at a time when it was

deeply in debt, he built the Purdue athletic facilities to their present status of second to none in size and usability. Never a man for needless frills, he made the athletic dollar stretch to its fullest.

Five times he directed enlargement of Ross-Ade Stadium, using only athletic department receipts, until today it ranks as one of the top college stadia in the country with a seating capacity of over 69,500.

Through his strong leadership, Purdue football home crowds grew until at the end of the 1970 season the Boilermakers played before home crowds that averaged 67,525, fourth largest in the nation and outranked only by Ohio State, Michigan and Michigan State, and ahead of other such football powers as Nebraska, Texas and Notre Dame.

He started scheduling Notre Dame on an annual basis, home and away, back in 1946 when the Irish were having trouble finding football opponents and the series has grown into one of the finest in the country.

Mackey also was the moving force behind the construction and financing of the \$6-million arena that seats 14,123 for basketball and houses all offices for the athletic department, plus the finest equipment and training-room facilities in the country. It was dedicated in December, 1967.

In addition, he built in 1958 the first co-recreational gymnasium in the country (cost \$2.5 million) for use by all students—a facility that annually is used by thousands of students for all types of recreational purposes and covering all phases of intramural and coeducational recreation.

Included in Purdue's compact athletic plants are the Fieldhouse, two 18-hole golf courses, separate outdoor track, baseball field, and tennis courts.

HAS ANSWER

Mackey was criticized by some Purdue followers for the lack of championships in some of the minor sports—wrestling, swimming, tennis, baseball and track—but his answer to critics was "They must be self-supporting. I'll help when I can, but not to the point that they jeopardize the money-making sports, football and basketball."

His foresight on this point has been spotlighted recently by the fact that Purdue ranks as one of the few schools in the country—and the Big Ten—whose athletic program is not operating at a deficit.

Because of the athletic department's excellent financial condition, he declined to add an 11th game to the 1970 or 1971 football schedule.

After earning three letters as an end in football (1926-27-28), Mackey joined the football staff as assistant freshman coach in 1929. In 1931 he was promoted to the varsity staff as an assistant, and in 1941 was named administrative assistant to athletic director A. H. "Mal" Elward. In 1942 he became athletic director.

As a football player, Mackey played against Frederick L. Hovde, then quarterback at Minnesota, and in 1945 Dr. Hovde became president of Purdue University. They became very close friends and great competitors on the golf course.

HIGHLY PRAISED

In the spring of 1965 Mackey was honored by friends from over the country at a surprise testimonial dinner at the Lafayette Country Club. It was a turn-away affair.

Speaking of Mackey that night, Dr. Hovde said:

"Red Mackey is one of the few men I know who has always practiced what he preached. I thank him for the advice, loyalty, leadership and deep integrity he has given the university. He has brought nothing but honor to this institution and is truly one of the great men in his profession."

Hovde's remarks have been echoed many times by those with whom he was associated.

A staunch believer from the very beginning in the Big Ten-Pacific Coast Rose Bowl tieup, Mackey fought long and hard to preserve that association when it was in jeopardy of being scrapped, and it was an occasion very dear to him when the Boilermakers went to the West Coast in December, 1966, to be welcomed by his close associates on the Rose Bowl Committee.

He disdained the usual practice of letting Big Ten and West Coast alumni provide the entertainment for the annual Big Ten party, held in the Hollywood Palladium. Instead he scheduled the Purdue Glee Club and Show Band into the huge ballroom, and gave Purdue's West Coast grads a show with a Hoosier flavor.

An avid, low-handicap golfer, Mackey worked off his vast amount of energy with almost-daily golf on Purdue's two courses, and was highly sought after at alumni and civic golf events over the country.

He instituted the John Purdue Club and Coaches Club, channeling support for Purdue's athletic program into a scholarship fund to help pay costs of grants-in-aid, and saw it grow from a small organization into one that now numbers over 1,700 members.

Mackey suffered a heart attack in 1963, but recovered and carried on his normal work load within a few months.

Two days before he suffered the stroke that eventually took his life he told a press gathering at Michigan State University that he had never felt better in his life, and he desired to remain as Purdue's athletic director "until they kick me out," although he was approaching the retirement age of 65.

Mackey was born in Glasgow, Ky., and graduated from New Albany High School. He received his degree in agriculture from Purdue in June, 1929.

In 1944 he was awarded the Sigma Delta Chi's coveted Leather Medal, presented annually to the Purdue staff member adjudged to have made "the greatest contribution to the welfare, success and reputation of the university."

CITED BY ASSEMBLY

The Indiana General Assembly paid tribute to Mackey in January by adopting a resolution commending him for his contributions to intercollegiate athletics. The resolution cited Mackey's role in the success of the Purdue athletic program and his contributions to intercollegiate athletics across the nation, in the Big Ten and NCAA affairs.

On campus Mackey was an honorary member of the Gimlets, the Reamers and the Iron Key. A Sigma Pi Fraternity member, he was active in the community despite his deep involvement in university affairs.

He was a member of Central Presbyterian Church, Lafayette Elks Lodge 143, F and A M Lodge 724 of West Lafayette, Indiana Consistory, Scottish Rite of Indianapolis, Shrine Club, Murat Temple, National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame, John Purdue Club and Lafayette Country Club.

Mackey was married in 1945 to Goldie P. Nees, formerly of Rensselaer. She survives along with his mother, Mrs. Myrtle Mackey, West Lafayette, and two brothers, Weston "Butch" of West Lafayette, and Malcolm of Fremont, Ohio.

Mackey's friends may call from 5 to 9 p.m. Wednesday at Hippensteel Funeral Home. His body will lie in state at the Central Presbyterian Church from 11 a.m. Thursday to time of services at 2 p.m.

[From the Lafayette (Ind.) Journal & Courier, Feb. 23, 1971]

MACKEY GAVE MORE THAN HE GOT: HOVDE

Purdue University's president, Dr. Frederick L. Hovde, issued the following statement Tuesday morning, eulogizing his friend and associate, Guy J. "Red" Mackey, who died Monday night following a long illness:

"Purdue University and the legion of his friends and admirers in the world of intercollegiate athletics mourn the passing of Purdue's distinguished son, Guy J. Red Mackey, graduate of the class of '29, member of the Purdue faculty for 42 years and director of intercollegiate athletics for the past 30 years.

Red Mackey loved Purdue University and all its members with a fiery passion from the day he became a Purdue student in 1925 and he dedicated his enormous energy, enthusiasm and capabilities to the service of his alma mater. The quality of his friendship had a vitality and a zest which gave more to his friends than he asked in return. His word was as good as his bond and a deep basic integrity and honesty characterized his work and his relationship with others.

He was a man who will always be remembered by those who knew and worked with him, not only for his great accomplishment, but also for the spirit-lifting touch he gave to all who were privileged to know him."

[From the Indianapolis Star, Feb. 23, 1971]

GUY MACKAY, PURDUE ATHLETIC CHIEF, DIES

LAFAYETTE, IND.—Purdue University Athletic Director Guy (Red) Mackey died yesterday evening in Home Hospital following a lengthy illness.

The 65-year-old Mackey suffered a stroke here on Nov. 8 after returning home from the Purdue-Michigan State football game. He was transferred to the Mayo Clinic at Rochester, Minn., in December when circulatory problems arose and was returned to Lafayette Jan. 5.

His right leg was amputated at the clinic and it appeared to solve the circulatory problem, but he suffered another stroke Dec. 20.

Mr. Mackey was the dean of Big Ten athletic directors, taking over the Purdue program in 1942. He was associated with Boilermaker athletics since entering the university as a freshman in 1925.

An outstanding end on the undefeated 1929 Purdue football team that won the Big Ten championship, Mr. Mackey remained at the university as an assistant football coach until his appointment as athletic director. He also was head wrestling coach from 1933 through 1936.

Under Mr. Mackey's leadership the Purdue athletic plant became one of the finest in the nation. Five times the football stadium was expanded and it now seats more than 69,000.

The \$6-million Purdue Arena, dedicated in 1967, was Mr. Mackey's greatest achievement. The domed structure seats 14,123 for basketball, houses all the athletic offices and locker rooms for every Boilermaker team.

No state appropriations were used to remodel the football stadium or construct the arena.

A low handicap golfer, Mr. Mackey also realized the value of sports other than football and basketball. Included in Purdue's compact athletic plant are two 18-hole golf courses, a separate outdoor track, tennis courts, a baseball diamond, the fieldhouse and convenient recreational and practice areas.

Also included is a unique co-educational outdoor and indoor recreational center that rates with the best in the country.

Known for his leadership, Mr. Mackey would defend his position to the end, but he also listened to the other side of a story. He believed in backing his employees to the hilt and in doing everything first class.

At the same time he was a sound businessman. Under Mr. Mackey's direction, Purdue was the only Big Ten school that consistently showed an athletic profit at the end of the fiscal year.

Since taking over as Purdue Athletic Director Mr. Mackey always employed the same philosophy—he wanted a happy staff because

an unhappy man cannot give top service. He believed in delegating responsibility with authority and in return expected an honest and sincere effort and willingness to make whatever sacrifice necessary to get the job done.

One of Mr. Mackey's closest friends was Big Ten Commissioner Bill Reed.

"Nothing I can say can convey my feelings about the man . . . and that's what he was—a man," Reed said at Chicago when informed of Mr. Mackey's death.

Citing Mr. Mackey's "high principles and loyalty," Reed asserted, "There never was another man like him and never will be another. It comes down to the fact he was a man of absolute integrity."

"The remarkable thing so often overlooked is the fact he was a very sound and far-sighted director. He was a solid administrator and managed finances in such a way as to never be a burden to the university."

Mr. Mackey's integrity was demonstrated when he placed Notre Dame on the Purdue football schedule shortly after World War II and kept the Irish there on a home-and-home basis despite the fact no formal contract was signed for years.

He did it at a time when most schools were thinking only of their own records and would not schedule Notre Dame.

One of the men Mr. Mackey played football against in 1929 was a Minnesota quarterback named Frederick L. Hovde. Today the former Gopher star is president of Purdue and was a constant companion of Mr. Mackey on the golf course.

Speaking at a surprise testimonial for Mr. Mackey in 1965, Hovde said, "Red Mackey is one of the few men I have known who has always practiced what he has preached. I thank him for the advice, loyalty, leadership and deep integrity he has given the university. He has brought nothing but honor to the institution and is truly one of the great men of his profession."

Among the many awards and certificates he received, Mr. Mackey particularly cherished the "Leather Medal" award from Sigma Delta Chi, national professional journalism society.

He was a member of Sigma Pi fraternity, the Elks Lodge, Masonic Lodge, Scottish Rite, the Shriners and the Lafayette Country Club.

Mr. Mackey was born at Glasgow, Ky. on Dec. 14, 1905, and was graduated from New Albany (Ind.) High School in 1925.

He is survived by the widow, Goldie.

Funeral services are pending in the Hippensteel Funeral Home here.

[From the Indianapolis News, Feb. 23, 1971]

GUY "RED" MACKAY DIRECTED PURDUE'S ATHLETIC GROWTH

Guy Joseph "Red" Mackay was the full name.

Red Mackay explains the full man.

Of all the athletic directors in the Big 10, perhaps of the nation, Red Mackay, who died last night after a prolonged illness, was the common man with the uncommon touch.

Athletic director at Purdue University since 1942, following a football career as a Boilermaker end beginning in 1925, Mackay ran one of the soundest, financially clear athletic programs of any major university.

The physical facilities under Mackay's direction became outstanding—largest football and basketball arena in the state, a 10-lane all-weather track, an intramural set-up that is the envy of many and two championship golf courses.

It rebounds to Red's credit that Ross-Ade Stadium, which grew from a 13,000-seat site to the present 69,400-seat plant, this year averaged more fans at its home football games than any other school in the nation excepting Ohio State and Michigan.

Five times under Mackay's direction the stadium has been quietly enlarged and, as

Mackey liked to point out, without the use of state appropriations.

And when anyone tried to assert that universities were placing too much emphasis on sports, Mackey reduced their argument by saying the emphasis could be lightened any time the taxpayer agreed to "pay the freight" for all the sports.

"We have many club sports now," Mackey once said, "... sports you do not have to subsidize. They get some help and that is possible because of football gate receipts. Basketball pays its way, but football is the main go."

Purdue's basketball arena, completed and opened for the 1967-68 season, is a 14,123-seat domed structure that cost 5½ million. For the first three years each home game was a complete sellout.

Red loved golf and was one of the state's best amateurs. His push not only developed and maintained the university's two 18-hole courses, but it also provided finally an adequate clubhouse situated between the two. Red was not without recognition.

Only two years after he was hired as Purdue's sixth athletic director, Mackey was given Purdue's Leather Medal, the university's highest honor given to the person making the "greatest contribution to the welfare, success and reputation of the university."

And in 1965, at a surprise testimonial, Purdue president Dr. Frederick Hovde said, "Red Mackey is one of the few men I have known who has always practiced what he has preached. I thank him for the advice, loyalty, leadership and deep integrity he has given the university. He has brought nothing but honor to this institution and is truly one of the great men of his profession."

Services for Mackey will be at 2 p.m. Thursday at Lafayette's Central Presbyterian Church.

Friends may call at the Hippensteel Funeral Home from 5 to 9 p.m. tomorrow and from 11 a.m. to 2 p.m. Thursday at the church.

The family has requested memorials be made to the Purdue Alumni Scholarship Fund.

While recovering from the stroke that first hospitalized him Nov. 8, Mackey developed a circulation and clotting problem. He underwent minor surgery to arrest the circulatory problem in early December. On Dec. 6, he was moved to the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, Minn., where amputation of his right leg at mid-thigh appeared to solve the circulatory problem.

While making satisfactory progress from the surgery, Mackey suffered a second, more serious, stroke Dec. 20. Moved back to Lafayette Jan. 5, by mid-January, his condition had improved to fair from serious.

In 45 years with the university, Mackey, a native (Dec. 14, 1905) of Glasgow, Ky. and graduate of New Albany, Ind., High School, participated as an end on the varsity football team (1926-29), became assistant freshman coach in '29, and three years later varsity assistant. Before becoming director, he served as administrative assistant to Mal Edward in 1941.

Five football coaches served under the Mackey directorship—Elmer Burnham (1942-43), Cecil Isbell (1944-46), Stu Holcomb (1947-55), Jack Mollenkopf (1956-69) and Bob DeMoss (1970).

Ward "Piggy" Lambert (1919-1946) was Purdue's basketball coach when Mackey was appointed athletic director. But the next three Red hired—Mel Taube (1946-50), Ray Eddy (1950-65) and George King (1965).

The 1971 Indiana Legislature paid tribute to Mackey by adopting a resolution commending the veteran sportsman for his contribution to intercollegiate athletics and Purdue.

Mackey was married to the former Goldie P. Nees of Rensselaer.

[From United Press International, Feb. 23, 1971]

PURDUE'S "RED" MACKEY DIES MONDAY EVENING

LAFAYETTE, IND.—Guy "Red" Mackey, the man who made the Purdue athletic department one of the flowers of intercollegiate athletics, died at Home Hospital here Monday night. He was 65.

Mackey, the dean of the Big Ten athletic directors and a student, coach and athletic department administrator at Purdue for 45 years, had been hospitalized for three months after suffering a stroke early last November. Recovery from the stroke was complicated by a circulatory problem which caused some clotting.

He underwent one minor operation early in December to relieve the circulation difficulty, but he was later transferred to the Mayo Clinic at Rochester, Minn., where surgeons amputated his right leg at mid-thigh to eliminate the problems.

SECOND STROKE

However, while recuperating from the major operation, Mackey suffered a second, more severe stroke, from which he never fully recovered. Purdue officials said doctors reported death was connected with the circulatory problems.

Mackey was born at Glasgow, Ky., Dec. 14, 1905, but called New Albany, where he graduated from high school in 1925, home.

Mackey began his career at Purdue as a student in the university's agriculture school, but he spent most of his time on the football field.

He won outstanding plaudits for his brilliant play as a defensive end on Boilermaker teams from 1926 to 1928.

From the days as a player, Mackey could be described as growing up with the modern Purdue athletic system. He became an assistant freshman football coach on the Purdue staff following his graduation in 1929. Three years later he was promoted to the varsity staff as an assistant.

Mackey was made an administrative assistant to athletic director Mal Elward in 1941 and stepped up to the top spot in the Boilermaker athletic setup a year later when Elward entered the Naval service.

STIMULATED GROWTH

The smiling, affable and hard-working redhead stimulated athletic department business and plant improvements to the point that Purdue is one of the top-rated, most soundly run intercollegiate athletic programs in the country.

Under his direction, Purdue erected a \$6 million basketball arena. The domed 14,123-seat structure was completed in 1967. Five times during Mackey's reign as director, the Purdue Ross-Ade Stadium was enlarged without state appropriations.

He administered the setup which included a fieldhouse, two 18-hole golf courses, a separate outdoor track, a unique co-education recreational gymnasium and outdoor pools, tennis courts, a baseball field and practice areas for both indoor and outdoor sports.

Throughout his years as boss of Purdue's athletic system, Mackey aided his coaches as an assistant or scout.

Mackey was married to the former Goldie P. Ness of Rensselaer.

The 1971 Indiana Legislature paid tribute to Mackey by adopting a resolution commending the veteran sportsman for his contribution to intercollegiate athletics and Purdue.

Services will be Thursday at 2 p.m. at the Central Presbyterian Church in Lafayette. Interment will be in Grand View Cemetery. The family has suggested contributions be sent to the Purdue alumni scholarship fund in lieu of flowers.

[From the Indianapolis Star, Feb. 24, 1971]

GUY "RED" MACKEY

Victory after a hard struggle makes the blood course like few other things and victory in that ritualized combat called sports is born in the strong hearts and minds of men like Guy (Red) Mackey.

There's something of the general and admiral in the way great athletic chiefs live and think, choose their lieutenants and their men, their coaches and their players, the loyalties they command with quiet power of presence, the shrewdness of their strategies and the grand excitement of their triumphs.

That something was a driving force in Red Mackey when he entered Purdue University in 1925 as a freshman. It was working when he turned in a fine performance as an end on the undefeated 1929 Boilermakers team that won the Big Ten championship.

Red Mackey's abiding kinship with Purdue would last his lifetime. He stayed as assistant football coach until he became athletic director in 1942. Under his mastery, the Purdue athletic plant became one of the nation's finest and the mighty Boilermaker teams made history. It is further testimony to his talents that his programs, season after season, showed a profit.

The illness that would cut his span of years to 65 came on all too suddenly, like a storm that would keep a winning game from running its full course. But the end, in spite of that, makes his victories and his manly life glow all the brighter.

As Purdue President Frederick L. Hoyde, his long-time, close friend said: "He has brought nothing but honor to this institution and is truly one of the great men of his profession."

The honor of Red Mackey of Purdue shines on the state and nation and the whole world of sports.

[From the Indianapolis News, Feb. 24, 1971]

RED MACKEY

In the intensely competitive world of intercollegiate athletics, a university's athletic director is one of the most important officials on the staff. It is he who is mainly responsible for the success or failure of the institution's athletic program.

Purdue has been fortunate for nearly a score of years in having Guy Joseph (Red) Mackey as the man in charge of its far-flung sports program. Under his direction, an athletic plant at Purdue was created which ranks among the best. He enlarged Ross-Ade Stadium until it is the largest football arena in the state, and it has seen attendance grow until Purdue is next to Ohio State and Michigan among the nation's colleges in home football crowds.

Red Mackey's entire adult life was devoted to Purdue athletics, beginning with the time he played end on the Big 10 champion football team in 1929. Athletic director since 1942, he was an articulate spokesman for the value of athletics in college. He often pointed out that football receipts make it possible to operate a varied sports program which benefits all students. The Purdue program has been recognized as one of the soundest financially in the nation.

Red Mackey was an administrator of vision whose ability won him recognition and respect throughout the collegiate world of athletics. His host of friends had hoped he was recovering from circulatory troubles that led to the amputation of a leg this winter. But death came Monday in a hospital at Lafayette. The great new basketball arena and enlarged Ross-Ade Stadium are among the physical reminders of how well Red Mackey served the university he loved.

[From the Indianapolis Star, Feb. 24, 1971]

SPORTS OVER LIGHTLY

(By Bob Collins, sports editor)

I would rather remember the happy times. And there were many.

There was Red the "teaching pro," who couldn't keep his mouth off of anybody's golf swing, completely taking apart my game and reassembling it in nine holes.

Then, peacock proud of himself, he asked, "There, don't you notice a difference?" To which I replied, "It would be hard as hell not to, since I was hitting the ball in the air before I started listening to you."

And there was the day he dedicated himself to curing my hook and was so spectacularly successful I finally sliced a tee shot across two fairways.

Then there was the time, like two big, friendly grizzly bears, feeling our oats (or was it corn?) we engaged in a wrestling match for the "overweight" championship of Vinton Woods. It concluded with me on top and Red declaring himself the winner—a real hometown decision.

And there was Red the world's worst teller of jokes. He always had one and I used to drive him up a tree by sitting poker-faced after he delivered the punch line and saying, "Go on, Red, what's the rest of it?"

And let us not forget the annual "Mackey Open" for members of the media. It featured some of the worst golf and best corn and prime rib in Indiana.

Red Mackey was a man of strong opinions. And he could be cantankerous. But he was straightforward and nobody ever doubted exactly where he stood on any issue. Also, I don't think I ever met a man who tried so hard to be fair.

He was a man of fierce unyielding loyalty. Members of his staff knew that, whenever his personal feelings, he would stand behind them if they were under attack. And they repaid him in kind. In 22 years of covering Purdue, I never heard a staff member, even in anger, saying anything derogatory about Red.

Red loved Goldie and he loved sports. But Purdue was his mistress. It was a love affair that never wavered. There couldn't have been a happier man on this earth. He was exactly where he wanted to be, doing exactly what he wanted to do for most of his life.

