

H.R. 7074. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7075. A bill to amend section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7076. A bill to establish an Environmental Financing Authority to assist in the financing of waste treatment facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 7077. A bill to amend the Horse Protection Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-540); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FISH:

H.J. Res. 527. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the President to proclaim September 12 to 19, 1971 to be "American Field Service Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 528. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the calendar week beginning on May 30, 1971, and ending on June 5, 1971, as "National Peace Corps Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.J. Res. 529. Joint resolution to place the question of approval of dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) for human use as a prescription drug before the National Academy of Sciences; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.J. Res. 530. Joint resolution declaring it the sense of Congress that all American servicemen be withdrawn from Indochina at the earliest practicable date; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BARING, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. DULSKI, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FORTSYTHE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GARMATZ, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MCCLURE, and Mr. MATSUNAGA):

H. Con. Res. 247. Concurrent resolution proposing unconditional large-scale repatriation of enemy prisoners of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MAYNE, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. MYERS, Mr. POFF, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THONE, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WINN, Mr. WYATT, and Mr. WYDLER):

H. Con. Res. 248. Concurrent resolution proposing unconditional large-scale repatriation of enemy prisoners of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. NIX, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. LLOYD, and Mr. HALPERN):

H. Con. Res. 249. Concurrent resolution proposing unconditional large-scale repatriation of enemy prisoners of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H. Con. Res. 250. Concurrent resolution urging that Lt. William Calley be invited to address a joint session of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H. Res. 357. Resolution creating a select committee of the House to conduct a full and complete investigation of all aspects of the energy resources of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

98. By the SPEAKER. Memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the mistreatment of American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

99. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to a payment in lieu of taxes to the State of Idaho and its local units of government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

100. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to the manner in which the Census Bureau records college students; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 7078. A bill for the relief of Herman James Young and Mrs. Norma Brenda Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY (by request):

H.R. 7079. A bill for the relief of Sergio Farina, Maria Farina, Sergio Giovanni Farina, Gino A. Farina, Maria L. Farina, and Bianca Farina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 7080. A bill for the relief of Trinidad Trevino-Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRASSO:

H.R. 7081. A bill for the relief of Jadwiga Sobon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 7082. A bill for the relief of Pietro Ratta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 7083. A bill for the relief of Beatrice Dascal Aquino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 7084. A bill for the relief of Evelyn and Francesco Mujemulta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 7085. A bill for the relief of Eugene M. Sims, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 7086. A bill for the relief of Lyuba Bershadskaja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 358. Resolution to authorize the pardon of Lieutenant Calley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

55. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Leoncio Monell, Culebra, P.R., et al., relative to the establishment of a committee of "Citizen-Sons of Culebra," which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### MORE DOUBTS ABOUT F-14 AND F-15 DEVELOPMENT

#### HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in December 1970, I noted the bad news that the F-14 had crashed on only its second test flight. Yesterday's Washington Post reports growing doubt about the F-14 and F-15 stemming from the crash and other factors. The Post report, by Michael Getler, is further evidence for the need to bring the F-14 and F-15 programs under the "fly before you buy" policy that has been endorsed for future systems by the House Appropriations Committee and the Department of Defense.

The Post article, "Twin' Navy, Air Force Planes Questioned," follows:

"TWIN" NAVY, AF PLANES QUESTIONED

(By Michael Getler)

A confidential study by aeronautical experts is raising doubts in Congress about Pentagon plans to spend some \$15 billion over the next several years to mass-produce two separate fighter planes whose fighting qualities are judged to be roughly the same.

The investigators, according to well informed sources, found little difference in performance between the Navy's carrier-based F-14 and the Air Force's F-15.

Each service wants to buy roughly 700 planes, with the F-15 costing just below \$10 million each and the F-14 with a Navy-estimated price of \$11.5 million each. That is about three to four times as expensive, respectively, as the current F-14 Phantom, which both services now use and which the new planes are meant to replace.

The study also reportedly points out that the United States may in fact be gambling with its air superiority over the Soviet

Union's fighters by putting all its money into two admittedly good—but expensive and roughly similar—aircraft.

The argument is that because of the high price, the military may not be able to buy as many planes as are really needed (the U.S. eventually bought more than 4,000 Phantoms) and may also be neglecting other types of fighters.

Capitol Hill sources say the study suggests it might be worth considering a shift of one of these projects to a cheaper, lighter-weight plane that could be bought in large quantities to help tackle the thousands of light, maneuverable Mig-21 class fighters already in Communist inventories and other similar fighters to follow.

The F-14 and F-15 are designed to counter the latest and most sophisticated Soviet fighters which are only now entering service.

Or, according to Hill sources, the investigators suggest that more attention might be given to a fighter even more advanced than the F-14 or F-15 that could take on Soviet air threats of the 1980s still on Kremlin drawing boards and unknown to U.S. intelligence.

The just-completed fighter study was ordered last fall by Rep. George H. Mahon (D-Tex.), who is chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.

Mahon's aides said the chairman then "was concerned over the apparent similarity between the two aircraft."

Capitol Hill sources say results of the study, which was undertaken by a four-man team headed by an aeronautical expert on loan from NASA, generally confirmed Mahon's suspicions.

#### NAVY'S F-14 FAVORED

The study was aimed at developing facts, rather than making recommendations. But congressional sources who have seen the document say that it favors the Navy F-14 if a choice had to be made between the two planes.

The reasoning is that the swing-wing F-14 can fly from aircraft carriers or airfields while the F-15 can only operate from land bases. Also test versions of the F-14 are already built, while the F-15 will not make its first flight until mid-1972 and would be less costly to stop.

However, it has been learned from administration and congressional sources that the Navy and the F-14's manufacturer, Grumman Aerospace Corp., have run into serious money problems on the plane and that a "significant" increase in the already agreed upon price is expected as well as a delay in the schedule.

Deputy Defense Secretary David Packard provided a public hint of this prospect in an unclassified version of his testimony before Congress on March 18.

Packard pointed out that the contract for the F-14, which crashed on its second test flight, was prepared before the Nixon administration took office.

Congressional staffers say that crash, in which three separate hydraulic control systems failed almost simultaneously, has eroded confidence in the F-14 among some influential lawmakers. The failures occurred in titanium hydraulic lines, a feature of the F-14 design which was specifically criticized in a report last summer by the defense committee of the 115-member bipartisan, Member of Congress for Peace Thru Law.

The F-14's problems, coupled with the Mahon study—copies of which were sent last week to Packard as well as Navy and Air Force officials—has set the stage for what could become the first tough test of their two top priority Pentagon programs in Congress.

On Capitol Hill, those who have seen the study regard it as the most professional challenge against the two aircraft.

But, within the services and especially the Air Force, the two fighters are viewed as having critical differences that would imperil American pilots forced into accepting the wrong plane.

Outside the Pentagon, some weapons experts say the Mahon study has hinted at the right course, namely one plane of the F-14/F-15 class rather than two, but is leaning in favor of the wrong airplane. These sources believe the F-15 is a much better all-around fighter.

#### WOULD INCREASE TOTAL

There is also a small group of Air Force officers and defense officials who privately favor the idea of perhaps buying fewer than 700 F-15s and putting some of the money instead into a plane costing and weighing about half as much. This would add to the total number of fighters that could be sent into an air battle.

Some defense officials say it still is not clear whether the edge in aerial combat belongs to the side with the best planes or the most planes.

Starting up a completely new small fighter project would add to the overall cost, but some officers believe the new international fighter—Northrop's F-5-21—already being

developed for the Military Assistance Program might fill the bill.

Efforts to get a light-weight fighter into the Air Force inventory of hotter and more sophisticated jets have been attempted unsuccessfully in the past.

Finally, hanging over this expensive and critical question is the ghost of the TFX, or F-111, perhaps the classic example of an attempt to force two services to buy one plane. It met with disaster for both the military and the taxpayer.

On all sides of the argument, there is general agreement that both the F-15 and F-14, assuming troubles are solved, will mark a big improvement over the F-4, which was designed in the early 1950s.

Both are twin-engine jets which will eventually use the same engine now in development for the F-15. The early model of the F-14 will use the engines developed for the F-111.

Both planes are big, but the Navy's swing-wing design and equipment needed for carrier landings will make it at least 12,000 pounds heavier than the Air Force plane. The F-15 is also estimated by the Pentagon to cost almost 20 per cent less than its Navy counterpart.

The differences in the planes are accounted for by differences in their respective missions.

While both are meant to shoot down enemy fighters, the Air Force plane is aimed primarily at winning the close-in dogfight battles with enemy fighters. Thus, Air Force officials argue, they cannot accept the reduced maneuverability which would be forced upon their pilots by having to use the heavier Navy plane.

Air Force officials are said to have already challenged the validity of the Mahon study group data, which reportedly suggests that both planes are about equally maneuverable.

By forcing a higher-priced plane on them, the Air Force also argues it will be able to buy even fewer planes than if it bought the F-15.

The Navy mission, on the other hand, involves both shooting down enemy bombers that might try and attack the fleet as long a distance from the fleet as possible, and accompanying Navy carrier-based strike planes on missions to ward off enemy interceptors.

This requires generally a bigger, longer-range airplanes than the Air Force says it needs.

Congressional sources admit that the chances of halting one or the other project are very slim. Nor are they yet convinced that it would be a very good idea to do so.

But, they say, the costs are so enormous and the military stakes with the Soviet Union are so great that another mistake would be disastrous.

#### DAV'S GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY YEAR

#### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in saluting the Disabled American Veterans in their golden anniversary year.

The Maryland Department of the Disabled American Veterans, commanded by Mr. Walter D. Hyle, Jr., has 30 chapters and 5,000 members. Six of these chapters, with more than 525 members, are located in my district—Harford County and the major portion of Baltimore County. In fact, Commander Hyle

and most of the other department officers live in my district—including first junior vice commander, Robert G. Wilson; third junior vice commander, John Braun; Chaplain Howard F. Doner; and the junior past department commander, John A. Andrews.

The national service officer program is one of the many services this organization provides Maryland's veterans. The DAV maintains a representative at the Baltimore Veterans' Administration office to provide veterans with assistance in applying for benefits. Another important service is performed by their five-man Hospital Commission, which sponsors trips and assists patients at the VA hospitals at Fort Howard in my district, and at Loch Raven and Perry Point. I know how much these activities are appreciated by Maryland veterans and their families.

We owe a debt of gratitude to our disabled veterans. The DAV's 1971 legislative program to provide disability benefits commensurate with the high cost of living, increased appropriations for VA hospitals, and the aid and attendance allowance for totally disabled veterans confined to nursing homes will have our careful consideration.

Finally, I want to commend the DAV for their efforts toward securing better treatment for our prisoners of war in Southeast Asia.

I know their next 50 years of service to our disabled veterans will be equally productive.

#### INTRODUCES BILLS TO HELP SOLVE ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS

#### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I introduced last Thursday, March 25, two bills which would help solve two of our major environmental problems.

The first bill, which is a simple amendment to the Solid Waste Disposal Act, would do much to encourage local governments to adopt recycling programs in lieu of traditional solid waste disposal systems. To accomplish this, my amendment would provide for Federal funding of up to 90 percent of the cost of resource recovery or recycling systems assisted under the grant system established by the Solid Waste Disposal Act. Federal funding for traditional solid waste disposal systems, which can be up to 75 percent under existing legislation, would be reduced to a maximum of 50 percent. This change in the Federal share of financing for resource recovery and solid waste disposal systems would not result in an increase in Federal expenditures for such projects, but merely in a reallocation of Federal funds.

There can be no argument against the fact that America today is choking on her own refuse. Last year, it was estimated that we Americans discard about 1 ton per person per year of refuse; New York City alone must collect and dispose



22,000 tons of solid waste every day. Clearly, we must find ways to reuse the bulk of this refuse—for we are rapidly running out of sites suitable for sanitary landfill and other methods of disposing of bulk waste. Recycling, or resource recovery, systems are also vital if we are to reclaim a major portion of this "waste" through reuse of paper, glass, aluminum, and other valuable metals. In my judgment, recycled materials are one of the greatest natural resources we have to draw upon—they constitute perhaps the greatest mine in the world, and use of recycled paper would save thousands of trees each year. I am confident that the bill I am introducing today will give communities added incentive to install the needed recycling systems.

I am also introducing today a revised version of a bill I sponsored last year, to authorize the Corps of Engineers—and any other Federal department with similar authority—to reject applications and deny licenses upon the recommendation of the Interior Department, the Environmental Protection Agency, or State agencies involved in protection of wildlife resources. Hopefully, this will solve the problems encountered by the Corps and other Federal agencies when they are forced to choose between Interior Department recommendations and other pressures, and provide us with the assurances we need regarding complete attention to environmental matters.

I urge prompt action on both these measures.

#### PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO H.R. 6531

#### HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with clause 6 of rule XXIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives as amended by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, I am inserting at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an amendment to H.R. 6531, the Military Selective Service Act Amendments of 1971. It is my understanding that under this rule, I will be entitled to 5 minutes in which to explain my amendment even if the Committee of the Whole agrees to a limitation on debate time.

The text of the amendment follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 6531, AS REPORTED,  
OFFERED BY MR. GIBBONS

Page 1, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

(2) Section 4(a) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"No person inducted after June 30, 1971, for training and service under this title may be used in combat or deployed to a combat zone outside the United States unless at least one of the following shall have occurred:

"(1) The President has declared that an armed attack has been made upon the United States.

"(2) The President has declared that an armed attack on the United States is so imminent that full mobilization of the armed forces is required.

"(3) The Congress by concurrent resolution authorizes such use and deployment of persons inducted under this title and directs that a full mobilization of the armed forces be effected.

"(4) The President has requested that Congress declare war, but the authority to so use and deploy inducted personnel pursuant to this clause shall expire at the close of the 30th day after such request was made if the Congress has not declared war on or before such 30th day.

"(5) The Congress has declared war.

"(6) Such person consents to such use and deployment in such written form as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Military department concerned."

#### JUSTICE DOUGLAS WRITES AGAIN

#### HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, in assessing the increasingly difficult question of whether the usefulness of Associate Justice William O. Douglas on the U.S. Supreme Court is ending, it may be helpful to review the latest of a long list of publications by the Justice, entitled "International Dissent: Six Steps Toward World Peace." Many citizens feel that Judges on courts of final appeal ought to refrain from taking positions of controversial issues that may come to them on a later day for adjudication.

Whether from the draft to pornography to pollution or what-have-you—and now international dissent—there are few issues that can come to our court of last resort in the United States on which the position of Justice Douglas has not in one way or another been recorded by his own hand. This means that in ever-increasing numbers of cases he must disqualify himself leaving the court further polarized which is unfortunate.

I commend a careful reading of the following study of Justice Douglas' new book by the able columnist, Allan Brownfeld, appearing in the March 18, 1971, issue of Roll Call, the magazine of Capitol Hill:

#### JUSTICE DOUGLAS' NEW BOOK

(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

Now that the effort to impeach him seems to have failed, or at least to have been temporarily shelved, Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas has seen fit to resume his political activities. He has done this in the form of a short book entitled *International Dissent: Six Steps Toward World Peace*.

The new volume makes the reader wonder why Justice Douglas has for so long been hailed as a "brilliant" and "independent" thinker, since the proposals he makes are neither novel nor realistic. We have heard them all before, they have been tried before, at other historical periods, and they have failed miserably before.

What, then, does Mr. Douglas tell us is the path to peace? His first proposition goes like this: "The most important step toward world peace is to propose an end to all military alliances, indicating our willingness to return to

George Washington's original proposition that the United States should have no military alliances . . . SEATO and NATO and CENTO should be liquidated as military agencies; and the United States should withdraw all its military from both Southeast Asia and Western Europe."

One normal response to such a suggestion is: wouldn't the Soviet Union and Communist China take advantage of such an American isolationism to expand their own sphere of power? But Justice Douglas does not view this even as a remote possibility because, in his worldview, it is we, the United States, who are responsible for the Cold War, not world Communism.

He goes to some extreme to make this sound plausible. He states, for example, that "the United States pact with West Germany is, in reality, an alliance against Russia." He overlooks the fact that the Soviet Union has violated its agreements made at Yalta and Potsdam with regard to holding free elections in East Germany and elsewhere in Eastern Europe. He does not mention that, in clear violation of international law, the Communists built the Berlin Wall, preventing free access to East Berlin and locking the East Germans into a rigid totalitarian society as so many cattle. Somehow his sympathies seem with those who are oppressing people while all the time he maintains that he has an affinity for the oppressed. The Cold War, he declares, was somehow the work of Harry Truman.

His second proposition is that "All colonies should be made free and all protectorates abolished." He states that "the United States has been the voice defending the status quo . . . Russia was . . . the great protagonist for ending colonialism."

Yes, these words from a Justice of the United States Supreme Court. The United States defeated Germany and Japan in World War II. Did it colonize those countries? No, instead, it helped to restore them at great cost so that today they are among the most prosperous and most free countries in the world. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, has never removed its occupation forces from Eastern Europe. When the Hungarians revolted for their freedom, the Soviet Union marched in an army. The same happened in 1968 in Czechoslovakia. But somehow, according to Justice Douglas' view of what "colonialism" is, this does not count.

Proposition three is that "We should recognize China; she must also be in the United Nations." Justice Douglas does not explain how Peking, which the United Nations condemned for aggression in Korea, can join an organization such as the U.N., whose members must be "peace-loving." Since its aggression in Korea, China has invaded India, committed genocide in Tibet, and aided guerrilla warfare in Vietnam, Thailand and elsewhere. It presently trains Palestinian guerrillas as well as African terrorist organizations. It has shown no evidence whatever of desiring peace or accommodation.

Justice Douglas manages an end run around these facts by once again reversing history. In Korea, it was not the Chinese who were the aggressors, it was the United States and the United Nations. The Justice says this quite openly: "When the United Nations armies appeared near the Yalu River, where the electric power stations for Manchuria are located, Peking moved into action. MacArthur was thrusting a dagger at China's heart and China—whom we still call the 'aggressor'—responded in a counter-military action . . ."

It is clear so far: Harry Truman started the Cold War, NATO represents a threat to the Soviet Union, the United States is a colonialist power, Communist China has never committed aggression and only wants recognition from us. Given all of this, the

way to "peace" is simple: end all alliances, recognize Communist China, withdraw American troops, and permit the Communization of the world. Justice Douglas may be quite a man with words, but this prescription resembles what we always used to call surrender a lot more than it resembles what was ever referred to as peace.

The remaining three propositions relate to international law and the relinquishing of national sovereignty to an international body. Given the concept that Communism has no aggressive intentions in the world and that all of us are united on certain human and legal principles, an international rule of law concept makes sense. But how, for example, would you agree to an international concept of this kind with Hitler, whose goal was the destruction of all "inferior races." You could only do it by first agreeing to eliminate the "inferior races" and then unite in a legal system to which all could adhere.

Justice Douglas' answer is that "A world regime founded on law would have to accommodate these competing schools of thought." He states that such a rule of law "could not presume to regulate civil disorder, say in Hungary, that sought to establish a freer society." The reason is that Mr. Douglas assigns all of Eastern Europe to Russia's sphere of influence and shows no concern whatever for the quality of life lived by the people in such societies.

He evades this by saying that "The two systems seem to be converging," yet he provides no evidence that Communism is really any different than it ever was. The Soviet Union remains a vast prison from which escape is very difficult. The Jews who now clamor for free exit from Communism argue eloquently against Justice Douglas' "convergence" theory. And what of the new Communist coalition government in Chile? We were told it would be different, yet it has recently banned the showing of the movie, "The Confession," and free speech appears to be coming to an end. Justice Douglas says that Communism is changing, but we cannot take this from him on faith when the available evidence argues otherwise.

Justice Douglas' proposals are, of course, simply the isolationism we practiced with such disastrous effects in the nineteen thirties, permitting Hitler to march across half of Europe before deciding that such aggression was, in the long run, a threat not only to us but to civilization itself.

What is striking, however, is his lack of compassion for the tyranny which men, women, and children today suffer under in Communist societies. He seems willing to overlook the human suffering which tyranny produces in order to condemn his own country as the world's villain. Perhaps only those who have had their freedom taken from them can appreciate its value.

#### A LETTER CONCERNING OUR POW'S AND OUR PERSONNEL MISSING IN ACTION

#### HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, last week was declared a National Week of Concern for U.S. prisoners of war and personnel missing in action. I received a letter last week which begs far more than a week of concern. The letter itself represents the crying need for every bit of the efforts and suggestions made during that week

to be focused at once on getting something done.

I am taking some steps on my own to see what can be done about the request this letter contains. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I am asking that it be inserted in the RECORD. I commend it to the personal attention of every Member of Congress.

I include the letter as follows:

RICHARDSON, TEX.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PURCELL: My husband, Lt. Col. L. W. Whitford is missing in action, Southeast Asia since Nov. 2, 1969. He was downed in Laos.

The wives of men who are missing have been allowed to write once a month, 7 lines, form letter. This was not a plan mapped out by the North Vietnamese. These letters are sent through regular mail channels.

Monday I received a letter that I had written my husband Dec. 2, 1970. It had been opened, pictures taken and glued back. Wednesday, March 17, 1971 I received another one back, it had been opened but the pictures of my children were taped together.

The North Vietnamese have never issued an official list of prisoners that they hold—I have no proof that my husband isn't held in a prison somewhere in Southeast Asia.

To date this is the worst thing that has been done by our "foes." I understand that many other families are having mail returned—where do they stop with their "mental torture"?

I resent their returning the letters, I despise the act of opening my letters and feel that it warrants attention.

Congressman Purcell, please help us, it would seem there is nowhere to turn. Rest assured that I will not let my husband be forgotten, neglected.

Sincerely,

JO WHITFORD

Mrs. L. W. Whitford, Jr.

#### BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

#### HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1971

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, today the people of Byelorussia celebrate the 53d anniversary of the proclamation of independence of their tiny nation.

I am pleased to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to these brave people whose brief period of freedom was ended by the Bolshevik forces of the Soviet Union.

Today, the Byelorussian people live under a Communist regime imposed by the Soviet Union. Yet they still seek restoration of the independence which was snatched from them.

In 1864, before Kastus Kalinowski, beloved by the Byelorussian people, died on the gallows for his treason, he spoke these words:

Know ye that ye will never be happy if the Muscovites rule over ye.

These courageous people, since the beginning of the 13th century, have struggled to preserve their national identity.

Byelorussian history is marked by numerous border wars and bloody uprising against would-be conquerors.

But each time, gallant patriots sacrificed their lives for their ideals, demonstrating their dedication to freedom and to their right to national independence.

Despite the depredations that the people of Byelorussia have faced; despite the violations of their heritage, they continue to retain faith in their identity and in their democratic ideals.

Those of us who can celebrate Byelorussian Independence Day, do so with profound admiration for those who cannot.

#### SUPPORT FOR CONTINUED DEFERMENTS FOR DIVINITY STUDENTS OF ALL FAITHS

#### HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention this morning that there are only two nations in the world, according to the best information available to me, that do not exempt divinity students from their respective draft systems.

These nations are the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Communist China.

Though I favor elimination of the draft in favor of an all-voluntary military system as soon as this is feasible, in the meantime, I will continue to support this Nation's historic role of granting deferments for divinity students of all faiths.

Mr. Speaker, the New Jersey Legislature approved a joint resolution urging Congress to continue the exemption extended to divinity students. The resolution was sponsored in the State senate by Milton A. Waldor of Essex County and in the State assembly by John F. Brown of Ocean County.

I am pleased to offer this resolution to be printed in the RECORD as evidence of my State's concern over this matter.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE SENATE OF NEW JERSEY, MARCH 29, 1971

Whereas legislation currently pending before the Congress of the United States to continue the Selective Service System has been introduced therein in a form which deletes the traditional and historic exemption now and hitherto uniformly extended to divinity students of all faiths;

And, whereas at the time of no immediate national emergency, and when national policy is to reduce, rather than expand, the manpower requirements of the armed forces, there appears to be no compelling need for the United States Government to withdraw an historic exemption by which it has heretofore expressed its recognition of the vital and beneficial service performed for this nation by the clergy of all faiths in the pursuit of their high calling;

And, whereas an amendment to the aforesaid legislation which would continue this exemption has been offered and is pending before the Congress;

Now, Therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey: That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized to take the necessary measures to amend the pending Selective Service Bill so as to continue the exemption now hitherto extended to divinity students of all faiths;



And, Be it further resolved, that the members of Congress elected from this State are urged to take all steps within their power to secure such action by the Congress;

And, Be it further resolved, that duly authenticated copies of this Resolution, signed by the President and attested by the Secretary be transmitted to the Vice-President of the United States and the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to each of the members of Congress elected from this State.

Whereas legislation currently pending before the Congress of the United States to continue the Selective Service System has been introduced therein in a form which deletes the traditional and historic exemption now and hitherto uniformly extended to divinity students of all faiths;

And, Whereas at a time of no immediate national emergency, and when national policy is to reduce, rather than expand, the manpower requirements of the armed forces, there appears to be no compelling need for the United States Government to withdraw an historic exemption by which it has heretofore expressed its recognition of the vital and beneficial service performed for this nation by the clergy of all faiths in the pursuit of their high calling;

And, Whereas an amendment to the aforesaid legislation which would continue this exemption has been offered and is pending before the Congress;

Now, Therefore, be it resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey: That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized to take the necessary measures to amend the pending Selective Service Bill so as to continue the exemption now hitherto extended to divinity students of all faiths;

And, Be it further resolved, that the members of Congress elected from this State are urged to take all steps within their power to secure such action by the Congress;

And, Be it further resolved, that duly authenticated copies of this Resolution, signed by the Speaker and attested by the Clerk be transmitted to the Vice-President of the United States and the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to each of the Members of Congress elected from this State.

#### SUPPORT FOR H.R. 6050

### Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced legislation which would authorize the payment of reduced annuities to the survivors of members of the National Guard and Reserve who die before reaching age 60 and have had 20 years of creditable service. I would like to commend to my colleagues the following letter which points up the necessity for the Congress to take affirmative action on H.R. 6050. The letter is from Maj. Gen. R. M. Cram, adjutant general of the Vermont National Guard.

I include the letter as follows:

STATE OF VERMONT,  
OFFICE OF THE ADJUTANT GENERAL,  
Camp Johnson, Winooski, March 25, 1971.  
Hon. G. V. MONTGOMERY,  
House of Representatives, 1529 Longworth  
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.  
DEAR MR. MONTGOMERY: On behalf of all Vermont National Guardsmen, may I express deep appreciation for your action in

introducing H.R. 6050, a bill to provide an annuity for widows or other dependents of Guardsmen or Reservists who qualify for Reserve Retirement with 20 or more years of service, but who die before reaching age 60.

The need for legislation such as this was brought home to Vermonters forcefully and tragically in September of 1966 when Major General Francis W. Billado, the Adjutant General of Vermont, died at the age of 59 years and 6 months. He had served in the Guard and Reserve for nearly four decades and, yet, his widow received no benefits upon his death.

Sincerely yours,

R. M. CRAM, Major General,  
The Adjutant General.

#### TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH W. BARTUNEK

### HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, Joseph W. Bartunek, chairman of the Cuyahoga County Democratic Party, was recently honored as the Outstanding Alumnus of 1971 of the Cleveland State University Cleveland-Marshall Law Alumni Association annual award luncheon in Cleveland.

It was an unusually sincere, bipartisan tribute to a man who has contributed so much to the Greater Cleveland community. It is rare that a man so young accomplishes so much in so little time.

I include the material as follows:

JOSEPH W. BARTUNEK

On the day he graduated from college in 1948, Joseph W. Bartunek fled as a Democratic candidate for the Ohio Senate and at the age of 25, was the youngest state senator ever elected.

This was the start of a continuing career of public and community service which has included service as a judge of probate court and in a wide variety of civic organizations in Greater Cleveland.

During his fourteen years with the Ohio Senate, from 1949 to 1958 and from 1961 to 1964, he was minority leader from 1951 to 1958 and was clerk of the senate in 1959 and 1960. While serving in the Legislature, he was a strong backer of the bill which created The Cleveland State University and later was instrumental in the merger of Cleveland-Marshall Law School and Cleveland State in 1969.

He was a judge of the Cuyahoga County Probate Court from 1964 until his resignation in 1970, when he became chairman of the Cuyahoga County Democratic party.

Now in his second term on the board of trustees of The Cleveland State University, he has been chairman since June, 1970.

Mr. Bartunek was born on February 16, 1924 and is a lifetime resident of Cuyahoga County. He is a graduate of Shaker Heights High School and holds a B.S. degree in Psychology from Adelbert College of Western Reserve University.

He received his LL.B. degree from Cleveland-Marshall Law School in 1955 and was admitted to the practice of law that year. His professional memberships include the Cleveland, Cuyahoga, Ohio, and American Bar Associations; the American Judicature Society and the Ohio Association of Probate Judges.

In addition to his term as a probate judge and as a legislator, the public service career of Mr. Bartunek includes membership in the Cuyahoga County Charter Commission and acting as chairman of the Citizens Advisory

Committee for Alternative Form of County Government.

As an active participant in the civic affairs of Greater Cleveland, he has served on the board of trustees of St. Luke's Hospital, Greater Cleveland Hospital Association, Catholic Charities Corporation, Cleveland Community Chest, Greater Cleveland Growth Association, Cleveland Zoological Society, Hudson Association, and the Legal Aid Society. Other major civic activities include the Mental Health Act Task Force, Cleveland Mental Health Association, and the Citizens League.

Member of the Alpha Delta Phi Fraternity, he also served as international president of Delta Theta Phi.

Married to the former Pauline Evans, he and his wife are the parents of four children, two sons and two daughters.

#### MISGIVINGS ABOUT THE CONCEPT OF FEDERAL REVENUE SHARING

### HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, following is a recent letter to the editor of the Hamburg Reporter, written by a distinguished citizen of Iowa, Mr. Dwight Fellows, Superintendent of Schools for Mills and Fremont Counties. In it, he expresses the misgivings which some of the more thoughtful among our electorate feel about the concept of Federal revenue sharing. Mr. Fellows' reservations about the proposal deserve a public hearing in our deliberations on this important issue.

I include the letter as follows:

The general public should be amazed that at least a few of our Congressmen, or Governors, or State Legislators, or business men have not questioned the TAX or ECONOMIC consequences of the proposed Federal Revenue Sharing Program. They all know that the Federal Government is hundreds of billions of dollars in debt. They all know that the Federal budgetary plans are to continue to go further in debt at the rate of from ten to twenty billion dollars per year. They all know that the Federal Government has no money or credit except that which it gets from the people. However, the people of the United States have been brain-washed with the idea that "If it comes from the Federal Government, it doesn't cost anything".

Two financial items the Federal Government has to share with the people are higher Federal Taxes or higher Federal Debt. Even though some of the money may be given back to the local area, wouldn't it be much more sensible to raise the money at the state and local level and keep 100c of each \$1.00 at home with local control, rather than send each tax \$1.00 to Washington and get back 75c with Federal Control? We criticize the Federal Government for financial irresponsibility when it continues to increase taxes and the national debt. Yet, we continue to demand more and more money and services from the Federal Government. Where has our local sense of responsibility gone? We plead for states' rights and local control, yet we want the Federal Government to pay our bills for us.

Every informed person knows it costs more when the Federal Government does things for us than it does if we do them at the local level. The Federal Government has a tremendous financial responsibility in taking care of national responsibilities without

having to be the financial nurse maid to every state, city, county and hamlet in the United States. Over spending and too much debt is the Achilles Heel of individuals, corporations, states, and the Federal Government. Let us consider what the alternatives are before we plunge into Federal Revenue Sharing. Some of them are: Financial irresponsibility at the state, city and local level; Depreciation of the value of the dollar through more federal debt; Loss of state and local control; More and more inflation; Risk of Federal financial insolvency, etc.

Is the Congress of the United States really and sincerely concerned with the financial welfare of the nation when they advocate federal revenue sharing, or do they put political expediency ahead of national financial solvency and national welfare?

The main reason why states and cities are in bad financial condition is due to excessive spending. If the Federal Government bails them out every time they over spend, it will encourage them to continue to over spend. If a state or city over spends the people of that state or city should be required to pay their own debts or they will cease to have any sense of financial responsibility. They incurred the debt, they received the benefit, they should pay the bill. Why should the people of Iowa or any other state be taxed by the Federal Government to pay for free garbage hauling for the residents of the big cities in the east? If they want this or any other local service they should pay for it at the local level.

We should consider these and many many other points before we make up our minds concerning Federal Revenue Sharing and then contact our political leaders and let them know how we feel about the issue. Federal Revenue Sharing could easily develop into a FINANCIAL CATASTROPHE rather than a bonanza.

DWIGHT FELLOWS,  
County Superintendent of Schools,  
Mills and Fremont Counties.

#### THE FEASIBILITY OF ENDING THE DRAFT IN 1971

**HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, when we consider amendments to H.R. 6531, extending the draft, I intend to offer an amendment that will permit the President's induction authority to expire on June 30, 1971. Many people have expressed doubts about the feasibility of ending the draft in 1971. Particularly in view of the very substantial pay increases approved by the Armed Services Committee. I believe that an end to compulsory service would not have a negative impact upon our national security. The National Council To Repeal the Draft has just prepared a paper that cogently argues the hardheaded practicality of ending the draft this year. I hope that my colleagues may read this before the vote.

I also wish to bring to the attention of the House the response to the proposed changes in the law regarding conscientious objection in H.R. 6531 that was approved today by the board of directors of the National Interreligious Service Board for Conscientious Objectors. The statement points out the punitive and dangerously disruptive aspects of

the suggested new C.O. provisions, such as the 3-year work requirement and the restriction of the definition of alternated service to exclude service in private organizations such as churches and private hospitals. This latter provision would be sure to penalize many conscientious religious objectors who could not in good conscience work for Government organizations because of the traditions of their churches.

I intend to vote for an amendment that will preserve the present law and delete the C.O. provisions contained in the bill.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR SERVICE  
OF THE NATIONAL INTERRELIGIOUS  
SERVICE BOARD FOR CONSCIENTIOUS  
OBJECTORS,

Washington, D.C.

A RESPONSE TO THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF  
SECTION 6(j), H.R. 6531

First, and underlying all other considerations, we are opposed to the extension of the induction authority, and urge repeal of the Selective Service Act.

If a draft exists, we are committed to the fullest recognition of individual conscience within such a system. The recognition of individual conscience is seriously limited by the new section 6(j) in the following ways:

(1) The definition of alternate service as "employment with agencies in government or public institutions which have difficulty finding eligible and qualified individuals to perform essential work" is unduly limiting. It would channel conscientious objectors from much meaningful work with private and nonprofit religious and service agencies into government service which may or may not be as significant. Furthermore, the requirement to work for government or public agencies would violate the consciences of many conservative religious objectors who could not conscientiously work in such agencies because of the traditions of their churches.

(2) Having as sole criterion for job assignment "difficulty" in filling "essential" jobs would effectively force conscientious objectors into jobs which could well be unrelated to any significant service, especially in a time of high unemployment.

(3) Giving the President discretionary power to determine "satisfactory" performance of a registrant while on civilian work can only serve to make the employer an agent of the government for the determination of sincerity. Personality clashes and other normal employment incompatibilities could become reasons for dismissal and a possible order for induction.

(4) Broad discretionary powers vested in the President to develop a program "which is in truth alternate civilian work" by identifying and assessing "total national deficiencies in certain specific areas of employment" could effectively place conscientious objectors in a forced work program at the discretion of the government. Individual conscience, differences in temperament, skills and abilities would not be recognized. Such a program could clearly be a pilot project for compulsory national service in which coercion could replace voluntarism and the draft could become universal. Government could channel workers into occupations rather than allowing them a free choice.

(5) Three years of alternative service instead of two (in existence for the past twenty years) can be interpreted as a discriminatory and punitive measure designed to limit the number of sincere men making claims as conscientious objectors. There is no evidence to indicate that years of service prove sincerity. Rather than limit the number of conscientious objectors, this may lead more into some form of non-cooperation.

The above changes—all of which seriously circumscribe the right and practice of conscience under law—would have one basic effect: large numbers of conscientious objectors who previously complied with the law and regulations would find themselves unable in good conscience to cooperate. This proposal would almost certainly complicate greatly the administration of the Selective Service System and further overload the courts. Thousands of responsible and sincere objectors would needlessly end up in prison.

For these reasons we believe it would be far wiser to retain the present section 6(j), despite its shortcomings.

THE NATIONAL INTERRELIGIOUS SERVICE  
BOARD FOR CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS,  
WILLIAM T. SNYDER,

Chairman, Executive Secretary, Men-  
nonite Central Committee.

HERMAN WILL, Jr.,

Vice Chairman, Division of World Peace,  
Board of Christian Social Concerns,  
United Methodist Church.

GIVEN H. CULLEY,

Treasurer, American Baptist Home Mis-  
sion Society.

E. J. CLELLAND,

Recording Secretary, Christ's Sanctified  
Holy Church.

As passed by the Board of Directors,  
March 30, 1971.

#### ON CREDIBILITY GAPS

**HON. BOB WILSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Joseph Alsop from the Washington Post of March 26, 1971:

#### ON CREDIBILITY GAPS

(By Joseph Alsop)

Week by week, it is being increasingly said that President Nixon is suffering from a "credibility gap." This silly but fashionable phrase is meant to imply that nobody believes the President, because he does not tell the country the truth.

It would be ludicrous to deny that the President does not exercise the politician's privilege of being mealy-mouthed about some things that could be stated far more starkly. But it really is time to point out that the President has usually been decidedly forthright and accurate about great matters.

Or at least he has been rather more accurate than the people in politics, in the media, and even within the government, who go on and on about this "credibility gap." To begin with the government itself, some very strange results have been produced in these last years by bureaucratic rivalries, by ideological slants, and above all, by the desire of a good many permanent officials to follow the currently fashionable herd.

In tangible terms, these results have mainly taken the form of grossly misleading estimates of problems of very great importance. The fact-gathering apparatus is not at fault. The problem lies in what is done with the facts, once they are gathered.

Thus from 1966 to 1969, it was officially estimated that the Vietcong were able to deploy no less than 300,000 guerrillas of one sort or another. A misuse of facts produced this figure.

Then more facts, too strong to ignore, caused the figure to implode, as it were. In one swift shrinkage, it was reduced to an outside total of 60,000 Vietcong guerrillas. An



admitted error by a factor of five is rather considerable, one must add.

Yet it is hardly more considerable than the equally important error that was made about Cambodia's enormous logistical importance of Hanoi—which was only revealed by the President's Cambodian venture. And no one has done any Indian rain dances about these well known governmental errors, precisely because they were errors on the currently modish side!

If you turn to the politicians, you find another interesting study in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's inquiry into the American activities in Laos. The inquiry produced great "revelations" of subsidized Meo guerrillas, of Americans out of uniform who aid the Laotian people to defend their country, and of other wicked activities.

There are two things to be said about these "revelations." Sen. Stuart Symington of Missouri and of the Foreign Relations Committee has been a member of the watchdog committee of the Central Intelligence Agency for a very long time. All the facts "revealed" by his committee's inquiry had either been known to Sen. Symington, or had been very easily accessible to him long before the so-called "revelations" began.

By the same token, all the facts of any significance were equally well known to scores of newspapermen, both in the field and here in Washington. It may have been desirable to place the facts before a larger public. But it was a perfect conspiracy of hypocrisy to pretend that the U.S. government's activities in Laos had been successfully and purposely concealed from anyone, including newspapermen.

If one must be bluntly honest about it, moreover, there is another conspiracy of hypocrisy about the record of the media in recent years, on certain very critical occasions. It has already been pointed out in this space that both the Tet offensive and the President's Cambodian venture were grossly misrepresented when these two great events were covering the front pages.

Some of the chief culprits have admitted in print—but hardly on the front pages—that Tet was in fact a perfect disaster for Hanoi, instead of the precise opposite as first reported. It has been admitted, too, that the Cambodian venture has just about ended the war in the lower half of South Vietnam. But no one has boldly admitted that, in consequence, earlier judgments of President Nixon's decision at least deserve qualification.