Once, some years ago, I was sitting in his office complaining about the people who lie to newspapermen. After the tirade I said, "Red, I don't think you'd ever lie to me."

Without hesitating, he answered, "I would if I had to do it to protect Purdue."

Red was not wealthy and he and Goldie were childless. But he left a legacy. While his achievements were many, the legacy is not in the brick and steel of the athletic plant or in the record book.

It is right here, walking this earth. It is his hundreds of friends who will remember him and think well of him as long as they are here.

If life is but a journey, then there is no doubt that Red had a beautiful trip.

[From the Lafayette (Ind.) Journal & Courier, Feb. 25, 1971]

"RED" WAS A WINNER

In the world of intercollegiate athletics, the Big Ten is considered a powerhouse. On a given Saturday, it is said, any university in that conference can lose to any other member.

Now, this week, all of them lost. All the Big Ten and all the countless others who inhabit the complex world of athletics.

When Guy J. "Red" Mackey died Monday at the age of 65 he left more than the normal deflection that fans feel when a star is removed permanently from the game.

For Red Mackey was, in his own sphere and times, a unique man with an unusual combination of talents. He had the personality and the stamina of a successful politician, with an astonishing capacity to accumulate and retain friendships. The formula was simple; a friend was a person who understood his devotion to Purdue University.

But behind the vigor and the charm was a skilled administrator who was able to make Purdue's athletic program impressively successful, both in the quality of its people and the physical plants they used.

Red Mackey's critics called him a "square," and he would instantly accept the identity. Progressive and even visionary in his own field, he wore old American values like chips on his shoulders, and few tried to knock them off.

In a field that produces coaches with charisma who can dominate athletic departments, Red Mackey was the unchallenged director. The coaches and the stars had the spotlight and responsibilities were generously delegated, but Red had the power. By following rigidly the rule book on leadership, he won respect and affection, the elusive ingredients that make leaders successful, and he ran his organization as a model of stability and efficiency.

During his 45 years of service to Purdue, Red Mackey brought national prestige to the University's athletic department and he became, of course, a national figure with enormous prestige in his profession.

But Red was a total Hoosier. It is here, near Purdue, that he will be buried. Here his widow, his mother and his brothers will find an abundant sharing of their grief. For to Purdue and this community Red Mackey brought an exciting lifetime adventure in fair play and competition, and there will be enduring memories of an uncommon man whose own stature was appropriate to the greatness of the University he served.

[From the Lafayette (Ind.) Journal & Courier, Feb. 26, 1971]

SPORTS FIGURES AT RITES: PASTOR CALLS MACKEY CHAMPION'S CHAMPION

"Let us thank God for the life and accomplishments of Guy 'Red Mackey,' the Rev. Dr. J. Dayton McCormick said Thursday afternoon, eulogizing Purdue's athletic director who died Monday night.

Dr. McCormick spoke from the pulpit of Central Presbyterian Church during funeral services for Mackey, 65, Purdue's athletic director since 1942. The church was filled with Mackey's friends from this city and sports figures from over the country.

"Let us now praise great men," he said, quoting from the Apocrypha, "leaders of people, wise and eloquent in their instructions . . . their bodies will be buried in peace, but their names will live evermore."

Quoting from Browning, he said: "He never turned his back on any man . . . we fall to rise, sleep to work, fight on forever, there as here."

"Red Mackey was not only a champion, he was a champion's champion. His heart included a large amount of compassion, honesty, loyalty, and integrity. He accomplished in less than a biblical three score and ten years what we all strive for."

Mackey was laid to rest in Grand View Cemetery, not far from his West Lafayette home and the University to which he dedicated his life. A long cortege of automobiles, perhaps the largest in the city's history, wound its way across the Wabash River to the cemetery.

Among the many friends, associates and Big Ten dignitaries attending the rites were several former Purdue athletes. The list includes Mike Phipps, Randy Minnleer, Leonard and John Jardine, Ed Cody, Abe Gibron, Alex Agase, Babe Dimancheff and Stormy Frohl from outside the city.

Mackey's former teammates and compatriots included Paul Pardoner, John Oehler, Roy Horstman, Doxie Moore, George Bell and Harvey Olson.

From the Big Ten office were "Tug" Wilson, former commissioner, John Dewey and Herman Rohrig.

Athletic directors present included Biggie Munn, Michigan State; Don Canham, Michigan; Bump Elliott, Iowa; Bill Orwig, Indiana; Moose Krause, Notre Dame; Bill Rohr, Ohio University; Ed Weaver, Ohio State University, and Tippy Dye, Northwestern. Milt Bruhn and Bud Foster represented the University of Wisconsin, and Ray Elliot, former football coach at Illinois, represented that university.

Others present included Wilfred Smith, former sports editor of the Chicago Tribune; Pete Elliott, former football coach at Illinois, and Mrs. Ray Schalk, Chicago, widow of the late "Cracker" Schalk, long-time friend of the Mackey's.

ON SALUTING FARM CARTS

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that most of our 28 million veterans will react as I with mixed emotions to the news that the hand salute is not quite what it once was in the military services.

In the old days, of course, the general assumption was, "if it moves, salute it." This created some pretty absurd situations, such as those described in an article which I will insert at the end of these remarks. Rendering honors to a cart load of geese with the snappy precision expected at a full dress review at West Point was clearly ridiculous—yet that actually happened, according to the veterans publication, Stars and Stripes-National Tribune.

Things are a great deal different in the "new" Army, with its more relaxed standards. Local commanders are under orders to modify saluting policies in "high-density" areas when too much saluting is "repetitious or otherwise unfeasible."

Those of us who served in World War II, Korea, or World War I may grumble at bit at this erosion of tradition, while at the same time acknowledging that perhaps some new rationality has crept into the daily humdrum of military life.

In any event, the article on hand salutes published in the February 18 edition of Stars and Stripes-National makes good reading, and I am pleased to include it at this point in the RECORD:

ORDER ENDS SALUTES TO FARM CART

After the 1918 Armistice both enlisted personnel and officers had a tendency to let down a bit on discipline. Saluting was one of the fields where they definitely slid.

Writer of these paragraphs recalls that some one of the General Pershing's upper staff passed through the little village of Gudmont where his regiment was quartered after the war ended. A main highway to Chaumont, General Pershing's headquarters, ran through the narrow street of the village. Soldiers got out of the way of his passing car and flying mud. Few of them gave thought of saluting.

A day later the regiment's colonel got a rough message from Chaumont. At retreat

that evening, battery commanders issued stern warnings on saluting cars carrying officers.

"Even if you only think the car may have an officer in it," directed Major Louis Howard of the Second Battalion, 65th Artillery, "salute it. As for saluting me, I'll give you back a better one."

"The day of the Armistice the war was over as far as I was concerned, but some of the generals don't think it is. If you want to get out of this forsaken country and back home, do what the generals want. And don't forget to salute them on foot, car or horseback."

The men obeyed the major's word to the letter and better. If a peasant's cart came down the street with a load of geese, the battery men would snap to attention and render a salute adequate for West Point. The farmers and villagers did not know what it was all about, but they waved and saluted back."

Remembering these days of 1918, an article in Army News Features on new saluting orders caught the editor's eye. It is printed herewith:

"Salutes are no longer required to be rendered by or to personnel in vehicles, according to the latest word from the Department of the Army. An exception has been made for gate guards who will continue to salute recognized officers in official vehicles only."

"In another change to the rules, salutes are no longer required to be rendered or returned if either the senior or subordinate or both are in civilian attire."

"Word has been issued to local commanders to 'carefully review saluting policies for their installations. Where considered desirable in their judgment, they will develop and publish modified saluting policies for congested, student or high-density living areas where saluting would be highly repetitious or otherwise infeasible.'"

"It has also been announced that personnel will not be required to wear military headgear on or off a military installation while in a private or commercial vehicle."

STRIPMINING

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, stripmining for coal is rapidly destroying—beyond recall—much of this Nation's precious land and water. It is also creating unbelievable hardships for thousands of people who are driven out of their homes or who live in the wake of the strippers.

Many will remember John Steinbeck's famous novel, *The Grapes of Wrath*, describing the plight of the thousands of good Americans who were driven off their farms in the Dust Bowl back in the 1930's. The plight of the residents of the stripmining areas is strikingly similar. This time, however, not nature, but giant machines controlled by huge, faceless corporations are driving good Americans off the lands of their ancestors and turning them into deserts. This tragedy is even more poignant because it is entirely man made.

Stripmining is a national problem, and it deserves a national solution. It is estimated that there are 71,000 square miles containing 128 billion tons of coal in the United States. These lands are being

ravaged at an alarming rate. Last year in Ohio alone, 10,000 acres were devoured. Some 280,000 acres have been previously despoiled in Ohio and 4 million acres nationwide.

I am pleased to have joined with Congressman KEN HECHLER in sponsoring a bill to ban coal stripmining. I am hopeful that hearings on that bill and others providing for the regulation of stripmining will be held in this session.

Stripmining is of particular concern in Ohio where thousands of acres have already been chewed up by the giant gouging machines. And the strippers are working faster than ever now as the threat of State and Federal regulation approaches.

Last weekend I spent a day inspecting some of the more heavily stripmined areas of Ohio. Less than 10 years ago, most of these areas were productive farms and some of the most beautiful scenery in the State. Today, thousands of acres are devoid of vegetation and wildlife. Lakes, streams, and underground water-courses are poisoned. Climb any hilltop and you will see, in every direction, once verdant hills now gashed and eroded and resembling the "bad lands" of some of the arid western regions of the United States.

Whole towns have disappeared from the face of the earth. Many public roads have been closed. The population is falling off drastically. The assessed value of buildings per acre has dropped even more drastically.

The tragedy is so immense in scope that it is almost impossible for the mind to take it in. It is even more difficult to comprehend the kind of mentality that perpetrates and justifies this wanton destruction of the land that is, or was, America. The only hope is that, once the people understand what coal stripmining is doing to their country, they will demand that it be permanently prohibited.

Mr. Speaker, James Herzog of the Akron Beacon Journal has written an excellent series on stripmining in Ohio which I think will be of interest to all Members of Congress. We can and we must learn from the tragic experiences of Ohio and other Appalachian area States if we are to prevent similar destruction in many other parts of the country.

The articles are reprinted below:

BEAUTIFUL OHIO SPOILED

(Every year Ohio strip miners cut coal out of 10,000 acres in 27 eastern Ohio counties. Digging from the surface with equipment that can remove 200 tons of rock and clay with a single swipe, the miners feed the state's ever-growing industrial needs. Once the miners are through with a mine, they meet Ohio's tax reclamation law and move on, leaving behind useless land. This is one of a series of reports on Ohio strip mining).

(By James Herzog)

Working like a horde of locusts—from Portage County to the southern borders of Ohio—strip miners annually gouge 30.5 million tons of coal from the ground with gigantic shovels and huge draglines.

In their wake the dairy land of Tuscarawas County, the farm land of Harrison

County and the rolling hills of Belmont County become scarred and useless.

For 55 years destruction and waste have been the story of the strip mining industry.

A month-long Beacon Journal study of the situation in Ohio shows:

An ineffective law fostered by the coal industry has allowed the widespread destruction of land.

Jagged cliffs—Sometimes 150 feet high—are created. The law has no provision for leveling these when the stripping is finished.

Stripped land—generally worthless—is often praised for tax purposes at \$25 an acre. This puts a tax burden on others whose land must support local needs.

A front group for half the strip miners—the Ohio Reclamation Association—has tried to protect the mining industry through lobbying and public relations work. It has a \$90,000-a-year budget but reported no lobbying expenses for 1965, the year it worked long and hard to beat back a strong strip mining measure.

Ohio officials, charged with the responsibility to enforce Ohio's strip mining law, maintain a close working relationship with the Ohio Reclamation Association.

Ohio Department of Natural Resources officials, who once proposed selling mineral rights under park lands to coal companies, say they are satisfied with the Ohio law.

This law also allows miners to delay for several years the reclamation work that is actually demanded under it. Sometimes they can avoid any reclamation.

Its complicated provisions allow miners to continue operations in a new corporate front even if they fail to comply with the existing law. Such title changes usually occur after a miner forfeits a bond placed on land as a promise that reclamation will be done. The bond does not always pay the cost of reclamation.

INDUSTRY FOUGHT OFF CONSERVATIONISTS

Strip miners are allowed to knock the tops off piles of waste materials, leaving areas that will not support vegetation and which contain acid-producing material.

Provisions of the law are so loose that a strip miner can increase the number of acres he is mining up to 10 pct. without additional bonding or licensing fees.

Strip miners came to Ohio about 1914. From 1914 to 1947 they stripped about 45,000 acres. Across the state there are naked reminders of those days—jagged cliffs, ditches behind a cover of trees, eroded hillsides.

As conservationist pressure began to rise, the miners employed a Cleveland advertising agency to protect their interests.

An ad man with the firm, Larry Cook, set up the Ohio Reclamation Association in 1945 and became executive director of what became a well-financed Columbus lobby.

In 1948 Ohio's first strip mining-law was passed. Like those that were to follow, it was weak and ineffective.

The miners were strong, and so were the industries that depended on cheap coal. When Frank J. Lausche was governor, he pushed the first stripping law through the legislature. He said he met "almost insurmountable opposition" to a strong law.

In the legislature men like Sen. Oakley Collins, himself an Ironton coal producer, maintained that ever-increasing pollution and cliff-like highwalls didn't exist. He said that before the 1948 law: "There were a few eyesores but not many. The bad strips were made by fly-by-night operators, and there aren't too many of them left."

Nearly 10 years ago Collins said: "I've been all over the state looking at stripping operations and they're doing a good job."

In 1963 a strong strip-mining bill was pushed through the Pennsylvania legisla-

ture. It inspired conservationists in Ohio to fight for a tough measure. In 1965 such a proposal was put in the hopper by Sens. Ed Garrigan of Akron, Oliver Okasek of Northfield, Robin Turner of Marion and the late Edmund Sargus of St. Clairsville.

When the bill came before the Senate's Agriculture and Conservation Committee, a subcommittee—Sargus, Collins and Max Dennis of Wilmington—was assigned to study it.

"It was apparent that Sargus and Collins had significantly different viewpoints," said Dennis who chaired the agriculture committee that year.

Dennis, whose position was key, said: "My role was one of attempting to mediate opposite viewpoints."

Statehouse observers recall that the struggle over the bill was one of the toughest the legislature has seen. When the bill came before the full committee, 72 amendments were offered—many written by the Ohio Reclamation Association, according to Dennis.

Dennis said the committee and the Senate "finally decided mining interests simply couldn't stay in business" if a tough bill were passed.

Sargus, a lawyer from the heart of strip-mining country, was caught in the midst of a dogfight. One statehouse observer recalls that a coal industry representative told Sargus: "If you continue to pursue this bill, we will destroy you politically and professionally."

Garrigan, a member of the committee, recalled: "I was personally upset by the devastation in the State of Ohio. I thought it an example of blatant inhumanity to rape a natural area and leave it in this condition."

He added: "You are virtually building monsters in the sky with high walls. For the benefit of future generations I was a co-sponsor of the bill."

"When we went through hearings on the measure, it was accepted with 72 amendments. It lost any identity to what it was."

"The coal mine industry won the battle to reduce the effect good legislation would have had."

Garrigan withdrew his name from the "emasculated" substitute measure that came out of committee.

Supported by petitions that carried 250,000 signatures, conservationists had hoped for success with the 1965 measure.

But, according to Garrigan: "It was a case of 'little people' fighting a big economic block. In mine country I am sure every legislature is supported by people associated in some aspect of the mine industry."

"Do you bite the hand that feeds you?"

Cook, the pale and balding executive director of the reclamation association, speaks for strip miners—the only ones permitted to join the association.

He contended the 1965 bill "wasn't a strong bill—it was a ridiculous bill."

The amended version that has made life fairly simple for the miners is a "doggone good law, working out beautifully," he said.

STRONG PROPOSALS, WEAK LAWS

In 1965 the first bill in the Senate hopper was a strong strip mining measure. Its intent, however, was lost in a flood of amendments, a substitute measure and a conference committee compromise. Here are some of the principal differences between the proposals and the law that emerged:

What must the strip miner do with the highwall (the cliff left by the last cut into the ground?)

Proposal—Put fill back against the highwall "to restore the approximate contour which existed prior to the operation." Or create terracing with a minimum grade of 45 degrees.

Law—No provision for eliminating high-wall.

What must be done with water?

Proposal—"Leave no place where acid water may accumulate and permit no drainage of acid water or silt-laden water from the area of land affected."

Law—"Prevent, if possible, drainage of acid water or silt-laden water from the area of land which is affected which is harmful to any stream of adjoining land."

What must be done with piles of waste material called spoils?

Proposal—Grade them "to a useful contour" as ordered by the chief of reclamation. No coal or large stones shall be in the top 12 inches. Those 12 inches must be original top soil or the equivalent "capable of supporting vegetation."

Law—Reduce the peaks and depressions to a "gently rolling, sloping, or terraced topography." Clear the surface of rocks "wherever practicable." Isolated peaks should be leveled. No provision in the law for returning top soil.

Proposal—Geological data on the area. A "description of the technique to be used in the operation and reclamation . . ."

When should an application be denied?

Proposal—The chief of reclamation may not approve a project "until he has found on the basis of information set forth in the application" that the law will be followed.

Law—The chief of reclamation may not approve a project "if he finds on the basis of the information set forth in the application" that the law will not be followed.

(Under the proposal the chief could not allow mining until he was certain the law would be followed. Under the law the chief cannot stop mining until he is sure—on the basis of an application—that the law will not be followed.)

How much bond must be put up as a guarantee that the law will be followed?

Proposal—A minimum of \$2,000 per acre and a per acre fee of \$500.

Law—A minimum of \$2,000 and a per acre fee of \$500.

By how much may a stripper increase the area he is mining without paying an additional fee?

Proposal—He must pay additional bonding and licensing fees for each acre added.

Law—Up to 10 pct. without paying anything.

If a strip mining company has violated the law and seeks a new license by creating a new corporation, what must the reclamation chief do?

Proposal—Refuse the license.

Law—No provision.

If the cost of reclaiming land will exceed the bond required under law, what must the chief of reclamation do?

Proposal—He may ask for additional bond money.

Law—No provision.

What part of the bond should be withheld after grading is completed and before planing is finished?

Proposal—\$200 per acre.

Law—\$75 per acre.

ABANDONED STRIP MINES: HANDY JUNK PILES

(By James Herzog)

Just beyond the small well-kept lawns of Mt. Eaton in Southwestern Wayne County is an abandoned strip mine that skirts Ohio 241.

Though long deserted and without growth on its jagged cliff, the old strip mine is useful—it is an informal junk yard for residents who want either to dump or to search for something.

Tacked to a tree is the sign, "No Picken." But everyone picks.

In 1967, the U.S. Department of the Interior issued a special report on "Surface Mining and Our Environment." The special report said that one-third of the surface mines surveyed "were being used illegally by the public to discard garbage, rubble, junked vehicles and construction materials." Strip mining is a principal form of surface mining.

The report prepared under Stewart L. Udall, then secretary of the interior, recommended federal regulations to stop the abuse of the land that is being caused by all types of surface mining.

Udall charged the accepted practice in America is "to mine as cheaply as possible the deposits that are most accessible and provide the greatest profit to the producer."

"This preoccupation with the short-term gain too frequently has ignored the long-term social costs involved—the silted streams, the acid-laden waters, and the wasteland left by surface mining."

He said, "Valuable mineral resources have already been lost and several million acres of productive land and water have been left derelict."

Despite land titles and ownership papers, Udall said, "Each generation has only a temporary rendezvous with the land . . . By exercise of choice or by careless default, we shape the land legacy of our descendants."

An estimated four million acres of land—a mass the size of Delaware and Rhode Island together—have been disturbed by surface mining in the United States. Of that 41 pct. of the mining has been for coal. The rest is divided among sand, gravel, stone, gold, clay, phosphate and iron.

In the State of Ohio 267,000 acres have been strip mined in the last 55 years.

The Udall report cited the harmful effects of strip mining:

Stream and river pollution caused by erosion and acid mine water.

Isolation of land areas by the creation of steep walls that are the result of cutting to reach sought-after minerals.

Destruction of natural beauty through the building of huge piles of waste material, through the amendment of equipment at deserted mine sites and through the creation of informal rubbish dumps.

The total effect of surface mining, according to the report, "is a drastic reshaping of the surface, with huge ditches and massive landslides that block streams and highways."

There is an Amish family in the hills of Tuscarawas County that wouldn't use the same language as in the Udall report. But the mother, father, son and daughter know and live with the consequences of strip mining.

A few hundred feet away from the family's house, across the road, the land is naked, stripped clean in the search for coal.

The land is rounded to contour, more so than the law requires, but hard rocky waste prevents any growth.

The strippers need more land to mine. They want the Amish family's 187-acre farm. The family is scared. They aren't sure what the strippers can and can't do, but they aren't selling out.

The family stood in front of the house. The mother served as spokesman. Speaking accented English, she said, "Twelve different times the coal company tried to get the land. They won't take no for an answer."

The father stroked his beard and nodded his agreement. Mother continued, "They keep their equipment across the road. They said our farm has to be next. But we won't sell."

"A lot of our friends sold or leased their land. It was terrible. They're sorry now. We don't even have enough people for a church anymore," she said.

A farm family understands the land is a

legacy. The father is ill, and the children are too young to take over the farm. Perhaps it would be best to sell for a quick profit and go South, especially since the land isn't very productive. But the family doesn't want to sell to strip miners.

"This place would never be the same. We won't let them do it," the mother said.

"They offered us \$400 an acre if we would sell or 35 cents a ton if we would lease the land," the woman said as the wind rippled through her traditional ankle length dress. "But the first thing that happens is they spoil the water."

"If you lease, you can't raise anything more for 50 years. If you sell, they tear down the buildings to lower taxes. It's the ruination of life—the ruination of churches," the woman said.