The thing does not end there, either. One of the major news agencies has rather flatly predicted the imminent fall of Phnom Penh so often that this reporter has lost count. At least four times, these wholly erroneous predictions have again covered the front pages. But no one, so far as is known, has even murmured, "So sorry!"

As to the television coverage of the Laos campaign, if the Battle of the Bulge had been similarly covered by television, the natural tendency would have been to ask Adolf Hitler for the best terms he was willing to offer. So the question arises, just what is credibility, and who has a gap?

#### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS COMMENDED FOR ITS PROMPT ATTENTION TO H.R. 4403

**HON. VERNON W. THOMSON**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Public Works is to be commended for its prompt attention to H.R. 4403, the accelerated public works bill. I am also pleased that the

committee incorporated several amendments which I suggested to broaden coverage of the bill to include areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce as "redevelopment areas" or "economic development centers," or by the Secretary of Labor as having suffered "substantial unemployment." Prompt floor approval of this measure would benefit many locally depressed areas.

#### LEGISLATION TO BAN NATIONWIDE TV AND RADIO BLACKOUTS OF MAJOR SPORTING EVENTS

**HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce with four initial cosponsors this afternoon legislation to ban nationwide TV and radio blackouts of major sporting events.

I can think of no more appropriate cosponsors than my four distinguished colleagues, Mr. FORD, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. KEMP, and Mr. MIZELL.

The distinguished minority leader was a fine athlete at his university. The gentleman from California (Mr. MATHIAS) carried this Nation's excellence in track and field events in the Olympic games with honor and distinction.

My colleague from New York (Mr. KEMP) was one of the best and most respected quarterbacks in professional football and the legends of "Vinegar Bend," the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MIZELL) as an outstanding pitcher will always be remembered by fans of baseball.

This legislation, the drafting of which I announced here on March 10 shortly after the Joe Frazier-Muhammad Ali heavyweight championship fight, has not been written in haste and is most certainly not a "shotgun" approach to the most sensitive and important issue of the availability of sporting events to the general public of the Nation.

Instead, this bill acts to insure that the general public will have the opportunity to witness major sporting events on all types of electronic media.

The problem, as demonstrated most vividly by the handling of the Frazier-Ali broadcast arrangements, is that it is now possible for promoters to impose nationwide blackouts of events of national interest by simply refusing to grant broadcast rights to entire types of media, such as television, and radio.

In the case of the fight, of course, the promoters simply cashed in on the high national interest by awarding presentation rights to a cable or closed circuit TV system to the exclusion of free TV, free radio, and the other types of media.

There is no question that this approach was a financial success for the promoters and others involved. But it was a major catastrophe for the great bulk of the sports fans of the Nation, some 200 million people who, for whatever reason, were simply "blacked out" from witnessing the bout, perhaps the greatest sporting event of the century.

Mr. Speaker, there is no need for me

to dwell on the fact that Congress and the courts have been extremely lenient with professional sports on the basis that they are not merely businesses, but that they are also worthy forms of public entertainment and diversion of our citizens from their normal concerns.

In fact, professional sports are currently receiving favored treatment as businesses in that they are exempted from the various antitrust laws of the Nation. I therefore think that it is only right that these privileged businesses consider their responsibility to the public; namely, to allow the greatest possible number of fans to witness the final championship events.

Mr. Speaker, the day is fast approaching when the financial attractiveness of nationwide blackouts by way of exclusive closed-circuit arrangements could force promoters of other such great events as the Super Bowl or the World Series to limit spectators on the basis of dollars only.

Congress must act now to spell out and protect the public's right to witness major sporting events via the various electronic media. The bill I am introducing today does this and the text of the bill follows in the RECORD.

H.R. 6992

A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to provide for the regulation of the broadcasting of certain major sporting events in the public interest.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That part I of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"ACCESS BY BROADCAST AND OTHER MEDIA TO MAJOR SPORTING EVENTS

"Sec. 331. (a) No person may present a major sporting event to the public by means of any type of electronic medium unless a permit has been issued with respect to such event under subsection (b) by the Commission.

"(b) The Commission shall issue a permit with respect to a major sporting event if and only if—

"(1) application is made for such permit in such manner as the Commission may prescribe, and

"(2) the applicant satisfies the Commission that—

"(A) in the case of each type of electronic medium, a reasonable number of persons capable of presenting such event to the public throughout the United States by means of such type of medium have been (or will be) afforded an opportunity to bid to obtain the rights to present such event to the public by means of such type of medium,

"(B) the highest responsible bidder for the rights each type of electronic medium has been (or will be) awarded the rights to present such event throughout the United States by means of such type of medium, and

"(C) any person to whom such rights are awarded will in fact present such event throughout the United States by means of such type of medium.

Any permit issued under this subsection shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Commission may prescribe in order to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(c) For purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'type of electronic medium' meant each of the following types of media (as defined in regulations of the Commission):

"(A) Television (other than subscription, closed circuit, and cable television).

"(B) Subscription television.

"(C) Radio.

"(D) Closed circuit television.

"(E) Cable television.

"(F) Any other communications medium the inclusion of which under this paragraph the Commission determines is necessary to carry out this section.

"(2) The term 'major sports event' means any event which regulations of the Commission provide is the final national or international championship event in professional boxing, football, basketball, baseball, or hockey."

Sec. 2. Section 503 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Any person who presents a major sports event in violation of section 331 or in violation of the terms of any permit issued under such section shall (in addition to any other penalty to which he is subject) forfeit to the United States a sum of money not in excess of the gross receipts realized with respect to such event by such person."

This morning Mr. Speaker, my four distinguished cosponsors and I held a press conference here in the Capitol to explain the intended impact of this legislation. In response to questions then and for the background information of all Members, I am listing some of the major points of the legislation, both in what it will accomplish and in what it will not do.

The major thrust of the bill is to break up the possibility of any future nationwide blackout of major sporting events on any of the various types of media.

Traditional and justifiable local blackouts are not affected. These will continue to be allowed to exist to encourage attendance.

The bill only concerns itself with professional sports, namely boxing, football, basketball, baseball, and hockey, though the sponsors are considering proposals to extend the provisions to major amateur events such as the Olympics, the Rose Bowl and various NCAA and AAU championships.

No "type of electronic medium" will be prevented from seeking to present the major events to their viewers, listeners or subscribers. Television is a type of electronic medium, just as radio is a different type. The FCC is empowered to designate these categories of media.

The various "types of electronic medium" will not be bidding against each other for presentation rights. A promoter may not award presentation rights, for example, to radio to the exclusion of television and other systems.

Within each "type of electronic medium" however, the various private networks or stations will bid for presentation rights. Promoters are required to accept the highest bid or bids within each "type of electronic medium." Proof that this procedure is followed is a prerequisite for issuance of an FCC permit.

Naturally, if there are no bids for presentation rights in a type of medium, promoters have fulfilled their obligation to simply give each media the opportunity to secure the presentation rights. The sponsors of the bill feel that if the various media realize that there is a sufficient public interest in a sports event, they will bid for the rights to broadcast it.

The requirement that promoters secure an FCC permit will create no hardship. The procedure will be simple enough and will involve advertising for bids, accepting them on a specific date, then awarding contracts to the successful bidder in each media, all subject to prompt FCC approval if it is satisfied the interests of the public are served.

Mr. Speaker, the need for this legislation is clear. The time to act is now before this trend toward discrimination against all but the affluent to witness major sporting events gets out of hand.

And of the various proposals we have heard such as abolishing closed circuit systems or limiting broadcast seasons, I believe this permit system is the most reasonable, acceptable and effective tool at hand.

#### FUNDS APPROPRIATED BY CONGRESS AND IMPOUNDED AND FROZEN BY BUREAU OF BUDGET SHOULD BE RELEASED IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

### HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the Office of Management and Budget—a beefed-up version of the former Bureau of the Budget—has withheld, frozen, and impounded funds totaling more than \$12 billion appropriated by the Congress last year for worthwhile, vital and needed programs and projects.

The OMB has by its freeze orders virtually stopped many programs authorized and funded by the Congress. This action represents an arrogant assumption of power and substitutes OMB judgment and priorities for the judgment and priorities set by the Congress.

In this connection I want to again urge the President to look into this matter fully and carefully and effect the release of funds in accordance with the intent, mandate and direction of the Congress.

On the two Appropriations Subcommittees on which I serve—the Independent Offices-Housing-Space Science and the Public Works-Atomic Energy Commission Subcommittees—we have found that the OMB has withheld substantial funds.

Some \$1 billion 325 million has been withheld from the HUD appropriations bill—shortchanging the urban renewal program by \$200 million—the water and sewer grant program by \$200 million—the model cities program by \$727 million—and \$193 million from the public housing program.

In the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, OMB has impounded funds totaling \$91,700,000 for 145 public works projects throughout the Nation. Delay on these projects means substantial increased costs in materials and labor—and losses by delayed benefits.

Every day in my office we receive letters from citizens throughout the Nation who are reporting the impact of this arbitrary action by officials of the Bureau of the Budget.

This wholesale impoundment of funds must be stopped.

In this connection I place in the RECORD herewith an editorial from the Nashville Tennessean pointing out that rather than applying pressure for pet projects for special interests, the time has come to move forward in the public interest with programs and appropriations passed by the Congress and signed into law by the President.

The editorial follows:

#### MR. EVINS MAKES A VALID POINT

Rep. Joe L. Evins of Tennessee's Fourth District has accused the Nixon administration of "flagrant abuses of executive power" and the "usurpation" of the powers of Congress in freezing more than \$11 billion appropriated by Congress last year.

Among the frozen items are \$91.7 million for 145 public works programs and \$45.6 million for 107 Army Corps of Engineers projects. Some of these are Tennessee projects which are vital to the economic growth of this region and reduction of the unemployment rolls.

"The OMB (Office of Management and the Budget) is arrogating power vested in the Congress by the Constitution by disregarding priorities set by the Congress and substituting its own priorities..." the Tennessee congressman said in a statement prepared for delivery to a Senate subcommittee on separation of powers.

Mr. Evins is justified in his charges. The President—apparently in a pique at Congress—has been refusing to spend appropriations above what he requested. This, in the view of Mr. Evins, amounts to an item veto in violation of the Constitution.

While he has been freezing funds appropriated by Congress for needed public works projects to benefit many average people, the President has been putting great pressure on Congress to approve funds for his special projects—like the supersonic transport plane—for the benefit of a few wealthy people.

#### PRESIDENT IMPLEMENTS CONSTRUCTIVE RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS—FINALLY

### HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, after waiting for 2 years for the President to implement constructive rural development programs, we have finally heard from him. However, I fear that the administration's rural community development program was an afterthought—forced upon him after rural America recognized that they had been taken for granted and consequently gave his administration a vote of "no confidence" last November.

The President's proposals consist of what he terms "new" funds for the future. What rural America has needed is not promises of "new" moneys at some later date, promises premised on the possible enactment of revenue sharing, but release of the hundreds of millions of dollars he has frozen, and signing of the bills he has vetoed. During the last 2 years, he has slashed out the heartland of rural America's budget by—

Freezing \$56 million of the \$100 million Congress appropriated for rural water and sewer grants;



Freezing \$68 million of the \$98 million Congress appropriated for rural water and sewer loans;

Cutting the 502 rural housing insured loan program, from \$1.4 billion to \$946 million—and only restoring the funds after strong congressional pressure was applied;

Cutting the REAP agricultural conservation program by \$44.5 million, almost a quarter of the \$195.5 million appropriated by Congress;

Vetoing the \$18 billion Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970;

Vetoing the \$4.42 billion Education Act of 1970;

Vetoing the \$2.79 billion Hill-Burton hospital construction program;

Cutting out the school milk program; and

Vetoing the family medical practice bill.

This money—much better than any promised funds—could have helped the 7,300 rural communities that, over the past 3 years, had their loan and grant applications returned because the Farm-

ers Home Administration could not assist them in the immediate future because of lack of funds. This new-found money could still help fund some of the 129 pending applications, totaling \$31 million in loans and \$6 million in grants, for sewer and water systems in my own State of Iowa.

The problems of rural development are now, not tomorrow. If the President has new-found money, he should release existing rural development funds and stop tantalizing rural America with the promises of new funds as a basis for politically sugar-coating the concept of revenue sharing.

The President's package of rural community development with capital letters is only a portion of what is needed for sustained, substantial rural community development. Funds for Government programs, whether through grants or revenue sharing, can never take the place of a sound agriculture program, adequate housing and employment, and ample business development. And it is in these

latter areas that the last 2 years' policies have been most disastrous.

The administration became the first since World War II not to send Congress a farm message. Last year it opposed a farm bill supported by all major farm organizations. And this year, seeing that parity had dropped to its lowest level since the depression, achieved "prosperity" by changing the way you compute parity so that the country can now be told that parity stands at a healthy 91 percent when it is really only 68 percent.

More hocus-pocus. When Iowa's unemployment is the worst in 13 years, when rural education and medical assistance lag far behind national norms, when farmers must struggle from one crisis to the next, we do not need new mathematical models for parity nor sleight of hand with rural development funds. What we do need is the release of funds that Congress had appropriated to provide rural Americans their fair share of assistance and to begin at once the imperative task of revitalizing rural America.

I include the following tables:

IOWA—1ST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL APPLICATIONS ON HAND, FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION, FEB. 22, 1971

Name of applicant	County	Type of project	Funds		Name of applicant	County	Type of project	Funds	
			Loan	Grant				Loan	Grant
Libertyville	Jefferson	Water	\$100,000		Birmingham	Van Buren	Sewer	\$30,000	
Hillsboro	Henry	do	90,000	\$22,000	Columbia City	Louisia	do	110,000	\$65,000
Milton	Van Buren	Sewer	220,000	56,000	Bonaparte	Van Buren	do	180,000	90,000
West Point	Lee	Water	200,000	120,000	North Liberty	Johnson	Water	120,000	60,000
Letts	Louisia	Sewer	191,000	125,000	West Liberty	Muscatine	do	100,000	
Parnell	Iowa	do	80,000	30,000	do	do	Sewer	165,000	
Libertyville	Jefferson	do	103,000	65,800	Wellman	Washington	do	220,000	
Nichols	Muscatine	do	99,000	70,000	Buffalo	Scott	Water	260,000	100,000

IOWA—2D CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL APPLICATIONS ON HAND, FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION, FEB. 22, 1971

Name of applicant	County	Type of project	Funds		Name of applicant	County	Type of project	Funds	
			Loan	Grant				Loan	Grant
Wadena	Fayette	Sewer	\$101,000	\$46,800	Greeley	Delaware	Sewer	\$100,000	\$55,000
Goose Lake	Clinton	do	58,000	30,000	Aurora	Buchanan	Water	60,000	
Prairieburg	Linn	do	75,000	25,000	Stanley	do	Sewer	80,000	70,000
Aurora	Buchanan	do	76,000	25,000	Dyersville	Dubuque	Water	390,000	
St. Olaf	Clayton	do	100,000	75,000	Celmar	Clinton	Sewer	278,000	120,000

IOWA—3D CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL APPLICATIONS ON HAND, FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION, FEB. 22, 1971

Name of applicant	County	Type of project	Funds		Name of applicant	County	Type of project	Funds	
			Loan	Grant				Loan	Grant
Marble Rock	Floyd	Sewer	\$170,000	\$39,000	Rake	Winnebago	Water	\$140,000	\$32,000
Coulter	Franklin	do	90,000	55,000	Plymouth	Gerrard	do	170,000	100,000
Bassett	Chickasaw	do	70,000	30,000	Ventura	do	do	160,000	
Beaman	Grundy	do	83,000	49,600	Woolstock	Wright	Sewer	120,000	80,000
Holland	do	do	105,000	55,000	Garner	Hancock	Water	365,000	
Frederika	Bremer	do	75,400	42,300	Raymond	Black Hawk	Sewer	240,000	160,000
Chester	Howard	do	90,000	70,000	Geneva	Franklin	do	94,000	60,000
Leland	Winnebago	Water	60,000	45,000	Rudd	Floyd	do	234,000	100,000

IOWA—4TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL APPLICATIONS ON HAND, FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION, FEB. 22, 1971

Name of applicant	County	Type of project	Funds		Name of applicant	County	Type of project	Funds	
			Loan	Grant				Loan	Grant
Deep River	Poweshiek	Water	\$100,000		Decatur City	Decatur	Water	\$100,000	\$50,000
Drakesville	Davis	do	28,000	\$10,000	Dallas	Marion	do	130,000	60,000
Numa	Appanoose	do	80,000	70,000	Kellerontown	Ringgold	Sewer	90,000	30,000
Williamson	Lucas	do	55,000	35,000	Agency City	Wapello	do	112,000	70,000
Van Wert	Decatur	Sewer	90,000	55,000	Urbana	Benton	do	180,000	80,000
Clutier	Tama	do	130,000	94,000	Blakesburg	Wapello	do	130,000	95,000
Van Wert	Decatur	Water	90,000	78,000	Kent	Union	Water	50,000	30,000
Promise City	Wayne	do	95,000	55,000	Exline	Appanoose	do	90,000	70,000
Lineville	do	Sewer	150,000	114,000	Jasper	do	do	50,000	40,000
Seymour	do	do	200,000	65,000	Killduff Development Corp	Decatur	Sewer	144,000	96,000
Melrose	Monroe	Water	70,000	50,000	Davis City	do	Water	75,000	75,000
Afton	Union	do	100,000	50,000	Grand River	Monroe	do	500,000	
Walford	Benton	Sewer	90,000	45,000	Monroe County Rural Water Association	do	do		
Woodburn	Clarke	do	140,000	40,000	Wayne County Rural Water Association	Wayne	do	1,800,000	
Hartford	Warren	Sewer	140,000	60,000	Appanoose County Water Association	Appanoose	do	950,000	
Ollie	Keokuk	do	100,000	80,000	Town and County Water District	Ringgold	do	300,000	
Odley Public Utilities	Marion	Water	90,000	70,000	Lucas County Rural Water Association	Lucas	do	1,500,000	
Elberon	Tama	Sewer	110,000	95,000					
Hamilton	Marion	Water	47,000	28,000					
Derby	Lucas	do	66,000	27,000					

IOWA—5TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL APPLICATIONS ON HAND, FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION, FEB. 22, 1971

Name of applicant	County	Type of project	Funds		Name of applicant	County	Type of project	Funds	
			Loan	Grant				Loan	Grant
Callender	Webster	Sewer	\$190,000	\$60,000	Harcourt	Webster	Sewer	\$138,000	\$92,000
Vincent	do	do	96,000	72,000	Barnum	do	do	76,000	50,000
McCalsburg	Story	do	110,000	50,000	Gilbert	Story	Water	240,000	50,000
Dayton	Webster	do	40,000	20,000	Moingona	Boone	do	30,000	30,000
Clarke	do	do	70,000	45,000					

IOWA—6TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL APPLICATIONS ON HAND, FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION, FEB. 22, 1971

Name of applicant	County	Type of project	Funds		Name of applicant	County	Type of project	Funds	
			Loan	Grant				Loan	Grant
Paton	Greene	Sewer	\$170,000	\$70,000	Cherokee County Rural Water System No. 1	Cherokee	Water	\$1,330,000	
Rock Rapids	Lyons	Water	100,000		Fostoria	Clay	Sewer	110,000	\$70,000
Mallard	Palo Alto	Sewer	190,000	90,000	Salix	Woodbury	do	110,000	70,000
Brunsville	Plymouth	Water	45,000		Osceola County Rural Water Association	Osceola	Water	2,250,000	
Oto	Woodbury	Sewer	89,000	56,000	Fenton	Kossuth	Sewer	117,000	77,000
Wallingford	Emmet	do	87,000	54,000	Calumet	O'Brien	do	55,000	28,000
Archer	O'Brien	Water	26,000		Smithland	Woodbury	do	110,000	80,000
Okoboji	Dickinson	do	150,000						
Rural Water System No. 2	Lyons and Sioux	do	1,260,000						
Wesley	Kossuth	Sewer	170,000	85,000					

IOWA—7TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL APPLICATIONS ON HAND, FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION, FEB. 22, 1971

Shambaugh	Page	Water	\$60,000	\$49,000	Arcadia	Carroll	Sewer	\$127,000	\$60,000
Yorktown	do	do	50,000	25,000	Portsmouth	Shelby	do	55,000	26,000
Pacific Junction	Mills	do	100,000	60,000	Knierim	Calhoun	Water	50,000	40,000
St. Charles	Madison	Sewer	119,000	51,000	Minburn	Dallas	do	10,000	
Kirkman	Shelby	Water	50,000	20,000	Twin Lakes Utilities and Pollution Control	Calhoun	Water and Sewer	350,000	250,000
Conway	Taylor	do	40,000	28,000	Blencoe	Monona	Water	40,000	
Bridgewater	Adair	Sewer	100,000	70,000	Bayard	Guthrie	Sewer	320,000	140,000
Kimballton	Audubon	do	83,000	37,900	Imogene	Fremont	Water	40,000	40,000
Pisgah	Harrison	do	140,000	40,000	De Sota	Dallas	do	100,000	
Adair County Water Corp.	Adair	Water	4,600,000		Dexter	do	do	200,000	50,000
Tennant	Shelby	do	24,000	20,000	West Central Rural Water Association	Carroll, Crawford, and Shelby	do	1,800,000	
do	do	Sewer	51,900	20,000					
Braddyville	Page	do	61,000	30,000					
Halbur	do	do	115,000	10,000					

	Loans	Grants
1st	\$2,268,000	\$803,800
2d	1,318,000	446,800
3d	2,266,400	917,900
4th	9,172,000	1,817,000
5th	990,000	469,000
6th	6,389,000	680,000
7th	8,685,900	1,066,900
Total	31,069,300	6,201,400

## SOUTH DAKOTA RESOLUTIONS

## HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, the South Dakota State Legislature has recently passed a resolution asking that the shrine of democracy at Mount Rushmore be declared a primary Western focal point for the celebration of our Nation's 200th birthday. I believe that Mount Rushmore is uniquely suited to symbolize what the West has meant to this country. Its setting in the Black Hills of South Dakota is typically Western, and its memorial to four great Presidents has meaning for all Americans. I, therefore, feel that the following resolution passed by the South Dakota State Legislature should receive serious consideration:

## CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 9

A concurrent resolution, Inviting the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission to include in its primary focal points for the observance of the 200th anniversary of this nation's founding, the Shrine of Democracy at Mt. Rushmore

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein:

Whereas, at Mt. Rushmore the nation's dedication to the principles of our founding fathers is carved out of granite in the form of the faces of the drafter of the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson; our first president, George Washington; Abraham Lincoln who preserved the nation; and Theodore Roosevelt who is identified with the opening of the west; and

Whereas, this National Memorial links in

a most direct way the western part of the United States with this nation's founding heritage; and

Whereas, during our nation's Bicentennial it is desired that all in our country experience a re-kindling of a sense of pride and history in our national origins and traditions; and

Whereas, the Shrine of Democracy has, over the years, come to symbolize such a spirit to millions who have visited this National Memorial; and

Whereas, the formal dedication of Mt. Rushmore as one of the primary focal points of the Bicentennial observance will encourage others to share with their fellow Americans this inspiring experience; and

Whereas, at the present time there has been no formal designation of a western point as one of primary settings for the Bicentennial; and

Whereas, Mt. Rushmore is located amidst the scenic and unspoiled splendor of the Black Hills National Forest; and

Whereas, the communities in the Black Hills area are experienced in providing the necessary services to the visiting public;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the Senate of the Forty-sixth Legislature of the state of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein, that we invite the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission to schedule as the primary western focal point for the 200th anniversary of the founding of our nation the Mt. Rushmore National Memorial; and

Be it further resolved, that the Secretary of the Senate of the state of South Dakota be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, to the members of the South Dakota congressional delegation, and to the President of the United States.

Despite the pleasurable anticipation with which we look forward to the 1976 bicentennial celebration, there is a blot on the future of South Dakota and all other agricultural States. The South Dakota Legislature, at the same time that it called for a Mount Rushmore celebration, called attention to this fact in another resolution. This resolution points out that the agricultural economy of the United States is in serious difficulties. This problem can be dealt with only by immediate action on the part of the President and Congress to create a program to revitalize our agricultural

economy. This must be done now, before it is too late. I ask you to listen to the voice of South Dakotans speaking through their State legislature asking for your help:

## CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 10

A concurrent resolution, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to initiate and implement action to revitalize the agricultural economy of our nation

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein:

Whereas, the agricultural economy of the United States is in a period of serious instability because of almost total inaction and lack of concern by the government of the United States; and

Whereas, the number of those people involved in producing the foods for America are so small compared to those people who are benefiting from this productivity that the agricultural problems are subordinated to those of greater political numbers; and

Whereas, the President and the Congress of the United States have the joint responsibility to establish a complete agricultural program for the general welfare of this nation and the world; and

Whereas, the time for action by the President and the Congress of the United States is the present if serious consequences and unnecessary suffering are to be avoided;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the Senate of the Forty-sixth Legislature of the State of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein, that the Congress of the United States initiate and the President of the United States implement without delay the necessary programs to revitalize the agricultural economy of our nation; and

Be it further resolved, that copies of this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted by the Secretary of the Senate of the State of South Dakota to the office of the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the United States House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate of the United States and the members of the Congressional delegation of the State of South Dakota.



**THE PRESIDENT'S DOMESTIC PROGRAM: OLD WINE IN NEW BOTTLES, BY LEON H. KEYSERLING**

**HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 30, 1971*

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the National Housing Conference held its 40th Annual Conference on March 7 and 8 here in Washington. Prior to joining this House, I sat on the Board of Directors of NHC for a good many years. It was a rewarding and fruitful association with an institution dedicated to the public interest.

As Senator JOHN SPARKMAN said on the floor of the Senate this last March 11:

The National Housing Conference is one of the most outstanding and effective public interest organizations for housing in our nation. Founded in 1931, it was the earliest organized national group in support of Federal assistance for the elimination of slums and the provision for decent housing for all of our people. Over the years, it has been a consistent and forceful promoter of the public interest in housing and urban development programs.

This tribute from the chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, clearly illustrates the esteem with which this association is held as an active advocate for the best concerns of citizens.

On March 7, Leon K. Keyserling addressed this convention. Former chairman of the Council of Economic Affairs, a consulting economist and attorney here in Washington, and president of the Conference on Economic Progress, he stands as one of the foremost figures on the national economic spectrum. I highly recommend to my colleagues the reading of Mr. Keyserling's address which follows:

**THE PRESIDENT'S DOMESTIC PROGRAM: OLD WINE IN NEW BOTTLES**

(Address of Leon H. Keyserling)

My Friends: I detect in this audience many of my co-workers over many years, and some for almost four decades. I also congratulate all of you here tonight, because you have zealously retained your position as the most responsible guardians of the most mistreated step-child of American economic and social performance. This step-child, of course, is housing—the activity supposed to improve the living conditions of the American people, and to help rescue our urban areas from frightful deterioration and impending bankruptcy.

Housing has indeed been like Cinderella before her sudden change into a princess. The big difference is that the cinder girl was not promised very much long in advance of her transformation, while housing has received one glittering promise after another, from the highest authorities on down, but the transformation is not yet.

Before getting into this in detail, I want to talk mainly about the general economy, its recent performance, the current outlook, and the reckless promises, also from the highest authorities, to bring about a change for the better. This is very pertinent to housing. Excessive unemployment, massive poverty, and economic stagnation and recession make the housing task insurmountable. Although housing is relatively neglected even when the economy is doing well, it gets hit the hardest when the economy is in the dumps. It is

the prime victim of the mistaken national economic policies, first designed deliberately to get the economy into the dumps, and now groping blindly to get it out of the dumps. Thus, it is axiomatic that straightening out the national economy and national economic policies is the first and foremost aspect of the task of straightening out housing.

During the past five years, the size of our unmet domestic priorities and the size of our international burdens have challenged our nation and our people, as seldom before, to utilize fully our unrivaled productive powers. But during this five-year period, our real average annual economic growth rate has been cut to about half of what it was during the immediately preceding six years. It has been cut to far less than half of our growth potentials. Full-time unemployment, in ratio to the civilian labor force, has risen by 66 percent since December, 1969. During the five years as a whole, we have forfeited, through excessive idleness of manpower, plant, and other productive resources, almost 550 billion dollars of total national production, measured in 1969 dollars, and endured almost 6 million man-years of excessive unemployment. This has brought civil and social strife and disorder, in part because of the extreme deprivation suffered by many, and in part because of the divisive quarrels among those who have competing priorities in a stunted economy unable to serve them all.

If all of this had happened by mere accident or negligence, we should have been sorry; but because it has happened through positive national economic policies, we should be ashamed. These policies have been deliberately adopted to reduce inflation by creating vast idleness of plant and manpower. Ever since earlier efforts of the same sort were made in the mid-1950's, I have persistently pointed out that the so-called "trade-off" of causing more unemployment in order to achieve greater price stability was not only unconscionable, but was also a figment of the imagination. I do not have time here today to state the theoretical reasons why this is true; suffice it to say that it has been proved true beyond the shadow of a doubt. The average annual rise in consumer prices during the most recent five-year period was 4.6 percent, compared with less than one third of this during the six previous years of moderately high economic growth and great reduction in unemployment. And with insignificant exceptions, prices have moved upward more rapidly when the economy has moved downward more rapidly.

Turning to the current economic situation and the outlook, the President now tells us that his fiscal 1972 Budget, sent to the Congress early in calendar 1971, represents a shift from a restrictive to a vigorously expansionary economic policy. This claim, accompanied by all the gadgetry of "revenue sharing" and "government reorganization" and "giving the Government back to the people," is a great tour de force in the art of politics. But it has no semblance to reality.

On the spending side, the President's Budget for fiscal 1972, trended six months beyond the end of that fiscal year, implies 239.9 billion dollars of actual Federal spending in calendar 1972, measured in fiscal 1972 dollars.

This would increase calendar 1972 Federal spending above estimated calendar 1971 Federal spending by almost exactly the same amount as the actual average annual increase in such spending during the immediately preceding four years or so, which were claimed to represent a severely restrained Federal spending policy in the misguided and ill-fated battle against inflation. So the President has made no appreciable change in Federal Budget policy on the

spending side. He is merely maintaining an established trend which has proved far too restrictive on both economic and social grounds, and been highly inflationary for this very reason.

The President also says that he is deliberately developing a large deficit in the fiscal 1972 Federal Budget, in order to expand the economy. The deficit that he estimates for fiscal 1972 is consistent with a deficit of about 12 billion dollars in calendar 1972. But a deficit of at least this size was forecast by most competent economists even before the President announced his alleged change in policy; and a clear majority now forecast that this deficit will be closer to 20 billion than 12 billion in calendar 1972, because of the grossly inadequate economic growth which will result from the President's grossly inadequate program. Thus, on the deficit side, the President has done nothing new; he has merely attempted to make the worse appear the better cause by hailing loudly the prospect of a deficit which is occurring, not through a constructive attempt to stimulate the economy, but rather by continuing to neglect it.

Taken as a whole, the President's skillfully packaged program is nothing more nor less than the pouring of old wine into new bottles, with much hulla-ba-loo.

The President's various estimates, reasonably projected, impart that his program would lift total national production, measured in fiscal 1972 dollars, to about 1142.7 billion dollars for calendar 1972, and reduce full-time unemployment to about 4.2 percent by the end of that year. But most independent and objective analysis, with which I agree, indicates that total national production for calendar 1972 will fall about 24.2 billion dollars below the President's target, with full-time unemployment of 4.8-5.0 percent by the end of that year.

Even more important are the differences between these likely results of the President's program and appropriate goals for the economy, which are much higher than the President's targets. His program is likely to result in total national production for calendar 1972 about 54.6 billion dollars below an 1173.1 billion goal for that year, representing adequate movement toward full production. And the likely result of 4.8-5.0 percent unemployment at the end of that year, under the President's program, contrasts with an appropriate goal of 3.7 percent and the further goal of getting down to 3.0 percent, or full employment, early in calendar 1973.

Now, just how far does the President's proposed Budget for fiscal 1972 fall short of that required to meet the employment and production goals I have just set forth? First of all, the President's implied expenditure program for calendar 1972, consistent with the President's Budget for fiscal 1972, is 27.4 billion dollars below the 267.3 billion which would be appropriate in terms of achieving economic restoration at the desirable pace which I have indicated. This higher level of spending might result in a Federal deficit of about 30 billion dollars in calendar 1972, contrasted with the 20 billion likely to result from the President's program. But this difference of about 10 billion dollars would be a very wise investment to yield an estimated difference of 54.6 billion in total national production in calendar 1972. Moreover, the President's program involves the likelihood of a huge deficit in the Federal Budget, not only in calendar 1972, but also for many years thereafter, in consequence of deficient economic performance. But a deficit consistent with adequate progress toward economic restoration in calendar 1972 offers the prospect of a balanced Budget within a few years.

The adverse impact of the President's inadequate Budget upon our economic and so-

cial performance is intensified by the distorted composition of the Budget in terms of our national priorities—a distortion not masked by the small and misguided proposal for "revenue sharing."

For calendar 1972, the President's Budget, consistently carried forward, imports spending for all domestic programs about 9.2 billion dollars below the needed amount. His proposed spending for public assistance imports about 10 billion below the needed amount. His proposed spending for health comes to about 0.8 billion below the needed amount. His proposed spending for manpower imports about one billion below the needed amount. And his proposed spending for housing and community development, importing about 4.7 billion dollars, is about 7 billion below the needed amount of 11.7 billion. All of these needed amounts for calendar 1972 are those estimated by me, and not far from those estimated by some others, in the course of long studies of what kind of Federal Budget would do most for the economy and the people, and therefore be best for the Federal Budget itself in the long run.

One reason why total domestic spending imported for calendar 1972 from the President's fiscal 1972 Budget comes to only about 9 billion dollars below the needed total, despite the fact that the deficiencies which I have just stated come to far more than 9 billion, is that his Budget contains far too much spending for other purposes, and I am not talking about national defense. His Budget imports about 20 billion dollars for Federal spending in calendar 1972 for interest payments on the national debt. This is more than 8 billion above what the interest payments would have been on a debt of the same size, if interest rates had stayed where they ought to be. In addition, if unsound monetary and fiscal policies had not contributed so much to economic stagnation and recession, the Federal debt now would have been much lower than it actually is, or at least enormously less in ratio to total national production. The program which I advocate would reduce this ratio from 38.3 percent estimated for calendar 1972 to 21.4 percent in calendar 1980.

What I have just said indicates that fiscal policy has not been the only culprit, in the processes of economic default and social neglect. The prevalent policy of tight money and rising interest rates has stunted economic growth; increased unemployment; fed the fat and starved the lean; done incredible damage to housing and to many programs in the public sector; and, during 1952-1970, transferred an estimated 407 billion dollars in excessive interest rates from those who need income supplementation most to those who need it least.

For calendar 1970 alone, the excessive interest costs in the Federal Budget are estimated at 8.2 billion dollars, contrasted with programs in the fiscal 1972 Budget which come to only about 6.3 billion for education, and about 4.5 billion for housing and community development. Also, housing and community development outlays almost three times as high as those proposed in the fiscal 1972 Budget could be financed, if only the excess interest payments in the Federal Budget were being used instead for housing and community development. The calendar 1970 cost of excessive interest rates in the Federal Budget come to about two-thirds of the total Federal spending that would be required annually, by way of income supplementation, to lift out of the poverty cellar all American families who now live in poverty.

We are told that interest rates are now coming down. Some of them have come down substantially, but only in response to damage to the economy which far exceeds the benefits of the lower interest rates. And if the prevalent monetary philosophy continues, it is as sure as nightfall that these interest

rates will go up again, when the economy at long last begins to expand significantly, and when we rekindle the upside-down fight against inflation.

I will not undertake here to review the whole record of interest-rate performance to date. But let us say that the official average interest rate on home financing has thus far come down from 8½ percent to 7½ percent, not taking account of the undercover extra charges which make the absolute rates far higher than those I have just stated, and may make the reduction far less than I have just stated. An interest rate of 7½ percent, especially when coupled with other rising housing costs, makes it impossible to do any substantial amount of building of homes for 35 percent or more of the population, and practically none for those living in slum housing. When the effective interest rate was only about 4½ percent, everybody who knew anything about the subject recognized that an interest rate very much lower than this was essential to rehouse slum dwellers, or to help revitalize our urban areas. An effort in this direction was embodied in the General Housing Act of 1949, but due to the resistance of encrusted Federal agencies, and the failure of legislative implementation, this effort died aborning.

There are many other aspects of error in current national economic thinking and policy. The farm parity ratio has fallen to the lowest level since 1934. The income disparities of average farm families mount year by year, as do their deficiencies in public services and housing, while these families continue to be driven into the cities, where they swell the relief rolls and add to the intolerable burdens of urban governments. The wage earner continues to be pilloried as a main factor in the raging inflation, when in fact the real take-home pay of workers in manufacturing has declined during the past two years. Total wage payments today fall tremendously short of those needed for adequate expansion of consumption as the dominant factor in the restoration of full employment and full production.

I could add to the list. But let us now turn specifically to housing—remembering always that the housing problem cannot be met, except in the context of a healthy general economy, and the reconstruction of national economic and social policies toward this end.

Some of us preen ourselves upon the fact that "housing is looking up," in that total private housing starts, nonfarm and farm, rose at seasonally adjusted annual rates from 1.06 million in January 1970 to 1.70 million in January 1971. But much more perspective is in order. From January to December 1969, the drop in total private housing starts was about 34 percent, or the most catastrophic decline for any major industry since the Great Depression. The annual rate in January 1971 does not look so encouraging, when compared with more than 1.91 million, two full decades ago in 1950, in a nation and economy which has advanced so enormously during these two decades in population, incomes, and business activity. During 1959-1970 inclusive, the average annual rate of total private housing starts was only 1.42 million, when the need was at least 1.8 million a year.

Vacancy ratios are now critically low in most of our largest cities; overcrowding is outrageous; costs of occupancy soar; one sixth or more of a nation still live in urban and rural slums; the slums are choking our urban areas; and we all continue to talk about the housing problem, and to hold housing meetings and conventions.

Moreover, it is crystal clear that the current rate of homebuilding is so predominantly concentrated upon the upper half of the market that "saturation" and decline will again set in, even if interest rates and national economic conditions and policies did not remain so unfavorable.

To achieve, during the decade ahead, a rate of considerably more than 2 million new homes a year—which we need—about 300 thousand a year, contrasted with a record in recent years of less than one seventh of this number on the average, should be built for those who require public housing or its equivalent. The more than 1.7 million remainder per year need to be divided, approximately equally, between conventionally financed housing and new types of housing, at very low interest rates, with large Government assistance in one form or another.

Compared with the need for a total increase in civilian employment of more than 20 percent over the next decade, the employment increase in contract construction needs to be close to 40 percent. Investment in residential structures, which declined from 34.7 percent of total fixed investment in 1961 to 22.4 percent in 1970, needs to be lifted to 34.0 percent by 1980, and most of this increase is needed long before then. Compared with an average annual real growth of investment in nonfarm residential construction of only about 0.5 percent during the past decade, this rate needs to be lifted to more than 11 percent during the decade ahead to achieve balanced economic growth, full employment, meaningful urban renewal, social amelioration, and elimination of social and civil tensions. In short, this type of investment needs to grow, in real terms, at an annual rate more than twice as fast as the total U.S. economy during the decade ahead.

Viewing the inexorable technology displacement of workers in mass production industries and agriculture, an adequate volume of housing investment and complementary community development can solve almost half of the total problem of excessive unemployment which is bound to arise if the prevalent national economic policies are not drastically revised.

The steps which need to be taken, to restore the economy and to lift housing to its rightful place in the totality of nationwide endeavor, follow naturally from what I have thus far said.

*First*, action under the Employment Act of 1946 must be rescued from a long residence in limbo. This means that the *Economic Report* of the President should contain a long-range—at least five year—quantitative economic and social budget for the nation, setting forth goals responsive to our needs and potentials;

*Second*, there should be no "trade-off" of full employment, full production, and the priorities of our needs. A reasonably full economy has turned out to be the less inflationary in the long run, and a stagnant or recessionary economy fans inflation;

*Third*, by calendar 1972, the Federal Budget should be running at an annual rate more than 37 billion dollars higher than the fiscal 1972 Budget proposed by the President, and more than 27 billion dollars higher than the translation of the President's Budget into its implications for calendar 1972. Vast priority rearrangements within the Budget are essential;

*Fourth*, we ought, for the time being, to put an end to all talk about Federal tax reductions in general. During the past decade, we have indulged in a veritable orgy of tax reduction, which has provided unconscionable bonanzas for some, and seriously impaired the progressive nature of the Federal tax structure. Tax reduction, and especially this sort of tax reduction, has been discredited as an effective weapon for sustained economic growth, and has added greatly to inflationary forces; it totally ignores priority needs;

*Fifth*, we must get to work at once, as I have already stated, to vindicate the promise to build more than 2 million new homes a year, with about one seventh of these public housing or its equivalent, and the balance about equally divided between conventionally



financed private housing and new quasi-private programs for lower middle-income groups, with very low interest rates and other forms of Federal assistance;

*Sixth*, in calendar 1972, the Federal Government ought to be spending about 11.7 billion dollars for housing and community development, compared with about 4.5 billion in the President's fiscal 1972 Budget, which implies about 4.7 billion for calendar 1972;

*Seventh*, we need complete abandonment of the step-child attitude of national policy toward housing and community development. In the most recent year for which data are available, 45.7 percent of the value of all depreciation and depletion allowances granted by the Federal Government went to manufacturing, and only 5.8 percent went to real estate, including housing and related community improvements. Tax legislation in 1969 went even beyond this, and in the name of reform imposed punitive treatment upon housing and related real estate investment, even while the evidence had become overwhelming that housing was the weakest major sector of the economy. During 1964-1969, only 2.9 percent of net Federal subsidy expenditures went to housing and related community improvements, while 47.7 percent went to agriculture, and 19.4 percent to air transport and maritime. The President's allocation to housing and community development in his fiscal 1972 Budget comes to only about 0.40 percent of the total national production implied in that Budget, while his allocation to national defense, space technology, and all international comes to 7.56 percent, or about nineteen times as much;

*Eighth*, the prevalent monetary policy, which in my view has been nothing less than a public crime, should be scrapped by legislative action. It has already wrought havoc; its perpetuation would be tragic. The Federal Reserve Board should be brought under the meaningful control of the President and the Congress. The Board should be required to expand the money supply at a rate consistent with appropriate goals for economic growth. It should undertake far more selective monetary and credit controls, taking account of national priorities and the goals of the Federal Government, as defined by Congressional and Executive action; and

*Ninth*, even before achieving any or all of the above measures, the Congress should legislate a ceiling of 3 to 4 percent on private and public loans for housing and related community improvements. This will hurt for a while, and produce many squawks. But in the longer run, the downward movement of one interest rate after another will be highly beneficial to all except the usurious, while the jacking up of one interest rate after another has been like playing Russian roulette with our economy and our people. The size of recent reductions in interest rates, especially for housing, has been a mere bagatelle compared to the need, and the prevalent monetary policy offers no assurance that interest rates will continue their decline; they might well rise again.

Those of you here today have a big task ahead. In my view, you have spent too much of your energy and resources, albeit understandably, in rearguard battles against reaction, or in fighting for the better choice among small and inadequate gains. Returning to the original purpose and crusading spirit of this organization in its early days, you need to be on the front lines of the educational and political effort to reawaken the Government, the nation, and the people, and to move forward with what F. D. R. in his last message called "a strong and active faith." Obstacles no greater than those we overcame in 1937 and 1949 can be overcome again in the early 1970's, if we will let our minds be bold.

As I have just referred to political effort, I owe it to you to explain just what I mean. In a Democracy, public policy is determined by political action, as it should be. But too often, political action consists of becoming more interested in parties and personalities than in programs and causes. To be sure, it is both practical and right that the responsible citizen should take political sides. But this has too often resulted in standing by our side *because* it is our side, and castigating the other side *because* it is not. This has imposed a very heavy toll upon programs and causes, because the Opposition shrugs off criticism of its programs as being political in a narrow sense, and our side, when in charge, feels that it has been given *carte blanche* to do as it pleases without fear of rebuke from its side.

I have not criticized the current Administration in this talk, nor elsewhere, because I am not on its side in a political sense. I have criticized it only where I believe its policies to be against the public interest, and I have not hesitated to criticize equally on the same grounds those previous national administrations of my political party. I did not start to attack tight money and rising interest rates in 1969; I started in 1952, and I have never stopped. I do not think that the abandonment and betrayal of what a nationwide housing program should be commenced in 1969. With moderate variations, this has been going on since the end of World War II, under both Democratic and Republican Administrations.

It is perhaps natural that a majority of the membership of an organization such as this one gravitate toward a particular political party. But this organization would swerve from its traditions and its true course, if it ever permitted narrow political preferences to distract it from that brand of political action which is the highest duty of the citizen. This is to demand that all candidates and incumbents, all parties and all administrations, act in the interests of the nation and the people, receive praise when they do, and condemnation when they do not.

The NHC convention with a benediction delivered by Rev. Msgr. Lawrence J. Corcoran, secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities.

#### BENEDICTION—NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE BANQUET

(Rev. Msgr. Lawrence J. Corcoran, secretary, National Conference of Catholic Charities, Washington, D.C.)

O God, the Creator of all things and the Architect of the Universe, we ask your inspiration, guidance and assistance for all here present. You have brought the world into being and endowed it with great resources. You have created man, endowed him with deep intelligence, and charged him with the completion and perfecting of the world around him.

All of us gathered here are dedicated to this work of building up and perfecting of this world—its neighborhoods, its communities and its environment. We are engaged, O Lord, in Your work, in that portion which you have given to man, and left to his ingenuity and his labor.

We renew our devotion to this task, O Lord, and ask your blessings on our efforts. Grant us an awareness of the high purpose of our work, help us to recognize Your design and thus to mould our energies and our directions in conformity to Your Divine Law. Sustain us in our deliberations and our labor, so that our handiwork will be a beautiful reflection of Your own creative activity.

Above all, enable us to reflect this same Divine beauty in our daily lives, so that these too will be built into Your image and respond to the noble dignity which You have bestowed upon us. Amen.

#### HOW CONFIDENTIAL IS THE CENSUS?

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker for over 2 years I have had the honor of being chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. During these 2 years my subcommittee has investigated in depth the methodology and procedures utilized by the Census Bureau in conducting the 1970 Census. The Subcommittee on Census and Statistics concluded its oversight of the 1970 census procedures by evaluating the accuracy of the census. Our comments and recommendations on the census can be found in House Report No. 91-1777, "Report on Accuracy of the 1970 Census Enumeration." I recommend, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of Congress take time to review our report as it discusses in a concise manner one of the most important undertakings of our Federal Government—the decennial census.

During our subcommittee hearings on the census we, of course, investigated the confidentiality system instituted by the Bureau of the Census. After the most intense review of the Census Bureau's confidentiality system ever conducted by a congressional committee, we concluded that the only improvement necessary was to further strengthen the Census Bureau's administrative procedures for confidentiality by writing them into law. Our subcommittee, therefore, drafted H.R. 12884 which passed the House of Representatives on September 25, 1969. This legislation would:

First, eliminate the requirement that the census must include questions on unemployment and housing, thus directing the enumeration of a census of population only—though authorization is provided for the inclusion of unemployment and housing and other census information as deemed necessary;

Second, provide to the committees of the Congress having legislative jurisdiction over the Bureau of the Census, the final authority for the approval, rejection, or revision of the proposed decennial census questions;

Third, direct the Secretary to submit the proposed census questions to the appropriate committees of Congress for review and approval 3 years before the census date;

Fourth, eliminate all jail sentence penalty provisions, whether for individuals or organizations, and whether for refusal to answer census questionnaires or for willfully falsifying the information being provided;

Fifth, incorporate into law present administrative procedures for guaranteeing confidentiality of census information as well as strengthening these procedures;

Sixth, increase the fine from \$1,000 to \$5,000 and the jail sentence from 2 to 5 years for any employee of the Census Bureau who divulges confidential information;

Seventh, provide the Secretary of Commerce with specific authority for conducting special census for States and local communities;

Eighth, encourage the greater use of sampling techniques; and

Ninth, direct the Secretary to prevent duplication of effort by using existing information instead of conducting direct inquiries.

Unfortunately, the other body did not act on H.R. 12884. However, I am hopeful that similar legislation will become law during this Congress.

Because my subcommittee has devoted so much time and energy in overseeing the activities of the Census Bureau, I was very interested in an article that appeared in the Washington Post on March 28, 1971, entitled "The Census: Data Bank Airtight Against Snoopers." I feel that this article serves as an excellent historical review of the efforts of the Bureau of the Census to guarantee the confidentiality of the data it is charged to collect and compile by our Government. However, it is unfortunate that the words "data bank" appear in the title of this excellent article, as the subcommittee does not consider the activities of the Census Bureau as having much relevance to the popular conception of data banks as expressed in recent congressional hearings.

Mr. Speaker, I include "The Census: Data Bank Airtight Against Snoopers" in the RECORD:

**EVEN THE GOVERNMENT IS TURNED AWAY: THE CENSUS: DATA BANK AIRTIGHT AGAINST SNOOPERS**

(By William Chapman)

It happens rarely now, but on occasion FBI agents show up at the U.S. Census Bureau seeking information on suspects they're tracking. So, occasionally, do immigration authorities, narcotics agents and military security men.

From outside government come lawyers searching for heirs to estates and genealogists looking for ancestors.

All are politely but firmly fended off by one of the few government agencies so pledged to secrecy that it won't share its personal information even with other parts of the bureaucracy.

"As far as we're concerned," says one census security man, "the individual is just a statistic and we want to keep it that way."

The government's biggest collector of information, the Census Bureau is backed up by a special public law preventing disclosure of personal data. It has a string of court decisions and administrative rulings protecting its confidentiality. It even has a special computer which "edits" the output of other computers to make sure that gross statistical data does not emerge in detail small enough to pinpoint individuals.

"We've had evidence of information leaking everywhere but from the Census," says Rep. Cornelius Gallagher (D-N.J.), who headed a House subcommittee investigating agencies which collect private information.

"They really are tight. We never found one example of a break. I wish I could say that of the other agencies."

"I can't recall even any hints that the Census information was leaking out in any form," observes Rep. Jackson Betts (R-Ohio), a persistent critic of the type of questions census-takers ask—such as how many people use a particular shower or bath.

Even the wide-ranging investigation of government snooping and dossier-keeping by Sen. Sam Ervin (D-N.C.) made only a quick pass at the Census Bureau, deciding early that the risks of disclosure there were minor.

There are possible loopholes in the Census apparatus, but its penchant for privacy contrasts sharply with recent disclosures of how other government-collected personal information is handled about among many government agencies.

Social Security information, for example, is given on claims of national security to the FBI, the Secret Service, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Internal Revenue Service. It is also passed on to state welfare agencies.

Federal tax returns, by law, can be pored over by FBI, Narcotics, Customs, and Secret Service agents, certain congressional investigating committees, and state income-tax collection agencies. Cases of unauthorized disclosure are not uncommon.

By contrast, the Census Bureau for years has rigidly opposed such dissemination of individual files. Its classic test came during the old War Department's campaign to imprison Japanese-Americans on the West Coast during World War II. Census refused a demand to turn over names and addresses, although it did furnish statistical data used by the military to select neighborhoods where Japanese-Americans lived.

Immigration authorities once came seeking addresses of persons sought for deportation. The Justice Department finally decided Census was legally prohibited from turning over the information. Similarly, the Labor Department was refused names and addresses it wanted for a survey of all working women in Rochester, N.Y.

Once, the Federal Trade Commission seemed to have broken through the wall when it won a Supreme Court ruling that it could subpoena a corporation's copy of a business questionnaire it had filled out for the Census Bureau. The Bureau promptly got Congress to plug the hole with a new law.

#### GROUND RULES

Such efforts to reach Census personal data are now rare. "Occasionally, an FBI agent will come in and ask for help in locating someone," says one Census official. "But it's always a case of him not knowing the ground rules we play by."

Conrad Taeuber, associate director of the Bureau, says there never has been a formal request from top-ranking FBI officials. Others say an agent comes around only once every six or seven years.

There have been cases of suspected leaks by Census employees, but never one with enough substance to warrant prosecution, Taeuber says.

Every employee takes what is called the "census oath," an unusual pledge not to disclose information under penalty of two years in jail and a \$1,000 fine. No one ever has been prosecuted.

There are, however, a number of theoretical loopholes in the confidentiality system. A census enumerator could peddle information on a citizen's living habits, income, health, employment record, child-bearing plans, education and the like—the results of either the decennial census or the many special surveys the bureau performs. Such deliberate leaks would be hard to pin down and prosecute.

Furthermore, anyone willing to risk forgery charges could get minor information such as birth date or places of past residence by filing an application under someone else's name with the Census Bureau's personal census service branch in Pittsburgh, Kansas. Behind guarded doors, records are kept on microfilm there for citizens who need to prove their age and birth date in obtaining passports or becoming eligible for Social Security. More than 2,000 requests a day pour into the Pittsburgh branch. Only the individual or his legally authorized representative can obtain the information.

Confidentiality of census data is enhanced further because it is available in individual form only in the earliest stages of the gathering process.

Questionnaires are photographed onto microfilm in the Jeffersonville, Ind., branch, held for up to a year, and then destroyed either by shredding or by dissolution in a paper mill's chemical vats. The person's address is dropped off during the microfilming stage.

At the Census headquarters in Suitland, Md., the information is transferred from microfilm to magnetic tape to be used in the computers which piece together such information as population counts, income levels, education and housing characteristics. In the process the individual names are dropped, so that in the computer stage there is no way to track back on the individual who supplied the original information.

#### GUARDED DOORS

All the tapes are behind guarded doors. They are kept on reels in a vault-like library instead of being stored permanently in the computers. Thus, it takes a guard's authority to release a particular reel, another confidentiality checkpoint.

What comes out of the computers is gross statistical information from which no personal data could be extracted. It can tell, for example, how many blacks live in a census tract in southeast Washington, but not who they are individually.

As an extra precaution, a special computer "edits" the tapes before they are released to eliminate any small-detail data which might give away the characteristics of an individual person or company. For example, if there were only one steel factory in Johnson County, Illinois, its productions, earnings, and costs could show up separately on a business census of Illinois and provide valuable information for a competitor.

The editing computer blacks out such small-scale statistics and the information would appear only as part of the gross data on steel companies in the entire state.

Census material identifying individuals gets out of the bureau's hands in only one instance—a special series of health surveys taken for the Public Health Service's National Center for Health Statistics. The center wants the names and addresses of respondents for re-surveying later as a way of keeping track of health characteristics over a period of years.

The center's employees are bound by the same non-disclosure oath as the Census employers and the original questionnaires wind up in the federal records center in Atlanta. They are stored in sealed boxes and are released only on the authority of a health statistics official in Washington.

No one—not even the FBI—can see them, according to Carlton Brown, director of the records center in Atlanta.

#### BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

**HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marked the 53d anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian National Republic. Sadly, this freedom was shortlived, though the undaunted spirit of this brave people has never ceased in the quest for liberty.

On the occasion of this anniversary I want to affirm my commitment to the cause of self-determination for the Byelorussian people and for men everywhere who seek a fundamental right to effect their own destiny.



## THE MIDDLE EAST

## HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my belief that any settlement of the Arab-Israel conflict must be political, founded upon clear and binding agreements between rival parties confident of their own security. There can be no military resolution of the Middle East crisis.

This does not mean, however, that military considerations must have no role in a final agreement. On the contrary, if future warfare is to be avoided, both sides must rest assured that their military interests have not been compromised in the course of negotiation. A final compact between Israel and the Arab nations must depend on the confidence of both parties that their national security is as much as guaranteed.

What the precise elements of a secure peace actually are has been the major question behind the recent United States-Israel discussions. Secretary Rogers contends that geography is of little importance to security and that the Israelis should rely upon "the political arrangement" and world power guarantees. Mrs. Meir, on the other hand, argues that defensible borders, requiring territory beyond the pre-1967 boundaries, are essential to any Israeli notion of military stability.

Mrs. Meir has the weight of history on her side. In 1967 President Nasser provoked the 6-day war by closing the Straits of Tiran from the Egyptian position on Sharm El Sheikh. He knew that Israel could not stand idly by as her oil supply was cut off from the countries of Asia and Africa.

Today, Israel is well aware of the possibility that this type of reasoning could once again come to the fore of Egyptian military policy. From her recent experience she can only regard geography as inextricably tied to security in the Middle East.

Secretary Rogers may, in fact, be correct in his appraisal of the situation. It just may turn out that history was wrong and that territory does not actually determine security. But as long as his appraisal remains in doubt, it cannot be the basis for Israeli policy. That policy, I have said, must be founded on confidence; there can be little confidence in a proposal as open to question as that offered by Secretary Rogers.

His proposal would, of course, rely upon American guarantees of the political arrangement; a seemingly sensible and imaginative approach. But again, history does not bear this reasoning out. In 1957 President Eisenhower promised that the United States would not permit Egypt to close the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping. When Egypt did, however, in 1959, Washington's answer was "leave it to the U.N." Similarly, a U.N. force could not insure the peace in 1967, vacating Sharm El Sheikh upon Egyptian demand. And, no matter how firm American guarantees are now, there is no cer-

tainty future U.S. administrations will maintain them with the same determination.

What seems obvious from history is that world power guarantees can only supplement, not replace, a political agreement based on defensible borders. By their very existence they provide evidence that something is lacking in the final settlement, that somehow stability has not been insured. So doing, they raise once more the specter of a major power conflict over the Middle East.

My point is this: Assuming that a stable peace can be negotiated by Israel and Egypt, we may find a U.S. or U.N. peace-keeping force unnecessary. Our goal should be real mutual security, not an artificial and surely tenuous set of paper contracts enforced by disinterested and, perhaps, uninterested third parties.

Secretary Rogers' recent efforts have been of great importance. By his persistence alone he has breathed new life into the Jarring talks. By his innovative and thoughtful proposals he has presented a whole new ground for discussion; numerous elements of his offerings will be the subjects of eventual negotiation and compromise.

More important than either of these, he has reaffirmed the Nixon doctrine with respect to Israel: Israel must be allowed to stand on her own two feet, not subject to U.S. pressure and not bound to an imposed settlement.

This last factor is critical. An imposed peace cannot instill confidence in either party; it works, rather, to renew doubts of national security, to require military buildup, and to prepare the way for new confrontations. Secretary Rogers should be complimented for his insistence upon the principle of Israeli independence.

At the same time, both parties in the Near East must be commended for their own willingness to compromise: the Egyptians for their formal recognition of the need for bargaining talks, the Israelis for their readiness to negotiate a partial pullback from presently occupied territory, as stated by Foreign Minister Eban. This new flexibility has been the key to continuing peace in the area.

That peace must still be our main concern. While the Israelis and the Egyptians bargain, every effort must be made to extend and strengthen the voluntary cease-fire that now exists. A mutual agreement to reopen the Suez Canal to the shipping of all nations would be a perfect move in this direction. Such an agreement would cut back military forces on both sides of the canal, thereby decreasing the chance of renewed shooting.

Peace is correctly our sole objective in the Middle East. But in our desire to see a formal resolution to the conflict, the United States must not rush Israel into an agreement that would compromise her security. That would only provide a temporary peace, likely to be disrupted by the most minor changes in the balance of power. What we should work for is a lasting settlement that will increase the confidence of both parties in their own security. That confidence remains essential to Middle Eastern stability.

## POVERTY IN THE ARMED FORCES

## HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, during general debate on H.R. 6531 I included excerpts from material relating to the problems of poverty in the Armed Forces. I want to include the full text of these articles for the benefit of my colleagues as we consider the bill reported by the Committee on Armed Services:

## AIRMAN IS FIRST CLASS . . . EXCEPT ON PAYDAY

(By Paul Merz)

Less than two years ago, Burl Oliver was a happy young college graduate with a bright future in teaching ahead of him. Working on a master's degree, his first job offer was for a starting salary of \$7,400.

Today, to the Portland youth, that modest wage would be a fortune beyond belief.

For instead of teaching in Oregon, he is supporting himself and his young wife in Sacramento on a regular job that pays \$41.75 a week. The Olivers, legally poor by government standards, live in a federal low-income apartment complex in Folsom with others like themselves.

She attends American River College, while he supplements their tiny income by moonlighting as a short-order cook at \$1.60 an hour.

A few months ago, even this wasn't enough: The Olivers swallowed their pride and began reporting to the Sacramento County Welfare Department for food stamps.

Ironically, Oliver's job is one that might cause many to feel he deserves better treatment, whatever their view on the welfare issue:

He is an Airman First Class at Mather Air Force Base.

Not so ironically, his plight is far from unique among the more than 12,000 military men and women in Sacramento.

For of that number, at least 2,000 are among "the forgotten poor" of the county—young airmen and privates, many married and with children, who eke out an existence in their country's uniform at incomes well below the federally established poverty level.

In an era of escalating outcry over welfare abuse, it may be strange to note that none of them is eligible for welfare benefits.

Friday, the Air Training Command (ATC), of which Mather is a part, published a survey showing that young airmen with families in 1971 "generally are forced to live in substandard housing, have no funds for leisure, and are forced to eat below their desired standards."

The survey, result of a census conducted by the ATC chaplain's office, concluded that there is "no doubt that the younger airmen's financial plight affects their morale, family life and job performance. Many must live on an income that is officially below the poverty level. Many are eligible for food stamps and other welfare benefits."

In the Capital City alone, a survey conducted by The Sacramento Union showed, there are 1,882 young enlisted men in military pay grades E1, E2 and E3—recruits, airmen, and airmen and privates first class—who fall into the subpoverty category, earning from \$143.70 to \$180.90 per month for their first two years.

Maj. Gen. William W. Veal, commander of the Sacramento Air Materiel Area at McClellan, said recently his base's statistics showed "a startling number of young airmen in the food stamp program for survival's sake."

A recent unofficial estimate showed the figure to be nearly 1,400 at McClellan alone, though welfare department officials Friday said they believed the number is considerably lower. No breakdown of food stamp recipients is made by occupation, they said.

Mrs. Dorothy Conrad, director of the Sacramento Red Cross service to military families program, which consumes about 40 per cent of the Red Cross budget, said that "we've referred almost every family we see in the lower ranks for food stamps."

But for other welfare programs, Oliver and those who share his plight are apparently out in the cold.

"Most of them don't qualify," explained Richard Winsor, assistant director of the county welfare department.

"It doesn't really matter what their income level is. We consider the military man a 'fully employed person.' You're dealing with an intact family with the father fully employed—and to qualify for aid, they have to meet a deprivation requirement, either through the absence of the father or the unemployment of the father."

Many persons familiar with poverty and its problems—among them local military officials; Robert Tyler, executive director of the Sacramento City-County Human Relations Commission; officers of the Sacramento Area Economic Opportunity Council; the United Crusade and the Red Cross—agree that the plight of the young airman does, indeed, exist.

But few offered solutions. A federal pay raise last Jan. 1 increased the "starting salary" of young military men from \$133.20 to \$143.70 a month, but it is doubtful they rushed out to buy yachts.

Last year, the local Red Cross urged the government to provide adequate housing or housing allowances—but since then, said Mrs. Conrad, "food has gone up so much more too. There've been slight increases in their income, but really not enough to take care of it."

Donald Bell, executive director of the Sacramento Red Cross, explained that "there's nothing more detrimental to a serviceman and his family than this constant financial trouble trying to make ends meet."

His group, which makes thousands of dollars in loans to the men each year, also writes many of them off at the end of each year: "Most people are proud. They don't like outright grants. Most of them would rather try to repay—but often they can't."

According to the ATC survey, published in Mather's base newspaper, "Wing Tips," there is more than financial hurt involved.

"The married lower-three-grade airmen," it said, "all agree that their pay and allowances are insufficient. Many airmen from middle class homes now find themselves living under poverty conditions."

"Many of the airmen feel that their status is lowly and demeaning. To many who come from middle class homes it is very difficult to adjust to the lower living conditions. Most reason that their wives are entitled to better conditions than they are able to provide."

It cited the case of one airman from Mather who contended the Air Force is "guilty of discrimination in its treatment of airmen, when compared to officers."

The unidentified airman cited not only the vast pay differences—whose vastness, with each succeeding across-the-board pay raise, somehow does not filter down to his level—but also such things as "double standards"

between airmen and officers to obtain a loan at the base credit union.

The base, in an accompanying story, denied the "double standard" charge, but explained that while the credit union's limit for a signature loan is \$700 to a first-term airman, the same limit is \$2,500 for officers and senior NCO's.

Summing up the case for Sacramento's "forgotten poor" in uniform, Airman 1. C. Burl Oliver and his wife provide an illustration of the dilemma.

Oliver, as an E3 with less than two years service, makes \$180.90 a month in base pay. In addition, he and his wife receive \$45.60 for rations, \$60 for housing (even the FHA low-income apartment complex in Folsom costs \$110 a month), and \$4.50 a month for clothing.

It comes to a total of \$291 per month, a figure low enough to exempt him from income tax payments. He pays Social Security, however. Should he stay in the Air Force long enough to achieve higher rank (and more money) he will be eligible for on-base housing (which is less expensive).

But Burl Oliver is not likely to stay in uniform when his four years are up.

Like many other first-termers, he shrugs at the non-cash side "benefits" of service—hospital facilities, base commissary food which is about 30 per cent less expensive than down town markets, and lower rates at such Base Exchange services as barbers, cleaners, dry goods, appliances, clothing and television repair.

"A lot of people point out the additional benefits we receive," he explained, "but that varies on an individual basis. I feel they compensate a little, but nowhere near as much as some people feel they do . . ."

Now 24, he is embarrassed that he and his family must be in the food stamp program as they live from payday to payday every two weeks.

Oliver, like others surveyed by the Air Force, is quietly frustrated by his plight. Money, he said, would not be his primary reason for re-enlisting—but it will certainly be a factor.

"I'm just not cut out for the Air Force," he explained quietly.

"I'm in a position that I can't do anything about. It wasn't my fault."

"I'm sure there are a lot of other guys in the same position. All we can do is hope things will be rectified one of these days . . ."

#### POVERTY IN THE ARMY

(By David N. Saunders)

(NOTE.—This article is based in part on the author's experience and observations when he was an Army social work officer in an Army Community Service Center. He is now a doctoral student at Bryn Mawr College.)

Poverty among United States Army families—so the Army contends—stems primarily

from the personal negligence of the soldier. This position conforms to popular attitudes that poor people are in some way morally and psychologically defective. Yet the fact is that the social fabric of the Army contributes to poverty, and no agency of the United States government has done more to create it.

Contrary to popular belief, there is poverty among both career and non-career Army families. In the spring of 1969 it was estimated that 6 to 8 percent (30,000-40,000) of all Army families were poor and that an additional 40,000-50,000 subsisted on marginal incomes. While the percentage of Army families classified as "poor" was less than the United States average of 10.7 percent (7:27), national figures include groups—the aged, disabled, families without male heads of household—that are not represented in the Army. The existence of indigency within a social system that exercises pervasive control over its members is particularly inexcusable, for such a system possesses the power to alleviate the condition.

This paper will attempt to demonstrate that poverty exists in the Army and that this indigency is caused not so much by the personal negligence of the soldier and his family as by a selective service system that inducts married men with or without children, an antiquated and inadequate military compensation system that encourages irresponsible behavior, and the inability or unwillingness of the Army to discharge most soldiers whose families are poor.<sup>1</sup>

#### THE MARRIED SOLDIER

The upsurge of poverty in the Army is primarily due to the influx of married men. The old saying that "If the Army wanted you to have a wife, it would have issued you one" is no longer appropriate. Between May 1966 and February 1969 the number of enlisted men with wives rose by 150,000 to a total of 516,000; the increase resulted both from the growth of the Army and from the fact that there was a higher percentage of married personnel (10a:8; 10e:6). In February 1969, about 39 percent of all enlisted men were married, a gain of 4 percent since May 1966. Although Regular Army personnel—volunteers who enlist for three or more years—are more likely to be married than are other personnel—primarily draftees—the difference was smaller than would be anticipated—45 percent versus 29 percent (10a:8; 10e:4,6). Contrary to expectation, one of every two married enlisted men and one of every three married enlisted men with children were lower-ranking soldiers (10e:6,8). The 85,000 potentially poor lower-ranking enlisted men with children included between 30,000 and 40,000 who earned less than the Census Bureau's 1968 estimate of poverty income, \$3,553 for a family of four, give or take \$500-\$600 per dependent (2). A breakdown of the percentage and number of these lower-ranking enlisted Army families with children is shown in Table 1 (10e:4,6,8).

TABLE 1.—FAMILY AND POVERTY STATUS OF LOWER-RANKING ENLISTED MEMBERS OF THE U.S. ARMY, BY RANK, 1968

Rank	Total		Marital status		Poverty status <sup>1</sup>	
			Married without children	Married with children	Below poverty level	Near poverty level
Total	900,854	656,446	158,891	85,517	35,500	3,700
Private (recruit)	199,719	156,636	30,762	12,321	12,300	-----
Private (nonrecruit)	128,615	99,389	18,866	10,360	10,000	-----
Private 1st class	200,189	145,140	36,223	18,826	10,800	-----
Corporal or specialist 4	372,331	255,281	73,040	40,010	2,400	3,700

<sup>1</sup> The approximate number of poor families was estimated by calculating the total number of families in a particular pay grade, adjusting for families of nonrecruit privates 1st class and corporals with more than 2 years of active service, and comparing their base pay and quarters allowance, with or without subsistence, to poverty income.



Despite the increasing size of families—nearly 24,000 of these 85,000 families had two or more children, and 7,000 had three or more (10e:8)—dependents' allowances in 1969 were still limited to \$30 a month for the first child, \$15 for the second, and nothing thereafter. While the number of lower-ranking families with children increased by 12,350 or 17 percent between August 1967 and February 1969, the presence in August 1967 of 73,000 potentially poor families (10b) gives credence to the speculation that poverty may be endemic to the Army community (10a:8, 10b:8, 10c:8; 13d:8).

#### FAMILY HARDSHIP

Because they do not qualify for either government quarters, travel, or moving expenses, dependents of lower-ranking enlisted personnel must reside apart from their sponsors in the civilian community, where access to military facilities and services is restricted. This separation usually reduces family income by eliminating the soldiers' monthly subsistence allowance, although soldiers in combat zones do draw an additional \$65 a month in combat pay.

Lower-ranking Army families residing apart from the family head have a variety of ways of adapting to these separations. The traditional arrangement, for the wife to live with relatives or parents, is not always satisfactory, for relatives or parents may not want to assist the family or may not have the financial resources to do so. The problems of maintaining separate residence will be most acute among members of low-income or minority families whose relatives live in the urban ghetto. Such families, whose husbands also stand a high chance of being drafted, will not have access to the personal, family, and financial resources enjoyed by middle-class families. Without family assistance the lower-ranking family may be forced to live with friends or perhaps rent an apartment through use of funds received from employment, welfare, or the husband's part-time job. For example, during her husband's absence the twenty-one-year-old wife and four-month-old daughter of a private first class shared a small apartment in Newark with the wife's mother and her mother's five other children to conserve her monthly allotment of \$130. The apartment was overcrowded. When the local health department ordered her evicted, the Army wife was referred to a military agency specializing in family and financial problems. Financial exigencies necessitated a referral to a public welfare agency, which provided supplementary assistance in this not uncommon situation.

Poverty among lower-ranking enlisted families is not, however, restricted to families living apart from their sponsors. At one large Army training center in New Jersey nearly fifty of the 2,147 assigned families with children earned less than poverty income and one hundred met income eligibility requirements for the state's work-incentive program for underemployed fathers.<sup>2</sup>

New Jersey's experience with military personnel on public welfare is perhaps a harbinger of what may occur elsewhere if President Nixon's work-incentive plan is approved. Under the New Jersey program a family of four, with 1968 poverty income of \$3,553, can receive supplementation up to \$5,640 annually (\$470 a month), provided the head of the household is employed and earns less than \$300 a month. Since certain deductibles—income tax, social security, and fifty dollars in work expenses—will be disregarded in determining eligibility, families earning above a poverty income can qualify for supplementation (3). In the spring of 1969 almost all families with children headed by privates and privates first class met welfare income requirements in New Jersey, as

did some large families headed by corporals and sergeants. Since grants are calculated by deducting the first thirty dollars in earned income, plus one-third of any additional earnings, those Army families who apply, meet eligibility requirements, and are accepted receive at least \$100 a month. In the first six months of 1969 the family of a private with two children would have received more from the public assistance agency than from the Army. In the county in which the training center is situated, a dozen Army families were receiving public assistance in February 1969.<sup>3</sup>

Although New Jersey has not used settlement laws to restrict applications to AFDC and underemployed programs, it has resorted to an even more tenuous subterfuge, the legal status of military reservations, to deny public welfare benefits to the residents of the military community. The state contends that, because these installations belong to the federal government, the inhabitants do not reside in New Jersey. Military dependents living off federal enclaves are treated as any other families. Similar reasoning has barred aid under other federally funded categorical assistance programs to military personnel living on military installations, despite administrative requirements of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, that services within states be available to "all in need thereof." When public assistance is available, military families will utilize it. For example, in March 1969 New York City had 329 military families receiving public assistance (1).

Married soldiers who have committed a variety of disciplinary offenses, particularly absence without leave, constitute another group of poor families. When returned to military control these soldiers are either incarcerated, fined, or reduced in rank. Since family separation, exacerbated by financial difficulties, often leads to absence without leave among married soldiers, military punishment, with its attending loss of pay and allowances, only compounds family problems. Officers who dispense military justice often appear unsympathetic or insensitive to the problems that fines and reductions in rank impose on families.

A final group of potentially indigent families consists of unusually large families of middle-ranking career enlisted personnel. In February 1969 there were 45,921 Army enlisted families with four or more children \* \* \*. While no Army-wide statistical data are available on larger families, nearly three percent of all the enlisted families with children assigned to one training center had six or more children, and a few families had eight or more.<sup>4</sup> Large families face a variety of problems in the Army. Since most installations lack sufficient quarters for them, many rather than rent expensive or inadequate civilian housing, will crowd themselves into existing government housing. At one training center one sergeant and his nine children lived for almost a year in a three-bedroom house. Reassignment of the soldier also imposes considerable hardship, particularly when the husband is sent on an unaccompanied assignment and the family must locate in the civilian community.

Restricted access to public welfare and other social welfare services, caused by restrictive eligibility practices and legal subterfuges, has had a deleterious effect on the Army family. The increasing induction of married soldiers has generated greater demands for services, demands that the Army is unable to fill. Army families are becoming more dependent on the civilian community and the venerable motto, "The Army takes care of its own," is no longer relevant.

#### THE CAUSES OF POVERTY IN THE ARMY

The compensation system. The inadequacy of the soldier's pay is, more than any other single factor, the cause of poverty in the Army. The total income of lower-ranking

married soldiers with children rarely exceeds \$5,000 annually.<sup>5</sup> Hence these families are in the lowest eighth of all United States families (5). These 85,000 families, who in February 1969 comprised 30 percent of all Army enlisted families with children, earned less than \$5,500–\$6,000 set by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics as necessary for a family of four to maintain a low standard of living that still permits a sense of "self respect and social participation."<sup>6</sup>

Had the military set out to develop a complicated pay system whose purpose was to confuse the soldier and the general public, the present system could be considered a resounding success. For pay purposes Army personnel are separated into three distinct groups—lower-ranking noncareer enlisted, and officers. Pay scales for lower-ranking noncareer personnel appear to have been developed with the bachelor in mind, although a large percentage of these soldiers are now married. While the income of the lower-ranking soldier is at best parsimonious, the career enlisted man fares somewhat better, and with in-kind benefits most career soldiers with four or fewer children can adequately support their families. The existence of in-kind benefits does, however, limit disposable income and leaves only a small margin for financial error, so that the budget of even a prudent Army family can be seriously strained by a sudden unanticipated expense, such as a child's dental care, which a comparable civilian family can more easily absorb. The vicissitudes of military life, with its constant moves, create added financial hardships for already tightly budgeted families.

Many in the Army have believed that lower-ranking enlisted men will, if left to themselves, squander their pay. This suspicion has led to the development of a relatively restrictive pay system that gears monetary rewards to specific needs and contingencies and limits the soldier's control over his finances. All enlisted men receive base pay, with increments based on rank and years of service, plus a small monthly clothing allowance (provided they have served six months). A few qualify for proficiency, travel, rations, subsistence, combat, foreign, separation, and other special pays under certain circumstances. Families of lower-ranking enlisted married personnel receive a mandatory monthly quarters allowance directly from the Army. This allowance ranges from \$100.60 for a soldier with one dependent, e.g., wife, to \$145.00 for a soldier with three dependents. The allowance includes a \$40.00 forced contribution from the enlisted man. No additional funds are provided for noncareer soldiers with more than three dependents (8: chap. 3, p. 17). One rationale for the forced family allowance, which was in existence for all enlisted men until 1963 (11a: para. 37E), is that the married lower-ranking enlisted man may not be capable of managing his finances responsibly. This is reminiscent of the arguments used to justify vendor payments in public welfare. Like the welfare recipient, the soldier eventually becomes dependent on the system (4).

If the saying that "you will never get rich in the Army" was true during World Wars I and II, it is certainly true today. During fiscal year 1969 the monthly base pay for the noncareer soldier varied from \$102 for a private to \$251 for a corporal with less than four years of service. The income of privates and privates first class with less than two years of service and two dependents, when stationed away from their families, varies between \$2,300 and \$2,800 a year. However, their families generally receive only the quarters allowance plus whatever else the husband can send home. The soldier who resides with his family and does not eat his meals with his company is entitled to an additional \$475 annually. As the 6 and 12 percent pay increases of July 1968 and July

Footnotes at end of article.

1969 were limited to base pay, they were of dubious value and simply froze existing inequities. In any case they were all wiped out by an annual inflation of over 5 percent.

Passing mention should be made of non-monetary benefits, like post exchanges, medical care, commissaries, and income-tax advantages for which Army families qualify. Since many lower-ranking Army families are located in civilian communities away from their sponsors and military installations, access to many benefits is restricted, and, with limited disposable income, opportunities to realize sizable savings are lacking. In the opinion of this writer, the presumed advantages of these benefits, particularly for the low-ranking noncareerist, are exaggerated.

The procedures used to pay soldiers also affect the financial stability of the Army family. The finance system operates through a centralized center in Indianapolis, which pays allotments, maintains central pay records, and handles special pay problems. The center is supplemented by local finance offices responsible for routine disbursements. In contrast to the Navy, Air Force, federal government, and most industries, which pay their employees either biweekly or twice monthly, the Army still pays once a month in cash or check. Cash seems to retain some kind of intrinsic appeal to the soldier. Like the \$20 gold piece, it provides a visible, immediate reward while obscuring the overall inadequacy of the compensation.

A soldier may authorize the finance center to deduct a portion of his pay, called an allotment, which is sent to a specific recipient. A continuing problem with the allotment is erroneous overpayment, which occurs when the soldier draws his total pay in cash, yet continues to have an allotment deducted by the finance center. Such an overpayment may continue for months unknown to the soldier. When the error is discovered the overpayment must be repaid within six months.

Soldiers anticipating a permanent change in station may also borrow against future earnings, with repayments prorated over a period of six months. These loans, known as advanced pays, are intended to defray anticipated moving expenses. The ease with which they can be obtained often encourages financial overextension that only increases future repayment obligations. A soldier on leave or in transit may also receive casual or partial pays during the month if he is carrying his pay records or possesses a special pay card. These differ from the prorated advance pays in that they must be repaid immediately after the soldier reaches his permanent duty station, even if their deduction leaves him penniless.