"When they dynamited across the road, our house shook every time. I had to take everything off the shelves or it would have broken," she said.

The Amish woman looked around at her aging white house and her red barn. "I wish they'd leave us alone," she said. "I'm afraid of them."

ABANDONED MINE POLLUTED WATER SUPPLY (By James Herzog)

Donald Heffelfinger knows there is something wrong with Ohio's strip mining law. He began learning the intricacies of the law in 1963 when fish in the 11-billion gallon Meander Reservoir began dying off.

Heffelfinger, chief engineer of the Mahoning Valley Sanitary Sewer District that supplies 280,000 Youngstown area residents with water, found that a strip mine abandoned in 1961 was releasing acid water into the vast reservoir.

While the 79-acre mine was being stripped throughout the 1950s, it provided a poor grade of coal and a high grade of sulfuric acid, a pollutant that can kill plant and animal life.

Closed, it became a constant source of worry and cost to the people of Youngstown.

STRIP MINING EXHAUSTS THE LAND

"The 'hard' water has regularly cost us \$15,000 to \$20,000 a year to treat," Heffelfinger said.

On June 30 a dam that held back most of the acid water in the strip mine ditch burst, sending 20 million gallons of highly acid water into Youngstown's water supply.

The reservoir is big enough to absorb the acid, and there is no immediate danger. But Youngstown will have to continue to pay an annual price of \$15,000 to \$20,000 to clean the water.

Heffelfinger doesn't know what he can do. "We are contemplating legal action. We are trying to get somebody to take the leadership in trying to solve this problem."

He said, "The strip miner complied with all the laws when he closed the mine and has no further legal responsibility. The laws were and are inadequate, or this would not have happened."

The pollution of the reservoir has not ended, Heffelfinger said. Water still collects at the mine site and is polluted as it comes into contact with sulfuric acid. "Nobody wants to do anything. No division of the state wants to take any responsibility," he said.

The Ohio strip mining law requires miners to "construct earth dams in the final cut of an operation . . . to aid in creating lakes and ponds." That was done in Youngstown.

The law also advises the miner to "prevent, if possible, drainage of acid water . . . which is harmful to any stream or adjoining lands." It apparently was impossible to prevent such drainage.

"The experts don't even agree as to what the solution to the acid drainage problem

should be. Meanwhile, it is costing us a lot of money," Heffelfinger said.

From time to time there are problems like that in Youngstown, problems that generate newspaper publicity and embarrass Larry Cook's Ohio Reclamation Association, the strip miners' lobby.

But in general strip mining is a back-road disease, hidden from public view in 27 counties, many of which are lightly populated.

In the hills of northern Tuscarawas County, Alice J. Grossniklaus depends on dairy cattle to support her thriving cheese company. For years as secretary to the Community Council for Reclamation the widow has fought for better reclamation.

She is strident and loud. "Go off the beaten path," she tells everyone. "See what is behind the roadside tree cover."

Mrs. Grossniklaus shook her head dramatically. "It seems hard to believe we're having our whole countryside destroyed beyond recognition," she said.

Mrs. Grossniklaus, who run Alpha Alpine Cheese, went to Columbus in 1965 to testify for stronger stripping laws. She did the same in Washington in 1968.

Mrs. Grossniklaus' business will die if the miners take too many farms. Already, a few hundred feet behind her company, strip miners have taken coal from the land.

"We're trying to get our land back to the point that it's approachable and usable," she said. With a sweep of the hand the Swiss-born woman added, "These were all dairy farms—rich land. What are they good for now?"

She takes visitors on a tour of abandoned strip mine after abandoned strip mine. At each one the land is nearly worthless. At each one reclamation has been left for future generations.

"Don't forget," she warned. "Strip mining exhausts the land completely and there are no adequate reclamation laws in the State of Ohio for the protection of citizens shouldering the burden."

In the spring, using Community Council for Reclamation stationery, Mrs. Grossniklaus write a letter to area school principals advising, "Many of the inviting swimming holes contain polluted water, especially in strip mine territory."

She suggested a "field day for interested students" who could take samples of polluted water and take part in an essay contest, with the council giving cash prizes for 200-word papers on "Be an Earth Preserver."

"I didn't hear from any one," she said. "Not one letter."

[From the Akron Beacon Journal, Nov. 18, 1970]

STRIP MINE PEOPLE ADMIT THEY'RE UPSETTING THE EARTH

(By James Herzog)

(Every year Ohio strip miners cut coal out of 10,000 acres in 27 eastern Ohio counties. Digging from the surface with equipment that can remove 200 tons of rock and clay with a single swipe, the miners feed the state's ever-growing industrial needs. Once the miners are through with a mine, they meet Ohio's lax reclamation law and move on, leaving behind useless land. This is one of a series of reports on Ohio strip mining.)

When an airport was needed in Harrison County, the Hanna Mining Co. cleaned up strip land and sold it to the county for \$1.

That is one of many stories Hanna Mining Co. officials tell of their generosity. They tell how the Little League uses two ball fields they provide, about how they built a park on the edge of Cadiz and about how they are providing an old strip mine as a free dump for the people.

At the same time, Hanna Mining, a division of the Consolidation Coal Co., is the largest strip mining company in the state,

stripping about 2,200 acres annually. Hanna, the Ohio Power Co. and Peabody Coal Co. mine about 5,000 Ohio acres annually. That is half of the state's total.

"There is no question that we're upsetting the earth," Arthur Wallace, the company's reclamation director, said. "But this was never good agricultural country."

Wallace, who joined Hanna as an electrician in the early 1940's, said he learned his lesson early in life. "My dad went broke on this land, raising corn at 60 bushels per acre," he said. So Wallace, like 2,000 others in the area, turned to Hanna for work and lives in a modern home in Cadiz.

Hanna strips on a mammoth scale: A huge shovel called the Silver Spade uncovers coal by tearing up to 200 tons of clay and rock away from the earth in a single pass. The machine requires 65 motors and has 10,000 total horsepower. As high as a 12-story building, the unit removes up to 180,000 tons of unwanted waste material that lies over coal each day.

In Harrison County Hanna gouges mile after mile, leaving behind bleak and brown mined land. According to Wallace, the land can eventually be turned to recreational use, to cattle pasture or to pulpwood forest.

But Hanna doesn't do any of its reclamation work quickly. Taking advantage of a loophole written into the law, Hanna reclaims by "substitution."

Instead of cleaning up land it has just finished stripping, it reclaims another parcel equal in all respects to the stripped land.

Once the state grants permission for Hanna to reclaim a parcel that may have been mined 50 years ago in place of the land being mined at the present, Hanna has no legal responsibility to do anything with its current mining site.

As a result Hanna is able to strip without the immediate worry of what to do with the land.

The company usually goes no further than the law requires, said Wallace. This means jagged high walls can be left standing, and acid water is often allowed to form.

Hanna has no special policy on treating polluted water. Instead of having two-step treatment pools like those in Pennsylvania, Hanna lets the water sift through piles of waste material. This, according to Wallace, is enough to take the sulfuric acid out of the water.

But if the waste piles themselves contain acid materials, polluted water escapes from the mining site.

Wallace defended keeping the bleak high walls that rise dramatically around Harrison County. "There are several uses for them," he said. He suggested using the pits beside walls for landfills or using the wall for protecting cattle from wind.

Along a Harrison County highway there is a sign. "Junked Cars," and an arrow pointed to an abandoned Hanna mining site. A steep high wall rises at the site out of polluted water.

Filled with worn-out cars, appliance and metal goods, the Hanna dump seems popular. The dump was meant to be a service to the townspeople, Wallace said. He said a toughened state landfill law makes it difficult to get rid of waste. The dump has no license. No filling procedures are followed.

Coal companies like Hanna seem secure. During the past year the price of coal rose from 60 and 75 cents a ton and sells for an average of \$5 a ton. Companies take from 2,500 to 5,000 tons from each acre they mine, sometimes making \$1 profit on each ton.

Nevertheless, coal companies have often said they are in a precarious business, and if more reclamation is required, they will be forced to quit. Ralph Hatch, president of Hanna Coal, warned the Ohio Senate in 1965 that a strong strip mining law would have "a disastrous effect on my company."

He said, "I can't operate my mines in Ohio if the bill is enacted." That would mean no work for the company's nearly 2,000 employees, he said.

The same argument was used for years in Pennsylvania. But passage of a strong strip mining measure in 1963 brought no crisis to the mining industry in that state. Indeed, in 1969 more coal was stripped from the land than in 1968, and more miners were licensed than the year before.

When Congress considered a federal surface mining law in 1968, the coal mining industry stalled action with the same arguments.

A Peabody Coal Co. vice president, Edwin R. Phelps, contended that a federal law "will lower our competitive position in the work market . . . and result in mining limitations in some areas and hence cause us to lose some of our valuable minerals."

Phelps said most stripped land is being reclaimed and added, "The results of this work are lost in emotional-type publicity and literature which do not tell the whole story."

STATE, MINE LOBBY WORK CLOSELY

(By James Herzog)

At age 62 G. Orville Bates, Ohio's supervisor of reclamation, is thinking about his Florida home and retirement.

He will stay on for a year or two, but he looks forward to the day when he won't have to crisscross Ohio week after week, inspecting strip mines.

Bates is charged with the primary responsibility for enforcing a strip mining law that the coal industry itself fostered. Under him are seven inspectors whose duties are to make sure the few conditions set forth in the law are followed.

While Bates said Ohio reclamation is imperfect, he insisted the law should not be changed. "In the next 10 years I'd like to see reclamation increase under the same law," he said.

"We're just now achieving some results from the 1965 law," Bates maintained.

Touring model projects with members of the strip miners' lobby, the Ohio Reclamation Association, Bates saw a Mahoning County field fully returned to farming and nodded his approval. But he added, "Only 1 pct. of all reclamation work ends up like this."

Bates said most of the strip miners meet the reclamation requirements of the law but that only a small percentage of the land ever gets back to something that approaches its original status.

In 1969 only four strip miners forfeited bonds put up as a guarantee that reclamation work would be carried out. The bonds on 29.1 out of 10,000 acres being mined amounted to \$4,020.

The forfeitures were on about .3 pct. of land being strip mined.

Bates has for years worked closely with the Ohio Reclamation Association. In fact, now that Bates is edging toward retirement the association, which is made up entirely of strip mine operators, has offered him a job. He said he turned it down.

One of his former inspectors, William A. Dietrich, 76, took a job as a field supervisor for the association when he retired in 1966.

This affinity between the industry's lobby and the state regulating agency is not surprising. Fred E. Morr, director of the Ohio Department of Natural Resources under which falls the division of forestry and reclamation, proposed selling mineral rights under the state park lands to coal miners in 1963. That proposal almost floated through the legislature as a rider. It was blocked by Ed Garrigan, then an Akron senator.

Garrigan said the state intended to sell mineral rights to a wildlife area to the Pea-

body Coal Co., one of the three largest coal companies in the state, in return for an area the same size or larger. "In the mind of the coal hunter there was nothing wrong with this," Garrigan said.

In interviews, Division of Forestry and Reclamation personnel say little that is directly critical of the industry or law. However, they paint a clear picture of the division's position and their attitudes toward the law.

"It's a known fact," said P. C. Woodruff, an administrative specialist in reclamation. "The strip miners have written every strip mining law this state has ever had."

Asked how good Ohio reclamation is, Woodruff simply replied, "As good as law will permit."

Later, he added, "If strip miners do a minimum job in accordance with the statutes, the next farmer won't lease land to him for mining."

Woodruff said Pennsylvania's tough strip-mining law "is not nearly as workable as ours. We have excellent cooperation. In fact, many strip miners were doing nearly all the things required before they were written into law."

He added, "Each individual mine or pit is different." Because of this, he contended, requirements must be vague.

Woodruff saw nothing wrong with the Ohio law that leaves steep slopes called highwalls. These cliffs that reach 150 feet in the air are "not as much a hazard as people make them out to be."

Besides, he added, it is economically "not feasible" to go around knocking down highwalls or grading land up to them.

Robert Redett, assistant chief of the division of forestry and reclamation, said he is worried that stiffer reclamation laws in Ohio "would add to the expense" of mining. While he agrees that at present reclamation requirements mean farm land is "not as good as before," he said, "now everybody is stirred up about the environment. But no one has figured out what he wants to pay in dollars."

The cost of saving the environment, Redett said, "will affect everything in the future." One of the leaders that Redett pointed to in the battle for better reclamation was the Ohio Reclamation Association.

The association, he said, is made up of 64 strip mining companies, and, "of course, has an industry viewpoint of the thing."

STRIP MINE LOBBY SAYS PRESENT LAW GOOD (By James Herzog)

Larry Cook, executive vice president of the Ohio Reclamation Association, leaned against the steering wheel of his new car.

He was tired. He had been on the road for nine days trying to convince federal and local officials and reporters that Ohio strip mining is under control.

Since he left the Hubbell Advertising Agency in Cleveland in 1946, selling the strip miner's point of view on stripping has been his job.

He didn't think much of the 1967 Udall report that said two-thirds of strip-mined acres in America need further reclamation work, that one-third of the abandoned mines were being used as informal junk yards and that mining is done as cheaply as possible in the interest of the "greatest profit."

"The report was written for a purpose—to get a federal law," Cook said. "The Ohio statistics weren't very accurate. They had \$2 million to write the report. I don't have \$2 million to answer it."

Cook does not like specific laws which require that there be no acid water drainage from mines that could pollute streams or that there be no steep highwalls left after the final cut in the lands is made by the strip miners.

"You have to talk about the principle and methods of operation," Cook said wear-

ily, almost angrily. "Industry principles have been accepted into law in Ohio."

The present state strip mining law, Cook said, "is a good law."

Cook's association is a registered Ohio strip mining lobby with 64 member companies like Hanna Coal Co. and Peabody Mining Co. It spends about \$90,000 annually, according to Robert J. Kinnard, executive secretary of the association.

In 1965 the association—members must be strip miners—helped tame a strong strip mining bill and had two lobbyists registered with the secretary of state: Cook and Harold J. Edwards, a Columbus lawyer.

State law requires lobbyists to detail all expenses incurred in trying to influence any matter before the Legislature. Such things as hotel bills, meal receipts and taxi fares must be listed in a report to the secretary of state.

Yet in 1965, when Cook and Edwards successfully lobbied against a strong strip mining measure, they did not spend a single penny, according to their official report.

Even so, according to Kinnard, the association often takes legislators on tours of striped and reclaimed areas to show them the good reclamation that is being done in Ohio.

On such a tour Cook drove through Portage, Stark, Columbiana, and Mahoning counties, stopping occasionally at model reclamation sites. With him on the tour was Dr. Charles V. Riley, Kent State University professor of biology and department chairman. He is a paid wildlife consultant to the strip mining lobby.

Riley said he has been receiving money from the association since he was a graduate student at Ohio State University in the 1940s. At present, he said, the association pays some "travel expenses."

He defended the law, saying, "Hell you can't write a law to handle every situation. You just work with the situation."

Cook echoed Riley's words: "The highwall argument (level off the cliffs as recommended in the Udall report) is a phony. Getting something to grow is what is difficult." He maintained, "Highwalls are beautiful."

Cook stopped his car at two abandoned limestone quarries. Grass was growing on what used to be waste. Cattle were moving through a field. But in a limestone quarry there is no acid drainage problem to inhibit growth.

"There is a tremendous demand now for coal," Cook said. "One day this Winter we had only nine days's supply of coal above the ground. That's too little. Environmental problems must be solved. We've got to solve these things. We want this land productive."

Riley said he is looking for "practical solutions" to strip mining problems. He said he does research on 12 plots and several lakes across the 27 mined Ohio counties.

In Mahoning County, two miles east of North Lima, the tour stops. The party visits George Lukich's farm. In 1957-58 the farm was stripped by the Marshall Mining Co.

Lukich at 75 is lively and energetic. He spends his days working near the corn he planted on land that was once stripped. Near the garden is a lake the mining company built for Lukich. The property is valuable.

"Would you lease your land all over again to the strip miners?" Lukich is asked.

"No, I don't think it was worth the worry," Lukich replied.

Fred Abraham has little faith in the strip mining industry. Abraham, the president of the Ohio Federation of Conservation Clubs, said, "There is always a vast amount of publicity put out by the industry through the Ohio Reclamation Association. They show you many views from the road."

Behind the tree cover along the road, charged Abraham, are barren hills and water-filled mining ditches.

"The greatest portion of the land can be and should be reclaimed. We don't oppose strip mining," he said. "Along with recovering coal from the land, restore the land to its original use."

Abraham sat in his Navarre home in Southeastern Stark County. "Recreational land is going to be a premium." He recalled the 1965 effort to pass a strong Ohio strip mining law. "We've always been defeated with a flood of amendments," he said.

"I don't think the law should be outrageous. But there should be something more" Abraham said.

He thumbed through the Ohio law. "If practical, if possible if practical," he quoted. "Where does it say you stop at a stop sign, if practical."

"It's really pathetic that the leaders in this state would allow this to go on. The next Governor will have to go for a stripmine law."

PENNSYLVANIA PROVES TOUGH MINE LAW CAN WORK

(By James Herzog)

"You don't have any law. Your law is just a phony."

William E. Guckert, director of reclamation in Pennsylvania, sounded angry. His words came in a rush.

"Industry has brainwashed you Ohio people," the large, florid-faced man said. "Our old law is exactly the same law Ohio has today."

He continued: "In Ohio they've lied to the people. They're doing the same thing they did in Pennsylvania."

In the early 1960s, Guckert was executive secretary of the Allegheny County Sportsman League. The association spearheaded a fight for toughened strip mining laws. In 1963 the sought-after law was passed, but political maneuvering prevented enforcement.

As a result, in 1967 Gov. Raymond Shafer asked Guckert to take charge of the reclamation program. Guckert, 62, who for 40 years has been stomping around the state demanding that the Pennsylvania hills be saved from strip miners, hesitated. Then, with the governor's promise that there would be no political interference, he took the job.

Not long afterward a county political boss asked Guckert to go easy on a strip miner. Guckert went to the governor.

He recalled that he said, "Ray, this isn't right. If you let this guy get away with it, you can have my job back."

The violator and the party chieftain both fell into line, according to Guckert.

Guckert likes to recall the battle for a tough but fair law. A sportsman newspaper continually attacked the miners. People across the state became aware of the problem. "Once the people saw what was going on, we beat the living H out of the politicians. Now we've got the finest reclamation in the country."

"The people in Ohio don't realize what the present Ohio law is going to cost. Billions. It'll be four times what industry could have done the reclamation work for."

Guckert drove through county after county in Northwestern Pennsylvania. Wherever work was going on he stopped his car.

He pointed to a field where wheat was ready for harvest. Behind it strip miners were digging coal from the land. The wheat field had been mined the year before. Careful reclamation had put it back into use within months.

"We don't allow them to leave the highwall standing—like they do in Ohio," Guckert said. No longer in Pennsylvania do the jagged cliffs that the miners cut remain when the project ends. "That is the most expensive part of reclamation," he said.

When strip mining is finished, under Pennsylvania law, it is necessary to fill the land back to something that approximates the original contour of the land. "We have the finest backfilling in the whole darned country," Guckert contended.

"Ohio has no law. It's a joke. It doesn't have any requirements. It's written by industry. The same experience cost us millions of dollars," he said.

Treating the problem of water that becomes highly sulfuric when it touches coal is a key to good reclamation, according to Guckert. In Pennsylvania miners cannot let water sit in a mining pit, and contaminated water must be treated in a two-pool process as it is pumped out.

A plan of how land will be reclaimed is required in Pennsylvania before a license is issued. There are 20 inspectors in the state, compared with seven in Ohio. "Ohio doesn't need inspectors," Guckert gruffly charged.

"They don't have anything to do under the law."

Guckert continued, "The only reason why a lot of strip miners are reclaiming the land is because we make them. If we wouldn't have made the strip miners put the land back, it would cost us billions of dollars."

The toughened Pennsylvania laws have not injured the stripping industry. In 1969 the state reported that 21.7 million tons of coal were stripped from the earth, compared to 20.5 million in 1968. Though miners contended that hard-to-meet reclamation requirements would drive them out of business, a study of Pennsylvania strip mining production does not support this contention.

There are nearly 270 mine operators in Pennsylvania now—120 more than in Ohio. The number of miners has been climbing steadily over the last few years in Pennsylvania, while in Ohio the number is shrinking. "The law did put many out of business,"

Guckert emphasized. A few of the marginal operators, however, have been forced to leave the state, he said.

One who lost the right to mine in Pennsylvania by not meeting state requirements, said Guckert, is Thomas Eddy, who now is a principal figure in the Wilmet Mining Co. in Stark and Tuscarawas counties.

In Pennsylvania, Eddy operated the Mac Coal Co., which was headquartered in Pittsburgh. "We confiscated his bond because he failed to live up to the law, period," said Guckert.

Pennsylvania state records show that in 1969 Guckert's department confiscated \$47,600 in bond from Eddy.

Hearing Guckert's charges, G. Orville Bates, who directs Ohio's reclamation, said Ohio has different problems than Pennsylvania. The current Ohio law should be tested for at least two more years before any changes are made, he said.