The multitude of pays and allowances has, more often than not, thoroughly confused the soldier and his family. Worse still, cash payments intensify money-management problems by encouraging pay-day spending and credit purchases. Advanced pays may appear an easy answer to a soldier facing a change of station, but their attractiveness diminishes when repayment begins and income is curtailed.

The complexity of the pay system often causes a number of clerical errors traceable to either the soldier or his personnel or finance unit, errors that, because of the impenetrability and unresponsiveness of the finance center, are often difficult to correct. The finance center has only three telephone lines available to provide general pay information to all Army installations in the United States, and it takes two or three months to change allotments or correct mistakes. The unresponsiveness of the finance system may impose considerable hardship on the Army wife with a pay problem if she resides apart from her husband in the civilian community.

*The draft.* By forcing increasing numbers of married men into the Army, the selective service system has been responsible for much of the poverty in the Army. In July 1965 married men without children lost their special draft classification and were subsequently inducted as if they were bachelors.<sup>7</sup> The induction of married men often causes considerable family and career disruption, not least among those who learned that their wives were pregnant too late to stop their induction. Students who received college deferments after July 1967<sup>8</sup> were not eligible for deferments when they became fathers. These former students could request hardship deferments from their local boards, but the presence of children was not in itself sufficient reason for deferment. While most local boards still defer fathers who have never had student deferments, even this latter group is not always immune from the long arm of the draft. The demographic composition of a selective service district and the number of deferments it grants can deplete the local manpower pool and force induction of normally exempt fathers. Some men with children are also drafted as delinquent when out of ignorance, indifference, or procrastination they fail to comply with draft-registration procedures. Responsibility for the hardships imposed on families is often dismissed by glibly saying that it "was the soldier's fault" or that "he knew he might be drafted so he should not have gotten married or had children," a line of reasoning that does little to alleviate financial deprivation and that conveniently ignores the social consequences of the draft. In the opinion of this writer, many boards are either unsympathetic to or unaware of the hardships induction imposes on men with children.

The draft's haphazard and sometimes arbitrary use of delays and deferments results in the increased draft vulnerability of certain groups, particularly the young low-income white man who lives in a rural area and has not gone to college and the Negro, wherever he lives (6). These are the very groups that often lack the personal, family, and financial resources to provide adequately for their families after induction.

*Hardship discharge policy.* A standard Army response to questions about poor families is that the usual family that suffers from financial deprivation may be discharged under existing regulations. This is easier said than done, however, and the administrative difficulties associated with obtaining such discharges often reduce their efficacy. If the soldier has sufficient opportunity to work on the application, understands the requirements, receives the necessary guidance, collects the required documentation, and correctly completes the application, then and only then can his request be submitted for approval. While the Army regulation covering hardship discharges (11b: chap. 6, para. 4) is permissive and gives commanders of major Army installations considerable latitude, many commanders seem reluctant to exercise their authority. Intermediate commanders, through whose hands applications must pass, often disapprove them or further delay the process by returning them for additional information. It takes an expert to navigate this bureaucratic Charybdis, and it is not surprising that many soldiers fail. Although the Army discharged 2,187 men for hardship reasons during the first half of fiscal year 1969, averaging between 350 and 400 discharges per month, some discharges were granted for other than financial reasons or to soldiers who were bachelors. That draftees, who account for a minority of all enlisted men, receive almost half of all the hardship discharges suggests that selective

service does not initially screen out many persons with family problems.

If the applicant was drafted or is serving his initial enlistment, the Army usually forwards his request to the selective service headquarters in his home state, which furnishes a statement about "whether the circumstances presented in the application would result in deferment on the undue and genuine hardship to the individual dependents if he were being considered for induction" (11b: chap. 6, para. 4).<sup>9</sup> Commanders are not required to follow selective service recommendations, but may place considerable weight upon them. There appears to be a pervasive belief, both in and out of the Army, that all men should serve in the Armed Forces. This may account, along with certain manpower problems, for the reluctance of the Army to liberalize the hardship-discharge regulations and to discharge more men whose families suffer financial privation as a result of military service.

#### WHAT CAN BE DONE

What can be done to alleviate the problem of poverty in the Army? The first step in the Army's own war against poverty must be a public admission that poverty exists among many Army families, and that this poverty springs primarily from institutional rather than individual sources. This is a difficult mission for the Army. As a conservative and perhaps even reactionary institution, it seems firmly committed to the traditional values of self-reliance and rugged individualism, and often seems intolerant of soldiers who cannot make their own way.

An often-used Army defense for inaction, that the Army has little or no control over appropriations, levels of compensation, or selective service, is simply not true. If the Army evidenced the same commitment for eradicating poverty that it shows for some of its weapons systems, most poverty could be speedily eliminated.

The low priority given poverty is aptly demonstrated by the official policy toward food stamps. In 1968, Fort Sam Houston in San Antonio, Texas, requested permission for its commissary to accept food stamps, in the hope that the stamps would assist indigent active-duty personnel, families of retired personnel, and eligible widows. The Defense Department disapproved the application on the contention that, since food stamp benefits were neither uniform nor available in all areas, their use would discriminate against some military personnel, and by combining two forms of subsidization would increase completion with local retail food stores (9:17). The number of potentially eligible families was thought small, although San Antonio has a number of retired personnel and eligible widows living on fixed income. Similar requests had been killed in 1966 and 1967. Underlying the Defense Department's refusal there was apparently a feeling that the military services could and should take care of their own, a dubious assumption in view of past responses and the magnitude of the problem. The concern seemed to be that the use of food stamps by military families might create a public impression that the Armed Services were not providing adequate compensation, which may well be the truth.

Recent pay increases will not significantly affect the number of poor families in the Army, for during a period of inflation changes in the definition of poverty income invariably accompany increasing wage levels. The 1969 poverty income for a nonfarm family of four should, for example, be nearly \$3,700, up from \$3,335 in 1966.<sup>10</sup>

For the first time in many years, there appears to be considerable national and congressional sentiment for modifying the draft. Poverty in the Army could be significantly reduced if men with families were deferred or exempted. The Army has more than a passing interest in removing draft inequities,

Footnotes at end of article.



since it is heir to much of the antagonism generated by the present inequitable system. And like all government agencies, the Army is ultimately dependent on the good will of the general public, exercised through Congress, for its continued prosperity.

The compensation system must be modified to provide higher rates of compensation in a less complicated manner. Although budgetary problems will probably preclude significant revamping of the compensation system in the near future, the financial situation of many lower-ranking enlisted families could be improved by upward adjustment of quarters allowances. The last change in quarters allowances was in October 1967, and revision is overdue. Attempts must also be made to improve the internal operation of the Army finance system to make it more accessible and responsive to the needs of the recipients.

The availability of hardship discharges for soldiers whose families suffer financial deprivation could be improved by placing greater emphasis on financial hardship in the applicable Army regulations and by earlier identification of such families. The pervasive attitude that early discharges are execrable must be modified if more hardship discharges are to be granted.

In today's society the Army can neither cope with all the social welfare problems within its community nor provide the range of services necessary to alleviate them. As needs have changed, the Army community has become more dependent on the states for social welfare services. It can no longer take care of its own. Restrictive state and local eligibility practices, particularly evident in the South, disqualify many Army families with social welfare needs. The mobility of the Army family gives the Army a particular interest in the elimination of archaic legal settlement requirements and other legal barriers. Despite several court decisions relating to the eligibility of servicemen for social welfare services,<sup>1</sup> no legal precedent has been established. The Army should encourage litigation to determine whether Army personnel can legally be denied social welfare services.

Like their civilian counterparts, the Army poor must be viewed not as moral defectives, but as individuals trapped within a system they can barely understand, much less control. Poverty, in or out of the Army, is a part of our social fabric. It cannot be eradicated through vague references to personal initiative or rugged individualism. Hope for the future lies in the Army's ability to acknowledge the existence of poverty within its community and to decide whether it will honor the commander's historic commitment to the welfare of his troops.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>All pay computations were made before July 1969. Though the conclusions apply specifically to the Army, many are applicable to the other military services as well.

<sup>2</sup>Data from results of Questionnaire on Family Housing, Department of Defense Form 1376, compiled in February 1969 by the directorate of housing at a large Army training center in New Jersey show the number of children and rank of soldier for each family assigned to the installation.

<sup>3</sup>*Burlington County Times*, 22 February 1968.

<sup>4</sup>Six hundred out of 2,100 families had six children or more. See footnote 2.

<sup>5</sup>Estimates were made from base pay, quarters allowance, and subsistence, on the basis of 1969 pay schedules. The validity of making direct comparison between Army and civilian pay can be questioned since Army pay does not include a variety of in-kind nonmonetary fringe benefits.

<sup>6</sup>*New York Times*, 17 March 1969, p. 1.

<sup>7</sup>U.S. Selective Service System, *Selective Service Regulations* (August 1965), sec. 1631.7, para. 4.

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid.* (July 1967), sec. 1622.30, para. A.

<sup>9</sup>Many states consistently respond negatively to enquiries.

<sup>10</sup>*New York Times*, 16 August 1969, p. 17.

<sup>11</sup>*Burlington County v. Lloyd W. McCorkle*, 237 A.2d 640 (Superior Court, New Jersey, 1968); *County of Arapahoe v. Donohoe*, 356 P.2d 267 (Supreme Court, Colorado 1960); *In re Kernon*, 247 App. Div. 665, 288 N.Y. Supp. 329; affirmed 272 N.Y. 569, 4 N.E. 2d 737 (1936). See also *George Washington Law Review* 12 (1943-44): 80-92.

## REFERENCES

1. Clendenin, Michael. "The War Hits Home as GI Families Here Draw Relief." *New York Daily News*, 3 March 1969, p. 3.

2. Dale, Edwin L., Jr. "Number of Poor Down Two Million." *New York Times*, 20 August 1969, p. 1.

3. New Jersey Department of Institutions and Agencies, Division of Public Welfare. *Revised Categorical Assistance Budget Manual*. Trenton, revised March 1969.

4. Scott, Robert A. *The Making of Blind Men: A Study of Adult Socialization*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.

5. "The Sizzling 70's." *Time Magazine*, 23 May 1969, p. 97.

6. Turner, Wallace. "Criticism and Evasion of Draft Grows with Unpopularity of Vietnam War." *New York Times*, 14 May 1968, p. 20.

7. U.S. Department of Commerce. *Current Population Reports*, Series P-60, No. 59, Washington, April 1969.

8. ———. Department of Defense. *Pay and Allowance Entitlements Manual*. Washington, October 1967.

9. ———. Department of the Army. "Personnel Affairs: Information and Guidance for the Army Community Service (ACS) Officer." Continental Army Command Pamphlet 608-1. Fort Monroe, Virginia, 17 April 1969.

10. ———. Office of Personnel Operations, Personnel Management Development Office. *Survey Estimate of Marital Status and Dependents of Army Male Personnel*: (a) Report No. 54-66-E. May 1966; (b) Report No. 2-68-E. August 1967; (c) Report No. 26-68-E. February 1968; (d) Report No. 47-68-E. August 1968; (e) Report No. 27-69-E. February 1969.

11. ———. Office of the Adjutant General. *Army Regulations*: (a) No. 600-20. January 1963; (b) No. 635-200. April 1968.

## WE ARE FOR HOOVER

## HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, in recent months we have heard some of the most shameful and vitriolic attacks in recent experience aimed at one of our most noble and dedicated Americans, J. Edgar Hoover, the illustrious Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Because of his dedication to the survival of America and his exposure of the menace of communism to our national survival, Mr. Hoover has become fair game for the new left elements and their apologists. Certain loyal but gullible political figures have swallowed the leftist propaganda and participated in the smear campaign, which has not hurt Mr. Hoover's image but has certainly tarnished the images of his detractors.

An editorial on this smear campaign, printed February 18 in the *Indianapolis News*, was recently brought to my atten-

tion. Since it expresses the truth about this controversy so well, I insert it in the *RECORD* to share it with my colleagues and the Nation:

## WE ARE FOR HOOVER

The American left is off once more on one of its periodic attacks against J. Edgar Hoover, director of the FBI.

As part of his early-starting campaign for president, Sen. George McGovern, D-S.D., has expressed the view that Hoover should be censured by Congress and dismissed as head of the bureau. Considering McGovern's presidential record to date, this is probably not a great source of anxiety to the FBI Director. The total onslaught from the left, however, is considerable, and needs an answer.

Part of that answer is supplied by the inconsistencies of the attacker's themselves. Some of Hoover's critics assert that he is too old for the job, implying that he is not sufficiently energetic. Others contend that his department is an instrument, zealous repression, suggesting Hoover is far more energetic than he ought to be. These arguments, inconsistent with each other, are also inconsistent with the facts.

On the matter of age, it is interesting to observe that the critics who raise this point are perfectly content with an aging Supreme Court Justice like William O. Douglas, or a septuagenarian diplomat like Averell Harriman—men who have worked on a far broader stage than Hoover with a far more erratic record of performance. The real objection to Hoover obviously is not his age, but the fact that he has stood firm in the American government for reasonable safeguards against Marxist subversion, criminal anarchy, and revolutionary agitation.

A fair summary of Hoover's record would disclose that his is one of the most efficient and fairest departments of the Federal government. That it has been run with a notable regard for the letter of the law and the rights of the individual. And that it has avoided the characteristic governmental sin of empire-building. Harry and Benaro Overstreet, noted liberal authors have praised the agency for its work as did former U.S. Atty. Gen. Ramsey Clark—more recently turned critic of the FBI.

And Morris Ernst, counsel to the American Civil Liberties Union, some years ago concluded after a searching inquiry into the FBI's performance that "a real smear campaign has been carried on against Hoover's work. The FBI is unique . . . It has a magnificent record of respect for individual freedom." That judgment, rendered in 1959, seems equally sound today.

## MYTHS AND FABLES COME TRUE

## HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the controversial peripheral canal project has been the source of much speculation and emotion-laden rhetoric in past years.

The proponents of the project repeatedly assure us all that the only reason for the need of construction of the canal is to ensure the survival of the fishery of the San Francisco Bay-delta system.

Yet there are no major conservation groups in support of it—rather the reverse is true—the proponents of the project are those who would buy State project water to develop presently arid areas.

This is but one example of the "myths

and fables" inherent with the peripheral canal controversy.

Mr. Speaker, recently the Antioch Ledger published an editorial on this very subject. I believe it merits the attention of the Members of the Congress.

The editorial follows:

#### MYTHS AND FABLES COME TRUE

The myths and fables about the State Water Project and the proposed peripheral canal, as arguments by detractors of those projects and referred to by state and federal proponents, have a remarkable tendency to become fact.

Norman Livermore, state resources secretary, recently denied ever having heard of plans to delay construction of the peripheral canal. He inferred that critics of the projects made up that story, although his boss, William R. Gianelli, made the announcement himself in January.

This week, to drive the point home, we suppose, Gianelli again stated that construction of the canal would be delayed "until 1974" or possibly even later.

So sure was Livermore that such a possibility did not exist that he claimed the state was ready to "go it alone" in building the canal, meaning that federal funds (which could be denied) were not needed.

Gianelli, in his remarks this week before a joint meeting of Assembly and Senate water committees, made no such suggestion.

It will be recalled that the State Fish and Game people were opposed to the peripheral canal before some arm twisting was done on the state level to gain that agency's "approval" on the grounds that it would benefit both fish and wildlife in the Delta.

Now the U.S. Department of the Interior, in the form of Ellis Armstrong, commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, has attempted to shoot down peripheral canal critics with "facts" as opposed to "myths."

These are myths, according to Armstrong: "The peripheral canal will deplete Delta outflows by approximately 80 per cent, cutting off the only fresh water sustaining the estuary. The reason for the canal is to provide more water to Southern California sub-dividers. The natural state of the Delta is to be destroyed to send water to Los Angeles, which will draw more people to that area. It is in the interests of Los Angeles area residents that the peripheral canal not be built, so that the resulting water shortage will ward off possible new residents in the area, thereby halting deterioration of the Southern California environment."

Armstrong completely ignores the fact that the peripheral canal will divert Sacramento River water in the upper Delta, where quality is high; that the standards he and state officials consider adequate protection for Delta water quality are unacceptable to most Delta residents and to conservation groups such as the Sierra Club; that "commitments" to Southern California are not sacred and can be changed; and, finally, that alternate methods of meeting Southern California water needs can be developed.

But then he was speaking before the American Society of civil Engineers, who need the jobs, and perhaps his remarks were for their consumption only.

We cannot believe all our fears are based on "myths."

#### INFLATION

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, the growing concern about

wage and price controls and inflation was the subject of a most useful poll recently conducted by the Cleveland Press.

I call this survey to the attention of my colleagues because I feel it offers an accurate reflection of the attitudes and opinions of average consumers, people forced to pinch pennies and stretch dollars to catch up with runaway inflation.

The poll showed that Greater Clevelanders feel inflation is running wild by a margin of 8 to 1. The results also indicated that the administration's efforts to control skyrocketing prices have so far had little effect on the average consumer. People are willing to go along with some wage and price controls to curb inflation, but nothing as drastic as rationing, the poll showed.

The poll appeared in the Press of March 12, 1971, as follows:

#### MOST SAY INFLATION IS RUNNING WILD

(By Dick McLaughlin)

Inflation has galloped out of control, unchecked by the light reins the Government has used to try to harness it.

That's the opinion of Press readers by a ratio of about 8 to 1. The minority who said inflation is not out of control added: "Not yet."

By a proportion of about 3 to 1 they are willing to go along with price ceilings, total or partial, to stifle inflation.

And by 2 to 1 they are willing to subject themselves to wage controls, although some say this should apply only to certain fields of work while others insist that no one should be excepted.

Almost unanimously Press readers are against resorting to rationing to attack inflation, many citing the hoarding, chiseling and other evils this might lead to.

There was no clear-cut opinion as to whether, if price-wage controls were invoked, they should be rolled back to the levels of last May, as has been proposed in some congressional hearings, or whether they should be pegged as of the moment.

A slight majority was against a roll-back, saying, "It's too late now," or, "It wouldn't make any difference." Some favored a roll-back in prices but not in wages.

No matter what opinions those interviewed expressed, all demonstrated one thing overpoweringly . . .

Inflation—the burdens and hardships it imposes on everyone and the dangers it presents to the United States—is a worry foremost in the minds of everyone.

#### INFLATION—OUT OF HAND?

"No, not yet," said John B. Abbott, 3321 W. 98th St., who has his own heat regulator service business.

"Prices are completely out of hand and should be balanced with the dollars available," Mrs. Jewel Gholston contradicted. She has a coiffure shop at 4098 Lee Rd.

"Prices on the ramp are hurting poor people," said Wayne Harper, 4400 Central Ave., who is retired, a widower, and blind.

"Inflation is getting out of hand," said Mrs. J. E. Schwalb, 3259 Elsmere Rd., Shaker Heights. "For instance, I just ordered some curtains and they are costing four times as much as when I bought some five years ago."

"My husband works hard every day and is completely pooped when he gets home," said Mrs. Horace Nation, 2608 Barber Ave. "Yet it all seems worthless. We are continually losing the battle against inflation."

"We cut down on our buying and our social life because we can't keep up with the spiraling prices," said Mrs. Keith Wallace, 55 E. Cottage Dr., Chagrin Falls.

"The things they (the Government) have tried so far haven't done much good," said

Paul H. Motz, 2383 N. Park Blvd., Shaker Heights.

#### CLAMP ON THE LID?

"Do I believe Government should pass laws to control its own inflation? No," said attorney Gordon T. Canning.

"I'm not in favor of wage-price controls," said Thomas E. Weil, of 2891 Paxton Rd., Shaker Heights, a steel products firm executive. "History will show that every time such controls have been tried wages and prices have soared to pre-control levels as soon as the restraints were removed."

"I'm in favor of trying wage-price controls on a temporary basis to see if it would help the situation," said George A. Keller of Keller's House of Travel in the Hanna Bldg. "As things stand workers able to get wage increases have to turn right around and pay higher prices. Far worse off are people on fixed incomes."

"Absolutely. It was proven during the Truman administration that price and wage controls curb inflation," said Eli Rukasin, a Cleveland Heights drug store operator.

"If they'd bring prices of food and the cost of living back then I'd be willing to put wages back too," said John Ruckner, 3529 E. 114th St., a foundry worker.

"Oh, I don't think wages should have ceilings on them, but prices, yes," said Mrs. John W. Wanenmacher, 11820 Edgewater Dr., Lakewood.

"If they are going to impose ceilings they ought to do it with every kind of industry—not just the construction industry," said Mrs. James W. Butler, 2814 Brookdale Ave.

"I've been in favor of wage and price control for some time. It may be too late for that now, but you don't control inflation by scarce money and other methods they have tried," said Loren Cook, Berea business owner.

"I'm against wage and price controls—at least for now," said Jerome Dollar, 19200 Roseland Ave., Euclid. "If you freeze, you have to freeze across the board and I'm afraid that over the long run this might hurt more people than it would help."

#### ROLL THINGS BACK?

"I'd go along with rollbacks as long as prices are rolled back along with wages," said Robert Engler, 22, of 4707 W. 211th St. Fairview Park, six months out of the Army.

"I don't see how it can be accomplished," said Mrs. Love X. Fuggs, 1531 E. 118th St., and barber Reginald Hubbard 12311 Superior Ave., thought a rollback to last May's wage-price levels would be good—"when prices were more stable and things weren't so rough."

"No, we can't go into the past. We should hold the ceiling where it is now," said a West Side grandfather, but a Heights businessman said, "Roll back the manufacturer's price but keep wages where they are."

#### RATIONING—AN OGRE

"I was a teen-ager during World War II and, believe me, rationing was no fun," said Mrs. Grace Bopp, 1548 Wood Ave., Cleveland Heights.

"There is no need for rationing," said a Rocky River accountant, but Mrs. Mary Kintz, 75, of 3600 W. 130th St., said, "I'll go along with anything that brings things down."

"Rationing would serve only to control the spending power of certain higher income groups," said Charles Perry, 2131 Fairhill Rd., an insurance counselor.

"Rationing would only cause hoarding and a black market in an economy of plenty," said William Seawright, 7508 Cedar Ave., a builder.

"Why rationing?" asked Hyman Burke, food market operator at 1004 E. 123d St. "There's no shortage I know of. Rationing would insure black market operations."



## OTHER COMMENTS

"I think controlling inflation is a matter of the individual," said Mrs. Charles A. McQuister, 1586 Elmwood Ave., Lakewood. "We have to tighten up all we can at home."

"A complete withdrawal from Vietnam might curb spending," said Mrs. Eleanor Horsey, 21961 Bruce Ave., Euclid, and William Hamilton, 1265 E. 105th St., was more emphatic: "Get out of that war in Vietnam—this would take care of a whole lot of problems."

"Cut down on foolish expenditures such as welfare, which has gotten out of line; city government, which is out of line, and war, which is out of line," said Norbert Fischer, 518 Lake Forest Dr., Bay Village.

"It's the unions that are doing it. Business itself is keeping things in good line," said David L. Tadyeh of Avon Lake.

"I'm really only concerned about pollution," said a Garfield Heights housewife.

## CALLEY DEFENSE NOT NEW

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's Washington Post, there appeared an excellent article written by Stanley Karnow concerning the U.S. involvement in Indochina and the responsibility for crimes committed "in the name of obedience." Discussing a very interesting study conducted nearly a decade ago by Stanley Milgram, a Yale psychologist, the article points out that Americans cannot label the Nazis as the only "war criminals." A copy of the article follows:

## CALLEY DEFENSE NOT NEW

(By Stanley Karnow)

Nearly a decade ago a Yale psychologist by the name of Stanley Milgram conducted a study that was remarkably prescient. He demonstrated in the laboratory what Lt. William Calley and his unit would later dramatize at My Lai—that man's behavior is almost invariably dominated by authority rather than by his own sense of morality.

This suggests that the real guilt for the slaughter of civilians in Indochina, whether in My Lai incidents or through B-52 raids, lies less with those who obey than with those who issue orders. Moreover, the guilt is shared by a nation that closes its eyes to atrocities, as the United States has for years.

The Milgram study, borne out as it has been by the realities of Indochina, also suggests that Americans cannot plausibly brand the Nazis as a singular breed of "war criminals" when they have shown themselves to be equally disdainful of human life.

In his original experiment, described as a "study of destructive obedience," Milgram assembled a group of schoolteachers, salesmen, engineers and other "average" Americans. Their task was to put a series of questions to students, and administer electric shocks ranging up to 450 volts to those who failed to answer correctly.

The shocks were fake. But this was unknown to the "examiners," since the student victims were instructed to stimulate extreme pain.

While many perspired, trembled, stuttered and groaned, none of the 40 examiners stopped short of administering 300 volts to his victim—and only 14 refused to go all the way up to 450 volts even though, at that

level, the victims were supposed to be suffering extreme shock.

Had he anticipated Indochina at the time of his experiment, Milgram might have pondered on the degree to which a group of average Americans willing to torture their fellow citizens would go if instructed to punish "gooks." My Lai has, of course, since provided him with an answer.

Looking back at his study against the perspective of the U.S. experience in Indochina, Milgram submits that Americans are now beginning to realize the hollowness of their claim to ethical purity. "If we now recoil at our own conduct," he says, "it is because we perceive that we are just as capable as the Nazis of committing crimes in the name of obedience."

Comparing Calley to Eichmann, Milgram explains that neither was a ruthless man but "functionaries" performing their duty rather than displaying personal hostility towards the innocent people they killed. Moreover, each employed euphemisms to justify his actions as constructive.

Eichmann, in Nazi rhetoric, was engaged in eliminating Jewish "vermin" in order to achieve the final solution. In GI jargon, Calley was destroying "gooks" in order to "waste the enemy" as part of a "search-and-clear" operation.

In addition, Milgram points out, both denied at their respective trials that they were responsible. Each insisted that he had been acting under orders. In short, they asserted, they were merely cogs in a larger machine.

To be sure, there are parallels between Calley and Eichmann that do not meet. The American officer and his men were operating in the heat of a battlefield, while the Nazi was working within the context of a coldly scientific system dedicated to the extermination of a selected segment of the human race.

But if Calley's resemblance to Eichmann has no limitations, there is nevertheless a similarity between the mechanical impersonality of the gas chamber and the dispassionate technology of the B-52 silently dropping its bombs from 30,000 feet on so-called "free-fire" zones.

And there is also a similarity between the B-52 bombardiers pushing buttons on their control panels and the "grunts," like Calley, squeezing the triggers of their machine guns at My Lai and other villages. They are all simply obeying orders.

"When you think of the long and gloomy history of man," wrote C.P. Snow, "you will find more hideous crimes have been committed in the name of obedience than have ever been committed in the name of rebellion."

In the long and gloomy history of the U.S. involvement in Indochina, it might be added, the responsibility for crimes committed "in the name of obedience" must certainly go higher than Calley.

JOHN I. MACGREGOR OF NEWARK, CALIF.

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on May 8 the citizens of Newark, Calif., will honor one of their most outstanding public servants upon his retirement after 34 years of devoted service to the young people of his community. The gentleman is John I. "Jack" Mac-

Gregor, superintendent of the Newark Unified School District. At the end of this school year, Mr. MacGregor will have completed 36 years of service to California schoolchildren, all but 2 of those years as a teacher and administrator in Newark schools. In that time, the school district grew from one elementary school to a unified district with some 9,500 students. Throughout this period of explosive growth, with all its attendant stresses and strains, Mr. MacGregor has provided that steady leadership and constancy of purpose in the community which represents the highest form of service. The fruits of his service will be found in the character of the young lives he has influenced and in the pride and solidarity of the community he has so faithfully served.

## FUTURE HOMEMAKERS CELEBRATE "NATIONAL FHA WEEK"

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1971

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to add my congratulations to the Future Homemakers of America as they celebrate "National FHA Week," during the period March 28 through April 3, 1971. Through membership in Future Homemakers of America hundreds of thousands of our Nation's young people have received invaluable guidance toward becoming responsible and capable adults.

FHA is an integral part of home economic education in our Nation's schools and its membership is open to all students who are taking or have taken a home economics course. Certainly few would question the vital importance to our Nation's families of knowledgeable and talented homemakers. The FHA's work in promoting the satisfactions and skills of homemaking is particularly important, furthermore, when considered in the context of today's environment. Many of us have observed and read with concern the weakening in the structure and fabric of family life in the rapid pace of today's hectic world and with the increased mobility of its people. The many young members of Future Homemakers of America who are learning and striving toward the highly commendable purposes of this organization give great hope, in my judgment, for stemming this trend.

The principles and aspirations which this fine organization instills in its members, moreover, extend far beyond the home and homemaking. The FHA's purposes and activities also include helping its young members to become responsible members of their communities with an awareness of their role in making our great democracy work.

At this point, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues in the House to the "Purposes of the Future Homemakers of America," as adopted at its 1970 national meeting:

First. To promote the joys and satisfactions of homemaking.

Second. To strengthen the function of the family as a basic unit of society.

Third. To encourage democracy through cooperative action in the home and community.

Fourth. To become aware of the multiple roles of men and women in today's society.

Fifth. To improve national and international relations.

Sixth. To provide opportunities for decisionmaking and for assuming responsibility.

Seventh. To involve youth with adults in individual and group activities.

Eighth. To develop interest in home economics, home economics careers, and related occupations.

Since its organization in 1945, the Future Homemakers of America has grown to a current membership of approximately 600,000 in 12,000 chapters in the United States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and American schools overseas. This incorporated, nonprofit organization is sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education, with the American Home Economics Association acting as a co-sponsor. Twelve youth officers, elected yearly, make up the FHA's national executive council and adult representatives in home economics education serve on a national advisory board. The individual chapters are advised by home economics teachers.

I am proud of the FHA and equally proud of the fine work and aspirations of its members. It is indeed a privilege to salute them during "National FHA Week."

#### VIETNAM POLICY

### HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement prepared for delivery before the Democratic caucus March 31, 1971:

VIETNAM POLICY: REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE THE DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS, MARCH 31, 1971

For over five years now, this nation has been deeply involved in the Vietnam struggle, and during this time, a great deal of heated debate over our presence there—similar to what we are seeing today before this Caucus—has taken place. Unfortunately, this debate has often been characterized by great emotionalism, and intolerance toward the views of the opposing side. These tendencies have, I believe, obscured some of the true issues at stake, and so before I state my views on this vital question, I would ask that our deliberations and decisions be marked by reason and a calm look at the facts, rather than simple slogans and overblown rhetoric.

It may be, in a sense, contradictory to ask that reason be the basis of consideration of a matter that involves human beings slaughtering one another; the burning of homes, schools, and churches; and the devastation of a small country. War, with the almost incomprehensible amount of waste that ac-

companies it, is the most telling evidence of the savagery that is still a part of man. However, I would also remind you that the violence, venomous hatred, and flaming self-righteousness which characterizes war has also in recent years characterized many of those who profess to be for peace, and against war. Thus irrationality is not the province of any single cause in the political arena. But man is also capable of reasonable thought, and I believe it is important that we try to use some of this reason in judging our country's policies in Indochina. I have sought to do this, and from my deliberations I have concluded that we should bring this war to an end as soon as we possibly can.

In evaluating this Governmental policy or any other, we must attempt to weigh the expected benefits of that policy against all of the costs which are incurred through its use. After we have placed a value on each of these factors, we ought to have some idea as to whether the course of action in question is worthy of being continued.

About the price we have paid for our involvement in Indochina there can be little doubt. 45,000 American youth have died as a result of this war, and 150,000 have suffered some form of serious wound. This alone would be a tremendous price to pay for any objective, but there is in addition the great financial costs of our Vietnam involvement. By latest estimates, the Government has spent over \$100 billion in executing this war effort. In considering this expenditure of manpower and money, it would be appropriate if we thought also of the many alternate uses to which this wealth might have been applied. How much better off would this country be if these men had been permitted to live full and productive lives, and how much closer would we be to solving the great problems of crime, diseases, malnutrition, and ignorance, if this amount of money was spent for these purposes?

The psychological effect of this war upon the American people is also very much apparent. Many of our citizens, old as well as young, are beginning to feel a sense of despair about the ability of the people to influence the affairs of their Government. They see so much opposition to the war, and yet the war continues. And the House of Representatives, that body which is supposed to be closest to the people, has not yet held hearings on the Vietnam war, and has taken few, if any, direct votes on it. Because of this alienation brought on by the war, the health of our democracy has been severely endangered.

In contrast to what we are spending to prosecute the Vietnam war effort, the benefits we can expect should the present policies be continued seem meager and elusive. Some have said that we must continue the fight in order to save face, and in order to make our losses of the past worthwhile. Statements such as these, far from telling us what the inherent value in this goal is, are rather based on the assumption that such a value does exist.

What can we expect to gain through the present policies? The nations of the world, first of all, would be assured that the U.S. still considers the numerous bilateral and multilateral commitments it has made in the past quarter century to be valid. But such a condition exists, they would realize, only because American foreign policy is so inflexible that even altogether new needs and world conditions do not cause any change in it. Another result might be that the leftist and often anti-Western guerrilla movements which are active in many underdeveloped nations of the world would be somewhat discouraged. Both the demands of American security, and the cause of world peace, we are told, require that these movements be stopped in Vietnam, and wherever else they

might exist. In view of the almost insurmountable difficulties encountered by the U.S. in Vietnam, however, it seems unlikely that these forces have been undermined to any large degree. This argument is invalidated even further by the fact that we are doing little to aid the crumbling pro-Western governments of Cambodia and Laos, even though a logical extension of the rationale behind our Vietnam policies would require an uncompromising defense of them. Others might view the factors which favor a continuation of our Vietnam policies to be quite different, for this is a subjective matter. But no matter what these factors are conceived to be, we must always keep in mind the necessity to weigh these against the terrible losses we have incurred through our Vietnam involvement.

Few policy objectives are prized so highly that an expenditure of the magnitude which we have made in Vietnam could be justified. I certainly cannot perceive any useful end that would be served by a continuation of the killing and suffering. Therefore, I ask that we call a halt to this war, and withdraw our troops as soon as we possibly can. Such a course is not an easy one, nor is it one without danger. All major policy changes carry with them some hazards. But an end to this war can also mark the start of a new foreign policy for the United States, one which will recognize the true responsibilities of the U.S. as a world power, as well as the limits of those responsibilities. Let Congress take the lead in the historic re-direction of policy, and let the first step be taken today, by this Caucus, through the adoption of this Vietnam Disengagement Resolution.

#### DODO, MIDSHIPMAN FIRST CLASS

### HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the life of a young man preparing for military service is one of stiff discipline and hard-nosed training. Often, there is little out of the ordinary to help him through the rigid day-to-day routine.

So it is understandable, then, that a small mongrel dog named Dodo came to mean so much to the midshipmen at the U.S. Naval Academy and that his death last week has left the brigade with an irreplaceable sense of loss.

Dodo wandered forlorn and alone into the Naval Academy yard one rainy night 5 summers ago. Since that time, he became the friend, constant companion, and unofficial mascot of the brigade of midshipmen.

To the middle, often far from home and family and under great pressure for scholastic and military perfection, this small fluffy dog was a trusted friend. With Dodo, a middle could unabashedly share his troubles and his hopes, take a "solitary" walk, find a joyous welcome after a long day.

Or, in the midst of a formation, with its dignity and precision and its intense competition and tension, seeing Dodo scampering alongside—or even leading them—lifted the spirits of the midshipmen taking part and made the occasion much easier.

Dodo was a free spirit—he belonged not to one midshipman, but to the entire



brigade. In the 5 years since Dodo's arrival at the Naval Academy, he was a part of the lives of thousands of young men. There are graduates of the Academy, now stationed throughout the world, who have their private memories of Dodo and what he meant to them.

And almost anyone who visited the Naval Academy in those years will, I venture to say, recall Dodo. He usually turned up at every imaginable place and hardly missed a school event.

In the year and a half I have been attending activities at the Naval Academy, I, too, came to expect to see Dodo there—whether at a chapel service or a football game. I recall that last May I took my entire staff to one of the Academy's dress parades where the midshipmen, in their dress uniforms, marched in precise step for top honors. Leading them was Dodo.

The impact of his presence was poignantly made clear to me by his absence at the Academy last weekend when I visited there. It was different without Dodo. It was then that I realized that I, too, had come to care for the little brown and black dog as much as the midshipmen had.

Associated Press reporter John Woodfield in an article in the Saturday, March 27, edition of the Washington Star captured the impact of Dodo's life in those 5 years at the Academy.

Because Dodo meant so much to so many, I would like to share this story with you:

DODO—MONGREL MASCOT—IS DEAD AND  
MIDDIES MOURN  
(By John Woodfield)

ANNAPOLIS—Dodo is dead.

The tiny black and brown mongrel dog, who wandered dripping wet out of a summer storm one night five years ago and straight into the hearts of the U.S. Naval Academy's 4,000-man brigade, was discovered ill in the academy yard and died shortly after being rushed to the veterinarian.

His past was murky and his ancestors unknown, but Dodo fast became a legend in his own time, outranking Tecumseh and the famed Navy goat in academy tradition, mournful midshipmen said.

Although he was never accorded recognition by academy officials—and in truth it must be said he would have nothing to do with them, either—he was that tiny touch of home to new recruits and a symbol of independence—once-known to upper classmen.

He never spent two consecutive nights in the same room, fastidiously avoiding favoritism. And the disdain with which he held commissioned officers brought secret delight to the hearts of his human roommates.

Wherever the brigade went, Dodo was there.

He slept in Bancroft Hall, ate in the mess hall, trotted happily alongside the midshipmen at parades, including the fabled June Week color parade, regularly attended classes and in 1967 he was granted all the privileges of an upper classman.

It was not unusual to see plebes (freshmen) snap to attention when he sauntered into one of their rooms, and various plebes were assigned to keep a log of his activities each year.

A sample entry reads: "Midshipman Dog was seen returning from Catholic chapel this morning. A glow of humility was noted in his eyes and he was obviously in penance to atone for missing morning meal yesterday. He decided to anticipate this morning's formation and arrived 17 minutes early."

Dodo became the official brigade mascot—although still ignored by the administration—at a pep rally preceding the Navy-Syracuse football game several years ago. He was presented with a Navy blanket with the gold "N" on top and gold letters reading "Bite Army" on either side.

And he made every Navy football game, be it home or away. The brigade saw to that.

Academy officials, who persistently refused to admit that Dodo had replaced the Navy goat in the heart and eyes of the brigade, continued to emphasize before each Navy away game that the small brown and black mongrel would not be accorded official transportation.

"But," admitted one high ranking officer shortly before last fall's Army-Navy game at Philadelphia, "I know that just as sure as the sun comes up tomorrow, that dog will be there if the Middies have to smuggle him up."

He was.

## THE VULNERABLE RUSSIANS

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the recent winter issue of *Golden Sphinx*, the publication of the National Counter Intelligence Corps Assn., appeared an illuminating review of the book titled, "The Vulnerable Russians." The book was authored by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, and has been received extensively in this country and abroad. It was my privilege to furnish the introduction to this work which, as anticipated, has been sharply criticized in publications in the Red Empire. The review, written by Vera A. Dowhan, emphasized numerous points that should be borne in mind as we pursue our relations with imperialist Moscow. I commend it and the work itself to the reading of our Members and citizenry:

#### THE VULNERABLE RUSSIANS

(By Lev E. Dobriansky, Pageant Press, Inc., New York, N.Y., 1967, 455 pp., \$7.95. (Review by Vera A. Dowhan))

"Know Your Enemy" could well be the subtitle of this timely work. For throughout, whether dealing on the national or international sphere, *The Vulnerable Russians* is a constant and sober imperio-colonialism.

The author loses no time in taking grips with reality. He cogently links the present with the past and his imperious confidence and authority unmask Russia, the last colonial empire in a modern world, with alarming frankness, revealing not only her strength, weaknesses and vulnerabilities, but also her course of action.