County	Total land area (acres)	Stripped 1914 to 1969	Percent strip mined land	Stripped 1914 to 1947 (prelaw)	Stripped 1948 to 1969 (under law)	Reclaimed 1948 to 1969 (under law)
Athens.....	323,000	2,425	0.75	731	1,694	1,606
Belmont.....	343,000	17,605	5.13	2,254	15,351	9,729
Carroll.....	248,000	5,389	2.18	1,150	4,238	3,434
Columbiana.....	342,000	18,929	5.53	4,382	14,547	13,140
Coshocton.....	349,000	15,808	4.53	622	15,186	12,361
Gallia.....	301,000	6,639	2.21	34	6,605	6,070
Guernsey.....	332,000	4,680	1.41	355	4,325	3,340
Harrison.....	258,000	45,523	17.64	10,777	34,746	30,835
Hocking.....	269,000	3,114	1.16	731	2,383	2,076
Holmes.....	271,000	2,040	0.75	303	1,737	1,368
Jackson.....	269,000	5,748	2.14	449	5,299	3,901
Jefferson.....	263,000	24,996	9.50	7,805	17,191	14,242
Lawrence.....	292,000	2,336	0.80	39	2,297	2,051
Mahoning.....	268,000	6,375	2.38	768	5,607	4,481
Meigs.....	278,000	5,398	1.94	68	5,330	5,274

County	Total land area (acres)	Stripped 1914 to 1969	Percent strip mined land	Stripped 1914 to 1947 (prelaw)	Stripped 1948 to 1969 (under law)	Reclaimed 1948 to 1969 (under law)
Monroe.....	291,000	14	0.00	14	0	14
Morgan.....	267,000	13,265	4.97	94	13,171	10,410
Muskingum.....	424,000	9,477	2.24	1,604	7,873	7,318
Noble.....	255,000	11,946	4.51	344	11,602	9,297
Perry.....	262,000	16,945	6.47	3,595	13,350	12,050
Portage.....	323,000	733	0.23	232	501	501
Scioto.....	390,000	148	0.03	148	0	148
Stark.....	367,000	10,752	2.93	2,897	7,855	7,403
Tuscarawas.....	353,000	21,379	6.06	4,956	16,423	13,545
Vinton.....	263,000	3,812	1.45	939	2,873	2,495
Washington.....	408,000	1,374	0.03	9	1,365	1,128
Wayne.....	353,000	554	0.16	75	479	456
Total.....	8,362,000	256,963	3.07	45,213	211,750	178,673

STRIPPED LAND: TAXPAYERS' BURDEN

(By James Herzog)

There's a sign by an abandoned strip mine in Northern Tuscarawas County:

"This strip mine is being reclaimed. Mullet Coal Co. Member Ohio Reclamation Association."

The sign is rusted and bullet-riddled. Dangerously near, land is being washed away by erosion. Behind there is a cliff, a highwall left by the miner operator. Almost nothing grows on the hills. Water discolored by sulfuric acid appears to be sitting at the foot of the hill.

The Mullet Coal Co. is bankrupt now. One of its owners, according to state officials, is involved in a new company and has no responsibility for old failures.

The new company is Wilmet Mining Co., run by Thomas Eddy. He lost his right to mine in Pennsylvania when the state confiscated \$47,600 in bonds he had put up as a promise he would reclaim land in that state.

The land is worthless. It will remain that way until future generations choose to reclaim it.

Across Ohio the story of strip mining is repeated over and over on the tax rolls. Where land once had value and could be taxed to support schools, now it is valueless and a burden to the rest of the community.

In Stark County 10,752 of the county's 376,000 acres were stripped between 1914 and 1969.

Generally in Stark stripped land is appraised at \$25 an acre. Marginal farmland there is appraised at \$150. Good farmland's value is from \$250 to \$450 an acre. Sandy ground goes for \$95.

Assessment in Stark are 40 pct. of the appraisal price—thus \$10 an acre is the assessed value of stripped land.

Osnaburg Twp. is in Southeastern Stark County, a few minutes away from the center of Canton. The land here is rougher than in the northern part of the county, but even

on top of many of its rolling slopes corn and wheat are growing.

The farmland in Osnaburg is fast disappearing, however, with new allotments and development taking shape as Canton suburbs.

To one side of Sam Krabill av., which runs north from U.S. 30, are piles of waste left by strip miners. Trees grow here and there, but tremendous gaps in vegetation dot the area. Beyond the piles of waste (called spoil) are steep artificial cliffs left by the strippers. Little grows on the side of these cliffs.

Much of the stripped land in Osnaburg Twp. belongs to Ida Garoux and Trustees, according to the Stark County auditor's records. The Garoux family owns several farms. One plot of 122.9 acres is appraised at \$5,310, about \$44 an acre for the plot that was less than half stripped.

Good land nearby is appraised at twice as much.

From 1914 to 1969 in Tuscarawas County 21,379 acres out of 353,000 were stripped. Only two counties in the state have been mined more.

A spokesman for the Tuscarawas County auditor's office said, "Stripped land just doesn't have the value it used to have."

"You might have had a fairly productive farm," he said. "Once it's stripped, the value is gone."

Throughout the county stripped land is appraised at \$15 an acre. Land of marginal value is appraised at twice that figure. Tillable land goes for four times as much.

When the auditor learns that land is about to be stripped, he automatically puts a \$600 appraisal on each acre. But often he doesn't learn the land is being stripped, and the miner is in and out before he can act.

In Harrison County nearly one-fifth of the county has been stripped since 1914—45,523 acres out of 258,000. A spokesman for the county auditor in Cadiz said most stripped land is appraised at \$20 an acre.

Meanwhile, good bottom land is appraised from \$150 to \$200. Grazing land goes from \$100 to \$125, the spokesman said. Some reclaimed land has been reappraised for as high as \$80 an acre, he added.

When land is about to be stripped, the appraisal value jumps to \$400 an acre. But as soon as the land is carved out, the figures go to almost nothing.

The spokesman acknowledged that loss of the stripped land hurt the tax duplicate, but said, "We have other things to replace it. The duplicate has gone up a little every year for the past twelve."

The story in the 27 counties that have been stripped is the same: Land values go up temporarily while the land is being stripped. Then they fall to a minimal figure for a long period.

Of 8.4 million acres in 27 eastern Ohio counties more than 257,000 acres have been stripped—or 3 pct. of the region.

Most of the land stripped after 1948 meets the Ohio reclamation requirements. But the law demands so little that less than 10 pct. is brought back to the former condition and usefulness, according to one state official.

The rest, an ever growing 90 pct., is scarred and useless, a blight on the countryside and a drag on the tax rolls.

TRIBUTE TO THE AEROSPACE TEAM

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the flight of Apollo 14 was a tremendous technical achievement for our Nation. Not only does this feat illustrate our prowess in conveying men to the moon and safely home; it also il-

illustrates our ability to overcome great obstacles, and to meet practically any challenge.

I am proud to say that the aerospace industry in southern California has been instrumental in the Apollo project. These great industries, with their tremendous supply of talent, are a national resource and should be treated as such. I am confident that they can undertake most any project and produce the desired results.

All of us have accrued the benefits of the aerospace program. These benefits will improve the quality of life for humanity. For example, communication satellites link us to all peoples of the world * * *. Weather satellites give advance warnings of hurricanes.

Technology developed to detect moonquakes will be adapted to predict earthquakes in California.

Space research has devised electronic components which will, someday, allow the blind to see.

Lunar walkers, prepared for use on the surface of the moon, will be adapted to allow a fuller life for the handicapped.

Clothing, designed for comfort in space, will keep you cool when it is hot and warm when it is cold.

Mr. Speaker, the great number of scientific and technical achievements that come directly from our space program are making our world a better place to live.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the aerospace team that has given us these technological and scientific advances and, especially, I would like to commend the courage and the dedication of Capt. Alan Shepard, commander of Apollo 14, Capt. Edgar Mitchell, and Lt. Col. Stuart A. Roosa.

VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST WINNER IN INDIANA

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. Cooper T. Holt, executive director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I am inserting a speech by Miss Alicia Alburis of Indianapolis, Ind. The speech was designated the winning one for the State of Indiana in the VFW Voice of Democracy contest.

The speech follows:

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

(Speech by Alicia Alburis)

I have witnessed, I have suffered, I am America. My vigil is endless. I possess an undeniable pride in my people. Their leaders are well chosen, for they are chosen by their brothers.

My people have stood by me in all of the wars, for the wars and the people make up my heritage. Men have fought since my beginning to keep me free. The great general Douglas MacArthur said in his memoirs, "Let no man misunderstand why they do that which they must do. These men will fight, and perchance die, for one reason only, for their country, for America."

As an emerging nation, one man cast a stone that brought down upon the colonies

a revolutionary war, a bloody battle in a fight for freedom. As said Patrick Henry—this was no time for the summer soldier or the sunshine patriot. Men of the colonies had in their hearts an unquenchable thirst for liberty. They denied all ties with the mother England and saw clear the cause—human dignity—the rights of men—truth.

At Gettysburg, the Great Emancipator spoke of one nation—by and for her people, that would not perish. And for human rights America fought. Perhaps this was the most terrible war of America's history, for it was fought on our land and among our own people. This Civil War tore America apart from shore to shore. The rivers ran red and brothers were enemies. But freedom was the cause and death was justified.

In the first World War, America saw the free world threatened and stepped in to help. We had never before faced a conflict of such magnitude. After, a Great Depression took hold and the people faced much poverty and hunger.

In the second World War freedom was again in trouble by the rule of iron dictators and power hungry nations, spreading tyranny throughout the world.

The two world wars brought us together with other free nations of the world in an alliance to protect it from total rule. We saw that freedom should be for all men, and our sons and daughters lost their lives in keeping freedom for not only America—but for the world.

Today our conflict in Viet Nam shows that America remains brave and willing to fight against aggression in other lands, in turn protecting the homeland.

Perhaps affluence has made those at home selfish, for many take freedom for granted. They ignore their right to vote—to choose their own government, to take hand in picking the laws. If they don't work every day, they will lose their rights and freedom. Those apathetic Americans permit adverse forces to come in and eat away at our government—our foundation—our freedom.

Don't let me die people. I am only what you make me. I am the heritage, you are the future, we are America.

DISTINGUISHED CIVILIAN SERVICE AWARD TO GORDON W. RULE

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Navy has recognized the immensely valuable services of Gordon W. Rule as a procurement expert in the Naval Material Command by giving him the highest award that he can bestow on a civilian employee. This is the Distinguished Civilian Service Award, which is granted only for extraordinary service or for contributions of major significance to the Department of the Navy. Nominees for this award are carefully evaluated to insure that the recipients are those who have performed truly exceptional services. The Secretary states that by his distinguished performance and outstanding service in procurement operations, Mr. Rule has demonstrated that he is richly deserving of this award.

The Secretary of the Navy, in a memorandum of February 9, 1971, notified the Chief of Naval Material that the Navy Distinguished Civilian Service Award

was being granted to Mr. Rule. For the information of the Members and in appreciation of Mr. Rule's dedicated public service, I offer the text of the citation:

FEBRUARY 9, 1971.

For distinguished performance and outstanding service to the Department of the Navy in the conduct of its immense procurement operations as Director, Contract Clearance Division, Naval Material Command, and in prior positions of high responsibility. Mr. Rule has consistently demonstrated extraordinary acumen, judgment, initiative, and integrity in developing significant advances in the field of defense procurement. He has personally handled with extreme professional skill the most complex and significant procurement problems of the Navy. His superior ability to reach the crux of such problems quickly and effectively has made his counsel sought throughout the Navy procurement community. In recognition of his outstanding service, Mr. Rule is richly deserving of the Navy Distinguished Civilian Service Award.

JOHN W. WARNER,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

SST SIDELINE NOISE ABATEMENT

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, one of the serious indictments against the proposed supersonic transport—SST—program was the fear of the so-called sideline noise.

I am pleased to report that engineers and technicians working in Cincinnati at the General Electric Evendale plant have reduced the noise level to the point where the huge jet engines will be quieter than the engines which now power the commercial 707 jetliners.

This breakthrough again demonstrates the technological capacity of American industry.

I feel that other technical breakthroughs will be made if Congress approves the funding of the two prototype SST's when the matter comes up for a vote by the end of March.

I wish to share with my colleagues a recent article written by Richard Witkin, which appeared in the New York Times on February 23, 1971:

NOISE REDUCTION IN SST PREDICTED—FEDERAL COMMITTEE REPORTS ON CHANGES IN DESIGN

(By Richard Witkin)

Recent engine redesign and airplane improvements will enable this country's supersonic transport to meet Federal rules on noise limits, according to the Government's SST noise committee.

In a report made public yesterday, the seven-member committee said the SST manufacturers had shown they could meet the 108-decibel criteria laid down for all large new jetliners.

Most intercontinental jets now in service, including the Boeing 747 jumbo jet, do not meet these rules. The 747 must do so by the end of the year.

Officials disclosed that the developments making possible the noise reduction included increasing engine size, eliminating the use of a raucous afterburner on takeoff, and refining wing contours to give the plane a steeper takeoff climb.

Proponents of the embattled SST acknowl-

edged that the changes would increase the cost of the production planes and cut into their potential earning power. But they insisted that the plane would still be able to make a profit.

Anti-SST forces, noting the cost increases, can be expected to intensify their questioning of the plane's economics, noise and other environmental problems during the impending Congressional battle over continued funding of the prototype supersonic program. This calls for construction and 100 hours of flights of two prototype or test versions.

The group whose optimistic report on noise from the projected plane was made public yesterday is known as the SST Community Noise Advisory Committee. Its chairman is Dr. Leo L. Beranek, chief scientist of a prominent Cambridge, Mass., acoustical firm. He had much to do with developing aircraft noise criteria while serving as a consultant to various airport authorities.

NAMED BY MAGRUDER

The committee was named last July by the director of the Federal SST project, William M. Magruder, to advise his office on the noise problem.

Last fall, the Beranek committee advised Mr. Magruder that the noise rules for production SST's should be the same as those imposed on large new subsonic jets. It did so despite complaints from the industry that, while it could get close, it saw no technological way of complying completely without disastrous economic penalties.

"We feel we had a considerable effect on the situation," Dr. Beranek said yesterday in discussing the report that the industry had now found a way to meet the stringent rules.

The rules impose a maximum of 108 EPNdb (effective perceived noise decibels) as recorded at three measuring points at an airport or in the surrounding community. These points are: one nautical mile before the runway threshold on a landing approach, three and a half miles from the start of a takeoff roll, and .25 nautical miles to either side of the center line of the runway.

The rules permit a plane to go as high as 110 at one point if this is offset by reductions below 108 at another.

A decibel is a unit for measuring the relative intensity of sounds. One decibel equals the smallest degree of difference detectable by the human ear. "Perceived" was added to the noise standard to give greater weight to more annoying high-frequency sounds, like those of a siren. "Effective" was added to account for duration of different component sounds.

It was announced months ago that supersonic planes would meet the 108-decibel level for takeoff and landing approach. But its takeoff noise to the sides appeared a good deal too high. This has been one of the craft's most vulnerable points in the struggle over whether the program should get more funds from Congress or be canceled.

The way officials tell it, three developments came together over the last two or three months to solve the problem of sideline noise.

First, when the first production version engine was completed and tested, its sideline noise was found to be 120 EPNdb, instead of 124 as paper calculations had estimated.

MORE LIFT ON TAKEOFF

Second, when the latest wind-tunnel model of the proposed production plane was put in the tunnel, it was found to develop considerably more lift on takeoff than had been expected. This meant that, on takeoff, the plane would require less engine thrust than planned, and therefore would produce less noise. The new model had improved wing flaps and a subtly refined wing shape.

Third, it now became possible to solve the

rest of the sideline noise problem with engine redesign that previously would have been inadequate.

Specifically, the engine size could be increased so that takeoff could be made without use of the afterburner. This is a device at the rear of the engine that provides a large boost in thrust by burning huge amounts of fuel poured into the exhaust stream. It makes a tremendous racket.

With the afterburner out of the way and exhaust temperatures somewhat reduced, it became possible to use various types of noise-suppression devices, such as tubes or spokes, at the rear of the engine. Most such devices would not have withstood the original afterburner temperatures.

The first plane to meet the new noise rules will be the McDonnell-Douglas DC-10 tri-jet, due in service late this year. The Boeing 747 produces only 101.9 EPNdb in the sideline category but its takeoff and approach figures are 115 and 113.6. The figures for the largest conventional Boeing 707's are 113 on takeoff, 119.5 on approach, and 107.5 to the side.

The Government is pushing to bring down the conventional jet figures but not to the 108 level, which is generally considered impracticable.

Promoting the SST fell largely to William M. Magruder, head of the Office of SST Development in the Department of Transportation, and on the two Senators from the State of Washington where the Boeing Company is doing most of the work on the plane's airframe: Warren G. Magnuson and Henry M. Jackson.

Corporations and trade associations with an immediate stake in the program stayed largely out of sight, whether through overconfidence or because they thought their activity would do more harm than good. In the aftermath of the Senate defeat, the recriminations were bitter.

The chairman of the new committee is Donald J. Strait, vice president of the Fairchild Hiller Corporation, the largest subcontractor on the SST project with about \$35-million worth of work assigned on fuselage sections.

AGRI-BUSINESS—CALIFORNIA'S NO. 1 INDUSTRY

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 1, 1971

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, for many Californians who are witnessing the tremendous growth of manufacturing and commerce in our Golden State, it may come as a surprise that farming still is the State's No. 1 industry.

It is interesting to note that California employs more people on farms—some 263,000 during 1969 which is the latest year for which comparative figures are available—than any other State in the Nation. The California farm work force is slightly more than 5.5 percent of the agricultural work force in all of the Nation, but it is interesting to note that these farmworkers produced nearly 10 percent of the national farm income.

A breakdown by the Department of Agriculture for 1969 reveals that the total cash receipts from farm marketings in the State of California amounted to

\$4,371,260,000, divided about equally between crop production and livestock production. To this was added some \$123 million in Government payments of various types for a total farm income of nearly \$4.5 billion for the entire State of California.

Approximately 37 percent of the total area of the State is in farms, slightly more than half of which is in permanent pasture. Another quarter of the total farmland is in crops of a broad variety.

By any standards, this is big business.

In considering the importance of agriculture to a healthy economy and the future of this great country of ours, a few national statistics also should be brought to mind.

Three out of every 10 jobs in private employment in our country today are related to agriculture.

Agriculture's assets total \$307 billion, equal to about two-thirds of the value of all corporations in the United States; or about one-half of the market value of all corporation stocks on the New York Stock Exchange.

Capital investment in agriculture is approximately \$50,000 per farm worker, double the investment for each manufacturing worker.

About 55 percent of the Department of Agriculture expenditures, in 1970 were for services which are of primary benefit to the general public. Only 45 percent goes for price support and related programs in which farmers are the primary, but not the only beneficiaries. Although, not generally appreciated, much of these subsidy payments are not for not planting crops, but rather are to make domestic grown commodities competitive with foreign products grown in areas with a much lower standard of living. This makes this Nation less dependent upon foreign products and keeps the price to the consumer of manufactured goods at realistic prices.

Assisting domestic farmers to compete with foreign operators in no way should be taken as an indication that American farmers are not efficient. Just the opposite is true. In the United States consumers spend 16.5 percent of their disposable income on food. In Western Europe, consumers spent 25 percent of their income for food. In the Soviet Union, consumer food costs total 50 percent and in many areas of Asia 75 percent of disposable income goes for food.

This magnificent performance of American farms is a direct result of the research and development programs largely authorized and financed by the Congress, beginning about 100 years ago, together with the credit, price, and income stabilization programs of the past 38 years.

In relative terms farm program costs are small—not large, and on a relative basis they are becoming even smaller as national income and other Government expenditures grow.

For the farmer, however, the picture is not all that bright. Less than a third of the disposable income spent on food in this Nation reaches the original producer, the farmer himself.

Farmers in no other country of the

world produce such a high proportion of its citizens' food and receive such a small fraction of the consumers income for their products.

A healthy national economy cannot be achieved without a healthy agricultural economy. Whether this fact is recognized by those who are making proposals to the Congress on restructuring our priorities and the like, remains to be seen. To date the administration's suggestions have been silent on farm priorities. Farmers face many of the same problems that many of the rest of us face—high interest rates, record high mortgage indebtedness, health care, housing, accompanied by generally low income and an advancing average age of those on the farm—now 53.

It is time to take a realistic appraisal of our farm needs of the future and determine how best they are to be met if we are ever to achieve a truly healthy national economy.

JOHN BARRETT OF MILFORD USES BILLBOARD TO PRESS FOR BETTER POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, in this era of polarization and discord, it is refreshing indeed to note the accomplishments of those who are willing to spend their time and money in the struggle to reverse these dangerous trends. I am proud to say that one of my constituents, John Barrett of Milford, Conn., is such a man.

Recognizing the increased friction between inner-city residents and the police in the neighboring city of Bridgeport, Mr. Barrett, the owner of an outdoor sign company, decided to use the medium he knew best in an effort to promote better police-community relations. On a billboard located off the Connecticut Turnpike in Bridgeport, he depicted a black policeman giving mouth-to-mouth resuscitation to a white child. The message was direct:

Some Call Him Pig—Support Your Police Department.

The reaction to Mr. Barrett's idea from inner-city residents, the police and passing motorists has been overwhelmingly favorable. He has been praised for showing "concern for the inner city and its problems" and for underlining the problem of law enforcement in Bridgeport. He has received favorable letters from as far away as Chicago. Perhaps the greatest compliment came from Alfredo Ribot, Bridgeport's coordinator of Community Development, who said:

I personally think that it's a beautiful idea. There are a lot of people who will talk about problems, but they never get up and express their opinion publicly. This sign really hits home to us.

I wish to add my congratulations to John Barrett, Mr. Speaker. His action should serve as an example to those who are truly seeking to bring us together. I

am including at this point in the RECORD a news story from the Milford Citizen which describes Mr. Barrett and his "beautiful idea":

MILFORDITES BILLBOARD STIRS COMMENT

The reaction to a large outdoor billboard sign featuring a black policeman giving mouth to mouth resuscitation to a white child in Bridgeport has been very good, according to Alfredo Ribot, Coordinator of Community Development in that city.

The sign and its very direct message, "Some Call Him Pig: Support Your Police Dept." are the work of J. Milford man, John Barrett, who dedicated it to the City of Bridgeport.

"I had noticed that there was a critical situation existing between the Bridgeport community and the police," Mr. Barrett told the Citizen, by way of an explanation. "As I own an outdoor sign company, the idea came to me to put up a sign of this nature. I had my son pose, with a patrolman that we know, for the artist."

Barrett stated that the entire idea was his own, was not connected with the Bridgeport police department, except that the police apparently came to like the sign the longer that they saw it posted.

"I have had letters about the sign from Chicago, Boston, Cleveland and points even further West," Barrett said. "I had hoped that some civic minded businesses might pick up the idea."

Mr. Ribot, of Bridgeport's Hall Neighborhood House, praised Barrett's sign as being sensitive to problems of the inner city and further stated that Mr. Barrett is "one of the few residents of your community (Milford) who has shown concern for the inner city and its problems." Ribot told the Citizen that from discussions with neighborhood groups, he felt that the sign really showed the problem of law enforcement in Bridgeport.

The only groups opposed to the sign, he said, were the Panthers and the Young Lords, who evidently were opposed to any such espousal of good relations between Blacks and whites.

"I personally think that it's a beautiful idea," Ribot said. There are a lot of people who will talk about problems, but they never get up and express their opinion publicly. This sign really hits home to us."

PFC. NORMAN J. PEARSON

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, a fine young man from Maryland, Pfc. Norman J. Pearson, was recently killed in Vietnam. I commend his courage and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

HEBRON SOLDIER IS KILLED IN SOUTH VIETNAM

HEBRON, February 23.—The Pentagon has reported the death of Pfc. Norman J. Pearson, 21, of Hebron in a mine explosion near Chu Lai, South Vietnam on February 9. He was serving in the 198th Infantry Brigade.

His wife, Mrs. Vickie Ann Kenney Pearson, who lives on Bradley street in Hebron, a small town west of Salisbury, said that Private Pearson was inducted into the Army less than a year ago, on April 13, 1970. He had been stationed in Vietnam for about five months. Mrs. Pearson said that in his last letter he wrote that he had received permission to come home next month on leave.

The Pearsons have been married only a few months when he was inducted into the

Army, sent to Fort Dix, New Jersey for infantry training, and within five months sent to Vietnam.

Private Pearson was born in Nassawadox on the Virginia Eastern Shore. He was graduated from Mardela High School in Wicomico county near Salisbury. At the time he went into the Army he was employed by Copes Candy Company in Sharptown, also in Wicomico county.

Besides his wife, he is survived by his mother, Mrs. Beulah Pearson Morley, of Sharptown; his father, Norman Edgar Pearson, now living in Louisiana; two brothers and a sister, R. Wayne Pearson, William Edgar Pearson and Linda Pearson, all of Sharptown; and another sister, Lola Pearson of Baltimore.

Funeral services for Private Pearson were held Sunday at the Holloway funeral establishment in Salisbury.

ONE EFFECT OF CONGRESSIONAL RESTRICTIONS IN INDOCHINA

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, a recent report by investigative reporter Paul Scott deserves the widest reading by all Members of Congress. The message is simple. Congressional restrictions on the use of U.S. ground forces in Laos are costing Americans their lives.

The article follows:

RESTRICTIONS IN INDOCHINA

(By Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—Before tying the hands of President Nixon further in Indochina, members of Congress should examine the way their curbs on American military forces in Laos are helping the North Vietnamese.

An impartial inquiry would show the congressional bar against using any American ground troops in Laos is causing heavier than usual losses of American helicopters and their crews.

The restrictions also have increased the casualties of South Vietnamese being airlifted into the battle for the Ho Chi Minh network of roads.

Ordinarily, American soldiers called Pathfinders are used to check landing areas for security, set up ground communications, and oversee loading and unloading procedures during battle operations.

But because of the limitation voted by Congress last year, Pathfinders are prohibited from Laos as ground troops, although some are flying in Army helicopters but not allowed to get out of the planes.

This congressional tying of the military's hands is taking its toll in helicopters and crews. These losses are the heaviest of the entire war. An average of from ten to fifteen a day are being downed by enemy fire. Hundreds of South Vietnamese troops caught aboard these helicopters are being killed or wounded during landing operations.

Since the South Vietnamese moved into Laos, middle-echelon commanders have repeatedly asked U.S. Military Command in Saigon for permission to use American Pathfinders to coordinate combat air traffic in Laos.

Use of these elite troops, they argue, could cut present helicopter losses by as much as two-thirds. They would also reduce needless South Vietnamese casualties.

The reply to their request is always the same. Washington says no. Pathfinders are not permitted because of the congressional ban on U.S. ground troops.

An estimated 200 helicopters have been shot down by the North Vietnamese since the fighting began February 8. Larger helicopters equipped with cranes are being used to salvage many of the damaged choppers.

UNNEEDED LOSSES

The problem is that helicopters are most vulnerable when landing troops or supplies at "hot" landing zones, since they cannot take evasive action then. Many of the landing zones are still heavily infested with enemy troops.

If the U.S. were permitted to use Pathfinders, they would have been able to pick and secure much safer landing areas and the losses of machines and men would be greatly reduced.

Originally, the Pathfinders were to train several platoons of South Vietnamese to take over their jobs inside Laos, but the planned five weeks of intensive training was cut to three days because of a decision to move up the date for launching the attack into Laos. The earlier move was deemed necessary when preparations for the Laos campaign began to leak out.

Because of their lack of training, it was painfully discovered that the South Vietnamese could not be used as effective Pathfinders. The Laos campaign was launched without them.

The U.S. Military Command in Saigon has tried to reduce the amount of enemy fire at helicopters with dozens of tactical air strikes and some earth-shaking B-52 raids. So far, these attacks have knocked out 200 of the enemy's estimated 600 guns in the immediate battle area.

HELPING THE ENEMY

Due to the difficulties the congressional restriction is causing the military operations in Laos, the Joint Chiefs or Staff have urged President Nixon to oppose any further legislative curbs on U.S. military forces.

The President has been warned that proposals now pending in Congress to bar the use of U.S. military forces in North Vietnam are an open invitation for Hanoi to continue to use that country as a sanctuary to attack American forces in South Vietnam.

Members of the military intelligence community are even more concerned about the effect these congressional restraints might have on Communist China. With the U.S. barred from hitting the North Vietnamese sanctuary, the pointed out, the Chinese Reds would be encouraged to move "volunteers" to help Hanoi.

These officials believe the President already has made a serious mistake by publicly announcing that he would never use tactical atomic weapons in Indochina. The A-weapons will be needed, they contend, if the North Vietnamese launch an all out offensive across the Demilitarized Zone between North and South Vietnam.

Administration insiders say it was Henry Kissinger, the President's Chief Foreign Policy Adviser, who recommended that the President publicly rule out the use of tactical nuclear weapons.

NOTE: An estimated 2,000 Chinese Communist military advisers have moved into North Vietnam enroute to Laos. They have been sent there to study North Vietnam's military position and advise on tactics.

STOP BEING FUNNY

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, local taxes throughout the country have been increasing from year to year because of

inflation, the need for more schools, higher welfare expenses, and the demand for more local public services.

Too many people fail to realize that these services must be paid for and that there is only one source of funds, their own pockets.

An editorial recently appeared in the Pierz Journal in my Minnesota Sixth Congressional District point out this fact that government has no money to give that it does not first take from its citizens.

Mr. Speaker, insert this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It contains a lesson for all of us.

The editorial follows:

STOP BEING FUNNY

The old saying that "people are funny" was never truer than it is today. Never were there so many millions asking for public charity doled out to them under a pleasing variety of titles. We overlook the fact that government has no money to give that it does not first take from its citizens in taxes, or higher and higher public debt. The latter today requires the payment of over \$20 billion a year in interest charges alone.

No matter what the government, federal, state or local is giving you, don't think you are not paying for it. We are paying for exorbitant government spending and debt inflated prices and reduced value and buying power of the dollar. We are paying for it in everything we eat, wear and use. The amount of taxes withheld from the average income would have paid for a home not so long ago. What used to be put into savings, now goes to the tax collector, and the one who earned it never sees it.

The people will have to stop being "funny" if they wish to save their bacon in the U.S. Your savings and you government are being destroyed by those who put politics ahead of fiscal responsibility.

DISTINGUISHED COLUMNIST KILPATRICK COMMENTS ON PRESIDENT NIXON—NEW AND OLD

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in a recent column in Human Events, the distinguished columnist, James J. Kilpatrick, provides a perceptive analysis of changes in the administration's fiscal policy—the shift from balanced budget objectives to deficit-spending.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter of fiscal policy, I place this column in the RECORD herewith.

The article follows:

[From The Human Events, March 6, 1971]

MR. NIXON THEN AND MR. NIXON NOW

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

These are hard times for the President of the United States. The economy flaps like a wild spinnaker; he cannot get the thing tied down. He is running in a sea of cross-currents and contradictions, balling with one arm and steering with the other. It is not the best moment, perhaps, to ask our skipper to reflect on the principles of navigation.

Yet a series of worrisome developments is causing increasing concern among Mr. Nixon's friends and supporters on the political right. We are not ready to abandon ship: Where do we swim to? But it would be

pleasantly reassuring, all the same, to know where in the hell we are going.

Treasury Secretary John Connally was up on the Hill recently, asking for a walloping \$40-billion increase in the legal limit on the national debt. The increase will have to be granted.

No such massive increase would be required if it were not for the massive deficits in prospect. Mr. Nixon's budget message predicts a deficit for the current fiscal year of \$18 billion, and a deficit for the next fiscal year of \$11.6 billion, but the figures are written on sand. It is probable that the deficits—and the debt—will be much greater.

"What we need," said Mr. Nixon not so awfully long ago, "is an intelligently balanced economy." And he went on to complain—this was in New York on July 6, 1968—that "we have not yet taken the first step toward federal deficit spending and the ever-increasing federal debt."

This was one of the major themes of the Nixon campaign. He belabored Lyndon Johnson for falling "to cut deficit spending which is the cause of our present inflation." Budget deficits, he said, "lie at the heart of our troubles." For his own part, he renounced any "massive step-up" in federal spending programs. "This is a prescription for further inflation," said Mr. Nixon. "I believe it is also a prescription for economic disaster."

Well, we cheered our skipper then. He was a philosopher of the free enterprise system. "There is nothing the matter with the engine of free enterprise," he said, "that cannot be corrected by placing a prudent and sober engineer at the throttle."

In a major radio address on Oct. 23, 1968, he assailed the notion that wage and price controls could be limited to a few areas. "In order to control wages and prices," he said, "it would be necessary to embark on a road from which it is very hard to escape without major damage to the freedom of all."

This was sound conservative doctrine. Mr. Nixon warmed our hearts in a related field, when he took a "dim view" of any welfare plan that might be predicated upon a guaranteed annual income. Such a plan, he said, would be doubly wrong: "First, it would not end poverty; and second, while it might be a substitute for welfare, it would have a detrimental effect on the productive capacity of the American people."

Where are we, Cap'n? The Administration's Family Assistance Plan, no matter how it is sliced and buttered, is a form of guaranteed annual income. Federal spending is up. Inflation continues. And we are offered, as a "responsible fiscal policy," a budget predicated upon real deficits and make-believe revenues.

The dismal thought is beginning to take hold that Mr. Nixon has jettisoned his charts and compass of 1968—tossed them over the rail—and now is steering by the seat of his pants. Last year he would not jawbone; this year he will. The limited price and wage controls that once were anathema now are widely foreseen. Mr. Nixon has us hanging on the rails.

Maybe his course leads to a stable economy; but these are desperate chances Mr. Nixon is taking. The rueful notion will not go away that we preferred our skipper then, to our skipper now.

MR. NIXON ON FOREIGN POLICY

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News in a recent editorial evaluated President Nixon's sec-

ond annual foreign policy report to the Congress.

The editorial concludes that this report is important because it provides "hostile powers" with an opportunity to understand the Nation's foreign policy and thereby lessens the risk of total miscalculations.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter of foreign policy, I place this column in the *RECORD* herewith.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Feb. 26, 1971]

MR. NIXON ON FOREIGN POLICY

President Nixon's second annual foreign policy report to Congress is a valuable document that aims at several difficult targets at once.

Mr. Nixon believes that no foreign policy can be effective without popular support, so he tries to explain and sell his goals to win backing for them.

He also seeks to reassure America's allies of the steadiness of these policies. This country, he promises, will keep its commitments and stand by its friends so long as they do their share.

Most importantly, the President invites the Soviet Union to join us in a series of negotiations whose goal would be a stable and just peace. His invitation, if accepted in good faith, could point to a safer future.

The 65,000-word report is dominated by the idea of balance. Mr. Nixon points the country away from its former policy of over-involvement everywhere and in everything. But he warns against a return to isolation, which he is convinced would lead to another great war.

He also tries to balance conciliation and firmness. He seeks good relations with Russia and Red China, offering to recognize their great power status and interests.

"But, when challenged," Mr. Nixon reminds the other side, "the United States will defend its interests and those of its allies."

On Vietnam, he wants to focus attention on his direction—out—instead of on the current furor over the thrust into Laos. He makes a good case in recalling that he has drastically cut U.S. troop strength, casualties and costs, while strengthening the Saigon regime and army.

The President is right in reminding the country that North Vietnam still has a strong military capability and that South Vietnam faces grave economic, political and social problems. This sober warning is, we think, more realistic than the heady optimism of his recent statements about Vietnam.

The Middle East remains Mr. Nixon's candidate for the most dangerous place on earth—where another Arab-Israeli conflict could lead to United States-Soviet confrontation. He may have reduced that hazard by declaring that he will resist any Russian attempt to dominate the area.

Mr. Nixon's disclosure that Russia's nuclear strength "exceeds the level needed for deterrence" is unsettling. The United States has taken the political decision to seek nuclear "sufficiency," not superiority, and the President urges Moscow to make the same decision. Mankind must hope that Russia does so, for without it there can be no real security or arms limitation.

The report takes a calm view of the new Marxist government in Chile. Mr. Nixon correctly believes that what governments do internally is their own business, and he will react to how they behave on the international stage.

We are glad that he does not extend that broadmindedness to regimes practicing racism or persecution. He makes clear America's dislike of apartheid in South Africa and Rhodesia and of Portugal's colonial wars. But he wisely rejects demands that international force be used against those regimes.

A great value of Mr. Nixon's report is that hostile powers get an understanding of his policies and are less prone to act by miscalculation. This is no guarantee of peace, but in a dangerous world it is a useful lessening of risks.

SUBSTANTIAL UNEMPLOYMENT HITS FIVE MORE AREAS OF THE COUNTRY

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, a Department of Labor news release on February 25 gave a bleak report on an already desperate situation. During the past month, five more major areas of our Nation have experienced "substantial unemployment," bringing the total number of areas to 45—the highest since 1963. This documentation serves to underscore the immediate need for an emergency program of public service employment.

The text of news release follow:

FIVE MORE MAJOR AREAS HAVE "SUBSTANTIAL" UNEMPLOYMENT; TOTAL NOW 45

Five major labor areas were newly classified as having "substantial" unemployment in February, bringing the total to 45—highest since April 1963, Assistant Secretary of Labor Malcolm R. Lovell, Jr., announced today.

They are: Sacramento, Calif. (6.7%); Utica-Rome, N.Y. (7.6%); Johnstown, Pa. (7.1%); Scranton, Pa. (6.3%); and Providence-Pawtucket, R.I. (6.6%).

All five of the areas shifted the Group C classification (moderate unemployment, 3 to 5.9%) to Group D (6 to 8.9%). Sacramento had not been on the "substantial" list in nearly 20 years.

Four other major labor area shifts sent the Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, Pa. (3.3%) area and the Madison, Wis. (3.2%), area from the low unemployment Group B (1.5 to 2.9%) category into Group C, and the New Britain, Conn. (9.2%), and Stockton, Calif. (9.8%), areas, already on the "substantial" list in Group D, to a Group E (9 to 11.9%) rating.

The Manpower Administration each month classifies the same 150 major labor areas, selected to be representative of job market trends throughout the Nation. The 150 areas contain two-thirds of the Nation's work force.

Several hundred smaller areas are also listed when they meet the "substantial" unemployment criteria, but these smaller areas are not otherwise listed in "A," "B," "C," or "D" categories.

In February, 12 smaller areas were added to the "substantial" list, bringing the total of smaller areas on the list to 634. The 12 areas added this month are:

Roanoke, Ala.; Ashdown, Ark.; Fort Smith, Ark.; Ottawa-La Salle, Ill.; Chestertown, Md.; Rolla, Mo.; St. Joseph, Mo.; Seminole, Okla.; Klamath Falls, Oreg.; Parkersburg, W. Va.; St. Albans, Vt.; and Beloit-Janesville, Wis.

Two smaller areas, Bristol, Conn., and Lock Haven-Renovo, Pa., were changed from "substantial" to "persistent" unemployment.

There were no changes in the list of "classified sections of concentrated unemployment or underemployment" in February. All changes made this month are effective March 1, 1971, for Federal procurement purposes.

In the aggregate, 679 major and smaller areas are now classified as areas of "substantial" or "persistent" unemployment. Parts of 141 cities, parts or all of 163 counties in 18 States, 31 Indian reservations, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico are classified as sections of concentrated unemployment or underemployment.

Firms in or near these sections, as well as those in the "substantial" or "persistent" unemployment areas, which agree to hire disadvantaged workers, are eligible for first preference in bidding on certain Federal procurement contracts.

"Substantial" means the area has a jobless rate of 6 percent or more with the rate expected to continue for at least two more months.

"Persistent" means that the average unemployment rate has been 6 percent or more for a year and has been at least 50 percent above the national average for several years.

Four major labor areas—Stockton, Calif.; New Bedford, Mass.; and Mayaguez and Ponce, P.R.—remained in the persistent category along with 458 smaller areas. In addition, three large cities—Oakland, Calif.; Newark, N.J.; and Cleveland, Ohio—and 24 separately classified counties are considered persistent unemployment areas.

Sacramento's shift into "substantial" unemployment was attributed to over-the-year job losses in both agriculture and manufacturing (aerospace) and a growing number of young job seekers.

In the other four major areas which joined the substantial list, the worsening unemployment reflected downturns in durable goods manufacturing employment over-the-year, principally in the metals and machinery industries. Scranton and Johnstown also experienced declines in apparel. In Providence-Pawtucket, over-the-year losses in such non-durables as textiles, rubber and plastics, and in jewelry contributed to the jobless rise.

All four of these areas had been characterized by high unemployment problems in the 1950's and early 60's.

The table below shows for this month, last month, and a year ago, the number of major labor areas in the various classifications:

Labor supply groups	Feb. 1971	Jan. 1971	Feb. 1970
Total, all groups.....	150	150	150
Group A (overall shortage)....	0	0	0
Group B (low unemployment, 1.5 to 2.9 percent)....	13	15	57
Group C (moderate unemployment, 3 to 5.9 percent).....	92	95	86
Group D (substantial unemployment, 6 to 8.9 percent).....	34	31	5
Group E (substantial unemployment, 9 to 11.9 percent).....	9	7	0
Group F (substantial unemployment, 12 percent or more).....	2	2	2

HOW THE WEST WAS WON—ANOTHER VIEW

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I place in the *RECORD* a letter from Attorney William L. Higgs, addressed to the honorable Justices of the

Supreme Court. For those of us concerned with the problems of the Spanish-speaking Americans of the Southwest, Mr. Higgs' letter gives much food for thought and sheds substantial light on the historical roots of the present Chicano movement. I am not sure Mr. Higgs' view is representative of the entire Chicano community or that his interpretation of the legal history is accurate in all respects. I am not qualified to make a judgment on either point. But I do believe he expresses a view which needs to be heard, a view which can provide us, as lawmakers, with valuable insights. It is in that, I hope, constructive spirit that I present Mr. Higgs' letter:

FEBRUARY 21, 1971.

U.S. SUPREME COURT,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I am writing you this letter somewhat in the nature of a petition for the redress of grievances, somewhat in the nature of a letter of deeply felt and needed expression.

Since I am trained in the law, as such is known in this country (Harvard Law School, LL.B., 1958), I realize that this communication will probably have no meaning, no effect. Nevertheless, I have always given in to the urge to express myself when I felt something was deeply wrong. And this time is no exception.

I shall try to be brief; you have enough to read as it is.

In 1896 the Court gave its opinion in the case of *Plessy v. Ferguson*, 163 U.S. 537. That opinion became the cornerstone of legalized racism in this country. One year later in 1897, the Court handed down its decision in the cases of *U.S. v. Rio Arriba Land and Cattle Co.* (167 U.S. 298) and *U.S. v. Sandoval* (167 U.S. 276). These opinions, together with *U.S. v. Santa Fe*, 165 U.S. 675 (1897), now stand as the bulwark against the property rights of the impoverished Indo-Hispanic (Chicano) of the Southwest. These cases grew out of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo (final ratification by Mexico on May 30, 1848) closing out the war between the United States and Mexico, which many people believe was the most sordid chapter in our history. This Treaty stated that the property (as well as civil and political) rights of the Indo-Hispanic would be faithfully protected by the United States. In essence these decisions of the Supreme Court held that the common lands of the pueblos (settlements) of the Indo-Hispanic people of the Southwest belonged not to these people but to the U.S. government. (It goes without saying that the Court never considered protecting the inalienable character of the common lands of the pueblos in the Indo-Hispanic people.)

The Supreme Court wrote down reasoning to the effect that, since, under the laws of Spain and of the Indies (Spanish America), the King of Spain held and exercised absolute dominion and control over the common lands of the pueblos, the U.S. government as the successor to the King of Spain and to the government of Mexico was entitled to the common lands. In large part these Supreme Court decisions meant that up to 100,000,000 acres of land (about 1/4 of the entire area of the Southwest, Texas to California—according to *The Public Domain*, U.S. Public Land Commission (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1884), p. 409, claims for 80,000,000 acres were evidently outstanding in New Mexico, Colorado and Arizona alone) was transferred effectively and successfully under the rubric of "legal process" from the Indo-Hispanic people to the U.S. government, to shyster lawyers such as the Santa Fe Ring, and to other "Anglo" opportunists skilled in the art of legal intrigue.