For those with stunted viewpoints that foolishly insist that Russia and the Soviet Union are a single and like entity, Dr. Dobriansky introduces many, for the first time perhaps, to the captive non-Russian nations in the USSR. With expertise, he defeats completely the erroneous concepts of the Soviet Union as a "nation-state," a monolith, a "polyglot society," the captive nations as "minority groups" in the USSR, "the Soviets," "Russian USSR," etc. He exposes Russia as the real threat to the United States and this country's national security. With marked precision, Dr. Dobriansky discloses Russia's stronghold on the USSR, her "theoretic humanism" toward the 123 million captive non-Russian peoples in the

USSR, militarily conquered and forcibly incorporated into the empire. He discloses why our fear should not be the Red satellite states, with their cacophony of leaders, but rather Moscow, for should Moscow collapse her satellites could not survive for long.

Much of *The Vulnerable Russians* is appropriately devoted to the captive nations, and their cultural, social, linguistic and religious differences are given broad exposure. It was Dr. Dobriansky who authored the Captive Nations Week Resolution passed by Congress in 1959. The resolution, now Public Law 86-90, calls upon the President to issue a proclamation each year during the third week in July and invites the people of the United States to observe the Week with suitable ceremonies and activities until such time as all nations once again enjoy freedom and independence.

The resolution rocked Moscow, and the ramifications of it and the Captive Nations Week movement have been especially hostile on the part of the Kremlin rulers. When it was passed in 1959, with his typical rhetorical finesse, Khrushchev said, "This resolution stinks."

We have entered a new decade and with it, we have gone from an era of confrontation to an era of negotiation. How different it will be, only time will tell. Surely we cannot afford to be out of step with the times. But if history repeats itself and must be lived to be understood, you have to know what happened in the years gone by. And the history of Russian expansionism has, indeed, repeated itself.

What does Dr. Dobriansky think would help the mitigating problem? He feels that for the immediate future, at least, an outstanding service could be rendered our nation and the free world by the creation of a Freedom Commission for concentrated cold war education for which, he says, political and psychological import cannot be exaggerated. Another, a special house committee on the captive nations in the House of Representatives. H. Res. 211 was submitted in 1961 for the formation of such a committee. Although several hearings have been conducted in the House Rules Committee with solid arguments in favor of it and no opposition to it, nevertheless, behind the scenes forces have been hard at work to defeat and stall the proposal. And a "first" in this or any decade since U.S. recognition of the Soviet Union, he says, would be a full-scale review of U.S. policy toward the USSR.

The consequences of this last point would have a twofold result. On the one hand, it would show whether the Russians really are sincere in their peace efforts and willing to relinquish their colonies, or whether they are the imperialists history has heretofore proven them to be, and secondly, whether our policy-makers are truly interested in the cause of freedom and independence for nations now under the yoke of Russian communism, or just not willing or are afraid to dismember the last existing imperio-colonialist empire in a modern world.

Dr. Dobriansky enjoys the well deserved reputation of being one of our foremost experts on Russia and the Soviet Union, and his many publications in these areas read like a Russian anthology.

## MILK PRICES

### HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill

to support the price of manufacturing milk at not less than 85 percent of parity for the marketing year 1971-72.

Mr. Speaker, a very substantial number of my constituents and others in the State of Kansas have written me requesting that the Congress do something about milk prices. For many, the situation has become critical. It is part and parcel of our overall farm policy that ignores the realities and has brought about deep dissatisfaction throughout our agricultural areas. It is, Mr. Speaker, in my judgment a short-sighted and unwise policy.

In introducing this legislation, I am joining a group of my colleagues who earlier this month proposed an identical bill, H.R. 6188. I trust that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE), will, in his usual effective manner, push this legislation through to enactment.

#### OUR QUESTIONABLE ACTIONS IN LATIN AMERICA

#### HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, over the past several months several incidents have occurred which raise some very serious questions regarding the efficacy and direction of the policies being pursued by the present administration in Latin America.

Foremost among these has been the ill-conceived and poorly handled actions vis-a-vis the new government in Chile. The United States is already greatly mistrusted in many sectors in Latin America and the attitude displayed toward the freely elected Allende government has not contributed to improving this situation.

Recently Mr. Ralph A. Dungan, former U.S. Ambassador to Chile, has written a well-balanced and highly perceptive article regarding the questionable role of the U.S. military in the development and execution of U.S. Latin American policy and its relation to the Chilean fiasco. As he correctly notes, a highly embarrassing situation could have been easily avoided and this incident illustrates "a weakness in the manner in which we conduct our foreign affairs."

Mr. Speaker, I highly commend Ambassador Dungan's article to our colleagues' attention and urge that they give his thesis full and careful consideration. Our basic disagreement over the philosophy underlying the current regime in Chile should be no excuse for not maintaining cordial and meaningful relations with this sister republic and I believe that what Mr. Dungan says is of critical importance in this period of heightened international tensions. I am pleased to insert his article for inclusion in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, March 27, 1971]  
CARRIER'S VISIT TO CHILE CANCELLED: FORAY  
BY THE ENTERPRISE INTO DIPLOMATIC AFFAIRS  
(By Ralph A. Dungan)

Although a "24-hour story," the recent furor over whether the U.S. aircraft carrier Enterprise should make a port call at Valparaiso, Chile, raises two issues, neither having to do with the merits of the port call itself. Both, however, illuminate continuing basic defects in U.S. policy toward Latin America.

How did the question of the port call arise anyway and how did it come about that socialist President Allende, despite his strong anti-U.S. military views, extended the invitation which was subsequently rebuffed by the United States?

The embarrassing and avoidable mixup in Chile occurred because the U.S. Navy like its sister services still conducts a quasi-independent foreign policy complete with resident representatives to foreign navies and periodic state visits by its highest ranking officer. These visits, carefully planned as much as two years in advance, are marked by luxuriously equipped aircraft rivaling Air Force One for the admiral, his consort and not inconsiderable retinue. In addition to top military leaders, these visits usually include calls on presidents, prime ministers, and other principal political leaders.

When the Chief of Naval Operations recently visited with Chilean President Allende, he apparently mentioned the desire of the U.S. Navy to have the Enterprise visit Valparaiso. Allende, who has been publicly trying to maintain a proper and friendly stance toward the United States while steadily pushing ahead with policies and actions which we don't like, agreed to the visit and announced his decision on Chilean national television.

One serious question which the whole episode raises is why it is necessary for the highest ranking U.S. military leaders to trot around the world on a more or less regular schedule like the enforcers of a 20th century imperium. The question is doubly serious at this point in history when so many Latin American countries are ruled by unconstitutional and, in some cases, severely repressive military governments. A visit by any high ranking U.S. military personage who seeks audience with major military and political leaders in every country he visits can scarcely be considered a neutral or low-profile posture. It certainly isn't seen that way by Latin American leaders especially since no high level civilian political leader from this administration has visited South America. At best, given the present political circumstances on the continent, such a visit suggests to Latin American military leaders that some elements in the U.S. government are tolerant if not sympathetic on unconstitutional military regimes.

Despite some laudable efforts by this administration—at least in Latin America—to de-emphasize the U.S. military presence and heavy influence on foreign policy, it is clear we have some way to go. The episode demonstrates once again the inability or reluctance of the State Department to exercise effective control over the persistent forays of the U.S. military into political affairs.

The second and equally disturbing aspect of the Enterprise affair is that it confirms again the perverse capacity of the United States in relatively small and unimportant decisions to subvert its own stated policies—in this case a policy of benign neutrality toward the Socialist-Communist coalition government of Chile.

One element of the U.S. government arranged the visit of the aircraft carrier and obtained a widely publicized Chilean presidential invitation. The State Department

apparently scuttled the whole plan, with subsequent White House affirmation. It matters little whether the carrier visit or the tour of the CNO was a good idea. (Neither was in my opinion.) But the decision not to permit the visit of the Enterprise was a clear public affront to President Allende and the Chilean government.

Coupled with a whole series of actions starting with failure to send a high level delegation to the inauguration of the democratically elected president, the behind-the-scenes opposition to the appointment of a Chilean to a high U.N. post, the not-so-private hostility of the U.S. Ambassador to the present government, and the warning to the Chilean government implicit in President Nixon's "State of the World" report—all these suggest anything but benign neutrality.

One does not have to be an advocate of the present Chilean government or its policies to believe that the United States should avoid petty acts of this sort, which feed unfounded speculation, thereby poisoning the atmosphere in which major issues between the two countries will have to be resolved.

The Chilean case seems to illustrate a weakness in the manner in which we conduct our foreign affairs. However sound a stated policy may be, the sum total of actions taken by a multi-agency foreign affairs establishment really constitute our foreign policy.

Reflecting—as these actions often do—agency and ideological bias, ineptness, lack of coordination, political naivete and worse, it is little wonder that blunders like the Enterprise affair occur. To permit the mistakes evident in the Enterprise affair is to foredoom the working out of a *modus vivendi* with a politically undefined regime so that the interests of both countries can be served.

#### SEEKS DECENT HOME FOR EVERY FAMILY

#### HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress, throughout the years, has demonstrated its concern with the problem of adequate housing for the American people. With the passage of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, the Congress established certain goals with respect to the creation of new and adequate housing to meet the needs of our entire population. Specifically, this act called for a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family.

During the early months of 1969, a large number of new housing starts occurred. At that time, we found ourselves faced with what, for many of us, was a very rapid and unexplainable increase in raw timber prices.

The House Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am a member, met to conduct hearings in an effort to determine a reason for the sudden rise in the cost of timber and to further determine the effect the rise would have on the housing industry which is vitally dependent upon timber and timber products. As a result of these hearings we learned that there were a number of factors which together caused the rapid rise in timber prices during the last few



months of 1968 and the early months of 1969. Among the reasons cited were extreme weather conditions which prevented normal logging operations, a shortage of boxcars which prevented the shipment of raw timber in the East, a longshoremen's strike which prevented the loading and shipping of timber by sea from the west coast to the east coast, and the sale of timber abroad, particularly to the Japanese.

As a result of the Banking and Currency Committee hearings, the cooperation of the rail industry in providing boxcars for the transshipment of raw timber to the east coast, and the end of the longshoremen's strike, we saw a decrease in the price of timber which was more compatible with the needs of the American public.

For a number of months during the years 1969 and 1970, the administration was engaged in an effort to reduce the precipitous price increases which were ravaging our economy. The combination of fiscal policy and monetary stringency to combat inflation reduced housing starts throughout the country. Because of this reduction in housing starts, the price of timber dropped and stabilized at levels which generally would be considered acceptable.

In recent months we have seen a reversal of fiscal policy as inflationary pressures have eased. Monetary policy has been loosened and interest rates have fallen. Fiscal policy of Government likewise has been revised so that additional funds are now available for all purposes in our economy including the housing market. Housing starts have increased almost as an inverse concomitant as interest rates have declined. We find, however, that timber prices once again have begun a rapid and sickening rise.

For example, on December 31 of 1970, Douglas-fir plywood was selling at \$66 per 1,000 feet. In March of 1971, this same product is selling at \$90 per 1,000 feet. A rise of 38 percent over a period of less than 3 months certainly would give anyone engaged in the housing market cause to stop and reflect on future housing starts.

Of course, we must recognize that the law of supply and demand which applies throughout all of our economy likewise applies to the timber market. Although the demand has increased rapidly, the small, independent logging operator has not returned to his normal logging operations as rapidly as we would like—supply has not kept up with demand. However, many of us fear that there may be other forces at work to cause this increase in timber and timber product prices.

As timber futures recently have begun to be traded on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange, they have been placed into a more speculative market. Whether this speculation is causing an adverse or, possibly, a beneficial effect upon timber and timber product prices is something that we are not equipped to evaluate at the present time. However, there is every indication that buying and selling in timber futures will continue to grow in the next few years. For example, trading in plywood futures totaled 25,008 contracts

last month. This is the largest volume of trading in this area since timber futures were allowed on the futures market in December of 1969. Another comparison is that in February of 1970, there were only 1,434 contracts negotiated on the futures market. Buyers on the futures market say that the reason for the increase in the purchase of lumber futures at the present is that there are high expectations that we are going to enter a housing boom shortly and that large profits could easily be made in timber futures.

One effect of the rapid fluctuations of timber prices in recent weeks has been the lack of confidence with which contractors and builders can quote prices on future contracts. The Wall Street Journal on Tuesday, March 16 of this year, stated:

Dealers overwhelmingly report that they are unable to obtain firm price commitments from their suppliers for deliveries as little as sixty days in advance.

Mr. Speaker, the critical need for additional housing in America is too well recognized to need debate or repetition in statement. The relationship between the supply of adequate housing and the supply of timber at stable prices and adequate quantities is also a subject which does not need debate.

Events in recent months have indicated that adequate timber supplies at stable prices are presently endangered in the current market. I would urge the members of my committee, the House Committee on Banking and Currency, to commence hearings at an early and appropriate date in an effort to determine what action, if any, can be taken by the Congress in an effort to assure timber supplies at reasonable prices. We should determine if the fluctuations in prices of timber products are due to natural forces of weather or other forces beyond the control of man, or we should determine if the fluctuations are due to the manipulations in the market which are subject to the control of man. In any event, Congress cannot permit this question to remain unexplored.

#### FUTURE FOREST FORECASTS

#### HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, many of us have seen frequent references to the Nation's housing needs for the future, and to our commitment to construct 26 million new housing units in the next decade. Naturally such commendable goals raise many questions as to the availability of materials to meet the need.

Will there be enough trees in the future to supply our Nation's homebuilders with lumber and plywood?

Can we grow enough of these trees to prevent further inroads on our remaining natural gas and oil supplies, which are the raw material for plastic substitutes?

And what is being done to supply the future raw material for pencils, photographic film, concrete forming, acetate fibers, bathroom tissues and the habitat for deer, eagles, elk, the pileated woodpecker, and spawning fish?

These have become important questions.

We know that old timber dies in its normal cycle, with vast stands of present "old growth" timber barely 150 years old and already rotting. We also know that man currently is harvesting only part of this timber as it matures.

We also know man has been harvesting for hundreds of years on some of today's finest European forests. And we know that today, in the United States, insects and disease still "harvest" more timber, most of it overage, than does man.

Just recently Mr. Rae Johnson, Western Timberlands manager, Georgia-Pacific Corp., Portland, Oreg., retired after a lifetime devoted to forestry.

Some have described Rae as a "modern Paul Bunyan" whose overwhelming desire to grow more and better trees has earned him a place in forest history—and in the hearts of the professional foresters following in his footsteps.

I would like to call my colleagues' attention to the following article which appeared in *Growth* magazine, the house organ for Georgia-Pacific Corp., on the occasion of Rae's retirement. This story I find encouraging and full of answers to those important questions about the future of our forest for both recreation and the products we need as individuals:

#### RETIRING FORESTER SHOWS RAPID REGROWTH AND FORECASTS EVEN MORE STARTLING THINGS TO COME

"You can't possibly predict anything like what's going to happen in forestry in the next 50 years," according to Rae L. Johnson, who has just retired as Manager, Western Timberlands Georgia-Pacific Corp. after a distinguished career as a woods executive.

"Fantastic things are coming in forestry... predict anything you like and the chances are that you won't have gone far enough," Johnson continued.

Pressed for a look into his woodlands crystal ball, Johnson said, "I believe the use of the forests for production of vitally-needed fiber products will be increasingly important. This will increase the price of timber. The demand will far exceed the supply and the price will continue to go up."

#### LEARN FROM EUROPE

The hope that the United States "will take a good look at the forests of Europe, in which it has been proved that timber harvest and recreation are compatible," was expressed by Johnson. The Black Forest of Germany is one example.

Continuing on this theme of utilization, Johnson said, "he feels the wise use of forest land is to harvest the timber when it is ready... but the rest of the time enjoy the scenery."

Predicting that a shorter harvest cycle will be the general rule in the Douglas fir regions, Johnson envisioned this type of "regular and forever use of the woodlands: cut the timber one year; the next, plant trees; then for two or three years protect and nurture the seedlings. The rest of the time this new crop provides scenery and even improves the air we breathe by producing oxygen."

"I never could understand those folks who shed gallons of tears about the temporary

roughness of a clearcut area," said Johnson. "Why don't they look someplace else where there are huge vistas of green trees and beautiful scenery?"

"Those people who cry about clearcuts wouldn't hold their picnics in a recently harvested cornfield, yet that is exactly what they often try to do," he added as an example.

There are many "marvelously scenic" areas in the Douglas fir region where the timber has been harvested and new growth has rapidly followed, Johnson pointed out. He recalled that in the Coos Bay, Oregon, area where Douglas Welch is Chief Forester, "there used to be old snag patches that were given up for lost and now they are beautiful and healthy forests."

#### FOURTEEN YEARS, 35 FEET

Johnson is credited with pioneering for Georgia-Pacific the now common practice of clear-cutting Douglas fir, then starting a new crop of trees by aerial seeding. He recalls vividly the controversy that surrounded the "pioneering tract," an entire section of land in the G-P Toledo, Oregon, holdings. A request was made to the Oregon State Forester for a permit to clearcut this section, to be followed by aerial seeding or hand planting with seedlings. After considerable verbal negotiation, this was granted. Johnson recalls he heard several references in the timber industry to "G-P being a cut-and-get-out outfit." "Well," says Johnson, "we haven't cut out yet and we haven't gotten out yet." And in this section of Toledo timber . . . Johnson can point to trees more than 35 feet high in the area logged just 15 years ago, "and I believe this tract will be ready to harvest at age 35."

Johnson spoke admiringly of the late Owen R. Cheatham, Founder of the Georgia-Pacific Corporation. "Mr. Cheatham," says Johnson, "was the best forester of his day." He said, "G-P started in the timber business from scratch, without any inhibitions whatsoever, and by leading in complete utilization and complete reforestation, it revolutionized the entire industry."

#### SEED TREES ARE EXPENSIVE

Johnson has made a continuing study of reforestation through the years. He feels the practice of leaving seed trees for reforesting Douglas fir is wasteful and expensive. "The timber you leave is vulnerable to fire and insects and it is worth thousands of dollars per acre" . . . leaving isolated seed trees "is the most expensive and least efficient method ever devised to reforest an area." But the way G-P (and most of the rest of the industry) does it now, is quite different. As Johnson explains it, "First, you get the crop. Then it costs about 10 cents a thousand board feet (of the harvested crop) to reforest. What can you do so cheaply and get a better return on your money?"

Now, as Johnson is (he says) hanging up his "cork" boots, the industry is on the threshold of better methods of reforestation. One of these that has great promise is reviewed on pages 2 and 3 in this issue.

#### KEEP LANDS IN PRODUCTION

"If the land owners keep the land in production, it will take care of the ecology," Johnson believes.

This 65-year-old forester was born at Clipper, Washington, where his father worked for a shingle mill. A year later the family moved to Mt. Vernon, Washington.

His first woods job came when he was seven and in grade school. He and his brother were hired to watch the nearby logging railroad track and put out small fires started by the steam locomotive. "Each of us got \$2.50 for the summer's work," he recalls. The next summer his mother cooked in the logging camp and the two boys were helpers. "We got a 100 percent pay raise, \$5 for each of us for the summer." Johnson's first career ambition was to be a pharmacist,

then a chemical engineer. But he needed summer work, joined the Weyerhaeuser woods crew in 1927 as a chairman on a survey gang. He then decided to be a logging engineer.

Someone told him, "If you're going to be a logging engineer, you first should learn something about logging." He did and continued to advance, meanwhile completing his engineering training and reaching the post of Chief Forest Engineer at Weyerhaeuser's Longview, Washington, operations in 1942. He shifted to a Canadian company in 1950 as Woods Manager for four years. On January 1, 1954, he went to Springfield, Oregon, in charge of timberlands for the Springfield Plywood Corporation. Washington Veneer Company owned a majority interest in Springfield Plywood and some years earlier, G-P had acquired that interest. With the acquisition of the Booth-Kelly Lumber Company, the two operations were merged into the Georgia-Pacific Springfield Division. In 1955 Johnson moved to Portland, Oregon, as Assistant to Vice President-Timber Operations.

Johnson says he plans to continue to live in the Portland area and "do what comes naturally." This includes operation of his own 90-acre Tree Farm on the Toutle River in Washington, where he has been harvesting timber regularly during the 24 years he has owned it. This tract was first cut in 1905. The trees on it now, Johnson says, "are just like money in the bank." Johnson plans to actively pursue his hobby of wood carving "if I can get the raw material . . . and I think I can." He also will keep in touch with the industry, as a few weeks ago he was re-elected Treasurer of the Pacific Logging Congress, a major industry organization.

### INDIANA'S TIME TURMOIL BROUGHT TO LIGHT

#### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times which outlines Indiana's time turmoil.

Although the geography may be a bit amiss, the article does present the problem and the need for a solution. It reads as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 29, 1971]

#### INDIANA SPLIT BY "ISLANDS OF TIME"

WASHINGTON, March 28.—In northwest Indiana, they tell a story about a man from Hammond who was contemplating a bus trip to Chicago, a distance of about 10 miles.

"What time does this bus leave?" he asked the driver.

"Seven o'clock," was the reply.

"And what time does the bus arrive?" he asked.

"Eight-fifteen," the driver said.

"Never mind," said the man, turning away. "I can get there faster walking."

The trip really takes only 15 minutes, but unless Congress passes emergency legislation before the last Sunday in April, when most of the country goes on daylight saving time, such apocryphal incidents will become a maddening reality for a million residents of Indiana.

#### TWO TIME POCKETS

The worried Indians, who last week sent representatives to petition a Senate Commerce subcommittee for swift action are

the unintended victims of a quirk in the Uniform Time Act, a 1966 law that was supposed to simplify national time standards.

About four-fifths of the state's population lies in the Eastern time zone, but two small pockets, in the northwest and southwest corners of the state, are in the Central zone.

The meandering boundary line is not the work of some perverse Government bureaucrat. The residents of the two pockets wanted them drawn that way, since each area shares the economic and cultural life of a large city also in the Central zone—the northwest corner with Chicago, the southwest with Louisville, Ky.

In years past, when Chicago and Louisville advanced their clocks an hour to observe Central daylight time, Indiana residents living in the Central zone did the same. But last month the Indiana legislature voted, at the behest of the Eastern zone residents, to exempt the state from daylight saving, and now the Indians in the western corners must remain on Central standard time while their big-city neighbors move an hour ahead.

There is a bill before the Senate, introduced by two Indiana Democrats, Birch Bayh and Vance Hartke, that would resolve the problem by amending the Uniform Time Act to permit states split by time zones to exempt one zone from daylight time while allowing residents in the other, if they desire, to advance their clocks.

The desire was evident last week when business and civil officials from the "islands of time" told the subcommittee of the "intolerable" problems that would arise unless the bill were passed.

One witness, Martin L. Leich, a radio station executive from Evansville, in the southwest corner of the state, pointed out that the checkerboard time pattern would affect travelers passing through Indiana, as well as residents.

#### HOW IT WOULD WORK

A person moving from East to West, Mr. Leich said, would have to set his watch back an hour as he passed from Ohio, on Eastern daylight time, into eastern Indiana, which would be on Eastern standard time. As he moved into one of the two pockets, both on Central standard time, he would have to set his watch back still another hour.

Then, when he entered Illinois, which would be on Central daylight time, he would have to advance his watch an hour.

"This is not the sort of uniformity that the Federal Uniform Time Act was supposed to promote," Mr. Leich said.

The Senate bill, and an identical one in the House, are described as "certain to pass" well before the advent of daylight saving time.

The subcommittee also heard testimony on another bill, introduced by Senator Marlow W. Cook, Republican of Kentucky, that would shorten the period of daylight saving time from six months to three. The bill would move the beginning of daylight saving, now the last Sunday in April, to the last Sunday before Memorial Day.

Daylight time would end the day after Labor Day, instead of the last Sunday in October, as it does now.

Support for Senator Cook's bill came chiefly from the Kentucky Farm Bureau Federation, which pointed out that during daylight time harvesting must often be delayed until noon, when the late-rising sun has finally burned dew off the fields.

Another witness, Mrs. Susan Spoonamore, the president of the Kentucky Congress of Parent-Teacher Associations, told the subcommittee that during the late spring and early fall, schoolchildren must leave their houses in darkness and are often in the classroom before the sun rises. She said that the hazard was especially great for rural children, who were forced to walk along country roads in the dark.



# WORKERS AWAITING PRESIDENTIAL AID ON TARIFFS

## HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, last week I spoke about the on and off quality of Presidential leadership which has put national trade policy in a vacuum, which has vitiated any positive movements to aid the pockets of serious dislocation resulting from imports and unfair foreign competition.

Today I wish to carry this concern with Presidential delay and inaction right to the homes of approximately 3,700 workers.

These are shoe workers who have won from the U.S. Tariff Commission a tie vote on their petitions for adjustment assistance.

They have been through the inevitable bureaucratic redtape and filed petitions with the Government for aid. They have waited the statutory period while the Tariff Commission deliberated to see whether as a result in major part of concessions granted under trade agreements, shoes were being imported in such quantities to cause or threaten to cause unemployment. They have come close to winning their case since the President himself last year, in petitions paralleling these, voted with the affirmative side and initiated adjustment assistance programs.

But what has happened this year? Nothing.

For 2 months since February 8 when the Tariff Commission split 2-2, 2,400 workers from Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Maine, and Illinois have waited for Presidential action.

For another month, since March 8, 400 workers from Brooklyn, N.Y., and Illinois, have also waited for Presidential action.

Now, yesterday, the Tariff Commission split once more in the same way that they have on each occasion since last June. Three more petitions, all from Massachusetts, involving an additional 750 to 1,000 workers have been forwarded to the President for his action, or inaction.

I urge the President to act immediately.

Frankly I do not understand the paralysis which has beset the Presidential offices.

The delay affects unemployed, many of whom are elderly. No precedent is involved in acting favorably on these petitions. No broad trade policy is established or undone. What the President does by voting in the affirmative is to make it possible for these nearly 4,000 workers to receive extended unemployment benefits and retraining aid, if it is locally available. In point of fact, these benefits are neither quantitatively nor qualitatively adequate, but they are what is available under existing legislative and administrative authority. They should be fully used.

In 1969, President Nixon called upon

Congress to enact "significant improvements in the means by which U.S. industry, firms, and workers can receive assistance from their government to meet injury truly caused by imports."

The President then recognized that freer trade can "cause hardship for parts of the community."

It is hard to understand that this same President has by his inaction delayed even the existing benefits available to workers.

## PUBLIC BE DAMNED: ATTITUDE BY POSTAL SERVICE POINTED OUT IN ST. PAUL DISPATCH EDITORIAL

### HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, if the events of the past several weeks are of any indication, I believe I am on the road to discovering a truism. And that is, if private corporations are generally unresponsive to the public; then public corporations with a monopoly guaranteed by Congress are totally unresponsive.

The public corporation I speak of is the U.S. Postal Service and under its new status as a corporation it is finding new "delights" to inflict upon the public above and beyond its habitual inefficiency.

These new delights include, and my list is far from inclusive, highhandedness, secrecy, disregard for Federal law, and a general disregard for the public as well as elected State, local, and Federal officials.

I believe the following editorial well sums up the present situation. I would additionally note that I was first made aware of the Postal Service's designs on Fort Snelling land by several concerned citizens nearly 2 months ago. I immediately launched a series of inquiries with the Postal Service and after 3 weeks of repeated inquiries by myself and my staff the Postal Service would neither confirm nor deny the reports.

Finally, in response to a routine inquiry to the General Services Administration, I discovered that the Postal Service did indeed covet 68 acres at Fort Snelling.

I concluded then and I firmly believe now that the Postal Service hoped to perform their land grab covertly before the public or its elected representatives could protest.

I immediately protested the highhanded and secretive route used by the Postal Service, and quickly my good friend and colleague from Minnesota, Representative DONALD FRASER, pointed out that the Postal Service was flaunting Federal environmental law and policy.

Soon the protest was joined by Minnesota's Gov. Wendell Anderson, the Minnesota Historical Society, Representative WILLIAM FRENZEL, whose district includes the land the Service wants to grab, the two Senators from Minnesota, WAL-

TER F. MONDALE and HUBERT HUMPHREY, and many private citizens.

Despite this bipartisan opposition and serious concern with both the land grab and the manner in which the Postal Service has conducted itself, the Service seems to remain arrogantly determined to stick unaltered to its present course. It will be interesting to see whether this "public-be-damned" attitude continues. If it does, now is the time Congress should know about it and further do something about it. As the following from the March 25 edition of the St. Paul Dispatch suggests:

The entire Congress should be made aware of the attitude of Postal Service officials.

I am taking the privilege of so informing Congress now:

## PUBLIC BE DAMNED

An unexpected and unwanted by-product seems to have been produced during the process of converting the U.S. Post Office Department to the U.S. Postal Service. The new corporation has emerged from the conversion process with a "public-be-damned" attitude that is not at all in keeping with what Congress had in mind.

The Postal Service's disregard for the public has been vividly displayed in the controversy over the future of the Fort Snelling polo field and parade ground. The Postal Service has been caught trying to quietly push through a proposal to build a large bulk mail handling facility there and postal officials have resisted a great deal of public pressure against the proposal.

Rep. Joseph Karth of St. Paul noted the attitude after the Minnesota congressional delegation made a concerted effort to get the Postal Service to abandon its plans. "There was little evidence that they wanted to be conciliatory or that they were willing to listen to our objections," Karth said. "Their attitude was considerably different than it was prior to the time they became a corporation."

The Postal Service did not notify any Minnesota lawmakers of the plan to locate the bulk mail facility at Fort Snelling, nor did it consult with either the Metropolitan Council, which has performed land use studies of the area, or the Environmental Protection Agency, which is supposed to study the environmental impact of such a facility before it is built. The Postal Service finally asked the Environmental Protection Agency for a study after Rep. Donald Fraser of Minneapolis pointed out this requirement under Federal law.

The area in question has considerable historical significance, is ideally suited to park land and is adjacent to the existing Fort Snelling State Park. Minnesota officials have sought to obtain the land for park purposes for many years.

There are a number of other potential bulk mail handling facility sites around the Twin Cities that would not meet any local opposition. Postal officials indicated little willingness to consider any of the alternatives in their meeting with the Minnesota congressional delegation.

The new corporate Postal Service was set up to improve the mail service, not to thumb its nose at the public. It is still a tax-supported public body and, as such, should be responsive to the wishes of citizens as expressed by their elected representatives in Congress. The entire Congress should be made aware of the attitude of Postal Service officials. If corrective measures are needed, they should be taken before the Postal Service grows into a monolithic monster that does not respond to any outside authority.

WELCOME TO THE NATION'S  
CAPITAL

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a statement, which appeared in the Washington Post on March 17, of the Irish American Club of Washington, D.C.

The recent troubles in Northern Ireland disturb us all very greatly, and I hope that my colleagues will give consideration to the position of this organization.

The statement follows:

WELCOME TO THE NATION'S CAPITAL, HON. JOHN LYNCH, PRIME MINISTER OF IRELAND

The members of the Irish American Club of Washington, D.C., wish you a most enjoyable visit and pray that your discussions with President Nixon prove fruitful. We hope that you will call to the President's attention the following injustices being perpetrated on your fellow countrymen by the British subsidized puppet "government" of "Northern Ireland."

(a) The rampant discrimination practiced by that "government," which systematically denies housing and employment to the Catholic population and thereby forces an extremely high percentage of its youth to emigrate. For example, the current unemployment rate in the ghetto of Ballymurphy, Belfast has now reached the staggering rate of 44 percent among the male population while the emigration rate among the Catholic male population of Dungannon, County Tyrone is 47 percent in the 18-28-year age bracket.

(b) The total denial of equal justice under law to minority citizens. Under the "Special Powers Act," innocent people are subject to arrest and imprisonment for up to 10 years without the benefit of a trial or, for that matter, without any formal charges being made against them.

(c) The blatant use of gerrymandering tactics to contemptuously manipulate constituency boundaries in a manner which will assure a Unionist majority. The most glaring example of these methods is the city of Derry, where a Unionist minority of 32 percent elects 12 Members to the City Council while the Catholic majority of 68 percent can only elect 8 Members to that body. Historically, the Province of Ulster consists of nine counties. Of these nine, five and a half are predominantly Catholic and three and a half Protestant. If all five and a half Catholic counties had been detached from Ulster, what remains would not have justified the existence of a separate government in Belfast. So the border was devised assigning the Counties of Donegal, Monaghan, and Cavan to the Republic of Ireland while retaining Fermanagh, Tyrone and South Down for rule by the government of "Northern Ireland," which, under these circumstances, would always have an artificial Protestant majority. If there was ever a case of gerrymandering, surely this is it.

It is sad that Britain has not learned from her experience in Cyprus, India, Nigeria, and every other Colony which ever flew the Union Jack. It is tragic that she should insist on maintaining a "paper" government in Ulster which in the long run has not got a snowball's chance in Hell.

It is imperative that you, Mr. Prime Minister, seek the full support of President Nixon and the enormous influence of his Office to help achieve the following objectives:

(1) The immediate withdrawal from the six counties of all British troops, whose very presence there only serves to increase tensions with the resultant senseless loss of lives on all sides;

(2) The establishment of a neutral United Nations peace keeping force which your Government has already endorsed;

(3) The holding of a free and open plebiscite in a true democratic fashion by the people of all Ireland, under United Nations supervision, to exercise their right of National Self-Determination.

We believe that the above proposals are a basic pre-requisite to the creation of a just and lasting peace among all the people of Ireland, North and South, Catholic & Protestant.

Respectfully,

JAMES D. HAGAN,  
Chairman, Political Action Committee,  
Irish American Club of Washington, D.C.

A PROFOUND COMMENTARY ON  
PROBLEMS OF TODAY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Calumet Index, a publication serving the far South Side of Chicago, in its Wednesday, March 24 edition, carried a very profound article by Rev. Harry D. Pierson, a black clergyman.

This article by the Reverend Mr. Pierson is stimulated by the complications he faces as an active clergyman working to stabilize a residential community and to provide the leadership which a man of the cloth is expected to bring to his congregation and the community in which he lives:

A PROFOUND COMMENTARY ON PROBLEMS OF  
TODAY

Black leadership, and we refer to Chicago Black self-elected spokesmen for our race; should start thinking in terms of the angry, distorted, and disoriented youth. It is their philosophy and ideology that is motivating our youth today. This anger is costly, neighborhoods are deteriorating, thousands of dollars worth of damages are inflicted upon schools weekly. Each week the board of education must replace broken windows.

About 99% of our schools that are located in our Black neighborhoods have the marking of the gangs written all over them. Not to mention the genocide among the youth, and the black-board, jungle-like atmosphere that is present in the class rooms. I have not read, nor have I heard any of the Black leaders who say "they are my spokesmen," speak out against these criminal acts against our institutions of public education. I have not heard them speak out against the violence or condone street gangs, or against Black crimes, against Black people, by Black people.

In fact, I haven't heard anything that would give our youth hope for a brighter and a well meaning future. All I've heard is demands of revolt, and hatred of the "White" man and his system. It is the only system that an American Black man knows, I think it is a rather nice one, considering the freedom that one could achieve in other countries it is second to heaven.

I am shocked to hear these "Black leaders" proclaim that they are for the freedom and dignity of the Black man and other minorities. They are speaking in terms of an armed revolution, a sure way to genocide and loss

of previous gains in freedoms and equality. It is also shocking to hear the "Black leaders" say: "What is happening to the Black youth of today? have they all gone crazy?"

It is remarkably unbelievable, and in a way, sad to see that they do not recognize the creation of their own work. It is the ideology that came into being after the death of Dr. Martin Luther King. This ideology advocates Black racism instead of true Black pride of the achievements of Black Americans in the building of the country. It advocates Black racism, and spits in the face of Whites and other minorities that struggled along with Dr. King to bring into being first class citizenship for the Black man. There is no emphasis on respect for the schools, the teachers, but yet education is the key to survival: it can conquer bias, racial discrimination, and bring our people out of the webs of ignorance.

It is also the possible way toward brotherly love and concern for all Black people, as well as for other races in order that we may all live in peace and harmony. People of all races are going to have to find solutions to these social problems that confront us. But Black leadership must begin to strive to bring the youth back to a sensible summit before we can go forward. Until they do this, we, the Black people, will continue in this atmosphere of confusion, and chaotic merry-go-round.

It advocates the three-hundred year old grudge of "the White suppression of Black people." It is a grudge that should remain in the past, for the White race of today is not responsible for what occurred three hundred years ago. But Black leadership is responsible for sowing the seeds of hate, and using this grudge as an excuse to illustrate and justify this false, deceptive philosophy of hate.

No wonder we are caught up in the cross fire of confusion and disunity. Black leaders have remained silent on the issues; their silence has been interpreted as consent, and that the criminal acts that are committed are justified. Just because one happens to be Black, and has suffered under bondage in the past, also has had injustices inflicted upon him, this does not give him the authority to commit criminal acts upon his fellow man, nor does it give him the right to demand more than what is expected. What I consider the most reasonable is decent housing, a safe community, free from criminal elements of extortion of home owners, merchants and children on their way to school, and equal job opportunities, providing one is qualified to perform the functions of that job.

Preserve the good appearance of our neighborhoods by not writing gang names on the buildings and walls. Compete with the situation of bias and bigotry instead of forming our own concept which solves nothing, but makes the problems even greater. We can compete by getting the most of our education from the schools we vandalize and mark up; we can compete by taking a realistic attitude of learning instead of ruining.

No, being Black does not give one the license to defy the system, to commit crimes against Black people in the guise of "Brother" to kill White policemen, etc. This ideology that is advocated is going to cause major grave violent occurrences of bloodshed, and this blood will be that of the innocent Black youth who have been programmed violent by our so called "Black leaders." Their minds have been distorted from the realities of truth, all because civil rights movements have ceased to become a cause for the freedom and dignity of the Black minority. Leaders see it as a job, an income.

Liberal whites who are conscience stricken donate thousands of dollars daily to these leaders who are teaching the Black youth that the White man is their enemy. Yet when I try and get them to help me with



a church and a community center in which they can receive the correct guidance, I cannot get one red cent toward this project. The Stone Foundation sent me a book on how to raise funds, I was aghast: here is a foundation that is spending thousands of dollars to bail out the gang members from jail, but yet they couldn't give our church a loan to start our project of keeping them out of jail in the first place. I can see a lost and confused generation of young Blacks going to slaughter because Black leadership valued the dollar more than they did the morals and dignity of our Black youth. Our schools are institutions of life, education is the key toward solving most of the problems that confront us in this present day society.

There is at the present, demonstrations against principals because they are White in the Chicago public school system, why is this so? Yes, Black leadership has really done a good job of disorienting the minds of the youth.

In conclusion, I would like to make these observations very clear: Black leadership is concealing from the youth of today, the key to life. I venture to say, that they don't want them to think for themselves; they wish to keep the puppet strings on their minds so that they can be controlled. I am a Black clergyman, my vows to God are sacred, I am sincere in my vocation, and dedicated to my fellow man. I see terrible injustices of deception being inflicted upon the Black youth of today. In all fairness to my conscience I can no longer remain silent, nor can other men of the cloth continue to do so. I appeal to them, I ask them to join me in this gesture of endeavor of righting the wrongs, for God sees neither White nor Black. I believe, like times of old, the church must come forward and not merely suggest, but do, become active in this challenge that calls for united efforts of all churches.

There is coming a time in the very near future of "an awakening," and the realization of the damage done will be seen, felt and experienced by all, Black and White alike. The Black leader of today has grown fat and rich from the exploitation of the minds of uninformed Black adults, and our youth, some will regret their deeds, others will not. For like Judas who betrayed Christ for thirty pieces of silver, Black leadership has betrayed the Black youth.

#### STUDY ON LAW ENFORCEMENT REVENUE SHARING

**HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 30, 1971*

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD the conference of mayors league of cities study on "Law Enforcement Revenue Sharing." This report is part of a systematic study of the entire Nixon administration's budgetary obligation for cities.

The general conclusion of this study is that—

Federal controls over states and protections for cities which Congress approved in the original act and in its 1970 amendments are seriously weakened.

I recommend this study to my colleagues:

LAW ENFORCEMENT REVENUE SHARING ACT  
OF 1971

One of the major causes of the increase in crime has been a serious shortage of funds for criminal justice at both the state and

local levels. Recognizing these facts, Congress passed the Safe Streets Act of 1968. This Act provided, for the first time, large-scale federal aid to state and local law enforcement and criminal justice systems.