In short, these decisions of the U.S. Su-

preme Court and the type of legal process that they fostered resulted in the loss of about 100,000,000 acres of land by the Chicano people to the U.S. government and Anglos—in direct violation of the guarantees of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo.

Though I could not conceivably hold myself out as being anything but an average reader of Spanish, I have spent some time examining the various Spanish Codes, including the *Siete Partidas*, *Recopilación*, *Novísima Recopilación*, and others, as well as *La Recopilación de las Leyes de los Reynos de las Indias*. Also I have examined some treatises in Spanish on the subject. I am convinced that the Supreme Court of the *Rio Arriba*, *Sandoval*, and *Santa Fe* opinions was not correct when it accepted the position advocated by the U.S. government that the King of Spain held and exercised absolute dominion and control over the common lands of the pueblos.

Law 4, Title VIII, Book VII of the *Novísima Recopilación* states in part:

"LEY IV.—Tiempo necesario para prescribir el Señorío de los pueblos, y su Jurisdicción civil y criminal, á excepcion de la Suprema, y de los pechos y tributos pertenecientes al Rey.

"Ley 2. tit. 27. del Ordenam. de Alcalá; y D. Felipe II. año de 1566.

"Porque algunos en nuestros reynos tienen y posen algunas ciudades, villas y lugares, y Jurisdicciones civiles y criminales, sin tener para ello titulo nuestro, ni de los Reyes nuestros antecesores, y se ha dudado, si lo suso dicho se puede adquirir contra Nos y nuestra Corona por algun tiempo; ordenamos y mandamos: que la posesion inmemorial, probándose segun y como y con las calidades que la ley de Toro requiere, que es la ley 1. tit. 17. lib. 10., baste para adquirir contra Nos y nuestros sucesores qualesquier ciudades, villas y lugares, y Jurisdicciones civiles y criminales, y qualquiera cosa y parte dello, con las cosas al Señorío y Jurisdicción anexas y pertenecientes; . . ."

Since the words "contra Nos y nuestra Corona" and "contra Nos y nuestros sucesores" are used I take this language to mean that the pueblos at one time—at least until 1805, the date of the *Novísima*—held titles effective even as against the King, primarily because that is what it says.

Moreover, Law 8, Title XXI, Book VII, of the *Novísima Recopilación* declares—since 1515—that even the King of Spain could not grant to outsiders the common land within the terminos or boundaries of a pueblo.

Laws 1 and 2, Title I, Book II, of the *Laws of the Indies*, above, explicitly makes the laws of Spain applicable to the Indies when the *Laws of the Indies* do not cover the subject.

These laws I have mentioned above apparently were never seen by the U.S. Supreme Court of 1896, which contented itself with studying only some available English-language works and excerpts, much of which was incorrectly translated and contained serious omissions.

In addition, these cases before the Supreme Court invariably reflected only the interests of the U.S. government and the Santa Fe Ring as they struggled over who would get the spoils of the lands of the Indo-Hispanic people.

Frankly, I do not feel that a legal brief is in order here. I just want to say that I am convinced that a reading of the Spanish Codes—in Spanish—will leave the reader certain that the Supreme Court of the United States incorrectly decided these cases that deprived the Indo-Hispanic people of their land.

In view of the gravity of the continuing harm being done to the Chicano people of the Southwest, I would hope some day a Supreme Court would be big enough and just enough to rectify the wrong—just as Chief Justice Marshall did in *U.S. v. Perche-*

man, 32 U.S. 50 (1833) when he reversed the holding in *Foster v. Nelson*, 27 U.S. 164 (1829) and upheld a Spanish land grant upon the Court having subsequently called to its attention by means of a translation of the Spanish version the correct interpretation of the 1819 Treaty ceding the Spanish Floridas to the United States.

The consequences of this loss of land to the Indo-Hispanic has been incalculable—in poverty, in suppression of culture, in denial of education, in encouraging of racial discrimination. And these effects are still continuing throughout the Southwest. One sees it here everywhere—in the facts and in the statistics.

And these are the consequences of this Court's decisions.

There is a man, Leies Lopez Tijerina, who—though having had only six months of formal education in his life and only learning English at 17—became interested in the plight of the Indo-Hispanic, of his people, and in the role of the land in that plight. He traveled to Spain and to Mexico. He studied and purchased many books, including the *Laws of the Indies* and all of the old Spanish Codes. After years of laborious study in lawbooks and talking to the old people he became convinced that the U.S. Supreme Court was wrong, that the pueblo common lands belonged to the people of the pueblos, not directly to the King of Spain. He sought in various ways to petition the U.S. government to correct its error, all in vain. In other contexts he has come to the extrajudicial attention of this Court, particularly that of Mr. Chief Justice Burger.

Mr. Tijerina was charged and convicted by the U.S. government of aiding and abetting an assault on forest rangers in the Carson National Forest in October, 1966, on land which Mr. Tijerina and the neighboring settlers claimed belonged to the common lands of the pueblo of San Joaquin del Rio de Chama (Canon de Chama). Since the rangers had only been led by the arm about ten yards, no one was hurt; but Mr. Tijerina received a two-year sentence, while the ones who actually touched the Rangers' arms were out of prison in two months. This Court refused to even hear the appeal in Mr. Tijerina's case, so Mr. Tijerina now (Jan. 17, 1971) has finished serving that sentence. He has just begun serving another sentence stemming from his wife's burning of two Forest Service signs designating the southern part of the San Joaquin pueblo as part of the Santa Fe National Forest, since he was convicted of aiding and abetting her. Mrs. Tijerina's sentence was suspended. Mr. Tijerina is now still in prison and has been there since June 11, 1969, when his bond on the "assault" case was revoked on the grounds that he was "dangerous to the community." At a new bond hearing after 18 months in prison, bond on the "sign-burning" conviction was denied for the same reason on January 19, 1971, in U.S. District Court in Albuquerque. Various petitions for vacation of sentence and habeas corpus have been summarily rejected or gone unanswered.

After relentless persecution by the state and local police in northern New Mexico because of his struggle for the common lands, Mr. Tijerina was involved on June 5, 1967, in a now-famous shoot-out in the Courthouse in Tierra Amarilla, New Mexico, the county seat of Rio Arriba County, a land of great size and beauty and of great poverty—for the Indo-Hispanic. Mr. Tijerina was brought to the state bar of justice on about sixty counts, several capital (kidnaping). At a November, 1968, trial at which the state was forced to select any three charges on which to try Mr. Tijerina, he was acquitted by the jury of all three. Subsequently, in spite of Mr. Tijerina's stand on the double jeopardy clause of the U.S. Constitution, he was retried in November, 1969, and convicted on two of

three of the numerous remaining charges. Mr. Tijerina was his own lawyer in both trials. The state had learned its lesson well: At the first trial he was physically free, during the second he was in prison and denied access to legal materials and witnesses necessary to his defense, in federal custody. At the first he had this writer as advisor sitting at his side, at the second I was ordered by the Court to sit with the audience. At the first he could introduce evidence about the pueblos and the common lands, at the second he could not. At the first he could have testimony from those directly involved such as the governor and the district attorney (the object of an attempted citizen's arrest that precipitated the shoot-out), and the second he could not.

Presently Mr. Tijerina's appeal from the sign-burning case is awaiting decision by the Tenth Circuit in Denver. He has been trying for parole or for bond ever since his June 11, 1969, arrest without success. He is now confined in the federal Medical Center in Springfield, Missouri, and has undergone several operations on his throat, accompanied by sharp loss of weight.

I have always considered that I have as much a direct stake in injustice as those who suffer from it. I have been active in the civil rights movement both in Mississippi and in Washington, D.C., ever since my graduation from law school in 1958. Many household names and many forgotten persons of the movement have been my friends or acquaintances.

I believe Mr. Tijerina to be a very great man who passionately believes in justice. I believe that he is being made to suffer not for his transgressions against the law but for his convictions, the light of which the administrators of law and government cannot stand.

I believe the common lands—all 100,000,000 acres of them—in law and in justice belong to the Indo-Hispano people of the Southwest.

I would like to see the Court act in this cause and correct some errors, right some wrongs, and render justice. I do not believe that it will, but a petition at the least has the salutary effect of making the petitioner feel better.

This letter is written with the greatest of respect to nine distinguished scholars and contributors of the law who have high dedication to justice as they perceive it—and I am not sure that one can ask for more.

Yours sincerely,

WILLIAM L. HIGGS.

NATION SUFFERING FROM INFLATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, economists have debated and argued in recent months over the apparent anachronism of our economy suffering simultaneously from both inflation and unemployment.

Metropolitan Federal Savings, in Detroit, analyzed the situation in the winter edition of its Quarterly Indicator, and offered the most concise and logical explanation I have seen:

We have both inflation and unemployment because the military expenditure levels have short-circuited the flow of money into long-term investments. Instead of permanent investments in plant, machinery, housing and public works of all sorts, we are diverting too many of our resources to nonproductive military use.

Mr. Speaker, here in simple language, is the basic problem of our economy today. This short paragraph puts the blame exactly where it belongs—on the huge percentage of our budget that is poured down the drainhole of militarism. This expenditure reached its logical—and ridiculous—climax this week, when a newspaper columnist pointed out that we are spending \$110,000 for every person we kill in Southeast Asia.

I include the Quarterly Indicator's article at this point in the RECORD:

HOW COME INFLATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT BOTH?

You can not understand the American economy if you leave the high level of military expense out of the reasoning.

There is nothing new about ever higher money outlays to workers from year to year. This is a necessary condition for an increased standard of living for the people.

Traditionally, these outlays have been offset by large investments in plant and machinery which keep the costs per unit down and provide an ever larger flow of goods and services to increase the standard of living of the people.

We have both inflation and unemployment because the military expenditure levels have short-circuited the flow of money into long-term investments. Instead of permanent investments in plant, machinery, housing, and public works of all sorts, we are diverting too many of our resources to non-productive military use.

And the high levels of unemployment exist because we have not shifted our production processes from war to peace purposes. It is now time to beat our swords into plow shares. Our current direction is to cut back without re-direction to solve human problems such as air and water pollution, better health care and the like. The result is that we have less and increasingly, our people are unemployed. It is bad economics to have so many people out of work. It is also hard on the business community which is suffering along with its customers. So, there is talk of a national budget in 1971 which will be 15 to 20 billion dollars in the red. If this provides a basis for long-term investments in health care, child care, machinery, housing and the like, we will have a genuine basis for combating the inflation, and providing jobs for the unemployed.

Reductions in costs do not come from jiggling with financial flows and adjusting money valves alone. You can have a good heart and circulatory system concurrent with terrible hunger pains in the stomach. Therefore, some attention must be paid directly to the costs of and distribution of food, housing, clothing, medical care, education and all of the other items which are critical to human survival. All of these things require investments in improved technology. This costs money. So does a huge military establishment.

If we are indeed a nation that believes in keeping people alive and raising their standard of living, we ought to back up our beliefs with our money.

A DEDICATION TO WOODROW WILSON

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 2, 1971

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the great men and great Presidents of the United States, regardless of their party, cease to be partisan figures in the minds

of the people as history puts their service to the Nation and to mankind in proper perspective.

Thus, it is that Presidents such as Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt have long since been embraced by Americans of all political persuasions.

Another President who falls into that category is Woodrow Wilson.

Recently, President Nixon spoke at the dedication of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars here in Washington. Also participating in the ceremonies was Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, the Democratic candidate for President in 1968.

The ideals, the dreams, and the accomplishments of Woodrow Wilson in his unending quest for peace joined these two leaders that night in a common bond, because they, too, are men who seek for peace. And true peace-seekers acknowledge no party and no narrow politics in that search, for peace truly transcends both party and politics.

For that reason I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point the remarks of President Nixon at the dedication of the Woodrow Wilson Center on February 18, 1971:

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT NIXON

Senator Humphrey, Dean Sayre, Dr. Ripley, and all of the distinguished guests present here today: I, first, express my deep appreciation to Senator Humphrey for his gracious introduction and also my commendation for his eloquent remarks.

And I would like to point out that in my opinion, had it not been for him, for his devotion, his dedication and his tenacity, we would not be meeting here today with this project now reaching its culmination. And to him and all the others who worked with him, certainly the thanks of the nation and the thanks of the people around the world go for seeing to it that the living memorial to one of America's greatest men is now coming into being.

And it, of course, is an historic occasion for all of us. For me, too, it is the first time that I have heard the voice of Woodrow Wilson, although I have read, as most of you have, most of what he has written.

And it brings a special meaning to this occasion that one of the distinguished religious leaders of this city and of this nation is here today, and that he is the grandson of Woodrow Wilson.

I am honored to celebrate this occasion and the dedication of this new international study to the memory of one of America's greatest Presidents.

Along with most Presidents of the past half century, I have long been a student of Woodrow Wilson. He was a man born ahead of his time. We have reason to hope that he was not born ahead of our time.

Ironically, this man, who used the English language to uplift and inspire, and who so enriched the lexicon of democracy is remembered most for one phrase he did not coin, a phrase that was twisted into a slogan of cynicism. He took that phrase from H. G. Wells' book, "The War That Will End War." Using that phrase as their center piece, there are some who class Woodrow Wilson as a colossal failure.

He won re-election in 1916 on the slogan: "He kept us out of war." But America went to war. That election, interestingly enough, was the background for my own interest in Woodrow Wilson and the inspiration he has provided for me, as he did for Senator Humphrey, the former Vice President of the United States.

My mother and father were both Republicans. California was the State, as you re-

call, that decided the election of 1916. The reason was that a number of Republicans voted for Wilson. My mother was one of them. She was a devote Quaker, a deeply dedicated pacifist.

I was only three years old in 1916, but for years afterwards, in a friendly way, my mother and father sometimes spoke of that election of 1916 in which my father had voted for Hughes.

But my mother, despite the fact that America did get into the war after 1916, always had her faith in Woodrow Wilson. She used to say to me, "He was a good man. He was a man who deeply believed in peace." And she believed that the United States made an error in not following his advice after World War I.

He inspired her with his idealism and she in turn passed on that inspiration to me.

We all recall how Woodrow Wilson rallied the hopes of mankind that World War I would be a war that could end wars. We all remember, too, that wars followed, tragically.

He tried to lead the United States in the community of nations, but he failed to stem the tide of post-war isolationism. He died a broken man.

But now, with a half century's perspective, we can see the success of Woodrow Wilson begin to emerge. He identified the United States of America with the principle of the self-determination of all nations, weak and strong.

He lit a spark that merged this nation with the cause of generosity and idealism.

Every war-time President since Woodrow Wilson has been tempted to describe the current war as the war to end wars. But they have not done so because of the derision that the phrase evoked, a reminder of lost dreams, of lights that failed, of hopes that were raised and dashed.

What I am striving for above all else, what this nation is striving for in all that we do is something that America has never experienced in this century, a full generation of peace.

I believe that right now is the time for us to learn to walk in peace. The first step, of course, is to still the sound of war around the world.

We are moving in that direction. We have taken the first steps toward walking in peace. But we must first break the terrible world habit of war and only then can we learn the wondrous habit of peace.

That is why today I do not speak of the war to end wars. Instead, I hope to focus on something that men alive today can achieve for themselves and their children, on a dream that we can realize here and now, a genuine beginning toward our ultimate goal.

That is why I have set our sights on a span of time that men in positions of power today can cope with, just one generation, but one long step on the path away from perennial war.

That, too, is why it is more important now than ever before to summon up the spirit of Woodrow Wilson. For we can only establish the habit of peace by answering the call for human brotherhood, his inspiration for an understanding between men and nations.

Some of Woodrow Wilson's most eloquent speeches were made on the trip that he took to Europe immediately after World War I. On that trip, crusading for a League of Nations, he made the point vividly in the Mansion House in London.

He told the story of a great Englishman of letters, Charles Lamb, who once casually said about another man, "I hate that fellow." And one of Lamb's friends replied, "I didn't know that you knew him." And Lamb said, "I don't. I can't hate a man I know."

And that is how Wilson made his point. He said, "When we know one another, we cannot hate one another."

Knowing one another in its deepest sense means far more than becoming acquainted or improving the atmosphere in relations between nations. It means that we must recognize our differences and come to grips with reality of conflicting national interests.

History has taught us that we do not know one another better by glossing over the substance of disagreements. We know one another better when we understand why nations disagree.

Then, and only then, can we act together to harmonize our differences. When we truly know one another we can have differences without hating one another.

I suggest that the greatest single achievement of Woodrow Wilson was in opening the heart of America for the world to see.

Since Wilson, the world better understands that America does stand for self-determination of all nations, that Americans fervently believe in a world living in freedom and peace.

Wilson died convinced he was a failure. He was wrong. The Wilsonian vision, the American passion for peace and freedom did not die. Through all the years of war, through all the setbacks of isolationism and weakness toward aggression, that vision has persevered—until now it is on the verge of triumph.

When we know one another, we cannot hate one another. In this still imperfect world, I am convinced that realistic understanding is on the rise and mindless hatred is on the decline.

The strong likelihood exists that there will be no need for a war to end wars, that instead by taking one careful step at a time, by making peace for one full generation, we will get this world into the habit of peace.

The time will come when Woodrow Wilson will be remembered not as a man who tried and failed, but as one of those Americans who saw the truth before his time and whose vision became the reality of the generation he inspired.

By his example, Woodrow Wilson helped make the world safe for idealism.

By following that example, by not fearing to be idealists ourselves, we shall make the world safe for free men to live in peace.

COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE—SAFE STREETS: A PRIORITY GOAL

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 18, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on December 13, 1970, I was privileged to sponsor the fifth annual Community Leadership Conference which was hosted again this year by New York University at its University Heights campus in the Bronx, N.Y. The topic this year was "Safe Streets: A Priority Goal." We were honored to have former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark and Acting Chief Inspector Elmer C. Cone, who represented Police Commissioner Patrick Murphy, as the principal speakers at the plenary session.

As in past years, following the plenary session there were panels devoted to specific aspects of the conference topic. We were fortunate in having distinguished local and national leaders, including former U.S. Commissioner of Education, James Allen, on these panels. Dr. Lewis Hyde, provost of New York University's

Heights campus, joined me as the host at the plenary session and later served as the chairman of one of the panels. I am grateful to him for his and NYU's invaluable assistance in making this conference a success.

Conferences such as ours are valuable for the many good minds they bring together to focus on a problem of importance, but are especially gratifying when the discussion leads to meaningful action. One item that was stressed at the Community Leadership Conference this year was the problem of crime in the schools, a concern particularly to minority groups. In checking into this matter in the days following the conference, I discovered that none of the existing Federal assistance programs provide funds specifically to combat this problem which means that local education funds, already short, must often be diverted to school security and away from central purpose—education. I have developed legislation to provide the needed funds—the Safe Schools Act of 1971 (H.R. 3101) which I introduced on February 1, 1971.

Mr. Speaker, because I believe that the discussions which took place at the Community Leadership Conference are of national importance, I insert in the Record summaries of what was said at the plenary session and at each of the six panel sessions:

PLENARY SESSION

(Introductory remarks by Congressman JONATHAN B. BINGHAM)

Many facets of the complicated problem of crime in our society require continued study and discussion. We desperately need to learn more about the nature of crime and its causes, direct and indirect. We need new and sharper ideas on how to curb crime without transforming the free society we all cherish into a garrison state that would be more oppressive than the uncertain fear we now live with. One way to forge these essential discoveries is to talk to each other—to share our experiences and insights. That is the purpose of this conference.

There are, however, a number of needed courses of action to control crime that are all too apparent, and have been for some time—that require not more discussion, but commitment; not more debate, but execution. In my judgment, control of firearms is certainly high on that list.

As the National Commission on Violence quite rightly concluded, firearms do not cause crime or violence. They do, however, facilitate crime and increase horrendously its impact upon society. For the individual that falls victim to a crime, the presence of a firearm in the hand of the criminal may very well mean the difference between the loss only of replaceable property, and the irrevocable loss of life itself.

In the wake of assassinations of some of our most beloved and able leaders in the 1960's, the nation was sufficiently stirred and outraged to make it possible for the Congress to enact new Federal gun control legislation—the Gun Control Act of 1968. That Act curtailed the importation of foreign firearms, significantly restricted mail order and inter-state gun shipments to individuals, and outlawed possession of handguns by convicted felons and other dangerous individuals. But it did nothing to reduce the overall size of the gun population in this country (conservatively estimated at 90-million). Similarly, it did nothing to get at the person-to-person transfer—by sale or otherwise—of second-hand guns. The Violence Commission determined that more than half

of all gun acquisitions involve second-hand guns changing hands outside commercial establishments where such gun control laws as we have are presumably observed. As a result, areas with strict local restrictions on firearms like New York continue to be public arsenals and market places for a lively trade in dangerous firearms.

No other developed country in the world is as permissive with firearms as this country. And no other country has anything near the death rate involving firearms that we do. The United States in recent years has had about 3.5 homicides in which a gun was used for every 100,000 Americans—195,936 homicides in all. The next most gun-crazy country in the world, by this index, is Italy—which had only 0.5 gun homicides per 100,000 population (one-seventh the rate of the United States). Countries with the strongest gun laws, like Britain, West Germany, Denmark, the Netherlands and Japan have 0.1 gun homicides OR LESS per 100,000 population (one-thirty-fifth the U.S. rate).

I feel strongly that we must take determined new steps not only to register all guns and license gun-owners, but also to stop completely the manufacture, transfer, transportation, or import in or into this country of handguns by any person except military and law enforcement personnel. I have introduced legislation in the Congress to institute registration and licensing, and to ban handgun trade, Long guns, which have legitimate recreational and sporting uses, and which are difficult to conceal, would not be included in such a ban. Strict gun control need not and should not deprive serious and responsible sportsmen of access to weapons. But neither should the rest of us have to live in terror in order to satisfy the sportsmen.