Because the Safe Streets Act, in making block grants to states, is already a form of revenue sharing, President Nixon has chosen the law enforcement area for his first specific revenue sharing proposal. On March 2, President Nixon submitted to Congress the "Law Enforcement Revenue Sharing Act of 1971," a complete copy of which is included at the end of this analysis. The new proposal takes the form of a series of key amendments to the current Safe Streets Act. Some of these changes will improve the ability of cities to participate in Safe Streets Act programs. Other changes, however, are cause for grave concern in that they seriously weaken some important protections for cities in the current law.

The basic changes proposed can be summarized as follows:

1. Special revenue sharing payments replace block action grants to the states according to population.

2. State and local matching requirements are abolished both for the new special revenue sharing payments and for discretionary funds, which are available as direct grants to cities and states. In addition, the special revenue sharing payments may provide the local share of costs for grants for planning and corrections facilities.

3. LEAA is stripped of its authority to approve comprehensive state plans as a condition precedent to awarding states their block action grants. Instead, LEAA may merely review and comment upon each State plan. LEAA is also required to perform a fiscal and programmatic audit one year after each state has been funded, to be assured of state compliance with various statutory provisions, including those designed to protect cities. Thus, states no longer have to demonstrate that they will pass through adequate assistance to cities or that they will concentrate adequate assistance on high crime areas before they receive federal funds. Also, states now have much greater control over all substantive content of their comprehensive plans.

4. Provisions requiring grant recipients to show that they will assume full cost of aided programs after the assistance runs out and that they will maintain their levels of expenditure for criminal justice are dropped.

5. States are relieved of the requirement that they must make technical assistance available to local communities.

The new proposal does leave a series of important LEAA programs essentially unchanged. These include:

The planning grant program. (Part B).

The corrections program (Part E).

The discretionary grant program (with the exception that all state and local match requirements are dropped).

The National Institute research program.

The Academic Assistance Program.

The statistics program.

The LEAA sponsored technical assistance program.

To the extent that these programs benefit cities, their retention is positive. However it should also be noted that the new proposal does nothing to increase direct grants to cities or to relieve cities of the heavy burden of red tape they must now overcome to receive funds from states, and in these respects it is seriously lacking.

During 1970, Congress passed a series of badly needed amendments to the Safe Streets Act. These amendments benefited cities significantly by requiring states to give greater regard to city needs and improving city participation in both the planning and action grant programs.

Key amendments retained by the new plan include:

—Improved requirements for local repre-

sentation on state and regional planning councils.

—The requirement that planning money be made directly available to major cities and counties.

A provision promoting the use of action funds to establish comprehensive criminal justice planning capacities in major cities and counties.

Liberalization of the limitation on support for salaries of law enforcement personnel.

Many cities have already taken positive steps to benefit from these amendments, and have thus far received excellent cooperation from many LEAA officials in doing so. These amendments are of great help to the cities, and to the extent that the new proposal retains them, NLC and USCM supports it.

NLC and USCM also support elimination of local matching requirements for special revenue sharing payments and for discretionary grants. This 100% federal funding will be of great help to financially hard pressed cities, particularly since it would eliminate a requirement that part of the local match be in cash beginning with fiscal year 1973.

However, the section of the proposal which strips LEAA of its responsibility to approve comprehensive state plans prior to federal funding cannot be supported. Under the new plan, LEAA would have only two duties relating to states:

1. Review, comment and make non-binding recommendations on state plans; and

2. Perform fiscal and programmatic audits one year after states receive their revenue sharing payments to determine if statutory directives have been met.

Thus, federal controls over states and protections for cities which Congress approved in the original act and in its 1970 amendments are seriously weakened. We are particularly concerned about several key provisions in this respect:

Presently, states must pass-through 75% of their block grants to localities, and beginning July 1, 1972, the percentage of its annual block grant each state allocates to its localities must equal the local share of total state and local criminal justice expenditures.

States must adequately take into account the needs and requests of local units of government in distributing funds.

States must provide an adequate share of assistance to areas with both high crime incidence and high law enforcement activity.

All of these crucial provisions would be monitored by LEAA only retroactively. That being the case, if any of them were improperly administered by the states, there appears to be no effective recourse for local governments. This apparent lack of effective recourse for the cities is particularly troubling for several reasons:

The above provisions, while extremely important, are not precise in nature, and thus there is an obvious possibility that states may interpret them unfairly, to the detriment of the cities.

The 100% federal funding will give states a stronger inducement to retain as much activity money as possible for themselves.

LEAA's central and regional staffs have always been very heavily burdened, and they are not staffed for a major post-audit operation.

#### FOR THE DISADVANTAGED THERE IS A MESSAGE IN VETOES

**HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 30, 1971*

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I have been deeply concerned by the pattern of Presidential vetoes which, in the last

Congress, has indicated a total lack of regard for the disadvantaged in our society. It seems to be that too little attention has been paid to the evidence of these vetoes, perhaps on the theory that this is only what one would expect of a Republican administration.

But I do not think the explanation is so simple. It is not simple partisanship which has produced these vetoes; it is a deeper-seated prejudice against the disadvantaged and a narrow concept of the American economy, and society which, I believe, has produced these strange inconsistencies and inconstancies.

I expressed my concern and puzzlement in a letter which I handed to President Nixon when I visited him last week with a group of colleagues. I wish to submit for the RECORD my letter and my comments on these vetoes:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., March 25, 1971.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,  
President of the United States,  
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have been around Washington long enough to realize that the true test of an Administration's attitude is to be found not by what a President proposes but by what he chooses to veto.

Reflecting on the disturbing collection of Presidential vetoes in the last Congress—nearly all of which touched on some aspect of Federal assistance to the disadvantaged—I believe it fair to question just where the heart of this Administration lies. Even more important a question is what we can expect in the future?

It does not seem to me that the vetoes reflect an especially keen sensitivity to economic trends or to the extraordinary hardships brought about by unemployment to the lives of millions of Americans, black and white.

It seems to me that the Administration at times has been its own worst critic when choosing to launch unprecedented campaigns for such items as a \$1.49 billion appropriation for ABM development but being unable to come up with the \$200 million necessary to initiate public service employment for men and women desperately in need of work.

I believe that everyone here today might well consider that the dissatisfaction with present domestic policies as they effect the underprivileged, the unskilled and the discriminated, is sorely aggravated by the chasm that exists between Administration rhetoric and Administration performance.

I have myself on more than one occasion warmly applauded a statement by you or by one of your Cabinet officers to the effect that the Administration was "irrevocably committed" to minimizing this or that domestic problem or social injustice. Unfortunately and even needlessly, such eloquently phrased objectives were often dashed by a subsequent contradictory act.

To be specific, consider the eleven veto messages you sent back to the 91st Congress. Of those messages, two were private claim bills of no great public import. Nine most definitely were.

Nine of those vetoes were measures relating to job training, public service employment, election reform, hospital construction and modernization, education, water and sewer grants, urban renewal, wage comparability and family medicine.

Taken as a whole, those vetoes displayed an astonishing insensitivity to and lack of appreciation for the problems of the disadvantaged to get an education, to find employment, to receive adequate medical care and in general to enjoy the rich and rewarding

life to which so many millions of Americans have become accustomed.

Those vetoes evidence a willingness to exploit the needs of the disadvantaged in a cynical and callous manner—a willingness to veto today and propose tomorrow much of the same when it suits some tactical or political purpose.

Beginning with the first of your vetoes, Mr. President—the rejection of the fiscal 1970 appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare—I have set forth in the attached list some of the salient points which contribute to my personal inability to credit this Administration with a sincere and consistent approach to meet the needs of black Americans and the needs of all Americans for better educational opportunities, a decent place to live and employment paying an adequate wage.

Sincerely,

ROBERT N. C. NIX,  
Member of Congress.

#### VETO LIST

Veto of Appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education and Welfare and Related Agencies for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1970. Vetoed January 26, 1970. Compromise approved March 5, 1970. P.L. 91-204.

In your veto message, Mr. President, you stressed your feeling that an increase of 34 percent in appropriations for vocational education and Title I funds for educationally deprived children was "too large," especially in an inflationary period. You did not note that total Federal assistance for elementary and secondary education had declined in fiscal 1969 from the previous year; so what we were talking about was an increase of 34 percent over a two-year period, not a one year increase. But assuming inflation, rather than a lack of concern, was the real issue in the veto, how can we account for the proposals you have offered for fiscal 1972, at a time when we are suffering from high unemployment and economic depression?

Your budget recommendation for vocational education, while an increase of nearly \$60 million from \$322 million to \$382 million, is nevertheless far below the \$609 million authorized by the Congress for this program and even further below what we really need to provide adequate job and vocational training for our young people.

But what I simply cannot understand is your recommendation of no increase in funds for the program for educationally deprived children. I cannot understand why, if increases in this program should be limited in an inflationary period as you stated in your veto message, there is not some evidence that you would seize the opportunity offered by a period of economic slack to make a significant increase in this program. Instead, you recommend \$1.5 billion—the same dollar figure which was appropriated in fiscal 1971, and in view of the 9 percent increase in educational costs, an actual decline in Federal support—a sum less than half the \$3.6 billion authorized by the Congress for this vital educational program for deprived children. I cannot understand why, if a 34 percent increase is too much in an inflationary year, an actual decrease in Federal support is warranted when the economy is lagging far below its potential.

Veto of Appropriations Authorizing \$2.79 billion through fiscal 1973 for the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Program. Vetoed June 22, 1971. Overridden: 279-98 roll call vote in the House; 76-19 vote in the Senate.

Mr. President, the burden of your objection to this legislation was that it continued and expanded the program of hospital construction and modernization grants which has played an important part in the improvement of the health and medical services en-

joyed by the American people over the last quarter of a century. I could not understand why you insisted at a time when interest rates were the highest in our history that we shift abruptly from this successful grant program to one of Federal guarantees and subsidies for private construction and modernization loans.

Veto of Appropriations for the Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development. Vetoed August 11, 1970. Compromise approved December 17, 1970. P.L. 91-556.

I am no less mystified, Mr. President, by your veto of the Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriation on the grounds that the Congress included \$541 million more than you requested, and especially \$350 million above the amount you asked for sewer and water grants. While you emphasized the inflationary potential of the Congressional action in raising your budget request from \$150 million to \$500 million for sewer and water assistance, the national economy actually had already entered a recessionary period.

Now, however, you come forward with a double mystery in recommended level of funding for sewer and water needs. You suggest that the existing categorical grant program for sewer treatment facilities be thrown into one of your special revenue sharing packages. At the same time you have proposed a new categorical program under the Environmental Protection Agency to fund to the tune of \$2 billion a year. This is a program four times as large as the one you vetoed and it is to take effect when the economy is moving upward rather than when it was moving toward a recession. Surely sewer facilities are not four times as important or four times as non-inflationary when administered by an anti-pollution agency rather than by an urban development agency.

Veto of the Appropriation for the Office of Education. Vetoed August 11, 1970. Overridden in the House August 13, and in the Senate August 18.

In contrast to your veto of the HEW appropriation bill for fiscal 1970, your veto of the Office of Education appropriation for 1971 did not emphasize objections to individual programs. The overriding theme was the need to hold down Federal spending to cool an inflationary economy. The question, you said, was "not one of cutting the present level of school funds. It is not even one of whether to increase school funds. It simply is a question of how much they are to be increased—and for what purpose."

It is my understanding that the primary responsibility for determining "for what purpose" is the legislative function assigned by the Constitution to the Congress. Therefore, I make no apology for joining with more than two-thirds of my colleagues in rejecting the Executive's right to determine "for what purpose" Federal funds should be spent in the area of education.

I raise what I think is a most important consideration for future judgment of veto recommendations within your Administration. In August of 1970, at the time when you were persuaded to strike down the Office of Education appropriation on the grounds that it was inflationary and expansionary, the national economy was in the second month of the current recession.

The leading economic indicators had been forecasting this recession for months but the popular concern was still with runaway boom and inflation. It would appear that a willingness to react to the popular assessment of the problem, rather than an expert assessment of the actual economic situation, lay behind this veto and the equally inexplicable veto of the appropriations bill for the Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Veto of amendment to the Communica-



tions Act of 1934 for the purpose of limiting political campaign broadcast spending by candidates for all Federal and gubernatorial elected offices. Vetoed October 12, 1970. Sustained by Senate, November 23, 1970.

The stated objection to this bill was that it unfairly imposed a limitation on candidate expenditures for television without imposing similar limitations on expenditures for other media. The veto was coupled with a promise to recommend more comprehensive legislation to prevent those with great wealth or the ability to tap great wealth from subverting our basic democratic electoral processes.

The real attitude of the Administration toward the vital reform of excessive campaign expenditures is apparent in its failure to recommend such legislation or to even respond to a Senate Committee's request for Administration views until the last minute. It was only a few days ago, when the Committee in the Senate had completed hearings and started to mark up an elections reform bill, that the Justice Department finally asked to be heard.

Veto of the Employment and Manpower Act of 1970 (with related provisions for Public Service Employment). Vetoed December 17, 1970.

The justification for this veto, in addition to the familiar cry of inflation was that it purportedly lacked any linkages with training programs or with efforts to move temporary public service employees into permanent or "real" jobs. In the first instance, this simply is not true.

The legislation had a great many provisions for such linkages and for regular and continuing efforts to move public service employees into non-subsidized employment. In the second place, after vetoing a proposal to create 300,000 public service jobs as part of the Employment and Manpower Act, you have now recommended the creation of 200,000 public service jobs as a part of your Family Assistance Program. The difference seems to be that your public service jobs would be fully divorced from job training programs and there would be 100,000 fewer of them—unless local communities choose to use part of your proposed special revenue sharing funds for manpower to create additional temporary public service jobs.

In this latter case it is not clear, at least to me, how it reconciles the objections in your veto to what you termed inadequately mandated linkages with real jobs and your stated wish to give local communities greater freedom to disregard Federal guidelines through special revenue sharing. I hope that your submission of a manpower plan tied to revenue sharing will not obscure the need of the cities for immediate emergency employment relief. Your veto of last year eliminated the opportunity of hundreds of thousands of Americans to find meaningful employment.

Veto of Assistance for Professional and Technical Training in the Field of Family Medicine. Pocket-vetoed December 26, 1970.

Since by employing a pocket-veto you never really said "no" to this bill, there is no veto message explaining formally your objections. Presumably, it represents an effort by the Executive to prevent the Legislative Branch from establishing another categorical program. But I note that this objection to a categorical program to encourage medical schools to pay greater attention to the practice of family medicine did not prevent this Administration from recommending an entirely new \$100 million annual categorical program to encourage states to pay more attention to the need for statewide zoning and land use programs.

Veto of Legislation Establishing a Procedure for Fixing and Adjusting Pay Rates for Federal (blue collar) Employees Paid at Prevailing Wage Rates for Comparable Work in Private Industry. Vetoed January 1, 1971.

This legislation was intended to bring order

out of the chaotic situation which prevails in the Federal Government's procedures for fixing the rates to pay of 765,000 employees working under the so-called prevailing rate system.

Inflation, again, was sounded in the swinging of the veto ax. Nine days later, the Treasury Department announced a liberalization of depreciation guidelines to stimulate the depressed economy. To business, it was a \$2.7 billion windfall.

I cannot see why it is inflationary to give Federal blue collar workers \$130 million more a year to spend to boost a sagging economy and not inflationary to give businessmen \$2.7 billion more to spend.

Veto of Legislation to Include Federal Firefighters Within the Provisions for Retirement of Government Employees Engaged in Hazardous Occupations. Pocket-vetoed January 4, 1971.

This was a measure to attract and keep young men in the Federal Fire Service and reduce the loss of trained personnel to municipal and county fire departments which pay higher salaries, require less hours and provide better retirement benefits. Civil Service Commission arguments that Federal firefighters already receive higher pay and benefits was unconvincing to the Committees which studied the matter and determined more hazard pay benefits were in order.

## THE OEO HAS GOT TO GO

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the mounting number of instances of misuse of taxpayers' money in programs administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity makes it increasingly more apparent that the gigantic hoax known as the war on poverty is supplying the funds to enlist, train, maintain, and even defend legally the collectivist radicals assiduously laboring to undermine and destroy our great country.

Henry Winston, Communist Party official, stated after returning to the United States from a briefing in Moscow:

Today the Economic Opportunity Act has already become the basis for organizing in the slums and ghetto communities and it offers the point of departure for helping to rally the rank and file millions to a mass movement.

Writing in the Review of the News magazine, Mr. Wallis W. Wood, in an informative firsthand, on-the-spot account describes the appalling condition wrought in Des Moines, Iowa, as a result of the gross misuse of taxpayers' money not only by OEO but also by HEW and HUD.

The officials of OEO provide pressure from above through taxpayers' funds to the war on poverty terrorists in the streets including their legal defenders thereby allowing them to bring pressure from below for still more Federal funds.

Yet, with full knowledge of these alarming facts, the Nixon administration, for its new American revolution, has asked Congress for a 2-year extension of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

If we are ever to have peace on the domestic scene, the OEO has got to go.

I insert Mr. Wallis W. Wood's article entitled "Something Is Radically Wrong in Des Moines," as appearing in the American News Analyst of March 22, 1971, and a news clipping:

[From the American News Analyst, Mar. 22, 1971]

SOMETIMES IS RADICALLY WRONG IN DES MOINES

(By Wallis Wood)

Locking onto the approach to the Des Moines Metropolitan Airport, today's modern jets begin their descent over the Mississippi River, where it bisects the cities of Davenport-Bettendorf and Rock Island-Moline. Passing over the fields and farms of eastern Iowa a visitor is well aware that he is in the heartland of America. There below are the golden fields, the white farm houses and great barns, the gray windmills, and the handsome silver-domed silos from which the sun's rays reflect upward. Seeing this a visitor has no doubt that in those fields and barns and homes below there lives and works a people still close to their Creator and to the good earth He has blessed.

A visitor coming from the asphalt expanses of the Eastern Seaboard looks at the rolling hills of central Iowa, with their alternating fields of wheat and corn, their hooved version of beef and bacon standing fatly against rich pasture, and is convinced that he has entered a peaceful land where the tensions and anarchy and crime of the urban East are as foreign as the voodoo cults of Haiti.

Reaching Des Moines, such a visitor is in for an ugly surprise.

On October 10, 1968, the Jewett Lumber Company at 615 East Walnut Street on the outskirts of Des Moines was hit by revolutionary arsonists and, before the fire was brought under control, more than \$500,000 worth of property was destroyed. On April 30, 1969, at least four Molotov cocktails were hurled by urban guerrillas into the Statewide Construction Company at 1544 East University Avenue. On May 13, 1970, a dynamite bomb containing more than fifty pounds of explosives rocked the headquarters of the Des Moines Police Department on Court Avenue, doing an estimated \$250,000 in damage. On June 13, 1970, the Chamber of Commerce Building at 800 High Street was shaken by yet another bomb, this time causing damage amounting to more than \$150,000.

In fact, during the last two years there have been more than two hundred such successful bombings in Iowa, mostly in Des Moines. Another two hundred were threatened or aborted by luck and alert police work.

Damage in Des Moines, Iowa's capital and most populous city, has already reached \$2.5 million. Miraculously no one has yet been killed by the terrorists, but they are still trying. And, the frequency and severity of the terror strikes is escalating. Clearly, some kind of war is being waged in Des Moines.

Our assignment from *The Review Of The News* was to travel to Iowa to try to discover who is responsible for the continuing wave of terrorist attacks there, how the insurrectionists are being financed, and what is being done to stop them. The answers we uncovered proved to be part of a pattern being repeated in cities and towns from Maine to California.

## THE OPEN REVOLUTION

So serious has the problem of urban warfare become—and so few of the terrorists have been arrested—that apathy is turning to anger in Des Moines. Not only are citizens not safe on the streets at night, but many have begun to feel they aren't even safe in their homes and places of business. Obviously something must be done.

But who is responsible?

The Des Moines police would like to ask that question of Charles Knox, age twenty-six. For at least four years Mr. Knox has been a professional revolutionary—most of that time, curiously enough, while on the government payroll. He has operated as "Minister of Education" for the local Black Panther Party, though the Des Moines chapter now uses another name after a dispute with national headquarters and his current title is not used outside of revolutionary circles.

Knox's arrest record over the past two years includes charges of assault and battery, possession of narcotics, unlawful assembly, arson, resisting arrest, and disrupting a public meeting. His apartment at 1416 University Avenue has been raided twice by the local police on the basis of information supplied to police intelligence concerning illegal caches of dynamite and blasting caps. Both times police discovered enough rifles and ammunition to start a small war; pamphlets and flyers detailing the manufacture of Molotov cocktails and providing instructions for the sabotage of civil communications and utilities; and, enough hard-core Communist literature to open a library in Moscow.

Claiming that none of this was illegal, Judge Harry Perkins of the Polk County District Court promptly ordered the police to return to Mr. Knox and his associates the rifles and pistols, the gas mask, the 500 rounds of ammunition, and everything else seized in the raids. The Judge stopped just short of requiring the police to apologize publicly.

So the Marx, Lenin, Castro, and Guevara posters continue to stare out from the windows at 1416 University Avenue, while a Communist flag waves below them. And Charles Knox knows that the best defense is a good offense. On the afternoon of October 2, 1970, only a few hours after the last police raid, he and Pantherette Mary Rhem distributed a handbill in the black community calling on all "brothers and sisters" to "Organize To Change the World!" The flyer proclaimed:

"Again the Fascist authorities of Des Moines unjustifiably harassed the Black Revolutionary Communist Youth by ransacking our apartment while they were not at home. . . . These degenerates broke out windows, kicked in doors and held 3 sisters by gunpoint as hostages while they searched the apartments. . . .

"We Communists are not afraid to express our political views and to wage struggle against fascism. Our Politics Are The Politics Of Liberation (Marxism-Leninism-Mao-Tse-Tung Thought). Our Struggle Is The People's Struggle. . . .

"We further feel that the fascist attempts to intimidate us have failed for we intend to continue to disseminate Communist Literature (Mao Tse-Tung Thought), support the Revolutionary Struggles of the World against Imperialism, and display our 'Red Flag' supporting Red China and praising those whose 'Blood' has been dripped for Freedom. Dare to Struggle—Dare To Win!! Advance Peoples Struggle!"

A week passed without demonstrations, renewed agitation, or a single bombing. On Friday, October ninth, the people of Des Moines found out why. Lawrence Scales, Director of a federally funded project of the Iowa Children's and Family Services program, announced that Communist Charles Knox had just been hired by the agency at a salary of \$7,000 per year to be a "counselor" for juvenile delinquents. Scales told reporters that Knox, admitted head of the Black Revolutionary Communist Youth organization, had impressed him (and these are Mr. Scales' exact words) with his "ability in working with black youth."

The program under which Knox was hired is officially known as the Model City Juvenile Treatment Project. The \$225,270 in tax money to finance it is channeled through the Des Moines Model City agency (\$63,270),

the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (\$92,000), and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the Justice Department (\$70,000).

The Model City staff had hired Iowa Children's and Family Services, a private organization supported by United Way, to run the project in which Comrade Knox would operate. John Wolfe, a "senior planner" for the Model City program, explained that "we are trying to bring alienated individuals into the mainstream of our projects. A person shouldn't be shut out because his political views disagree with the majority." Knox was recommended for the position by the Concentrated Employment Program, another federally funded Model City project for which Comrade Knox had worked earlier in the year.<sup>1</sup>

Understandably, the hiring of Charles Knox became a subject of some controversy in Des Moines. Two members of the City Council—Republican Robert Scott and Democrat Jack Woods—were the first to act. They demanded that Knox be fired and said that if Model Cities or the Iowa Children's and Family Services (I.C.F.S.) took no action, the Council would.

Later that same Friday afternoon the Executive Committee of the Greater Des Moines United Way voted to suspend I.C.F.S. from further aid. The United Way, a local united charities fund-raising operation, declared that I.C.F.S. had violated its agreement by not even informing the agency that it had accepted the delinquency project. No doubt the concern of United Way was heightened by the fact that the scandal over Charles Knox erupted just as it was in the midst of a public canvass to raise \$2,726,000 for the coming year.

On Saturday, October tenth, the I.C.F.S. Board of Directors met to consider the squabble. Board President Lynn Vorbrich, who also serves as Chairman of the Des Moines Human Relations Commission, subsequently announced that Communist revolutionary Charles Knox would not be dismissed from the federal dole. According to Vorbrich, Knox had promised that he would not use his new position to recruit "marching, stomping Marxists." Moreover, the Human Relations specialist proclaimed, Comrade Knox "has a good relationship with kids, he doesn't like to see them in jail, and he's not going to counsel them to go out and rob a gas station." Right, Mr. Vorbrich, nothing that petty!

Director Scales of I.C.F.S. was more direct. If the City Council did not approve of his program and hiring practices, he declared, "they can cancel the contract." The next Monday, five members of the City Council took Scales at his word and said they would vote on Thursday to suspend the City's contract with the Iowa Children's and Family Services program.

Less than forty-eight hours later, as one might expect, the Iowa Civil Liberties Union leapt to the defense of Comrade Knox. And, later that same evening, the Citizens Board of the federally funded Model City in Des Moines passed a resolution reaffirming its "support and confidence in the judgment of the Iowa Children's and Family Services in conducting the program we have put into their hands." The Board asked the City Council to "reconsider the entire matter," then blasted the Council for "interfering or attempting to control the hiring practices of any Model City operating agency, particularly when such action relates to charging an individual on unfounded rumors and personal reasons."

<sup>1</sup> Knox was said to have been one of sixteen persons recommended by C.F.P. for the counseling job. When we pressed, no one at either agency could "remember" the names of the other fifteen nominees!

At the same time, John C. Neubauer, Director of the Accounting Aid Society (another tax-supported agency helping the "under-privileged" in the Model City area), praised Charles Knox for his "positive contributions" to Des Moines and his "constructive social efforts." You know, things like flying the Red flag and decorating his street-wide window with a giant picture of Mao Tse-tung! Knox was the "desirable choice" for the job, Neubauer declared, and criticized the City Council for "trying to destroy" this outstanding young man.

Meanwhile, to make the situation perfectly clear, Comrade Knox was telling anyone who would listen that his Communist handbill of October second "explains my political philosophy in full." Questioned in more detail about the "people's struggle," Knox would shrug and reply, "Read what Mao said about that." And what is he trying to accomplish in Des Moines? "My job is to spread revolution," he explained.

As a result, and to no one's great surprise, the Des Moines City Council voted on Thursday to break its contract with I.C.F.S. The resolution was approved unanimously. And so avowed Communist organizer Charles Knox, who had never reported for his job as a counselor for juvenile delinquents, found both the job and the program no longer existed. The villain had been found, and fired.

Would the citizens of Des Moines, so slow to become aroused, now relax? Would the complex of projects and programs financed by more than a dozen federal agencies be subject to close scrutiny, or would they continue to go unquestioned?

On Friday, October sixteenth, the Des Moines Tribune did its best to prevent further inquiry. The Tribune is owned by Cowles Communications. Other Cowles enterprises in Des Moines include the Des Moines Register and KRNT radio and television. Board Chairman John Cowles and Board President Gardner Cowles are both members of the secret and powerful Council of Foreign Relations, the New York-based organization described by such authorities as Dan Smoot as being so powerful that it is literally an "invisible government of the United States." The political radicalism of the Cowles brothers is known to Americans in other sections of the country through the pages of Look magazine. Their slick propaganda is, however, especially effective in Iowa since their two newspapers are by far the largest dailies in the state.

In an editorial entitled "Overreacting to Knox Hiring," the Cowles' Tribune used its most solemn tone to proclaim:

"The hiring of former VISTA worker, former Black Panther leader and current Black Revolutionary Communist Youth leader Charles Knox to a \$7,000 Model Cities program job helping delinquent youth is threatening to cause many in Des Moines to 'lose their cool.'"

"As we said earlier, we believe the hiring of Knox showed a lapse in judgment by Lawrence Scales, the director of Iowa Children's and Family Services (I.C.F.S.) which was to conduct the delinquent youth program. . . .

"It would be a sad irony if the furor over what one person might do to this worthwhile program led to the entire program being junked."

In the opinion of professional investigators in Des Moines, it would be an even greater irony if the recent furor prevented the entire "poverty" effort there from being junked. For if ever a program seemed designed to disrupt and destroy orderly government and the peace of a community, the tax-supported, government-directed War on Poverty in Des Moines fits that description. Consider some of the specifics.

#### THE UNDERGROUND REVOLUTION

On July 22, 1970, Attorney General Richard C. Turner of Iowa testified before the Sub-



committee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations concerning the recent bombings in Des Moines. After describing the explosions at the Police Headquarters and the Chamber of Commerce Building, as well as dynamite attacks on the Police Department in Ames, Iowa, and on the Science Building at Drake University in Des Moines, Attorney General Turner had this to say:

"The identities of the central figures who have planned and perpetrated these bombings and fires are known. They are known through the sworn testimony of witnesses before grand juries and trial juries. They are known as the result of statements made out of court by persons who are unwilling to testify. They are known by circumstantial evidence satisfactory to the common sense of the most skeptical layman.

"Yet, only two individuals responsible for any of the bombings and fires since 1966 have been convicted and sentenced to prison. Three others have been tried and found guilty by juries, but they have not been sentenced."

There are many reasons for the failures to convict. Fear and terrorism play no small part. And Des Moines police have been handcuffed by the restrictive court decisions which have thwarted police work nationwide. As Des Moines Police Chief Wendell F. Nichols told me, "Anyone who denies that Supreme Court decisions have made our work much more difficult is simply not informed—or is not telling the truth."

But, despite such difficulties, there is much that is known and can be divulged.

On the evening of May 5, 1970, the officers of the Quick Supply Company in North Des Moines were burglarized. More than 1,000 pounds of dynamite and blasting caps were stolen from the depot. Sworn testimony has been taken in secret by a Grand Jury in Des Moines concerning the theft and subsequent use of these explosives. One witness testified under oath how Charles Knox, assisted by other black revolutionaries from Des Moines, planned the robbery, drove to the supply depot, cut through a chain-link fence, and then hauled the dynamite away in a truck belonging to the local Office of Economic Opportunity.

Police subsequently recovered three boxes of dynamite and one box of blasting caps. They were easily identifiable as coming from the Quick Supply Company because the stolen dynamite was of an unusually large size—2.5 inches in diameter—and of a kind used exclusively in quarry mining. No other supply depot in the Midwest has reported the theft or non-industrial sale of such explosives.

On June 21, 1970, an anonymous caller suggested that police investigate an area near a Des Moines overpass. Officers called to the scene discovered a metal toolbox behind a girder. One of the policemen released the cover of the toolbox. Inside were two sticks of the odd-sized quarry dynamite, wired together and connected to the lid with an electrical detonator. Metal contacts had been

\*One of those who has been indicted but never convicted on arson and bombing charges is Mrs. Joanna Cheatom. The "Mrs." is honorary; she was born a Cheatom. The mother of four illegitimate children and leader of the militant Mothers for Dignity and Justice, which is tied to the radical Welfare Rights Organization seeking more aid to mothers of dependent children, Mrs. Cheatom budgets her aid so well she was able to use it to finance a trip to England. Joanna has joined Charles Knox on a breakfast program for needy children at the O.E.O.-G.O. center on Forest Avenue, where youngsters receive both nutrition and an "education" every morning. The food is donated by area merchants; the propaganda by Communist Charles Knox.

placed on the ends of a clothespin, with a small piece of wood inserted between them. A cord connected the wood to the handle so that when it was lifted the piece of wood would be removed, contact would be made, and a policeman would be killed and a bridge bombed. The officer was saved when a splinter of the wood remained in place and prevented the circuit from being completed.

An officer in Omaha, Nebraska, was not so fortunate. On August 23, 1970, he was killed in an explosion of a similar bomb made of that quarry dynamite. One arrest has been made in the Omaha case—David Rice, an O.E.O. employee who has boasted of his Black Panther connections in Omaha and Des Moines. Rice is a self-proclaimed revolutionary who had been under investigation nine months before the killing for his support of a "liberation school." Yet, he was kept on the O.E.O. payroll despite repeated warnings from concerned Congressmen and angry citizens. David Rice is now under indictment for conspiracy to commit murder.

The Communist revolutionaries are not above trying to make hay—or rubble—on their own side of the street, either. On April 26, 1969, a dynamite blast leveled the Black Panther headquarters at 1207 Eleventh Street in Des Moines. The Panthers—led by Charles Knox—immediately began to shout to the Cowlies media about fascist oppression and intimidation, and even accused the Des Moines police of setting the bomb.

Who lit the charge?

The Black Panthers did, in an effort to achieve publicity and national attention.

Police intelligence is sure of the facts. It has a tape recording of a conversation at a Trotskyite convention in Minneapolis between two Des Moines Panthers boasting about this coup. Intelligence also knows the names of the participants. Unfortunately, the man who actually planted the bomb, James W. Lawson, is not now available to testify. He was killed several months ago in Milwaukee, when a bomb he was building went off prematurely.

#### THE SUBSIDIZED REVOLUTION

Earlier this year a grocery store in Des Moines became the target of radical agitation. Owned by an immigrant couple from Poland, the Geiger Food Fair at 1307 Forest Avenue has been in business for over thirty years. The Geigers have always been proud to operate a clean store with friendly service, and they often extend credit to regular customers who are temporarily short of cash.

Nevertheless, in March of 1970, a handful of black extremists declared that the Geiger Food Fair must be closed. Supported by Great Opportunity, Inc., a local O.E.O. affiliate, a line of demonstrators, clenched fists raised high in the Communist salute, blocked the store's entrance. The Geigers' customers, mostly Negroes, were advised to shop elsewhere. An O.E.O. van was parked nearby, ready to drive them to another market. Customers who refused to be intimidated were pushed and shoved as they tried to cross the picket line. A few days later a gang of some twenty thugs entered the store, knocked cans and packages from the shelves, poured charcoal starter-fluid over the mess, dropped a match, and left.

The Geigers are still in business. But their windows have been bricked over and the store appears to be under siege. Long-time residents of the area told me that the whole neighborhood feels equally threatened. They wonder why the federal government is financing the terrorists in their streets.

Earlier in the shabby history of the O.E.O. in Des Moines, Greater Opportunity, Inc. (G.O.), actually approved a formal grant of \$1,541 to the Communist Black Panthers to finance an African Festival and Cultural Center. The money was first requested by the Panthers in the spring of 1968, but approval was slowed by the usual bureaucratic

delays. Finally, G.O. Director Donald McKenzie, N.A.A.C.P. leader John Estes, Assistant City Attorney Gary Swanson, and several other influential citizens of Des Moines—including Monsignor Paul Connelly of Catholic Charities, the Reverend Frank Kroll of the United Church of Christ, and Robert Manheimmer of the Mayor's Task Force—issued an appeal for the money to be granted. McKenzie's letter said in part: "There is growing belief that the Black Panther Party is a positive dynamic force in this community, and should be assisted in doing their thing."

The very evening that the G.O. executive committee met to approve the grant, some twenty Panthers stormed into the meeting and announced that they didn't want the money after all. When order was finally restored, the motion to authorize the funds was rescinded. Two days later the G.O. Board of Directors reversed its own executive committee and allotted the funds anyway.

By this time the Panthers had decided they weren't going to get the money, didn't want it, and anyway they had changed their minds about an African Festival and Cultural Center and were instead raising money to pay bail bonds! And, yes, an O.E.O. program has also been established to assist these revolutionaries when they get caught. In fact, the Legal Aid Society in Des Moines even used part of an O.E.O. grant to bring suit against the Des Moines Police Department!

More recently, the Accounting Aid Society in Des Moines decided to use a \$75,000 grant from O.E.O., and \$50,000 from other federal agencies, to launch a "consumer education program" in that Iowa city. From Washington came a recommendation to hire for the project one Max Wiener, an "expert" from Philadelphia. Wiener is a former reporter for the Communist Party newspaper, the *Daily Worker*, who was once convicted of election fraud while trying to get Communists on the ballot. This "consumer expert" declared bankruptcy himself in 1965, so he could hardly be in this "business" for any reason other than to express his radicalism.

Wiener claims that he has not been a member of the Communist Party for years. Even so, his consultations on "consumer education" in Des Moines revolved around demonstrations, boycotts, and picketing of "unfriendly" merchants. Wiener is no longer in Des Moines, and the O.E.O. isn't telling how much he was paid for his advice.

Another O.E.O. employee who is the subject of some concern is Mr. James "Big Jim" Thompson, a former policeman who is described euphemistically as having resigned "under a cloud." Thompson, who is such a good manager that he was able to so stretch his policeman's pay as to be able to afford luxury automobiles and a palatial home, was about to be asked some pointed questions by the Narcotics and Vice Divisions of the Des Moines Police Department when he decided that department from the Force was the better part of valor. Now he receives federal funds as an O.E.O. coordinator in Des Moines.

You will be glad to know that at least one of the charges against O.E.O. was subsequently shown to be false. Clive De Patten, a former Panther and admitted revolutionary from Des Moines, had told investigators for the House Internal Security Committee that he was employed by the O.E.O. Careful checking established that he was not; the federal funds which revolutionary De Patten was receiving came through the Concentrated Employment Program, which used to be funded by the O.E.O. but was subsequently subsidized by the U.S. Department of Labor—to the tune of \$1.6 million a year.

De Patten's confusion about where his paycheck comes from is understandable when you realize that there are at least eighteen separate antipoverty agencies at work in Des Moines and, as we have already seen, in many cases poverty projects receive funds

from two, three, four, or even more different federal bureaus. Under such circumstances, which group is in charge? No one seems to know. In fact, it is virtually impossible to determine for certain which federal agency is paying for what, who approved the project, or who is responsible for supervising it.

One official who tried to penetrate this bureaucratic maze is Iowa State Auditor Lloyd Smith, who has earned a reputation as one of the most diligent and effective administrators in the State. Smith uncovered enough about the "War on Poverty" in Des Moines to conclude that such agencies had become little more than "havens for radicals." And, since his office is responsible for investigating the use of tax funds in Iowa, he began an investigation of those eighteen federally subsidized anti-poverty groups.

Auditor Smith did not get very far, however, before he was informed that the State of Iowa has no right to check on federally funded programs in Iowa. "We are," he was told again and again, "responsible only to Washington." In fact, Smith has even been refused the names of Iowa citizens employed by the "War on Poverty" forces. One hardly has to wonder why!

Representative William Scherle, whose Seventh Congressional District abuts Des Moines on the East and Omaha on the West, has also had some angry words to say on this subject. Congressman Scherle is a member of the House Internal Security Committee, which has been investigating the ease with which such Communist revolutionaries as the Black Panthers have been able to acquire federal funds for their radical purposes. Although he was in the final days of his campaign for reelection when I visited in Iowa, Mr. Scherle considered the situation so serious that he agreed to take much of a morning out of his busy schedule to discuss this subject with us.

I asked Congressman Scherle just how serious the problem of radicals and revolutionaries on the government payroll has become. "The situation is *unbelievable*," he replied. "It runs rampant throughout the country. It almost appears that the poverty agencies are seeking out the worst sort of militants!"

The Congressman identified three main problems turned up by the House Committee on which he serves. The first, he said, is the laxity in hiring practices. William Scherle cites Robert Tyson, Iowa's O.E.O. Director, as being among those who have taken a "soft line on hiring radicals." And the fact is, he said, that "the hiring of militants and revolutionaries is a common problem throughout the country."

A second difficulty is the multiple funding of so many programs. Congressman Scherle explained:

"I never realized before that it was causing such a problem. You take a particular project or program, and have it funded by O.E.O., by H.E.W., by H.U.D., and the Department of Justice; there is no way of knowing who has jurisdiction. They all contribute funds but nobody takes any final responsibility. And the agencies and regional heads are afraid to speak up, because they don't want to step on someone else's toes. So they do nothing."

The third major problem outlined by the Iowa Congressman was the irresponsibility of many of the officials involved. "At the worst, they feel immune to any type of investigation, any type of direction. This is typical throughout the whole anti-poverty program," he said. But not every official is arrogant; some are merely indifferent: "They have little or no interest in the people or the programs. They are just interested in protecting and expanding their own bureaucracy."

Have these problems become more, or less, serious during the past two or three years? William Scherle is emphatic: "There is no question about it; they are *much* more seri-

ous. More militants, more radicals, more undesirable characters have found a haven in the anti-poverty programs. The entire 'War on Poverty' has been racked with corruption, embezzlement, and lack of benefits."

What is Congressman Scherle's solution? He is a direct man, and he puts it simply: "The entire O.E.O. ought to be dismantled and junked!" Lest that recommendation sound extreme, the thoughtful Iowa Representative added that he is *not* recommending the abandonment of all federal efforts to help the underprivileged. But the O.E.O. and its allies in the "War on Poverty" have such an unsavory history, he believes, that "these agencies can no longer attract the sincere poor. The very people who need and deserve the help the most will not participate."

I was not surprised to find that many of Des Moines' citizens, both black and white, share Congressman Scherle's opinion. A number of them, however, are reluctant to be quoted for publication. One who is not is Pastor Ezell Wiggins, a Negro minister whose voice echoes with the wrath of Isaiah when he describes what the federal government is doing to Des Moines:

"In the past two years, these programs have not done hardly anything constructive. How are the leaders for these projects picked anyway? I know as well as anybody that Charles Knox has no business being a counselor for juveniles. He is an avowed, self-styled Communist. There shouldn't be any argument about him. He should never have been hired! He should never have been approached! But he's not the only one like that; there are plenty of others."

I asked Pastor Wiggins how other members of the Negro community feel about the situation. Too many people seem too willing to be "spokesmen for every Negro," he replied. "I'm not one of them." But, he added, I can tell you that "probably ninety percent or more of the Negro people I know do not agree with what has been happening. Yes, they feel they should receive some help, some assistance, so long as these programs have been legislated. But putting some of these radicals in charge is doing harm, not good."

As far as "rehabilitating dissident elements," or "drawing them into the mainstream" in Des Moines, Pastor Wiggins made more sense than any of the scores of federal bureaucrats with whom I have spoken. Here are his exact words:

"If you're going to wash a hog, you've got to take him out of the hog pen. You can't get in the mud puddle with him and expect to get him clean. You both just get covered with filth. The people who plan these programs should have more sense! But, instead, the government seems to be employing criminals to work against the government!"

Before I left, Pastor Wiggins said that if I was going to quote him I should add this final statement: "Tell your readers that Pastor Wiggins believes in America, and he believes in liberty. But he thinks rioters and trouble-makers don't get the punishment they deserve. In fact, some of them are arrested and back on the streets before the police have time to file a report!"

I could only shake my head in mute sympathy, and agreed to raise the matter during my interview with Police Chief Nichols the following morning.

#### THE WAR ON POVERTY

The federal "experts" who control the purse strings to the taxpayers' funds have a two-part solution to the problems of law enforcement. The first is to turn existing police officers into "sensitive," college-trained sociologists. The second is to get the criminals off the streets by putting them on the public payroll. Together, the two stratagems form a vise that can crush effective administration of justice. Both are well underway in Des Moines.

At least two federally funded programs, the Concentrated Employment Program and the Model Cities Police Cadet Project, have helped solve the financial worries of various dissidents, militants, and lawbreakers in Des Moines by seeing that they receive a government check every week. For example, Dennis Ashby is paid nearly \$7,000 a year through the Des Moines Police Department, ostensibly to help recruit young Negroes for police work. Since Ashby's criminal record includes charges of burglary, larceny, parole violation, intoxication, and armed robbery, one might be understandably skeptical of the caliber of recruits which federal money is paying him to attract.

But Mr. Ashby is ambitious. This summer he asked the Des Moines Urban Affairs Bureau to give him \$29,000 to organize a "crime prevention bureau" in the black community. Several members of that Bureau had the audacity to question him about his proposal. How would the money be spent, they wondered. And what would his "crime prevention bureau" actually do to prevent crime? Tongue-tied and sullen, Ashby stamped out of the meeting. Chairman Watson W. Powell Jr. then came to Ashby's defense, explaining that he thought he could come up with about \$20,000 in additional federal funds to finance the proposal. And it wouldn't cost Des Moines a cent!

It is curious to me that the argument that federal funds are harvested from trees somewhere along the Potomac continues to be offered by urban bureaucrats who would presumably find themselves embarrassed by the canard that a city might be saved by the tooth fairy or a pot of gold at the end of a rainbow. Yet, they persist in their odd delusions. Des Moines City Manager Tom Chenoweth, for example, supported the Police Cadet Program with this argument: "I think it deserves a try, particularly since no local funds are involved." Of course, *all* of the funds were local—once. And for every three dollars of the taxpayers' earnings that flow into Washington, only one dollar trickles back as "free" federal money.

Most of this business is howling madness. One project financed by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration was funded to pay for the hiring of a dozen youngsters to "walk the beat" with police officers in potential trouble spots. But when the Des Moines Police Department abandoned such foot patrols, and substituted patrol cars instead, the federal program went right on rolling. Today, twelve checks are still drawn each week to pay the "walkers" in an abandoned program. A policeman delivers them to a Des Moines market in the black community.

Sometimes, however, even the poverty wizards go too far. Such as when Communist Charles Knox was hired two years ago by the O.E.O. as a Careers Program trainee—to work in the records section of the Police Department. Chief Nichols thought this was a bit much, and fired him. Comrade Knox promptly filed a complaint with the Human Relations Commission, accusing the Police Department of discrimination!

When I spoke with him recently, Police Chief Wendell E. Nichols still seemed upset about programs under which the Police Department must pay the salaries of radicals, revolutionaries, and just plain old-fashioned crooks. It is galling, he declared, to have them "openly tell us—while taking our money—that we are nothing but a bunch of '\*\*\* pigs.'" Not that the Chief is against rehabilitation, he insists. It is just that he thinks some demonstration of a sincere change of heart should be a prerequisite to putting a criminal on the federal payroll.

Not every criminal can be given a government salary, of course. So tax-supported projects have also been established to see that lawbreakers spend as little time behind bars as possible. The National Council on



Crime and Delinquency, for example, operates a "pre-trial release" program that gets around such headaches as bail bonds. One effect of this relentless concern for the criminal, Chief Nichols told me, is that a tremendous number of criminals are arrested two, three, or more times—while waiting trial on a first charge. "On the average day," Wendell Nichols reports, "one-half the serious crimes in Des Moines will be committed by people who should be in jail. Some days the figure is as high as seventy percent!"

What about the federal O.E.O.? I asked the Chief.

"As far as I'm concerned," he replied, "it has done absolutely nothing to make the problems of law enforcement in Des Moines any easier. Nor have the persons connected with O.E.O. contributed one single iota to the peace of this community."

As we have already seen, Chief Nichols was putting it mildly.

#### WHAT CAN BE DONE?

Our investigations in Des Moines were necessarily limited. Lacking official status and extended time, we succeeded in doing little more than scratching the surface. Still, we have presented here only a small part of what we uncovered. Much remains unsaid. Things like how the revolutionaries have succeeded in capturing much of the Welfare operation in Des Moines; details on the massive corruption and irregularities in the multimillion-dollar Model City program; the direct tie-in between the Communist revolutionaries and more traditional criminal activity; and, a study of the "sensitivity training" program which is being promoted for top city officials and community leaders.

An exhaustive treatment of all of these issues would require a book, not a magazine article. Nor should it be necessary. Certainly we have presented enough of the facts to justify the demand for a calm, deliberate, and detailed investigation, by a responsible and impartial authority, of the entire "anti-poverty" operation in Des Moines. It is definitely not enough to entrust the politicians and bureaucrats who are on the receiving end of such funds to maintain the proper checks and balances.

Mayor Thomas Urban, who is so committed to the Left that he served as a sponsor of the Vietnams' Great Plains Moratorium, and who officially welcomed the Communist-riddled Vietnam Moratorium Committee to Des Moines, has dismissed the current concern over the poverty programs as an election-eve move to "discredit" the O.E.O. "I hope they are as interested in these programs subsequent to the election," Mayor Urban proclaimed. If the people of Des Moines really care about what is happening to their city the Mayor will get his wish.

Incumbent Governor Robert D. Ray of Iowa has been in the unenviable position of denying both that he has any knowledge about the wrongdoing in the anti-poverty programs, and that he has any control over these programs even if they are thoroughly corrupt. This despite the fact that his own appointee, Robert Tyson, serves as State Director of the O.E.O. And, despite the fact that local, state, and federal officials have all reported that on numerous occasions they have brought a variety of these abuses to the Governor's attention. Director Tyson, a close personal friend of the Governor, may be handicapped by a lack of familiarity with the local programs; in just ten months he has taken at least twenty-one trips out of the state.

But the solution to such incredible abuses of responsibility, authority, and public trust must, ultimately, rest with the people of Des Moines—and the people of every other city in the United States where our tax money is being used to finance crime and

revolution. For a war is being waged, and the productive wage earners of America are the target. Unless federal financing of this revolutionary turmoil is halted, there will soon be no noncombatants or innocent bystanders in this struggle. All will be victims.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 9, 1971]  
NIXON, IN SWITCH, REQUESTS 2-YEAR EXTENSION OF OEO

(By Spencer Rich)

The Nixon Administration, in a surprise move, asked Congress yesterday for a flat two-year extension of Office of Economic Opportunity.

But OEO officials contended the request doesn't signal any reversal of previously announced plans to shift all of OEO's action programs to other agencies and to change the central OEO office into a research agency.

They said the two-year extension is designed simply to keep the poverty war alive until Congress acts on the OEO reorganization proposals, portions of which have not yet been formulated in detail.

In a letter to the House and Senate Labor committees, which will consider the poverty program's fate, OEO Director Frank Carlucci said, "Pending congressional action on the President's proposals (for reorganization), we believe it would be inadvisable to consider any substantial revision of the Economic Opportunity Act, and accordingly, no amendments are incorporated in the proposed bill other than" a two-year extension.

Jacob K. Javits (R-N.Y.), senior Republican on the Senate Labor Committee, had previously introduced a two-year extension measure of his own and has been urging the administration to agree.

The fate of the poverty program has become a key issue between the administration and many Northern Democratic and Republican liberals.

President Nixon, in statements over the past two years, has indicated he wants to break away from the OEO all the action programs created by the Johnson administration and leave OEO as a research agency. Many liberals contend this would undermine the government's antipoverty effort.

Current programs expire June 30, and according to various administration bills or statements, the administration planned the following actions on programs now under OEO:

Abolish all the existing special manpower training programs now under OEO—Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Operations Mainstream and the Opportunities Industrialization Centers—and let the states and cities provide manpower training with funds from the President's proposed \$2 billion special revenue-sharing program for manpower.

Transfer OEO Legal Services to a new quasipublic corporation of as yet unspecified powers. Many liberals favor the corporation but say they fear the administration may seek to give it only limited powers to help the poor.

After Jan. 1, 1973, shift jurisdiction over the Community Action Program elsewhere (probably to the Housing and Urban Development Department) and let the cities fund the Community Action units with money from urban revenue-sharing.

An OEO spokesman said none of these proposals is being abandoned, but it is recognized they'll take time to get enacted by Congress, so a two-year extension is desirable.

The House Labor Committee will open hearings on the two-year plan Monday. The two-year authorization sets no specific dollar ceilings on appropriations.

## PROBLEMS FACING BROADCASTERS

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, for the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to insert in the RECORD the text of a speech delivered February 17, 1971, at Wake Forest University by Mr. Harold Essex, president and treasurer of Triangle Broadcasting Corp., and general manager of WSJS television and radio in Winston-Salem, N.C.

Mr. Essex, an eminent broadcaster for the past 40 years, addressed himself to the problems facing broadcasters of today—problems including the ban on cigarette advertising, proposed limits on political campaign spending, and other subjects as well.

His remarks, I believe, will be of interest to all of my colleagues, and I now submit the text of that timely address for their consideration:

#### PROBLEMS FACING BROADCASTING

(By Harold Essex)

I was delighted when Dr. Burroughs extended an invitation to me to come out and talk to you this afternoon. His suggestion was that I discuss some of the problems and trends in broadcasting today, and offer any thoughts that I might have on solutions to these problems. We broadcasters have plenty of problems. The only difficulty I had in preparing for this visit with you this afternoon was deciding on just which ones to address myself to.

The title I have given to my remarks here today is "Is The Honeymoon Over?" The dictionary describes the word "honeymoon" as meaning a period of harmony. So let's examine some of the problems that bug the broadcaster today, after which I'll let you make up your own mind about the end of the honeymoon for broadcasting, particularly television. The problems I'm going to outline will not be necessarily in their order of importance . . . the individual broadcaster must rank them in that order in accordance with his own situations.

And that leads me into an observation to set the stage. The average broadcaster is a rugged individualist. Many of our problems down through the years would not have become major problems if we, the broadcasters, could have gotten together and presented a solid front. But it just doesn't work that way. One of the major problems that broadcasters faced recently, and probably one of the most critical problems in broadcasting's history, was that of cigarette advertising. Congress finally stepped in and resolved that one when we couldn't resolve it ourselves.

I will always believe that broadcasting didn't have to lose cigarette advertising, but we fought among ourselves for so long over the problem, without agreeing to a solution, that we lost the whole ball game. Right now a group of radio stations are involved in an after-the-fact action—court action to determine whether the law passed by Congress prohibiting the advertising of cigarettes over the air is constitutional, because of its discriminatory nature. The law prohibits the advertising of cigarettes in one medium, broadcasting, leaving other media free to carry all the cigarette advertising the manufacturers want to run.

I'm not attempting here to make a case for cigarette smoking. I certainly agree that cigarette smoking is not beneficial to health,

but for my satisfaction it has yet to be proven that cigarette smoking is as dangerous to health as it has been made out to be by some people. I think the jury is still out on that one. Meantime, the broadcasting industry has been nicked by congressional action for annual advertising revenues in the neighborhood of 250 million dollars.

But the cigarette issue is water over the dam and broadcasting can now forget about it, unless by some miracle the legal action that has been instituted should succeed. I happen to believe that it will not.

Now let's move on to other problem areas that are as yet unresolved. I have said that I believe the law banning cigarette advertising is unconstitutional because of its discriminatory nature. I believe that the same thing applies to a law that was passed last fall by the Congress, setting a limit on political campaign spending in broadcasting, and requiring that broadcasters give political candidates the privilege of a favorable advertising rate, not available to other advertisers, while not setting forth any restrictions for other media, also to be discriminatory.

Fortunately, President Nixon agreed, and vetoed the bill. But that's only the first round. Already a number of bills to control political spending have been introduced in the new Congress and there are others to come. Broadcasters agree, almost to a man, that there should be some control over campaign spending by political candidates. But we don't think it right that we should bear the brunt of the control, leaving other media free to accept every dollar that's offered to them by the politicians.

Coupled with most of the bills being offered in the proposal to modify Section 315 of the Communications Act which now requires that a broadcaster, if he allows a candidate for a particular office to use his broadcast facilities, he must then provide equal time for all other candidates for that same office. Various proposals are being made for modification of Section 315, but the main thrust is in the presidential and vice presidential areas. As the law stands today, should the broadcaster provide time for candidates for President and Vice President of the major political parties during a presidential campaign, he must provide equal time for every candidate for President and Vice President in that particular campaign. This means that the air would be choked with all those splinter party candidates, and "no party" candidates who would come out of the woodwork demanding to be heard. Such a list might include the candidate of the Prohibition Party, The Vegetarian Party, the Socialist Party, and dozens of kook organizations that would grasp this opportunity to spout their kooky philosophies to the nation. The networks and the majority of the broadcasting stations in this country would be glad to provide time for meaningful candidates to present their views to the voters, and without charge, if Congress modifies Section 315 of the Communications Act. But as the law stands today, the broadcaster is prevented from doing that. Any law that is passed by Congress in an effort to control political campaign spending should contain provision for modification and modernization of Section 315, and it should not discriminate against any one medium. There's plenty to be said on the political campaign spending problem but there are other problems to cover here today, so let's move along to some of the others.

Within the past year the Federal Communications Commission has increased fees charged to broadcasters by more than 1000% over the application filing fees in effect since 1964. The total amount to be collected from all industries regulated by the Federal Communications Commission, including broadcasting, telephone, two-way business radio,

etc., represents a 600% increase. Numerous new charges include an annual fee, a large fee for new stations and changes in existing stations, and a 2% "sales tax" on the sale price of stations. The Federal Communications Commission's appropriation from Congress this year is in the neighborhood of 25 million dollars, and the Commission proposes to recover the full amount of its appropriation by this fee system. Broadcasters are in agreement that some reasonable fee system is probably in order. But for the Commission to attempt to recover its entire appropriation through the fee route does not seem proper. The Commission engages in many activities which are intended for the benefit of the general public and yet it now seeks to require the licensees of some of its regulated industries to pay the full cost of maintaining the entire agency. Of its 25 million dollar annual appropriation the Commission estimates it will collect 9 1/2 million dollars from broadcasters, which is more than one-third of its entire budget to handle all the business of communication with which the Federal Communications Commission is concerned. Another aspect of this fee system that bothers the broadcasters is the possibility that the Federal Communications Commission could, on its own volition, enlarge its agency, increase its annual expenditures, and increase the fees charged to broadcasters to pay for this increased activity. No other regulatory agency of the government, acting under the authority that is claimed by the FCC, has proposed to collect fees to recover the full amount of its appropriation. Unless some general limit is placed upon the authority of federal agencies, we can envision progressively higher fees as the result of increasing appropriations for bigger bureaucracies. Congressional guidance in the charging of fees by the FCC is urgently needed. Authority to agencies of the government to levy fees should be a limited one, and no new fee schedule should go into effect until the Congress has ample time to review it. As the situation stands now, the Commission seems to literally have a blank check.

A couple of examples here will show you what this means in dollars. The fee schedule now in effect would require an applicant for a new VHF television station in the Winston-Salem/Greensboro/High Point area, or in any of the 50 top markets in the United States, to pay \$5,000 down with his application and then, if his application is granted, he would pay a grant fee of another \$45,000. In other words, he would pay \$50,000 for a piece of paper, which in effect we would call a hunting license. That figure scales on down for applicants for stations in smaller markets. Such a fee schedule also applies in the case of applications and grants for AM and FM broadcast stations. For example, a station like our WSPS-AM would require a fee of \$400 to be paid with the application for a grant and an additional \$3,600 to be paid upon receiving the grant. So much for grant fees, which are one-time only fees. But now comes the annual fee that a station must pay. AM and FM radio stations must pay an annual fee to the Federal Communications Commission equal to 24 times the station's highest single one-minute announcement rate. Again, to give you an example in dollars and cents, currently we pay an annual fee to the Federal Communications Commission of \$672 for our AM radio station, and another \$336 annual fee for our FM station, or a total of \$1,008 annually for our radio stations. The annual fee paid for television is an amount equal to 12 times the station's highest 30-second announcement rate. In our case that rate is \$200, so simple arithmetic shows you that we have to pay \$2,400 a year to the FCC as a fee for our television station. And we have no assurance that next year the fee may not be increased to meet increased costs of operating the Federal Communications Commission.

Now these dollar figures that I've given you are those that apply to our operations here in Winston-Salem. But when you consider broadcast stations, television and radio, in the large metropolitan areas, where advertising rates are considerably more than what we charge here, you can see that it runs into quite a bit of money. Just one example, to give you an idea: WNBC-TV, the National Broadcasting Company's television station in New York City, has a rate of \$6,000 for a 30-second announcement. Quick arithmetic shows you that WNBC-TV must pay an annual fee of \$72,000.

Incidentally, Dr. Burroughs, since you do not have a rate card for WFDD, there seems to be no reason for your paying an annual fee. Also, the rule seems to provide that there is no fee to be paid by stations like WFDD on applications. So don't sell anything on WFDD, or it might cost you more than you make.

In some quarters this new fee system of the FCC is considered to be a tax, and the question has been raised as to whether an agency of the federal government can levy a tax. This seems to be the prerogative of Congress only, and this is being investigated. Again, I have spent considerable time on one subject, so let's hurry along.

Another item that proposes to hit at the broadcaster's pocketbook is the proposal made in a bill introduced in the last Congress—the Copyright Revision Bill—that record companies and performers be paid a special fee by broadcast stations in addition to the present fees paid to the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, to Broadcast Music, Inc., and to a third music licensing organization known as SESAC. This bill died when the 91st Congress ended, but it is expected that this or a similar bill will be part of any new copyright legislation introduced this year.

This is a pretty silly piece of legislation, strictly a grab for an additional piece of the broadcaster's dollar. The performers are already well paid for making records on a royalty basis by the manufacturers and the manufacturers certainly make a profit on the sale of the records. Beyond that, I wonder what the sales of records would be if there were no broadcasters to give these recordings exposure over the air to the public? Again to give you an example, our stations, radio and television, already pay approximately \$5,000 a month in royalties to the three music licensing organizations that I have just mentioned. The attempt to get this type of bill passed seems to me to be an attempt to bite a big piece out of the hand that feeds the performers and record makers.

While we're on the subject of copyright, the 91st Congress, in its Senate Judiciary Committee, considered at length a copyright law revision bill but it was not reported out. This is something that is needed badly because the present copyright law dates back many years, and the present state of the art in broadcasting plus the advent of CATV makes the current law somewhat archaic. We're hopeful for some modernization of it, but the broadcaster is going to have to be very watchful that he doesn't get clobbered in the process.

I mentioned CATV. That, of course, is community antenna television. This is a subject that could take up all the time allotted to us here this afternoon so I won't go into it except to say that many broadcasters are concerned about CATV and what they believe is a threat posed by it to free over-the-air broadcasting. I don't happen to share that feeling in its entirety. I think CATV and over-the-air broadcasting can live together if the Federal Communications Commission is reasonable in the rules it will adopt in the near future for the regulation of CATV. However, some of the proposals, if adopted, would cause such a radical change in the



existing structure of broadcasting that the American public would quite likely receive broadcast service inferior to that which is available to it today. Because of the complexity and enormity of this problem it is imperative that the appropriate congressional committees examine at length this regulatory plan of the FCC and determine what communications policy would best serve the American public.

Ownership of broadcast properties also is in jeopardy today. The FCC has issued proposed rules which, if adopted, would drastically restructure the broadcasting industry. The FCC contemplates regulations which would limit ownership in a market to one television station, or one radio station, or one newspaper. The broadcasting industry firmly believes that such a basic change in the traditional ownership patterns should be accomplished only by congressional authorization after demonstration that such action would be in the public interest. I believe the "one-to-a-market" rule, if enacted, would result in a loss of service to the public.

Freedom of expression and access to the broadcast media is a subject that is of much concern today. In today's atmosphere of turmoil and social conflict there is a growing threat to freedom of expression on radio and television. Stations, as well as networks, are under verbal attack because of alleged imbalance in presentation of news and public affairs. Such attacks come from liberals as well as from conservatives, Democrats as well as Republicans, "hawks" as well as "doves". The Federal Communications Commission is dangerously expanding the so-called "Fairness Doctrine" to control more and more who shall have access to the media. The Commission is in fact substituting its judgment for that of the broadcast licensee to prescribe what issues must be broadcast and what spokesman must be granted access. Broadcasters must exercise the highest possible degree of responsibility and must strive for fairness in presenting all significant points of view on controversial issues. But broadcasters must look to Congress to prevent the federal agency from assuming the power to make program judgments. I don't want, and you don't want, government control of broadcast programming.

There are those in this country today who are working hard, every day, to bring about radical social change in our country. And they know that the broadcast media, if they can control it, will speed the day of their take-over. They must not be allowed to prevail. Broadcasting must be kept free so that it may speak for all the people and not just for the pressure groups that want to destroy the free enterprise system and impose upon these United States a way of life that you and I would find unbearable.

But now I've worked myself up into an evangelistic state. That's not too much out of place on a Baptist campus, I admit. There are more problems to cover, but we'll leave them for another time and another place, and use any remaining time to kick around some of the subjects that I have covered here this afternoon.

In closing, let me make one thing quite clear. I have talked to you this afternoon about some—not all—of the problems that face the broadcaster today. Put them all together and it could be quite a discouraging situation. But we, the broadcasters, are not discouraged. The easy way out would be to get out of broadcasting and find something that you think would be less frustrating. But where in the world would you find a profession that is any more challenging, more interesting day by day, and more enjoyable overall? I've been in broadcasting for more than 40 years and I'd be the most unhappy guy you ever saw in any other type of business. I love it, and I recommend broadcast-

ing or one of its allied fields for your consideration when you start looking for your place in the business world. I can't give you many guarantees, but I can give you one . . . you won't be bored to death because there's never a dull moment in broadcasting.

Thank you, Dr. Burroughs, for the opportunity to be here this afternoon.

#### IN INTRODUCING A BILL TO PROVIDE TAX INCENTIVE FOR HOMEOWNER TO CONNECT WITH PUBLIC SEWERS

**HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to induce homeowners to abandon private septic systems and connect to public sewers. The taxpayer will be given an income tax deduction: any capitol expenditure incurred to connect a sewage line from the residence of the taxpayer to a municipal sewage system shall be considered to have been a capitol expenditure incurred with respect to property held for the production of income. At the present time, an assessment of sewer project costs is deemed simply a property improvement and, therefore, not admissible as an income for deductible items.

With the large amount of sewage plant construction taking place due to the increase in appropriations for such projects and the increased availability of State and local bond issues, there is a need to make it less expensive for the individual homeowner to connect to a public sewer line.

In many rural areas, homeowners cannot afford the expense of switching from a septic tank to a sewer line. In the State of Florida, for example, the average cost varies from \$750 to \$1,200. Moreover, health reasons make it mandatory that public sewer systems replace septic systems in the developing urban areas. The density of septic tank usage in these areas is polluting surface water and the septic tank runoff is polluting lakes and streams.

A corporation is, at present, allowed to deduct the cost of connecting to a sewage line. An individual homeowner should receive the same treatment. The construction of sewage facilities should be considered a general public improvement because of the general benefit of pollution control and elimination of hazards to public health.

The situation in Florida is becoming quite acute. Because of County Health Departments recommending that public sewage systems replace septic tanks, the State legislature recently passed a constitutional amendment to pledge the State's full faith and credit for local bond issues and also allow the State to issue bonds to construct sewage facilities. South Florida alone needs \$1.5 billion in sewage works.

The legislation I am introducing today will provide both an inducement and

relief for homeowners to connect with public sewage lines and, thereby, abate the pollution caused by over-reliance on septic tanks.

#### HASSLE OVER FROZEN FUNDS MAY NIP REVENUE SHARING

**HON. JOE L. EVINS**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the reaction throughout the country against the arbitrary and excessive impoundment of funds appropriated by the Congress by the Bureau of the Budget continues to mount.

In this connection the Nashville Tennessean in a perceptive editorial points out that by withholding funds, the budget bureaucrats may be jeopardizing the administration's chances for approval of some revenue sharing plan by the Congress.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I insert the editorial in the RECORD:

#### HASSLE OVER FROZEN FUNDS MAY NIP REVENUE SHARING

President Nixon has blocked the spending of \$23.2 billion appropriated by Congress last year for aid to cities, rural development, transportation and public works.

At the same time, the President has been increasing the pressure on Congress to pass his "revenue sharing" proposal which Mr. Nixon says is intended to return federal money to the states to help the cities, fund rural development, or be used for any other purposes the states desire.

It is no wonder that congressional leaders are beginning to accuse the President of hypocrisy in paying lip service to the needs of states and cities and withholding the federal money already appropriated for these purposes.

The frozen appropriations include funds for such things as environmental protection, \$11 million; health services, \$72 million; education, \$31 million; basic water and sewer facilities, \$200 million; farm credit, \$260 million; agricultural conservation, \$46 million; rural electrification, \$25 million, and many other such items which are of basic concern to people living both in the cities and on the farms.

Mr. Nixon has said he is for helping the cities, that he is for rural development and environmental protection and many of the other purposes for which Congress has appropriated funds. But when he refuses to spend the money that is available for these services, his actions speak louder than his words. It appears that the President is less interested in seeing that the people get the services than he is in seeing who gets the credit.

Mr. Nixon has been trying to convince Congress that his revenue sharing plan is the ideal way to put federal money into the service of the people. But the President may now have made a tactical error. The hassle over the frozen funds is giving Congress an opportunity to see what it is like to appropriate money with no say as to how—or when—it is spent.

Some congressmen seem to feel that Mr. Nixon wants revenue sharing so that he can take credit from the voters for federal money

spent by the states and local governments. They see Congress reduced to the role of handing out tax dollars to be spent by others.

Many congressmen fear that money which should go to combat pollution, improve living conditions in the cities, or buy milk for hungry children in the schools could end up paying for electronic devices and patrol cars for the local police.

This would be contrary to Congress' jealously-guarded tradition of appropriating public funds for specific purposes and taking credit itself from the voters.

President Nixon may be able to convince a majority of Congress that it should willingly give up this political advantage. But he has not improved his chances by freezing \$23 billion in appropriations intended for spending in virtually every congressional district in the nation.

## ARGUMENTS AGAINST ABORTION

### HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, arguments against abortion are varied, but on examining them closely, one thing remains constant. That fetus which is to be so casually disposed of is not some extraneous part of the body, but a human being with the right to life.

In a recent WTOP editorial reply, Mr. Thomas O'Herron, an attorney and a member of the U.S. Foreign Service, elaborates quite ably on this theme. I urge my colleagues to consider his rebuttal:

#### EDITORIAL

(A recent WTOP Editorial called on the Maryland Legislature to relax that state's abortion laws. Such decisions, said the editorial, should be left basically to the woman and her physician. Here with a reply is Thomas O'Herron, an attorney and a member of the U.S. Foreign Service.)

The view that the question of abortion is one which should be decided between a pregnant woman and her doctor would be a sound one if a fetus were a tonsil or an appendix, but it is not. The fetus is not an organ; it is not part of its mother and should not be subject to disposal at her wish alone.

Within a few weeks of conception, the fetus is recognizable as a child. Its genetic composition is unique in history and can never be repeated. Its nervous system, its circulatory system, its digestive system, and even its fingernails are well formed and need only time and protection to mature.

This fetus is one of us—he is a member of the human family. Because he cannot defend himself, society must defend him. And because this fetus is a human being, there is no pressing social problem or no degree of personal inconvenience which can justify his destruction. If history has taught us anything, it is that no society can function if it permits some of its members to decide which of the others shall live.

Those who would support easy abortion should see one performed. The act itself is hideous and repugnant to everything decent men value. In the early weeks of pregnancy, the fetus is destroyed by being sucked through a tube inserted into the womb; later he is scalded to death by a salt solution injected into the sac in which he dwells; in advanced pregnancies, he is removed by Caesarian section and left to struggle for breath until he dies.

Each of us lives briefly and but once, and we should treat each human life with the respect that its uniqueness demands. To do so is to dignify the human family; to treat human life as expendable if it is inconvenient is to demean all of us.

## A RESOLUTION URGING THE RETENTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AS A SEPARATE ENTITY

### HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the Iowa State Legislature is now completing action on a resolution passed by the Iowa House of Representatives which urges the U.S. Congress to retain the Department of Agriculture as a separate, independent entity with Cabinet status. This resolution was occasioned by the proposed departmental reorganization plan espoused by the administration.

The Iowa State Legislature recognizes the importance of agriculture to Iowa's economy and believes that the interests of its constituents are best served by a Cabinet post dedicated entirely to agriculture. The people of Iowa fear that the dissolution of the Department of Agriculture, and the resultant fragmentation of its responsibilities among agencies devoted to other interests besides agriculture, will deprive them of adequate representation in Washington. The agricultural sector of our economy has fallen upon hard times. Now, more than ever before, the agribusiness community needs a strong voice in the councils of government.

Representatives of rural areas in Congress should give careful consideration to the wishes of their constituents in their deliberations on this important issue. With your permission, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will insert the text of the Iowa State House of Representatives concurrent resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

#### HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 11

Whereas, the President has recommended sweeping governmental reorganization at the federal level; and

Whereas, the midwest virtually stakes its entire future on the agricultural industry in the production of corn, beans, livestock and produce; and is in fact the "bread basket" of the nation; and

Whereas, a majority of Iowa Senators and Congressmen have expressed their concern for the future of the Department of Agriculture under the aforesaid plan of governmental reorganization, Now Therefore,

Be It Resolved by the House, the Senate Concurring, That the General Assembly of the State of Iowa urges the Congress of the United States to retain the Department of Agriculture as an entity of cabinet status and that duties and responsibilities of the Secretary of Agriculture and his department be redefined and clarified with emphasis on local and regional control of crop production, acreage allotments, conservation practices and controls of environmental pollution; and

Be It Further Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, President of the United

States Senate, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to each member of the Iowa delegation to the Congress of the United States.

## AN OVERWHELMING SENSE OF DISGUST

### HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, there has been much debate recently over the setting of a deadline by the Congress for ending American participation in the Indochina war. Various dates have been proposed. I support the principle of setting such a time limit for a variety of reasons.

Yet I should like to set forth several factors that figure significantly in my consideration that perhaps have not been as widely publicized as some others.

I am aware of the overwhelming opinion of most Americans on this; they want out of our involvement there as fast as possible. There are those who take a strictly moral stand, and those who occupy a strictly pragmatic position. There is merit in all such arguments, especially in light of the fact that this administration has compounded disaster there by widening the war, with obvious cataclysmic consequences. It was bad enough to see the botch in South Vietnam. The sight of the so-called elite military units of the Saigon government fleeing in headlong, panicky route out of Laos adds disgrace to defeat and failure. I believe that the Disengagement Act of 1971, calling for our removal from involvement in that ongoing tragedy by the end of 1971 is necessary.

My first premise is that the Government of South Vietnam and its entire infrastructure is riddled with corruption, opportunism and a feeling that America is their permanent Santa Claus. This is the underlying supposition of practically all considerations on all levels of the Government of South Vietnam. Once we understand and accept this, then a host of other actions become instantly clear, even to the most casual observer.

We are not regarded as liberators by the people and authorities of South Vietnam, as we have been in other wars and other places. We are not even regarded as faithful allies. Instead, America is regarded as a massive sow, with myriad teats, all of which drip money rather than milk. Winning the war, morality, honesty, and a host of other altruistic considerations are adjourned by the South Vietnamese authorities in their scramble for a place at one of these financial faucets. Proof of this widespread destructive attitude is massive, damning and increasingly obvious. For this reason, we must place these so-called allies of ours on notice that they will shortly have to swim on their own. The gravy train is leaving town in short order.

After 10 years of involvement, American boys are still subject to a draft in order to be sent to fight in South Viet-



nam and other places in Indochina. The South Vietnamese have, as of this date and to my knowledge, not instituted an effective similar system in order to defend themselves. It is simple for South Vietnamese to evade whatever passes for mandatory military service. Why not? It is much easier to have some American youngster do his fighting and dying for him.

The black market in South Vietnam is a raving continuous scandal that is enough to cause any reasonably honest person to turn in revulsion from the spectacle. No move is in permanent terms by the Saigon government to even put a crimp in this traffic, which is all in American goods. U.S. service personnel are being deprived of items so they can be sold on the black market. Who profits from this? One guess. Swiss bank accounts and Riviera villas await a good many of our so-called allies after the final debacle.

The happenings in U.S. service clubs and PX's which have been recently revealed further degrade our position in Indochina and cast a shameful stain on the escutcheon of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in every case, when we have sought to obtain some redress of one or another of the existing imbalances, we are brought up short by the inescapable logic of the South Vietnamese. We are guests and they are hosts. We must abide by their house rules, even if it means that it is done at our complete expense.

This has even extended to the murder of American service personnel by high-ranking South Vietnamese officers. I am sure every Member of this body remembers the cold-blooded murder of two U.S. Military Policemen and the fact that their killer went free. Again this Nation swallowed what was thrust down its throat and smiled.

On March 19, last week, a member of the National Assembly of South Vietnam was arrested on charges of smuggling 9 pounds . . . 9 pounds . . . of heroin into his own country. This was the second such case in a week involving one of their legislators. Twenty pounds of heroin were involved in the previous case. There has been a subsequent suggestion by government legislative leaders that he probably will not be brought to trial until after his term expires in October.

Last September, an assemblyman, also a strong supporter of President Thieu, was stopped in a random customs search as he was leaving for Hong Kong. He was carrying a suitcase containing 1 million piasters, or \$35,000 in American money. He has yet to appear in court on any charge.

Let us bear in mind the fact that last year 1,100,000 Americans were discharged from military service. Most of these young men are returning from Southeast Asia. Many are arriving back in the United States with hard drug habits. There is a growing heroin traffic in South Vietnam. Practically all hard drugs are being sold to American service personnel. The South Vietnamese Government is obviously smiling benevolently on perpetrators of this massive atrocity against us, especially in light of the fact that

members of the government and its closest allies are obviously participating in and profiting from it.

This is pure heroin. Such a habit, once acquired, costs \$5 daily in Asia. The same serviceman, returning here, finds it will cost him upwards of \$100 daily to maintain that habit here at home. This, then, is the gift we are being given by our so-called allies. And most of those GI's who do not come back with heroin habits have at least acquired something of an acquaintance with marihuana, also courtesy of our friendly allies in Saigon.

Our Veterans' Administration is not equipped to handle the situation I have described. Upon discovering that a returning GI has a drug habit, he is more often than not given a less than honorable discharge by the military. As a direct result of the consequences of such a discharge, he is instantly ineligible for VA treatment. Now how many millions did we pour into South Vietnam today?

Troops are being brought home without testing them for such drug habits. It is imperative that we set up such detection programs. It is further imperative that we serve instant notice upon the Thieu regime that a major, effective, permanent crackdown must be made on the drug traffic there. All Veterans' Administration facilities here must begin to make available detoxification and rehabilitation programs. Dishonorable discharges on these grounds should be reviewed by the Department of Defense. GI's whose sole crime is drug addiction should not be given this type of discharge indiscriminately. They should be entitled to honorable discharges upon cure. The Department of Defense has an obligation to allocate funds for existing drug facilities such as Odyssey House, Phoenix House program, Samaritan Halfway Society, and similar programs to augment VA hospitals. These are minimum moves that can and should be implemented immediately instead of printing more slick manuals on how to combat drug addiction.

Mr. Speaker, the list of evils being perpetrated by the Saigon government upon America and her soldiers is, I believe, worse and longer than the dangers of combat we face against the Communists.

Random perusal of the news reveal one more atrocity after another. The Deputy Speaker of the South Vietnamese National Assembly was recently picked up in Thailand on a charge of gold smuggling. He was caught at the Bangkok airport with 3.3 pounds of gold bars in his possession. The Thais released him after intervention by the Saigon Embassy on the scene. He is identified with the Thieu regime in the South Vietnamese Assembly.

Rather than go on ad infinitum, let me simply state that I am gripped with an overwhelming sense of disgust. After 10 years of bloodshed by this country and expenditure of more than \$100 billion, all we have to show for it is the rout in Laos and the actions of such degraded people. Is this what America is fighting for? Is this the regime that has been touted as the democracy of Vietnam?

Our cities are dying. We are choking on air and water pollution. We are drowning in our own trash. Our jobless number close to 6 million of our people. Our graveyards and hospitals fill with young men. Hatred fills the air of our land. Yet the agony of Vietnam grows.

It is time to serve notice upon the Saigon regime that we are through propping it up with American bayonets. We are finished with providing them with American goods to peddle on their black market. We are full up to here with drug addicts they are creating among our boys. If they want democracy, they are going to have to fight for it on their own.

I feel the Thieu regime is never going to do this until we pick a date, enact a law embodying it as a withdrawal time and accelerate our withdrawals accordingly. Then they will perhaps begin to do what we have been doing for them up till now—fight.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include for the record a statement released by Lt. William L. Calley, the latest victim of the tragedy in Indochina, following the "guilty" verdict which was returned at his court-martial. He speaks more eloquently than I of the need for disengagement.