Support among the general population and in the Congress for stronger gun control measures has lagged deplorably since 1968. Not only has it been impossible to enact new gun control legislation, but the gun lobby has begun gradually to try to gut the 1968 law. Only last week the Ways and Means Committee reported out a bill that would exempt various kinds of ammunition from the reporting provisions of the 1968 Act—an effort I will, of course, do everything I can to block. The public's memory is indeed short, and its attention fickle. But the citizens who live in the cities of this nation realize fully that this nation faces a greater threat from firearms today than it did in 1968. Partial gun control is little better, in effect, than none at all. Is it any more a tragedy or a disgrace that one of our leaders is shot down than that one of our neighbors is shot down—as happens every day in this and many other cities across the nation? I think not, and with that in mind I call for renewed public support and demands to expand our controls on firearms on a nation-wide scale as the item of most immediate priority in the fight against crime.

HIGHLIGHTS OF REMARKS BY ACTING CHIEF INSPECTOR ELMER C. CONE, REPRESENTING POLICE COMMISSIONER PATRICK V. MURPHY

Inspector Cone believes the police and the community have a common interest and a mutual obligation to make our streets safe. The relationship between the urban population and the police is influenced by the effects of conflict and protest and discontent, with the unfortunate result that the police are sometimes cast in the role of an adversary. The policeman can apprehend persons responsible for crime, but apprehension has little effect on crime rate if offenders are not brought to trial promptly and, once tried and convicted, are placed into institutions that do not correct and return to society more responsible citizens. At least nine of every ten men who leave prison eventually return there. The overcrowded prison with inadequate personnel and poorly designed

facilities provides a fertile breeding ground for crime.

For a long time the community has looked to the police to solve problems that society has failed to solve. The amelioration of social and economic injustices is a battle which must be fought concomitantly with the battle against crime. There can be no war on crime without a war on poverty, on racial discrimination, on inadequate housing, and on unemployment. We must strive to ameliorate the conditions of life that drive people to commit crime and that undermine the restraining rules and institutions erected by society against anti-social conduct. Even with a vastly improved criminal justice system, it seems impossible that we can substantially reduce crime if society fails to make it possible for each of its citizens to feel a personal stake in it, in the good life that it can provide, and in the law and order and justice that are prerequisite to such a life.

Among the things being done by those in the police service to cope with the problem of crime and disorder are the following:

The pursuit of policies of modernization and innovation to increase efficiency. The addition of more radio cars and scooters to increase the mobility of the force. The improvement of communication facilities to permit flexible operation and speedy response to calls for assistance. The development of the capability to mobilize manpower and equipment rapidly to meet emergency situations. The adoption of new crime prevention techniques. The recruitment of the largest police force in the city's history coupled with an increased civilian staff to take on clerical and administrative jobs formerly performed by police officers—with the result that a much larger police complement is patrolling the streets of our city. The broadening of training for both recruits and veteran police officers, geared to improve police attitudes in serving the public as well as efficiency in law enforcement. The enlistment of professional educators to train recruits in human and civil rights and to build into every police training course a concern for human rights. The initiation by Police Commissioner Murphy of a new technique to combat street crime: The use of a limited number of officers in civilian clothes on rescheduled tours of duty to increase police protection during high crime night time hours has produced a significant number of arrests for crimes against the person. The implementation shortly of another new technique aimed at restoring a closer relationship between the patrolman and the people on his beat and increasing police accountability for crime control in each police sector. A police sergeant in a given neighborhood will have the responsibility for the work of patrolmen assigned to him, for a 24-hour day (rather than the present 8-hour working day). The local precinct commander, the sergeant and the beat patrolman will receive greater freedom of operation as well as added responsibility in crime control. The radio car patrolmen will be encouraged to leave their squad cars and walk around the community. This so-called "Beat Commander" project, which the Ford Foundation is expected to fund, will be directed by Captain James McGoe of the 43rd Precinct in the Bronx.

The Bronx is benefitting directly from many of these improvements and innovations. With increased demands on police service there has been also a significant increase in felony arrests.

In conclusion, Inspector Cone pointed out that the criminal element constitutes a tiny fraction of society but its conduct has a terrifying impact on the entire community. Peace and good order are attain-

able if there is a massive effort by society—the courts, the legislature, teachers, clergy, sociologists, penologists, parole and probation authorities, and most essentially, the community itself. The job of the policeman is extremely demanding and its effectiveness demands public support. Inspector Cone earnestly requested citizen cooperation with the patrolman whenever the opportunity arises, alertness and prompt reporting of actual or suspected criminal activity, and assistance in the hazardous task of policing this city.

HIGHLIGHTS OF ADDRESS BY FORMER U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL RAMSAY CLARK

In his definition of "crime in the streets", the former U.S. Attorney General indicated "that we have people among us who, for whatever reason, care so little about others or are so unable to control themselves that they destroy life or injure or take property." Clark asked that we try to use reason in our approach to this very emotional subject. He believes that the truth is fairly clear, but we must have the courage to uncover our eyes and face it. We know the answers. The question is whether we've got the will. We can do something about crime in the streets if we care—for we are a rich and generous nation—and Clark suggests that we must approach it in two ways: *The underlying causes and the system of criminal justice.*

Unless we are willing to recognize the underlying causes, all our efforts to reduce crime will be futile—like bailing out a sinking ship while water continues to rush in. Clark cited alcoholism, drug addiction, and mental instability as three symptoms of failure in our society.

Alcoholism is a medical problem, but police service is the way society copes with it. Of all the non-traffic arrests in the United States in 1960, one-third were due to alcoholism. Police cannot cure alcoholism.

Even worse than the problem of alcoholism is that of drug addiction, for there is no person with greater human misery than the drug addict suffering from enormous human degradation. And in this age of anxiety, it will get worse. We cannot control addicts with armed force. Surreptitious surveillance, clubs and guns are not the answer. We must seek cure and care. Clark suggested that we divert one-third the cost of a polaris submarine into a laboratory and find that synthetic chemistry that would relieve the body of reliance on opium and its derivatives and require "a national commitment to do something" about drug addiction.

And it follows that police cannot cope with the mental instability brought about by poverty in urban America—poverty which causes family breakdown, constant concern and fighting about money, inability to obtain food, malnutrition, constant insecurity, dehumanization from gross waste of life and talents, and the inability to function in essential interpersonal relationships. And our mentally retarded might be "different" but they are "gentle" people who find it difficult to cope. They need love. For them prisons are not the answer.

Clark put it directly to his audience, that if we care about human dignity, we must help on the underlying causes of crime.

The system of criminal justice in this country is comprised of the police, prosecutors, courts, and corrective institutions.

There is no activity in America that requires greater skills than police service, yet the average police salary in the United States is three quarters of the average necessary to support a family of four, and tens of thousands of our police officers must moonlight to support their families. What does this mean? It means we don't care; it means we want safety on the cheap. And is it fair to expect the police to hold together broken homes; keep our kids from dropping

out of school? We should integrate police into the community they serve. We must recognize that they are important to our freedom and our safety. We must be in the most intimate communication with them. All this if they are going to have a chance to make a difference. This will require a commitment of the people at community level.

Our neglect of our officers of prosecution and of our courts is unbelievable. We do not give them the necessary resources to provide effective justice and meaningful rule of law. They perform very much as they performed in the 19th Century. They cannot keep up; they can only mass produce. Justice does not lend itself very well to these shortcomings in our system, and human beings get ground up in the process. The system fails to act as a deterrent and not one serious crime in 50 results in a conviction. Justice is possible in mass society more easily than in earlier times, but we must want it, we must believe in it, we must work for it, and we must support those who live their lives in that service. We are not doing very well.

Perhaps the most tragic neglect in the whole system of criminal justice is corrections. In 1968 we spent about 1.1 million dollars on all corrections in the United States—federal, state, and local—all of our jails, all of our prisons, all of our probation, parole and pre-release guidance, half-way houses, pre-trial detention, with 95 cents of every dollar going into pure custody (iron bars and stone walls). We keep 10s of thousands of kids out of school that way. For many it is their last chance to get back into school. And what chance will they have to live a life free of crime without an education today? We know that 90% of these kids are drop-outs. If society had no other intention than its mere safety—no compassion, no concern for anybody, just safety—it would get them back in school. We brutalize in penitentiaries. We arrest without formal charge by a grand jury and we imprison without the benefit of legal counsel. Our prisons are manufacturing crimes. Jails are not the answer. To the offender we must give health, physical and mental, education, a chance to make a living, community stability. We must regard the offender as a human being. If we want him to have respect for the law, the law must be respectable. And therefore the law must not act immorally. When you say you presume they're innocent and you believe in the integrity of the individual and in his dignity until a jury of his peers finds him guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, you can't just throw people in jail without a trial. You cannot just create violent acts—like smashing in doors realizing that violence is behind those doors—and hope to have the respect of the people and not create more violence. You cannot create human dignity by wiretapping and electronic surveillance, hoping somehow or other to catch by mysterious speed of sound those words people utter concerning anti-social conduct. Injustice creates anger.

Clark, who is from the South, pointed out that the relationship between racism and anti-social conduct in America is just enormous. It is no coincidence Clark said, that the murder rate in the South is twice the murder rate in the nation.

In conclusion, Clark emphasized that what America must have to solve the problems of anti-social conduct is a passion for justice.

MESSAGE FOR DECEMBER 13 COMMUNITY CONFERENCE OPENING SESSION

It is a pleasure to send greetings to the opening session of the Fifth Annual Community Conference at New York University. Indeed, the theme of your conference is timely. The allegedly direct approach to crime as contained in the Organized Crime Control

Act of 1970 does not address itself directly to the problem of crime in the streets which represents the greatest danger to our society today. If we are drastically to reduce crime, the first reform that needs to be carried out is the elimination from the category of crimes, of certain common offenses which take a great deal of police time, clog the courts, and divert needed resources from the effort to combat serious crime. One area where this should be done immediately is in the area of drug abuse to which I note, you will devote extensive time in your conference. It has become evident that trying to deter drug-related crime solely by use of the criminal law, has not been effective. We must be prepared to use new approaches, if we are to effectively solve the problem.

Since drug-related crime has been estimated to be responsible for about 50 percent of the serious crime in big cities as New York, it will result in vast savings of money and human misery if we can reduce these crimes. My best wishes for successful deliberations. I would greatly appreciate you sending me transcripts of speeches and deliberations for my perusal.

With best wishes,

JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate.

PANEL IA: PROTECTION AND CORRECTION—THE POLICE

Chairman: Congressman James Scheuer.
Cochairman: Assemblyman Alexander Chananau.

Panelists: Chief Inspector Sydney Cooper, Dr. Morton Bard, and Mr. Alfred Vickers.
Reporter: Mrs. Ruth K. Nezin.

Congressman SCHEUER. It is important for the people to know about the police because we must know what we expect from them and what we expect them to be. We give them an impossible job—expect them to be social service workers, nurses, gynecologists, an ASPCA extension force, labor arbitrators—be able to do everything from taking care of a harmless, rambunctious drunk to cornering a heavily armed, dangerous and perhaps psychotic individual. The range of demands is extraordinary and the variety of skills we expect make the policeman's job requirements almost superhuman. If we are really concerned with violent crime in our neighborhoods and want the police to keep the peace and prevent violence, then we must lift off the statute books those laws which many feel society doesn't really want but they have to enforce—the whole range of non-violent crimes (prostitution, gambling, homosexuality, voluntary relations between consenting adults which do not result in violence or other criminal activity). Do we want the police to be traffic fighting or crime fighting police? The waste of manpower and time involved in having policemen deal with traffic offenses could be avoided by giving the job to paraprofessionals; as a matter of fact every time the police give a parking or other traffic violation ticket they erode the relationship between the citizen and the police. In addition to traffic and morals police we call upon them to be political police—to invade college campuses and take an active role in violent student demonstrations. "I wonder if it wouldn't be a good idea to get police totally out of political activities as well as traffic and moral offenses. Present laws define the police role in ways that are wasteful and put the police in a very difficult situation with large groups of the population. I hope there will be some clarification as to the kinds of roles citizens want the police to play." All of us know the police are highly skilled professionals; the average officer has training and background far in excess of what his counterpart had ten years ago. I believe New York's finest really are the finest. I have had a great deal of contact with them and have found the majority to be professional, with pride in their work and re-

sponsibility and who are doing their best to fulfill our hopes and expectations. He then introduced Chief Cooper, outlining his background of education and experience.

Chief COOPER, states he sees the concern for safe streets not only in the Bronx but throughout the city and the country as a whole. Congressman Bingham has met with him on many occasions in the past. While we have not increased the number of prisons we are making prisoners of ourselves—there are gates on commercial areas; locks and chains on doors; gates and bars on windows; burglar alarms. "We may not be placing more criminals behind bars but we are placing ourselves behind bars to protect ourselves, so that in effect we are the prisoners." The police are attempting to correct this. There has been vast increase in the number of uniformed patrolmen; radio cars; better communication through walkie-talkies and 911 (he quoted statistics; I have some figures if needed)—in an attempt to stem this feeling of fear and the growth of crime—it is going up. Police have only an index of crimes reported. Are finding that people are becoming so used to living with crime they feel there's no longer any need or use in reporting it to the police—"What can they do?" Cooper has made a study of conditions in the Bronx (has been assigned here since 1968). Recent population statistics show that since 1950 there are 3,000 more people residing in the Bronx and since 1952 we have doubled the police force. You measure the effectiveness of the police force by the amount of crime in the street; by safety first, to prevent or detect those responsible, arrest them and bring them before the bar of justice. If they were to measure the number of arrests made the police have been eminently successful; but if you measure success by the amount of crime and fear, the police haven't been successful. In the past two years the number of arrests have doubled in robberies and felonies. Police even undertook a program thinking that by arrests alone they could eliminate the drug problem in the Bronx. In 1968 robbery arrests were 1,400; in the first ten months of 1970 there were 2,300; in 1968 burglaries were 1,700 for a twelve month period and in the first ten months of 1970 there have been 3,500; narcotic felonies in 1968 were 100; this year almost 5,000; narcotics misdemeanors, in 1968 totalled 1,468; this year 5,000.

We are tying up more and more personnel in attempting to curb drug traffic and Cooper said he can see no diminution of drug traffic in the streets. If the police were to double the number of men no more would be accomplished. Beginning to become aware that arrests may not be the entire answer and the role of the police in identifying the criminal, apprehending him and bringing him before the court is merely pouring this into a basket without a bottom because 68% of narcotics arrests are being dismissed in the courts—not because they are poor arrests but because the courts, the D.A. and the correctional facilities cannot handle them. They find concentrating against addicts does not reduce other crimes. In re "pot"—the police are practical. With limited numbers of men to perform certain duties, of drug arrests in the Bronx only 4% involved marijuana; 92% involved heroin. "We can't be bothered with the 'pot' people except if we come across them either in connection with another crime or a very specific complaint by a member of the community." They have reduced the number of men assigned in plainclothes to enforce gambling laws and placed them to enforce narcotics laws or hard crime detection. With concurrence of the District Attorney have taken a chance and stopped enforcing the Sabbath law in the Bronx. Agrees with Congressman Scheuer on traffic enforcement but on the way up the panel room two Assemblymen and one Councilman complained about cars which were dou-

ble and triple parked. In 1952 served 47,000 white summons; in the first 9 months of 1970, 142,000. Not counting meter maids, in 1952 served 61,000 parking violations; the first nine months of this year there were 312,000. The public demands it. Program is in effect to turn this function over to para-professionals. Despite increased authority of meter maids demands are being made on police personnel because they are there 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and at the other end of 911. If we were to put enough police on the streets to bring back a climate of safety the city would go bankrupt. The police professionals are looking to pull police out of all areas where they believe police functions are not involved or which occupy low priority, and place them where they count. "This is our prime function and this is, at least, what we are attempting."

Congressman SCHEUER agreed with Chief Cooper that the drug problem is beyond the role of law enforcement. Estimated that from 5-10% of the drugs coming into the Port of New York are picked up and that if there were all the agents that could be used for this purpose they might pick up about 20%. Control of narcotics must be attacked in Turkey, Afghanistan, Laos, Thailand, Mexico, etc. He spoke about the need for the medical profession to develop a blocking drug that is long lasting to replace cocaine and opium. Once this was developed we could say no more opium and cocaine production because it is killing our kids all over the world. U.N. is trying to develop a treaty which will control substances like amphetamines, sleeping pills, barbiturates, etc. These problems are totally beyond the capacity of our police to solve.

Dr. BARD. States he came because he thought it would be useful to exchange views with someone from the academic community but who has contact with real people. Believes we have failed to provide police officer with the kind of strategies and skills he needs to do his job. He read a statement concerning lawlessness and crime in New York which came from an editorial in the New York Times of September 6, 1968—states he has a whole collection of this type which sounded like it might have been written today. While we would not think of subjecting ourselves to the administrations of a doctor with medical practices of 1868, we do not have similar expectations about updating the police yet they are similar to physicians in that doctors have authority with the power of life and death over situations involving physical disorder, the police have such authority in situations involving social disorder. In this country physicians are trained on the average of 11½ thousand hours while we provide police officers with fewer than 200 hours of training. A highly complex knowledge is required which will not be resolved by increasing patrol cars, number of communications equipment, computers, hardware. Highly complex interpersonal skills are more necessary. Unless it gets the trust and active cooperation by citizens of the community no Police Department can control crime, and the reason that communities do not trust the police is that the organization is not structured to deal with present realities. The Police Department is still operating structurally along lines similar to those of 1868 and that widens the gap. People do not report crimes because they do not expect anything to happen. We have to be less concerned with the selection and training of police but more about the structure of the organization in which police function; to perform services in relation to the real world; i.e. how it is and not as once was.

Congressman SCHEUER. There has been a spectacular increase in reported crimes although many crimes go unreported, ½ of armed attacks, ¼ of felonies and 10% of

rapes go unreported. In Black and Puerto Rican communities there are more people today who think that when they report to the police something will happen. There are intelligent, law-enforcement professionals who feel reported crime is going up because police are doing their job. Five years ago a black would not report his apartment was broken into because he felt nothing would happen and he did not want to be bullied and harassed as indeed he was. Today the fact is he will report such crime—there is an improved conception on his part of the fairness with which he will be treated and the increased possibility that something will happen.

Mr. VICKERS. Took exception to what Congressman Scheuer said—while there may be an increase in Blacks and Puerto Ricans who report a multiple series of robberies, they do not report the first ones. "If we, as people, will begin to look at ourselves, including the police, as human beings, then we will begin to do something about crime, drugs, education, housing, etc. We must change our attitudes as to how we relate to society, then we can look towards the police to protect that attitude. The police are representative of a structure of government because they are representative of enforcing the law. Therefore they have to observe the law. There is something basically wrong with our society when individuals must steal in order to live, and there is something basically wrong when enforcers of our society claim they do not make enough money and have to steal in order to live. You find police officers who have willingly and with intent sold drugs to individuals to keep them from being a witness against other police officers involved in drug traffic in NYC. Just as in a racial group, what a few individuals do affects the entire race, so the actions of a few policemen will be a reflection on the entire police force. The attitude of Blacks and Puerto Ricans to the police will not change until the behavior and actions of the police force change."

Question. Dr. Bard, it was mentioned earlier that you are involved in crisis intervention. Can you tell me something specifically about it in terms of what it seeks to accomplish, something about its successes, something about whatever its failures may be, future goals. . . .

Answer. The work I began in 1967 is still going on with NYC Police Department and currently with Housing Authority Police Department. It had to do originally with training police for specialized functions and intervening in family crises. I am currently training them to manage human conflict in general. About 80% of the murders in NYC involve people who are related to each other or known to each other. This is also true for assaults and major categories of crime against the person. The program as created at CCNY—dealt with the 30th Precinct; 18 police officers were trained to serve as general patrolmen, serving 90,000 people, for 2 years; to respond to all family crises in that area. They were highly skilled in the process of third party intervention—people want a supportive authority who can resolve their conflict with arbitration and impartiality and take the problem away. When arrests are affected in such circumstances charges are usually dropped before the case gets to court. They also served as primary case advisers and made referrals to other agencies. The Report, called "Final Report on Training Police as Family Intervention Specialists" is available to U.S. Printing Office. It involved a different concept of relating police services to crime; in this case as a crime prevention and preventive mental health service. The officers in this unit had a better over-all average in all police functions, because of a sense of pride and professional accomplishment and morale. The community was provided with the continuity of services which it wanted. The community "buys" relevant services from the police and are provided with sen-

sitive, professional care and the police are better officers for doing so—and the sooner the police recognize the need to reorganize their structure and provide such services the better for everyone. In their experiment there wasn't a single injury although the probability of injury was very high. From a purely administrative point of view it makes sense to give skills to the police to keep them functioning and have relationships with the community improved. Good community relations flow from fulfilling the hopeful expectations of the citizenry.

(Congressman Scheuer excused himself and left; the chair was taken over by Assemblyman Chananau.)

Question by Mr. Chananau: What happened to your project? Why was it not extended or is this a good example of projects completed and filed away?

Answer. When the results of the project were made known the Police Department was vitally interested in extending it. There are 79 police precincts in NYC and it will take a long time to reproduce that model with the same kind of training and structure but the current Police Commissioner was the man who originally gave the grant from the Justice Department for that project and he has a very vital interest in it. Units are springing up in Police Departments all over the country. There are courses devoted to family crisis in the Police Academy where there never were before, and starting January 1st of this year a method was introduced for collecting statistics on family fights citywide by all commands.

Question. Chief Cooper—take the statement Dr. Bard made—the trust of the community is not here any longer for the police. Why can't the Police Department come back to the old-fashioned idea of the cop on the beat? Children and older people can feel more confident when there is a man they know by name and face doing the job.

Answer. We do have permanent sectors and permanent assignments to the sector. We do not rotate men within the precincts. What you are referring to is that you don't see these men. We now have a system of automatic control and response to radio calls are computerized to provide instantaneous response to calls for police services. You may live in Sector A of the 44th Precinct and if there is a call for police services in another part of the 44th and the sector car there is not available, the computer will send the car there from Sector A. We would love to have a cop on post and I would say about 10% of my time is meeting with community groups and telling them we can't have a foot patrolman on every post. We take the complainants for a walk and show them the comparative distance they can cover on foot as opposed to a car. Every block would like to have its own patrolman and we would like to give it to you but can we afford it—we would have to have a police force of 200,000 and the City couldn't afford it. We are trying to give better service through better communication, walkie-talkies or radio for instantaneous dispatch. Calls for police services have been going up an average 10-15% every year. There were more radio runs this year in 9 months than in 12 months last year. The public demands it and has a right to expect it. With a given number of men this is the only practical and equitable way of doing this.

Question. Chief Cooper, would you say that better than 50% of the police eat free lunch and would you comment either way?

Answer. I don't agree with your comment. In the course of being in a higher command I receive an average of 200 letters a week directed to me through various agencies or from the community and complaints of this sort are few and far between. There has been some public comment about police going into bodegas and groceries in Spanish communities and ghetto areas to enforce Sabbath

laws. This has been pointed out as a corruption hazard. We have stopped enforcing this law so far as bodegas, groceries, restaurants, delicatessens, because it is a low priority.

Question. Mr. Vickers—I look at Chief Cooper and visualize him as a man who lies awake nights to try to solve problems. Where do you grasp a problem that is like a spiral that keeps moving around? I take it you are deep into the Black and Puerto Rican community. In your wildest dreams what would you want this man to do as far as starting a program to better community relations—to make the public feel from the guts that the police are with them. What would you suggest; what is on your mind?

Answer. I would be interested in seeing first of all not only Black and Puerto Rican people receiving this community or whatever you may call it relevance but every citizen in NYC and in the U.S. What I would look for is a basic change in human relations, so that the individual police officer can be interested not in the number of tickets he has to get out each month, the number of people he can catch and put in jail, but in justice and law and order; interested in seeing that he has the strength and personal ability to show each resident that he is personally interested not necessarily in the community but in people, because I am a person and what I protect protects you and what you are interested in protecting protects me because I am not a policeman 24 hours a day. I would also be interested in seeing that the idea we have increased the number of arrests in one borough—the number of people on our staff—I would like to see that kind of thing thrown out because it only fools people because the inspector mentioned that the number of people in the Bronx has increased by 3,000 in 20 years and the police force has doubled; that means we will have to do the same kind of thing all over again—building one army against another army. On a realistic basis it may mean that army can go against crime. On a human basis of dealing with the problem I think there is something else we can do. It takes a strong, in touch with the feeling individual to look at what is behind the problem, not to push it under the rug. I am not saying the police are responsible for that but I am saying we as a people are putting it under the rug. My comments are not to smack the police down; it is to smack the people down.

Question. Dr. Bard, what is your prescription to help the police improve human relations?

Answer. This is impossible to answer simply. For one thing, we as individuals must involve ourselves. We can't look to the police alone to control crime and improve relations with the community. You have to insist that certain new structural forms occur for the interaction and you have to participate in the process of crime control. In Syracuse a survey showed a preventive patrol would have to pass a possible target of burglaries every six minutes in order to prevent burglaries. That is impossible. How do we develop new strategies, those of the present, not of the past, to effect this? As human relations is one of these strategies it must be built into the structure of the Department. At the present it is not.

Question. There's so much trouble in the schools—if someone could communicate with young children—those playing hockey in the junior high schools—maybe if you can get to the younger kids you wouldn't be having them in court.

Answer by Chief Cooper: We attempt to give some service to the compulsory education law like many other laws on the books. But put yourself in the police spot. There are only 35-40 patrolmen to put out on the street at any one tour. Would you suggest taking any of them and put them after juveniles where there are other agencies who can handle it? While we would like to en-

force all laws and address ourselves to juveniles too, we do not have the police force to do that.

Question. I am very much concerned about whether there is a quota system of arrests. Must an officer have a certain number of arrests either as his duty or for promotion purposes?

Answer by Chief Cooper: Absolutely not. My answer is that if there are criminals out there and police out there to prevent crime or make arrests then every crime in which we don't locate the criminal is a failure or weakness on our part. Unfortunately we don't make enough arrests. There is no quota.

Question. What has not been mentioned is community control. What do you think of the decentralized police force since we have been talking about community involvement. One of the very important issues of the day is community control—the community having something to say at a police board that sits in a community. The first step in human relationship should be community control.

Answer by Professor Bard: Ramsey Clark referred to a practice being initiated about the first of the year called the "Beat Commander Program" which drops the level of accountability from the precinct captain down to the sergeant within a smaller district so that community participation is something that might be aided by an intimate relationship between a lower level accountable supervisor and them. All these things evolve slowly. This is a great step forward.

PANEL IB: PROTECTION AND CORRECTION—COURTS AND CORRECTION

Chairman: Assemblyman Seymour Posner.
Panelists: District Attorney Burton Roberts, Bronx County; Justice Edward Dudley, Administrative Judge, N.Y.C. Criminal Court; and Mr. Henry Ruth, Director, Mayor's Criminal Justice Coordinating Council.

Reporter: Mrs. Sharon Doyle Spring.

Honorable Seymour Posner introduced the panelists, and made the following opening comments: This panel on "Courts and Correction" will be discussing the end of the line: the long process which started with education and environment, continued with arrest and sentencing and now ends with jail. Of the ten people in New York City who end in jail, nine will go on to commit another crime.

The following is a summary of Mr. Roberts' remarks:

The situation confronting the courts and correctional facilities is very serious: during the last two years there has been a 70% increase in felony arrests and a 50% increase in the number of misdemeanor arrests in Bronx County. Court personnel and ancillary personnel are needed to cope with this terrific increase, as are additional correctional and detention facilities which have failed to be increased in proportion to the increase in police personnel.

The problem is money.

Detention facilities for Bronx County have a capacity of 476 but they presently have a population of 1,059—120% over capacity—and this is just the beginning of the problem.

In 1969 there were 36,392 criminal cases; in the first nine months of 1970 there have already been 34,021. Indictments are up from 1400 in 1958 to 4500 for the year 1970.

Despite this increase in volume, the three trial parts which we had in 1960 have only been increased to ten, and even with this increase, there aren't enough ancillary personnel—probation personnel and others who are needed to stop recidivism by providing the after-care during the parole period. There is not adequate supervision of these people in the city. There is a 90% recidivism rate in the city. Supervision and direction are needed.

For years there has been a bill introduced in the State legislature which would authorize construction of half-way houses which correction experts insist are necessary to give direction to one leaving prison. A person ready for parole needs supervision. A person not ready for parole needs something like the half-way house concept which consists of trained personnel such as psychiatrists to help the individual.

All district attorneys are in favor of this bill—and the appropriation for these facilities are always chopped up at the final budget trimming in the State legislature. There must be a reordering of priorities. We can't solve these problems without money. Buildings and personnel are both needed. We must get the legislature and executive branches thinking that citizens are concerned about those in prison—are concerned about recidivism and the crime it represents.

Remember, 85% of the victims of crime come from the poor areas of the city; this on top of the burdens which they already have to bear.

New schools, new housing are necessary, but in the medium range of the fight against crime, we have to reduce the congestion in the courts; the inhuman conditions in the prisons; and to not merely control, but rehabilitate prisoners to a useful life for society's sake as well as their own.

The following is a summary of Judge Dudley's remarks:

In the field of courts and correction, we need all of the energy and expertise we can get—things are getting worse and will get still worse during the next ten to fifteen years unless we turn it around.

The police department is our first line of defense against crime, and its concern should be for the security of the citizen's person and property: not with those 'crimes' which hurt the person committing them such as drinking, prostitution and gambling. We are presently moving in the direction of removing these things from the category of crime. The real problem is what do we do about the assaults, the burglaries? What do we do about the climate of individual homes where the majority of murders occur?

In New York City, crime has been increasing rapidly during the past four years. In 1967, there were 165,000 arrests (including felonies, misdemeanors and violations); in 1968, 181,000; in 1969, 220,000; and now, in 1970, it is projected that there will be 250,000—and this is only half the story. Good as the police are, they don't arrest everyone; there are hundreds of minor crimes where only summonses are issued. All of this gives you an idea of the numbers involved. The question is how do we cope with it.

First, a word about the structure of the courts in New York City. The Criminal Court handles the majority of criminal cases, everything except the felonies which are always tried in Supreme Court, and then only after the individual has been indicted. The criminal court has 1300 employees; 98 judges and ten court houses, and the worst series of its court houses are in Bronx county. The 98 judges are divided between the five boroughs and they must attempt to deal with the tremendous volume of the arrest cases... the police complaint that the arrested person is back on the street before the policeman returns to his post is frequently true.

If you talk to a shopkeeper whose goods have been stolen, he wants the criminal (or suspect) to stay in jail forever.

Other groups will say that is impossible, but the fact is that there were 14,000 in jail last year; some of them awaiting trial.

Until the people of the community are as concerned about social justice as their personal safety these problems will be with us. We're in for very rough times unless we turn it around. We need people first, then

buildings. We haven't had a court house built since 1924.

Mr. POSNER. In order to deal with the immediate problems of crime we're going to have to spend more taxpayer's money—must deal with the root causes, but there is the immediate problem of getting judges, courtrooms, jails, probation officers, and all of these things require taxpayer's dollars.

The following is a summary of Mr. Ruth's remarks:

We ought to look at the resources. 850-million dollars are in the budget for the general heading of "criminal justice" broken down as follows: 80% for police functions; 3/10th of 1% on rehabilitation; under 6% for courts and district attorneys. With this set of priorities, you can't really expect anyone to be better when they get out of jail. Plea bargaining has to be expected even on serious offenses.

Looking at New York City crime, the overwhelming problem is addiction. In 1966 New York State began its "war on narcotics" thought at the time to be the answer to the rising crime rate. Now we know that at this time there is no answer to the problem of narcotics addiction—but we haven't put sufficient resources to work to try to discover one. Most of the prisoners in the city prisons are narcotic addicts who just go through the process, having the charges reduced through plea bargaining, and go back on the streets and back to crime. Over half the people being held in detention facilities are addicts.

In the courts, lawyers aren't good administrators, and in the whole system of criminal justice there has been no attempt to bring in administrators who might try to cope with the situation. Lawyers are "clubby"—judges will grant continuances in order to give the attorney time to collect his fee.

As a society, we haven't decided what the full range of fairness is. The best way to approach fairness is in the proceeding which involves pre-trial hearings and motions. With a different concept of fairness, we could push cases through very fast. Even in England illegally seized evidence is admitted, and there is pre-trial detention. We're far ahead of them in approaching fairness. 90% of the cases in our courts, however, end up with some sort of plea bargaining, and this happens invisibly and is a symptom of our uncertainty in dealing with these problems.

The fundamental question is not just where do we get the money, but how ought the money be spent.

Mr. POSNER. I talk to police—they say "What's the point of arresting someone if they never get convicted?" How do we answer this?

Mr. ROBERTS. Something does happen. It's his function to make an arrest—it's a lot of other people's function from there on. Of 45,000 cases, 15,000 are felonies. Of these 15,000 about 9,000 or 10,000 are reduced to misdemeanors or sentenced to narcotic centers—remember, 60% are addicts.

The purpose isn't to punish, it's to deter and prevent.

Some people erroneously think that 'tis the severity of sentence that deters crime; I believe that it is the *certainly* of justice within a short period of time that is required. Plea bargaining is the only means of disposing of the large number of cases in the courts at this time. New York County has 7,000 indictments, and 98% of those going into the Supreme Court are disposed of by plea. If they weren't, there would be a complete breakdown.

In Bronx County, 95% of the cases are disposed of by plea. If we didn't do this, we would need court houses as large as the Triborough Bridge and half the Bronx for the facilities to cope with it.

Mr. Ruth's Council may have ideas to im-

prove the system—he mentioned the narcotics problem and it is the root cause of all crime in urban areas. 60% of the individuals committing crimes in Bronx county are narcotic addicts. The frequency of their crime is directly related to their need to supply a habit which cost \$15-\$50/day. The addict has to burgle, steal, rob and "push" in order to raise this money. We have to recognize him as a sick and unstable person. Of those who are narcotics addicts, 37% who obtain pre-trial release "skip" according to the Vera Institute of Justice figures. There are 8,900 parole and bail jumps in the Bronx, and 790 in the Supreme Court who have jumped. No one in parole believes in preventive detention—and I hope no one in this room does. When you talk about this, you're talking about the kind of system that they have in totalitarian societies.

A society's greatness is judged by the rights which it gives to the individual—but in doing so, you have to dig into your pockets and pay for it.

Our basic belief is in the presumption of innocence, and all of those involved in the area of criminal justice believe in it. But when you deal with an addict, you must recognize that he is sick with what must be recognized as a communicable disease—he is going to go out and commit crimes and infect others. Recognizing this, and the necessity of unclogging court calendars, you must reduce the crime and treat the person for what he is—sick.

I would urge you not to put labels on ideas which evolve to cope with the problems—don't call them "liberal" or "conservative." See instead if they are practical and workable given the problem.

I suggest that this is an answer to the problem: if the arresting officer states in his report that there are indications that the arrested person is an addict, and states his reasonable grounds for this belief, and the court is convinced that there are such reasonable grounds for this belief, he should be taken to a narcotics facility and tested there to determine whether he is or is not an addict (not because he is guilty of the crime with which he is charged). In any event, he should be back in court within 48 hours. If the doctor at the narcotics facility has found that he is an addict, the court then has to ask the defendant if he wishes to confirm or contradict the report. If he confirms it, and because of youth or the nature of the crime charged, or because there would be sufficient control within the program, the district attorney may move to dismiss the criminal charge and have the defendant sign a commitment to a narcotic addiction facility—and these are what you have to build—where the individual would be committed for 26 months—6 months in the facility itself, and the remaining 30 receiving after-care following discharge. The individual would have no criminal record, and would still be eligible for a civil service or other job.

If the individual decides to have his case tried, he would have to be tried within sixty days or be eligible for bail. An individual whose reported addiction is controverted, would also have to receive a trial within sixty days or be eligible for bail. This system would enable the district attorneys to attend to the more serious crimes and let the addicts get the help they need for their sickness. Remember, it is not the severity of the penalty which serves justice, but the certainty and rapidity.

Question (for Mr. Roberts): Your office recently issued guidelines on teacher searches of school children, in which it is stated that personal searches should be made by school personnel. If teachers, not trained to identify drug problems, have the power to conduct searches, won't this be used to harass children?

Mr. ROBERTS. The operative word in those guidelines is "no indiscriminate searches."

Question. It is a violation of the student's Constitutional rights.

Mr. ROBERTS. These guidelines were prepared by my office at the request of local school boards who wished to know what the law was on the subject of such searches.

Overton v. State of New York authorizes school personnel to search areas of the school. Narcotics are all over our schools—both senior and junior schools—with between 200 to 400 addicts in the senior high schools. Remember that these schools have students up to 21 years of age, infecting kids aged 14. It is necessary to protect not just the addict population, but the rest of the children in a school.

The Fourth Amendment to the Constitution prohibits unreasonable searches and seizures by the police—this doesn't apply to teachers or others. These teachers are acting *in loco parentis*—in the place of the parents who are worried about their children. If the police made the searches, their (the searched children's) rights would be violated if they were not done on "probable cause."

Probable cause: we discourage any searches, done by anyone, unless there is probable cause—in other words, if the teacher sees an individual with narcotics or needles and syringe, under the Code of Criminal Procedure, that individual has the right, as does any citizen, to make an arrest because a crime has been committed in his presence.

Reasonable suspicion: if the information which a student has supplied in the past has proved to have been reliable, that student's information would give a teacher probable cause to conduct a search.

Section II of the guidelines concerns the State Narcotics Law, and states that it is the preferred way of dealing with youngsters. Under the Mental Hygiene Law, on petition of a parent truly interested, not just one worried about their "Constitutional rights," a child can be committed for treatment.

A little more concern should be shown for the welfare of the non-addict children.

Judge DUDLEY. There is no violation of the Fourth Amendment unless the search is done by the police or state officer. The question is how far should teachers go. I would tell them to be extremely careful, but not to blind their eyes to it.

Question (for Judge Dudley): Why do courts make it so difficult for the victim who has been the object of a crime. I'm thinking of one case where the victim caught the mugger, appeared in court three times, was threatened with contempt if she failed to show up again, and finally dropped the charges.

Judge DUDLEY. Clogged calendars, the necessity of having the police officer present for trial, the defendant's attorney's delays which may attempt to wear out the complainant. It's the fault of the system where we try to get 300 persons before one judge in one day—there's got to be trouble in a situation like that.

Question. I'm a junior in a parochial high school and our lockers can be searched by the administration. I feel that it's a protection for me.

Judge DUDLEY. Don't take that notion too far; unreasonable searches should not be allowed by police.

Mr. ROBERTS. Such searches shouldn't be unreasonable. They shouldn't be done as a form of teacher harassment. In the guidelines, we gave the legal principles on when they would be authorized. The teacher is somewhat in the position of the parent, and the Fourth Amendment doesn't concern itself with private searches.

Question. I don't think much of your guidelines. They are a cop-out for the district attorney; police searches in police stations are claimed to be illegal in fully half

of the cases—teachers are far more vulnerable.

Mr. ROBERTS. The police department supplies undercover agents in the schools, and they are placed where they have been requested. These agents are very few in number, and their life in a school is limited because they are quite soon discovered as soon as arrests start being made. Police officers who violate the law in Bronx county are indicted. As to accusations that materials have been planted on them by the teachers, it becomes a question of credibility. What possible motive could the teacher have to do this? I

personally advise against the arrest of a kid who is found in possession of narcotics. I suggest that they be treated under the Narcotics Control Act, that the parents be called in, a physical exam of the child made, and the parents petition for facility treatment of the child. As district attorney, I would file the petition if the physical exam showed addiction.

Question. What can an individual do in an active role in problems of criminal justice?

Mr. RUTH. Lack of resources in addict treatment; lack of balance of resources in the budget. Pressure is on a mayor to add

more policemen—and this pressure comes from the public—each policeman costs \$15,000/year. The average cost of treating an addict for one year is \$2,000. The public has to ask for it.

We presently have a punitive system. If the Bronx Zoo kept its animals like we keep our criminals there would be a public outcry. There have to be jobs for ex-convicts; they can't vote, they can't be bonded. We need a system that can do more than rehabilitate. Most of these people need to become, for the first time in their lives, real members of society.

SENATE—Wednesday, March 3, 1971

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 17, 1971)

The Senate met at 11 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, to whom "a thousand years are but as yesterday when it is past, and as a watch in the night," watch over us moment by moment. Be Thou to us our strength and guide in things both great and small, in affairs of state and in our private lives. Deliver us from the little sins and petty concerns which lay waste to life. Give us grace to separate the big from the little, the important from the unimportant things, and to give our energies to enduring values. Help us to work as children of the light, as free men created for service in Thy kingdom. Clarify our vision so as to keep our eyes upon far horizons and distant goals while we work at common tasks. Impart Thy strength that we may ever love Thee with our whole heart and soul and mind, and our neighbor as ourselves. When the evening comes, give us the satisfaction of having been good workmen, the peace and rest of those whose minds are stayed on Thee.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 2, 1971, be approved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEATH OF A FRIEND—CHARLES W. ENGELHARD, JR., OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, inevitably, the death of a friend is a matter of personal sorrow. When it is the untimely passing of an intimate and trusted

friend of a quarter of a century and an outstanding American, it is a most grievous loss. Charles W. Engelhard, Jr., of New Jersey was such a friend and such an American. He died suddenly yesterday at the age of 54. I note his death with sorrow to the Senate.

As a business-statesman, Charles W. Engelhard, Jr., was in the vanguard of the enormous development of the international trade of the Nation since the end of World War II. He dealt in bulk minerals and basic commodities and led enormous and complex mining enterprises with ramifications in a half-hundred countries.

Those who knew Charles W. Engelhard, as I did, will attest to his personal detestation of bigotry as, for example, when he stated:

We all must begin to realize the dignity of man as a basic concept.

He was one of the pillars of Boystown, N.J., and contributed to the care and upbringing of the youngsters there. The Engelhardts visited them and they looked forward to their visits to the Engelhard home.

We all recognized and appreciated his interest in the furtherance of social welfare, education, and many other public interests. We were all aware of the fact that he was a confidant who served President Kennedy and President Johnson with dedication, dignity, and loyalty. For President Nixon he had the greatest respect.

To his wife, Jane Engelhard, and his five daughters, his mother, and the other members of his family and household, Mrs. Mansfield and our daughter, Anne, join me in extending our deepest sympathy in this time of great sorrow. May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I asked the Senator from Montana to yield so that I might associate myself with the beautiful tribute he has just paid to a fine and wonderful gentleman, a gentleman whose friendship I was privileged to share.

I want to express my deep and profound sympathy to Mrs. Engelhard, and my thanks to both the Engelhardts for their generosity, their kindness, and their goodness throughout the years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Presiding Officer (Mr. GAMBRELL) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations received today, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the next 45 minutes will be used by the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY).

The Senator from Minnesota is now recognized.

TRIBUTE TO THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS' NATIONAL ORGANIZATION ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the next 45 minutes are to be divided between the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) and myself?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct—for a colloquy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, 1971 is the 50th anniversary of the founding of a great organization, a fine, patriotic organization known as the Disabled American Veterans. We refer to it as the DAV.

This is their day on Capitol Hill.

It is our inadequate tribute to the sacrifices for freedom which they have made for us.

I am delighted, with the distinguished Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), to be able to lead in the Senate's tribute to this marvelous and truly dedicated, service-oriented organization and its membership.

I am particularly pleased to pay tribute to the membership in the State of Minnesota. I know of no organization that does more to be of help to the veteran, and particularly the disabled