I hope My Lai isn't a tragedy but an eye-opener, even for people who say war is hell. My Lai has happened in every war. It's not an isolated incident, even in Vietnam. The thing that makes My Lai so unique is it was a small tragedy in a small place, but for once, man was able to see all the hells of war all at once. I can't say I am proud of ever being in My Lai, or ever participating in war. But I will be extremely proud if My Lai shows the world what war is and that the world needs to do something about stopping wars.

Many people say war is hell who have never experienced it, but it is more than hell for those people tied up in it . . .

I am hopeful that My Lai will bring the meaning of war to the surface not only to our nation but to all nations.

#### THE ATTORNEY'S FEE BILL

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which I feel will encourage carriers of freight not only to take preventive measures, but will also encourage them to make more prompt settlement of legitimate claims for loss or damage to property shipped in interstate commerce.

The bill which I have introduced is identical to the one which passed the Senate during the last session of Congress. It provides:

That the court, in its discretion, may allow a reasonable attorney's fee to the plaintiff in any successful action, to be taxed and collected as part of the suit; but no such fees shall be allowed to the plaintiff except on a showing that the plaintiff has filed a claim with the carrier or carriers against whom the action has been brought, and that such claim has not been paid within ninety days after receipt of the claim by the carrier or its agent.

Present procedures for securing payment of claims no longer seem adequate. Today, in many cases it is necessary for the claimant to seek relief in the courts. In some instances the cost of litigation prevents shippers from seeking the relief to which they are entitled. The bill I am introducing would put the claimant in a more equal bargaining position with carriers in the settlement of losses sustained in the transportation of property.

It seems to me it is unfortunate that this bill has been designated during the last several Congresses as an attorney's fee bill. Actually, it is designed to encourage carriers to accelerate settlement of shippers' legitimate loss and damage claims.

It is my hope that this and any other pending proposals will be the subject of complete and thorough hearings by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee so that the whole question of claims can be better understood and handled in an equitable fashion by all those concerned.

#### LIEUTENANT CALLEY

### HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, we have used a young man as a scapegoat for a war which he himself disliked. In fact, Lieutenant Calley said he was not for war and prayed for peace. Yet he was dedicated to his assignment and carried out the orders of his superiors; he showed concern for the young American soldiers whose safety rested in his hands.

We have used this young man as a scapegoat to appease critics of the war. He is being punished for doing the job he was trained for. Lieutenant Calley is no hardened criminal—a young man of average intelligence dedicated to his assignment.

Most of you know, particularly those who have been to Vietnam, that the stresses and strains of this war, where our servicemen never know the identity of the enemy, have caused problems.

Children have been used to hurl explosives. Women in peasant dress have been used to set up explosive boobytraps that have taken the lives of American men.

The conviction of this young man destroys much hope for this country. It has angered and saddened the American people. It has killed incentive for our young men to volunteer in service for this country. It has hindered us in our efforts for peace in Indochina. It has hurt each of us in countless ways, and I say that we cannot stand by and let Lieutenant Calley be a sacrificial lamb. He already has suffered unduly.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the contents of a telegram I have this day sent to President Nixon, requesting that he give serious consideration to the granting of a pardon for Lieutenant Calley.

The telegram reads as follows:

The PRESIDENT,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.:

I respectfully request that serious consideration be given to granting a pardon to Lieutenant William Calley. He is being made a scapegoat for the appeasement of critics of the war. Under the stress and strain of war he did a job that we trained him to do.

JOHN J. DUNCAN,  
Member of Congress.

#### MANDATORY RETIREMENT OF JUDGES

### HON. RAY ROBERTS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been a strong advocate of mandatory retirement of judges. In fact, I have introduced legislation to that effect. There are many reasons why I seek such a measure.

In a recent speech before the National Conference on the Judiciary, Chief Justice Robert S. Calvert of the Supreme Court of Texas outlined his reasons for favoring mandatory retirement. Chief Justice Calvert is one of the most distinguished and respected men on the bench in Texas as well as the entire Nation. I value his thoughtful and knowledgeable comments on this question, and I would like to share them with my colleagues:

AN ADDRESS BY CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERT S. CALVERT, SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS  
MANDATORY RETIREMENT OF JUDGES

I consider it a signal honor to have been invited to address the distinguished delegates to this conference. I do not regard the invitation as a personal tribute; I have done nothing to earn it. Rather, I prefer to assume that the invitation came to me as Chairman of the National Conference of State Chief Justices, and as a recognition of that organization as an integral and important segment of this nation's judicial system, a system which, though far from perfect, stands stalwartly between the tyranny of government toward its citizenry and of man toward his fellow man.

Ours is a judicial system in which the highest court in the land can place its protective arm around "shuffling" Sam Thompson in Louisville, Kentucky, and say to the police of that city, "You cannot take a man's freedom because he was irritating you by patting his foot or shuffling on a dance floor; and more than that you cannot add a fine because he protested his arrest through argument."

It is a system in which a young man, hounded from a blossoming career and even from a means of livelihood, by self-appointed and self-anointed guardians of every individual's patriotism and censors of his innermost impulses, could receive \$3,500,000 in compensation from a jury, and later could describe his first day in court in these inspiring words:

"I saw the judge, the jury, the bailiffs, the court reporter, the lawyers and the spectators, and I was overwhelmed by the realization that a single citizen who felt an injustice done him could bring all of these people together. Even if the verdict went against me, I would feel that I had won."

It is a system which through its highest court has demonstrated within the last ten

MARCH 31, 1971.

days a sense of compassion for the poor and a determination that they shall not be made to suffer unnecessarily merely because of their poverty.

Those of us who serve on state courts are proud to be a part of this system. But the convening of this Conference on the Judiciary, and our presence here, is evidence that we still have problems to solve and reforms to execute, and that mere indulgence in self-praise, with eyes closed to our deficiencies, will not suffice. I ask your patience, then, as I speak briefly of one needed reform which I have not found on the conference agenda, which I have not found discussed in the Selected Readings prepared by the American Judicature Society, and which has rated only passing mention in the pamphlets sent us—I speak of mandatory retirement of judges.

Parenthetically, I never think of retirement without recalling my conversation with a Texas Supreme Court staff member upon the occasion of his retirement. A few years ago the official Reporter for the Court came to see me around September 1st and said: "I thought I should come and tell you that I plan to retire on October 1st. I am 86 years old, have been with the Court for 69 years, and I don't want to stay here too long like I have seen some of these judges do!"

One of our Texas newspapers published an article, on February 15th last, commenting on the report on state judicial systems made by a Congressional Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The article stated that, "[t]he commission recommended that compulsory retirement of state or local judges, now in effect in 22 states, be made a nationwide practice, setting retirement at age 70." The article quoted the report as stating that "[o]nce the most eminent judge is selected, there is no guarantee that he will remain competent. He will age, may become tired and grow out-of-touch." I agree absolutely; and I can think of no sound reason for limiting the suggested reform to state and local judges. I suggest in all charity and with the utmost respect for the many able Federal judges of my acquaintance that there is no sound basis for concluding that state judges age, become tired and grow out-of-touch, but that Federal judges do not. Moreover, a totally unselfish approach to improvement of our judicial system should impel those of us who are judges to lead the movement for mandatory retirement in both branches of the system.

The Commission report, in indicating that only 22 states now require mandatory retirement of judges, does not square with the statistical summary of state court systems prepared by the Council of State Governments in 1970. The latter report shows that 40 of the 50 states have mandatory retirement requirements at ages of from 70 to 75. Some, like Arkansas, California, Minnesota, New Mexico, Tennessee and Texas achieve compulsory retirement at age 70 through denial or diminution of retirement benefits if a judge remains on the bench after that age. Let me tell you briefly of our experience in Texas.

With lawyers and judges playing leading roles, we amended our Constitution in 1965 to provide, among other things, for automatic mandatory retirement of appellate and general jurisdiction trial judges at age 75, with power in the Legislature to reduce the age to 70. With some of us in the judiciary again taking the lead, our Legislature was induced in 1967 to provide an added retirement benefit of 10% of current salary for those judges who retired at or before age 70. A grandfather clause extended the benefit to those in office and over 70 who retired at the end of their current terms. On January 2d of this year, just four years later, the oldest justice of the Supreme Court was 65, the oldest judge of the Court of Criminal Appeals, the court of last resort in criminal cases, was 63, only two of 42 intermediate



appellate court judges were 70 or over and only three of 238 judges of courts at the District Court level were 70 or over. In sum, only 5 of 294 appellate and major trial court judges were 70 or over; and, to my personal knowledge, at least three of the five, and perhaps all five, are holding over under the grandfather clause. We have thus achieved a younger, more physically vigorous and mentally alert judiciary while providing a pool of retired judges who can be called into service with their consent at any time.

The Federal judiciary is one of the last bastions for employment of the aged. There seems to be some sort of pervading fear which makes it more or less untouchable and deters those who should speak out forthrightly. The Consensus of the National Conference on Judicial Selection and Court Administration, held in Chicago in 1959, states apologetically that "[a]utomatic retirement at age 70 is desirable." The Recommendations of the 27th American Assembly on the Courts, the Public and the Law Explosion, speaking only of state courts, concluded only that "[t]rial judges should be subject to mandatory retirement by age 70 . . ." Why only "trial judges"?

Business and educational institutions have long since adopted mandatory retirement and limited service programs. The general facts about these programs are too well known for me to bore you with them. Just last week the new Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress confirmed his earlier statement of his determination to retire by age 70. There is no sound reason for believing that judges are a master race of people or that appellate judges are immunized against the ravages of age which may beset trial judges.

The state judicial systems have blazed the way for the Federal judiciary. There are no able judges in the Federal judiciary than Traynor of California, Williamson of Maine, and many other state judges who have accepted retirement at age 70; and, yet, the only mandatory retirement requirement of the Federal system coming to my knowledge is the one which requires Chief Judges to step down from those administrative positions at age 70. Statistics developed at a congressional hearing last year disclosed that 10% of Federal district and court of appeals judges were over 70 years of age and eligible for retirement.

In 1966, I clipped an article from the American Bar Journal written by Hon. J. Earl Major, Senior Judge for The United Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, entitled, "Why Not Mandatory Retirement for Federal Judges?" I clipped the article because I thought much of what Judge Major said about retirement of Federal judges applied also to state judges, and at the time I was involved in a campaign for mandatory retirement of Texas state judges. But what Judge Major said in January, 1966 is just as cogent and compelling five years later. He said that "advocacy of compulsory retirement is not the high road to popularity," and I agree; and that he had "never heard a valid reason why a judge should not voluntarily retire when eligible," although he had heard many self-interest excuses.

It seems to me there are four main reasons for the reluctance of judges to retire. I would rate them in this order: The judge (1) has developed no subsidiary interests and hasn't the faintest idea what he will do to occupy his time if he retires; (2) has a secret feeling that he is the indispensable man and that no successor could possibly fill his shoes; (3) wants to keep some sort of a strangle hold on the social standing his position offers him and his wife and the favors and honors which are tendered to his position rather than to him personally; and (4) isn't wanted at home by his wife because through the years she has developed

her own 8 to 5 routine program and she doesn't want it interrupted. I well remember when I first was brought face to face with the reason last mentioned. One of our Texas Supreme Court judges had obviously become senile and could no longer even remember what he had done on the previous day. Our veiled suggestions to him that he should retire did not register and went unheeded. Finally, the judge's closest friend on the court called on his wife with the suggestion that she should induce him to retire. She replied: "What, and have him here under my feet all day! Not on your life!" Considering the lack of merit in the enumerated reasons, a cynical critic would be inclined to paraphrase the statement of a famous World War II General by observing that, unless required by law, "Old judges rarely retire; they just lean more and more on their law clerks."

I repeat what I said earlier: We as judges should take the lead in seeking mandatory retirement provisions for judges, state and Federal, trial and appellate. It is not a sufficient excuse to say that a constitutional amendment would be necessary before mandatory retirement at age 70 could be required of United States Supreme Court Justices, or even of other Federal judges. If you have the slightest doubt that consent to such an amendment would be forthcoming, just ask Congress to submit it and watch its speedy ratification by the states.

Now, I am too long experienced in government and politics to suppose that at the end of this program anyone is going to be trampled to death in the stampede of judges hurrying to seek legislative or constitutional mandate for the retirement of all judges, state and Federal, trial and appellate, at age 70; but a changing society is demanding something better than we have had, and we had better start listening with an attentive ear. We had better rap with those demanding major judicial reform and do our thing! And a very important part of our thing, in my opinion, is the capacity to realize when we should step down and entrust this great judicial system to younger men and the good judgment to do it!

#### SPECIAL CAMPAIGN CARRIED ON BY THE AMERICAN DAIRY CO. TO FREE OUR PRISONERS OF WAR

#### HON. ROGER H. ZION

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to learn that a special campaign is being carried on by the American Dairy Co., who has plants in Evansville, Huntington, and Washington, Indiana, and in Morganfield, Ky., and Robinson, Ill. This campaign is to encourage persons to write Hanoi for release of our American prisoners of war.

Approximately a half million milk cartons are having panels imprinted on them urging people to write President Tom Duc Thang, Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Hanoi, North Vietnam. The same message has been printed on large posters to be displayed in area grocery stores. The cartons and posters include the following suggested message:

Your Excellency:

I am disturbed about the condition of American prisoners of war held in your country. I ask you in the name of humanity to

return these men to their families. They are of no military value—and to link their fate with war aims is flagrant contradiction of the spirit of the Geneva Convention, which you signed in 1957.

I commend Mr. Carl Hottenstein, president of the American Dairy Co., for his efforts in behalf of our prisoners of war. If more private individuals and private industries would assume a role of leadership in their communities in the battle to help our POW's, Hanoi could not continue to close its ears to our pleas.

#### WE NEED MORE SPIRIT LIKE THAT AT FOURTEEN HOLY HELPERS SCHOOL

#### HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I have spent a lot of time with the youth in my district and I plan to continue to expand this area of communication. So much of what we will consider this year is also uppermost in their thoughts. So much of what we will consider is critical to their future plans.

The issue before us this week—the Selective Service—has brought up the question of the objectivity and even the loyalty of our youth today. I know they will meet their responsibilities to this Nation and I welcome their views, regardless of their diversity.

On more than one occasion I have been thrilled by the pronouncements of the youth in my district. I had the great pleasure to speak at the Fourteen Holy Helpers School in West Seneca and was presented with a statement reflecting a philosophy and attitude toward our flag. I could tell from the response of the students to the statement by young Joe Florea that all those at Fourteen Holy Helpers School—administration, sisters, teachers, parents, and students alike, believe in our country, its flag, and are working to restore the type of spirit that can make America even greater.

I take pleasure in calling this to the attention of my colleagues. The statement follows:

#### WHAT THE AMERICAN FLAG MEANS TO ME

I never really stopped to think about the American Flag before. I guess I have always taken it for granted. But, as I consider it now, just what does it mean to me?

It means I should stand when I hear "The Star Spangled Banner". Why? Well, the national anthem represents the land in which I live. My country, all of it, belongs to me. I can go anywhere, live anywhere, study, worship, believe as I choose, because I am free.

The American Flag reminds me of this freedom. It represents people—all kinds of people; all colors of people; all sizes of people; and I am people too! The Flag makes me think of how many people dreamed, and planned, fought, and died so that I can live as I do today. It reminds me of our government, and the great leaders we have and have had.

It makes me think of an uncle I never knew as a person, only as a picture on the wall, who died in Korea for that Flag.

I see our Flag every day in every classroom in my school. Sometimes I wonder, as we say the Pledge of Allegiance each morning, how many people really understand what it means. It means that we pledge ourselves to this great country, to support this republic as one nation, under God.

Respect for our Flag has decreased greatly in recent years.

We see flagpoles all over the neighborhood; but what is a flagpole without our Flag! People today should know and care about all that had to be done to make our country the world power that our Flag flies proudly over today.

# REVENUE SHARING A SUCCESS IN WISCONSIN

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues, I am including with my remarks material from the Milwaukee County executive in support of Federal revenue sharing.

In the "Wisconsin Plan," recognized for its excellence and its efficient, economical utilization of funds, State revenues are used to reduce local property tax burdens. Federal revenues can be applied in exactly the same fashion. Federal funds could credit the Congress with providing money, and also promote local fiscal responsibility.

The material follows:

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,  
March 3, 1971.

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER,  
Representative in Congress,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEIGER: The concept of Federal revenue sharing has been debated since 1958. Numerous legislators, organizations, and private individuals have offered variations on the subject and still no action has been taken by Congress.

The attached resolution adopted by the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors is one more variation and, hopefully, overcomes the objections that plague all others. This plan is unique in that it already has been tested in the Wisconsin political arena and was successfully implemented after passage. It can succeed elsewhere.

Also attached is an article by Mr. James R. Morgan, former Commissioner of Taxation for Wisconsin, explaining how State revenues are used to reduce local property tax burdens. Federal revenues can be applied in exactly the same fashion and serve also to justly credit the Congress with providing money, along with promoting local fiscal responsibility.

Also included is a sample property tax bill showing how the Federally shared revenue will affect each individual taxpayer citizen.

The "Wisconsin Plan" will distribute revenue directly to an overburdened local citizenry.

Milwaukee County will attempt to provide you with any further information you may require in your study of this proposal.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,

Very truly yours

JOHN L. DOYNE,  
County Executive.

## RESOLUTION

(Item 16): A resolution authorizing the finance committee to evaluate the alternate system for reviewing sharing as such by the Nixon administration and to make a recommendation, by recommending adoption of the following resolution:

Whereas, the Congress of the United States is currently considering a multitude of revenue sharing proposals; and

Whereas, it is apparent that all of these bills have encountered two objections which serve to impede adoption, namely

(1) the inadvisability of having one unit of government; responsible for raising tax revenues that other units can dispose of at their pleasure; and

(2) although the congressman has the onus of raising the revenue, he gets no credit for any programs that this money supports; and

Whereas, Wisconsin has a modified program of revenue sharing which disburses a specific amount of State monies as determined by the legislature to all municipal governments having a property tax rate in excess of 14 mills on a proportionate basis for the purpose of local property tax relief; and

Whereas, the exact amount of this relief appears as a State tax credit on every property bill thus giving due credit to the funding source; and

Whereas, this approach to revenue sharing serves to negate the criticism cited in 1 and 2 above, since the revenue is shared directly with the taxpayer; and

Whereas, property tax relief of this magnitude will serve as a direct spur to the construction of housing by reducing a major shelter expense item; now, therefore,

Be it resolved, That the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors hereby declares its support of a Federal revenue sharing program having a 100 percent pass through to be used solely for the purpose of a local proportionate property tax reduction; and

Be it further resolved, That the full extent of this relief for each taxpayer be shown as a Federal tax credit on every local property tax bill; and

Be it further resolved, That the County Clerk is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the entire Wisconsin Congressional delegation, members of the State Assembly and Senate, Senator Russell B. Long, Chairman, Senate Finance Committee, Congressman Wilbur D. Mills, Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee, International City Managers Association, National League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors, National Conference of Governors, and Chief Executives of all Milwaukee County municipalities, and to the National Association of Counties.

Fiscal note: Adoption of this resolution will not result in an increase or decrease of funds.

## WISCONSIN TAXATION

(By James R. Morgan)

### PROPERTY TAX RELIEF IN WISCONSIN

In 1961 when the legislature enacted Wisconsin's selective sales and use tax law, it also provided two kinds of state payments for property tax relief.

Each February 15th a sum sufficient appropriation (an estimated \$40 million in 1966) is made to allow the property taxpayer a 55% credit (60% in 1967) against the prop-

erty tax levies on merchants' and manufacturers' inventories and livestock. Each March 1, a \$53 million appropriation provides a credit for taxpayers against the levies on all real property and the remaining personal property not subject to the 55% personal property tax credit.

### General property tax credit

The \$53 million appropriation for general property tax credit is first used to finance a tax credit to utilities, railroads, telephone companies and electrical cooperatives. The utility allocation is determined as follows:

1. Average the three preceding years tax payments by all utilities to determine the average utility tax payment.

2. Average the three preceding years total tax levy (state, local, school and county), special assessments, occupational taxes, forest crop taxes, woodland tax and the taxes paid by utilities to determine the average property tax.

3. Determine the percentage that the average utility tax is of the average of all property taxes.

4. Apply that percentage to the \$53 million appropriation to determine the amount available for utility property tax.

5. Divide the amount for utility property tax relief among utilities in the same ratio that the individual utility's tax is to the total utility taxes.

The amount of utility tax relief is then subtracted from the \$53 million and the remainder is available for general property tax relief.

This tax credit is given only to taxpayers in tax districts (cities, villages and towns) that have an "average computed full value tax rate" in excess of 14 mills (\$14 per \$1,000 of full value).

The general property tax credit for each tax district is determined as follows:

1. Add the levies of the tax district (state, local, county and school taxes, special assessments, occupational, forest crop and woodland taxes) to determine the total levy in each of the three preceding years.

2. Divide the total levy of each year by the full value of property in the tax district of such year to determine the computed full value rate.

3. Average the computed full value rates for three preceding years to determine the average computed full value rate.

4. The average computed full value rate minus 14 mills is the mill rate over 14 mills.

5. Multiply the full value of property (less personal property receiving special relief) by the mill rate over 14 mills to determine the total levy over 14 mills.

6. Add the levies over 14 mills of each tax district to determine the total levy over 14 mills statewide.

7. Determine each tax district's percent of levy over 14 mills by dividing the tax district's levy over 14 mill by the total state levy 14 mills.

8. Apply that percentage to the state appropriation for general property tax relief to determine the dollar amount for the tax district.

9. Divide the dollar amount for the tax district by the total assessed value in the tax district to determine the tax credit rate.

10. The tax credit rate multiplied by the taxpayer's assessment determines the credit on taxpayer's bill.

The table below gives the detail of the general property tax relief program since its inception:

### HISTORY OF PROPERTY TAX RELIEF

State's fiscal year	State appropriation	Utility tax relief	General tax relief	Tax bills receiving credit
1962 to 1963	\$55,000,000	\$4,624,621	\$50,375,379	1962 payable 1963.
1963 to 1964	55,000,000	4,531,970	50,468,030	1963 payable 1964.
1964 to 1965	49,850,000	4,141,626	45,708,374	1964 payable 1965.
1965 to 1966	53,000,000	4,433,715	48,566,285	1965 payable 1966.
1966 to 1967	53,000,000			



*Personal property tax relief*

This special credit applies to the local tax levies on merchants' stock in trade, manufacturers' materials and finished products (including goods in process) and livestock. The following amounts have been paid or it is estimated, will be paid by the state:

*[Amount paid the following year]*

May 1, 1962 assessment, 50%---	\$30,043,918
May 1, 1963 assessment, 50%---	31,560,889
May 1, 1964 assessment, 50%---	33,072,075
May 1, 1965 assessment, 55% (estimated)-----	40,000,000
May 1, 1966 assessment, 60%---	-----

Each taxpayer receives a credit on his tax bill based on the applicable percent for personal property tax relief, unless the tax district assesses personal property at a higher ratio to full value than other property.

Both tax relief methods still require the local tax district to go through the regular assessment and tax levying procedure. The tax credits actually appear on the taxpayer's bill and the money is paid directly to the tax district as reimbursement for the credit.

JAMES R. MORGAN,  
*Commissioner of Taxation.*

## GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

## HON. RICHARD G. SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 31, 1971*

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, restructuring of the Government's executive branch will undoubtedly prove one of the most progressive pieces of legislation undertaken by Congress in this decade. The effects of restructuring will be felt not in one program alone, in only one Federal department or in just a few States, but rather in every neighborhood across this great land. It is the taxpayers supporting this Government who will reap the benefits of a reorganized system.

Because local residents best understand local needs, they should make the decisions concerning local Federal spending. Sending such questions to Washington is not only unnecessary, causing great delays, but it also interferes with other work Washington officials are particularly qualified to undertake.

As the President pointed out in his message to Congress, a great many people are today disillusioned with Government, its goals, and its methods. The best way to restore confidence in our Government is to move ahead in a straight path toward our stated objectives. Government should function in the best interests of its people, not in defiance of those interests.

Who knows local interests better than the people themselves? Is it the President? Washington bureaucrats? Of course not.

Local residents having weathered a few storms, know local flooding problems, they understand sewage disposal needs, as well as highway construction, urban renewal, and crop development needs. Sound advice from Washington professionals would naturally be welcome as part of the decisionmaking process, but why not let the actual power rest with the people involved?

I believe, with the President, that re-

turning more power to the people on the basis of his reorganization plan will restore faith in Government, improve communications between people and the bureaucracy and to a very great extent, speed Government operations by removing the small decisions which now clutter the desks of Washington bureaucrats.

## AN ANGRY MAN

## HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 31, 1971*

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, recently, there has been much discussion with respect to television's slanting of the news and biased reporting. WCBS of New York City, a direct affiliate of the Columbia Broadcasting Co., last week issued an editorial regarding a controversy between Senator EDMUND MUSKIE and the Republican National Committee. I believe that the editorial is self-explanatory in showing its prejudiced direction.

## AN ANGRY MAN

What would we do without the Republican National Committee to set the record straight?

For years now, most people have thought Senator Muskie was a quiet, reserved fellow—rather cool, very taciturn, a typical down-Easter. But that is not, it seems, the way the Republican National Committee sees him. In a recent article from the Committee's newsletter entitled "Is Muskie Cool Enough to be President?" the Maine Democrat is pictured as a lip-curling, fist-shaking, fire-breather. Underlining words in the story that seem to underline his black nature, the Committee points out (cut to text) his "surliness," his "tantrums," his "waspy temper." It describes his "towering rage," his "short fuse ready to explode," his "malevolence" that "boils and fumes."

Well we are not sure we can agree with the newsletter's description—after all, the Senator has kept those rages, if he has them, pretty well hidden during his many years as a public official. But we can agree with a quote from the Talmud that accompanies the story: It says, "When a man gets angry, he falls into error."

That might have applied to an unsuccessful candidate for governor several years ago, who snarled at the press, "You're not going to have Dick Nixon to kick around anymore." Or it might have applied to our President when he labeled some antiwar demonstrators as "bums," when he judged Charles Manson guilty before the jury did, or when he accused the Senate opponents of Judge Harold Carswell of "vicious tactics," and "malicious character assassination." Yes, anger is something the Republican National Committee has seen before.

Come to think of it, maybe the Committee, knowing the power of an angry candidate, is nervous about seeing it develop in others. After all, if election year 1972 rolls around and such emotional issues as the War, the urban crisis, the state of the economy, and divisions within the country are no more resolved than they are today, then a presidential contender—such as Senator Edmund Muskie—might have legitimate excuses to get angry.

Definitely, this is a partisan political controversy and WCBS was improperly exercising its privilege as a news reporting station in issuing this editorial. If

this group is as unbiased as it claims to be, they would leave it up to the Democrat Digest to respond.

In the March 29, 1971, edition of *Baron's*, a weekly newspaper, there is a lengthy article showing several instances in which CBS has slanted and purposely edited news in order to give a false impression. For the information of my colleagues, I am hereby inserting this article in the RECORD:

## BROADCAST LICENSE: CBS HAS FORFEITED ACCESS TO THE NATION'S AIRWAVES

We cannot help but admire a man who defends his principles and sticks to his guns. Last Tuesday evening Richard S. Salant, president of the News Division of the Columbia Broadcasting System, gave a nationwide television audience a demonstration of doggedness which, in other circumstances, might well have commanded our respect. Under fierce attack from Congress and the White House for airing the controversial documentary, "The Selling of the Pentagon," Mr. Salant refused to give an inch. Perhaps with an eye on the clock—the 11-12 p.m. slot, while not exactly prime time, is still too valuable to waste—the CBS executive took no more than a moment or so to rebut "only a few" of the critics' charges; however, he assured his viewers, "We have an answer for every one. . . ." Then, boldly switching to the offensive, the head of CBS News asserted: "We are proud of 'The Selling of the Pentagon.' . . . We are confident that when passions die down, it will be recognized as a vital contribution to the people's right to know." Lesser media of communications may occasionally run a correction or retraction; The Washington Post, not long ago, printed an extraordinary confession of error. CBS News, which is made of sterner stuff, stands definitely on the record.

Quite a record it is, too. As to "The Selling of the Pentagon," Mr. Salant addressed himself to merely two of the many points of criticism raised. Regarding the rest, the chief critics—including the Vice President of the United States, senior editor of *Air Force* magazine and a non-partisan citizens' organization known as Accuracy in Media (AIM), which plans to lodge a complaint with the National Association of Broadcasters—make a compelling, and thus far uncontroverted, case. In particular, CBS stands accused of various misstatements, including the amount spent by the Pentagon on public affairs, and the true identity of those responsible for a certain military briefing (not, as alleged, Peoria's Caterpillar Tractor Co., "which did \$39 million of business with the Defense Department last year," but the local Association of Commerce). Far worse were the omissions and distortions, including two episodes in which tapes were clipped and reassembled to convey false impressions of what the speakers said. Specific lapses aside, even the untutored eye could scarcely fail to detect, in a so-called documentary, pervasive malice and editorial bias.

On the CBS television network—which includes five wholly owned stations and 198 affiliates—slanted (or, in view of his authority and tenure, perhaps the word should be Salanted) journalism has long been the name of the game. As in "The Selling of the Pentagon," moreover, the thrust has tended to be violently against what most of the country would regard as its basic interests, institutions and values. In a prize-winning "documentary," key sequences of which subsequently proved false, CBS News professed to uncover "Hunger in America"; contrariwise, in an equally distorted report from Cuba, the television camera found, in effect, that Cubans under Castro never had it so good. Not content merely to cover (albeit in its own fashion) the news, CBS time and again has sought to make news. Shortly after

NBC scooped the competition by airing an LSD-stimulated interview with Dr. Timothy Leary, WBBM-TV CBS outlet in Chicago, participated in a headline-making, and illegal, pot party, which became the object of an investigation by the Federal Communications Commission. In a similar, if far more brazen, exploit—on which both Vice President Agnew and Mr. Salant touched last week—CBS sought to stage, and to film, an invasion of Haiti. One picture supposedly is worth a thousand words. High time the U.S. got the picture.

As last Tuesday's performance suggests, it isn't pretty. Among other sins of omission and commission, CBS News failed to mention that it was paid to produce one of the films at which it scoffed. In depicting a press conference, during which the briefing officer, replying to 34 questions, gave three no-comment answers, the camera focused on the latter. Statements made on tape by two Pentagon spokesmen, a Marine colonel and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, were cut up, transposed and pieced together again in a way that made both of them seem unresponsive and foolish. Rep. Edward Hébert (not Herbert, as the caption later had it), chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, turned up on the screen with this gracious—and, despite Mr. Salant's subsequent remarks, wholly misleading—introduction: "Using sympathetic Congressmen, the Pentagon tries to counter what it regards as the anti-military tilt of network reporting (Ed. note: where would it ever get such an idea?). War heroes are made available for taped home district TV reports from pro-Pentagon politicians."

All this is reprehensible enough. Far worse—in a format presumably dedicated to fact—are the extremist opinions which it was used to convey. Here is a disillusioned and slightly incoherent ex-Air Force officer: "I feel that the military information arm is so vast, has been able to become so pervasive by the variety and the amounts and the way and the sheer numbers it's able to present its viewpoint to the American people, I think this attitude it was able to develop, allowed Vietnam to happen. . . . Here is CBS-News' own dispassionate Roger Mudd: "On this broadcast we have seen violence made glamorous, expensive weapons advertised as if they were automobiles, biased opinions presented as straight facts. Defending the country not just with arms but also with ideology, Pentagon propaganda insists on America's role as the cop on every beat in the world."

Anyone—even CBS, though it won't concede as much—can make mistakes. What the record shows, however, is a pattern of distortion and slanted reporting stretching back over the years. In 1963, so a revealing article and exchange of letters in *The New York Times Magazine* has disclosed, President Kennedy gave an exclusive interview to Walter Cronkite of CBS News on such literally inflammatory issues as the Buddhists in South Vietnam and the allegedly repressive government of Ngo Dinh Diem. In the editing process, the footage shrank from 30 minutes to 12, and, according to Pierre Salinger, then White House press secretary, "the result was a partial distortion of JFK's opinion of President Diem. In the actual interview . . . President Kennedy spoke of his respect and sympathy for the problems of President Diem. When the film was shown to the public, only the unfavorable Presidential remarks remained, and JFK's praise of Diem had been deleted. The impression was left that JFK had no confidence at all in Diem, and when he and his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, were later shot to death in a military coup, there were persistent charges from Madame Nhu and others that the President's statements had given aid and comfort to Diem's enemies. JFK was deeply hurt by the accusations."

Prior to the Republican convention the fol-

lowing year, CBS News struck again. According to Senator Barry Goldwater (R., Ariz.), Daniel Schorr, then serving as correspondent abroad, "took it upon himself to put out a news report to portray the idea that I was trying to forge links with far-rightist, neo-fascist groups in Germany . . . Schorr dealt heavily in false facts which neither he nor CBS newsmen in this country made any attempt to check with my office." So it has gone year by year. In 1968, after a storm of protest, a Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce investigated television coverage of the Democratic national convention in Chicago. In viewing the video tape of the CBS coverage, the Congressional probers noted a passage in which Walter Cronkite cried that the police "were severely manhandling a minister." According to the Committee Report: "The accompanying action shows police merely attempting to get a man dressed in clerical garb into a patrol wagon, using what the investigators felt was reasonable force to overcome the man's resistance." The Report concluded, in part: "In an attempt to give an overall impression, it might be said that the coverage presented over the air does, in retrospect, seem to present a one-sided picture which in large measure exonerates the demonstrators and protestors and indicts the city government of Chicago and, to a lesser degree, the Democratic Party."

The long reel of distortion continues to unwind. In her nationally syndicated column, Alice Widener, frequent contributor to *Barron's*, has chronicled some of the gamier episodes. In the fall of 1969, Frank Kearns, CBS correspondent in Rome, broadcast a report on alleged Italian opinion in the criminal case against the man who hijacked a commercial airliner from San Francisco. Mr. Kearns chose to quote the views of a single editor, that of the Communist newspaper "Unità," who described the hijacker a "Robin Hood . . . who made a fool of the repressive and hated FBI." Again, on "Face the Nation," CBS devoted a half-hour of Sunday time to Tom Hayden, revolutionist of the so-called New Left. Mrs. Widener wrote: "He was permitted by reporter Martin Agronsky of CBS, and two other reporters, to get away with intellectual murder. . . . Thus it came about that at the end of the program the arrogant co-founder of the anarchic Students for a Democratic Society made an unchallenged statement about 'the poverty around the world that the United States is responsible for.'" Abbie Hoffman, convicted of inciting to riot in Chicago, appeared on the Merv Griffin show wearing a shirt made from the American flag (on the air, CBS thoughtfully blipped it out.) Small wonder that Desmond Smith of CBS once told TV Guide: "There's been a great deal of manipulation from the left. The left and SDS have been getting a great deal of play. Americans are starting to feel they're not getting the whole story."

Since then the credibility gap, notably with respect to so-called documentaries, has widened beyond belief. Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary defines documentary as follows:—"adj. (1) contained or certified in writing; (2) relating to, or employing, documentation in literature or art; broadly, FACTUAL, OBJECTIVE." The noun, of course, possesses the same qualities. Neither word belongs in the CBS lexicon. In the famous charade on "Hunger in America," the narrator's off-screen voice said "Hunger is easy to recognize when it looks like this. This baby is dying of starvation. He was an American. Now he is dead." Heart-rending, but untrue. The baby was born prematurely, and, according to an FCC report, died of "septicemia due to meningitis and peritonitis. . . . There was no evidence to show that either the mother or father was suffering from malnutrition. . . ." Far less

attention than it warrants has been paid the outrageous report on Cuba last September, which, by actual count of Accuracy in Media, contained 10 major doubtful statements, including: "For Cuba's poor, things are a good deal better than they used to be . . . the Cuban poor man doesn't want to leave . . . Schools are free, everyone must go. There is a quiet equality of the races now in Cuba. . . ."

So ran the script. However, as AIM pointed out in a letter to CBS News, real life refuses to follow it. On the contrary, the organization cited specific examples of working-class Cubans who risked their lives to flee the Castro regime. One, a Negro bricklayer, was quoted in *The New York Times* as saying: "Not only is there not enough to eat, but they make you spend extra hours in the fields after a 54-hour work week." As to schooling, AIM pointed out that on January 5, 1969, Castro admitted that 400,000 school-age children were not in school. Brotherhood of man? AIM quoted Erneldo Oliva, an Afro-Cuban and one of the first Castro appointees, to the effect that even under Batista, "whom we rejoiced to see go," Negroes were judges, Senators and high officials. Today only one black man holds an important post. An American Negro, who defected to Castro for five years, returned in 1968 saying that he would rather live in an American jail than remain. Citing the list of inaccuracies, AIM solicited comment from Richard S. Salant, head of CBS News, which was duly forthcoming (and, with the rest of the correspondence, put into the Record). Nine times out of 10, the criticism went unanswered.

Last Tuesday Mr. Salant took a stab at answering criticism of CBS' role in "financing a secret and illegal invasion of Haiti." Here, word, for word, is his rebuttal. "We did not finance the planned invasion. We did nothing illegal. No significant amount of money even inadvertently found its way to persons involved in the invasion plan. The Department of Justice found no unlawful activities on the part of CBS News. And John Davitt, Chief of the Criminal Division of the U.S. Department of Justice, said, quote: 'CBS advised us of the facts, advised the Bureau of Customs that they were there, and that they were filming these episodes.' At one point the Treasury Department asked us not to withdraw from the project. But the short answer to the Vice President is that he is attacking a journalistic investigation that never became a broadcast about an invasion that never took place."

For a short answer, not bad. But let's take a longer look at "Project Nassau," as CBS called it and it is known in the Report of the Special Subcommittee on Investigations of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Let's note at once that the executive producer, Perry Wolff, served in the same capacity on "The Selling of the Pentagon." Let's also dispose of Mr. Salant. If CBS News did not "finance the proposed invasion," it did, according to the House Report, provide funds for the leasing of a 67-foot schooner which was to be utilized by the invasion force, reimburse expenses for the transportation of weapons to be used by the conspirators, make payments to the leader of the conspiracy "with full knowledge of his identity and his criminal intentions." "Significant," of course, is what lawyers call a word of art; while exact figures were never forthcoming from CBS, the House Report states that "Project Nassau" cost more than \$200,000. CBS cooperation with the government was grudging, and, the Report indicates, evoked at official instance (a CBS cameraman blew the whistle to the authorities).

But let the Subcommittee speak for itself. "The implications of what has been learned are disquieting. To the average viewer, un-



sophisticated in the intricacies of television production, a network news documentary typically represents a scrupulously objective reporting of actual events shown as they actually transpired. If 'Project Nassau' is any indication, this is not always true. During the preparation of this news documentary, CBS employees and consultants intermingled and interacted with personages actively engaged in breaking the law. Large sums of money were made available to these individuals with no safeguards as to the manner in which these funds would be put to use. Events were set up and staged solely for the purposes of being filmed by the CBS camera. An individual who was retained as a consultant, and later an employee, of CBS, was allowed to or instructed to appear in the actual filming and to provide narration for it. . . .

"The CBS News organization, or at least the individuals charged with the immediate supervision of the project, displayed a shocking indifference to the real possibility that their organization and funds were being made use of to further illegal activities. The control exercised by CBS Management in New York over the activities of the producer in the field seems to have been practically nonexistent. . . . Had the decision . . . not to proceed with the documentary been founded on a recognition of any of the deficiencies indicated above, the only remaining question would be why the decision was so long in coming. But, under the circumstances, the rationale for the decision is itself far from reassuring. Rather than responding to any taint of artificiality or fraud in the considerable volume of film which had been prepared, the decision was apparently made on the basis that the project was journalistically unsatisfactory in view of the unfinished nature of the enterprise."

The law requires television quiz shows and commercials to be honest. Unfortunately, however, the public enjoys no similar protection against documentaries, a credibility gap which the Subcommittee hopes to bridge. We would like to offer a proposal or two of our own. Believe it or not, Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System Inc., serves as Chairman of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information. Unlike Vice President Agnew, who backed away from the idea, we suggest that he be asked to resign. Moreover, to judge by the record cited above (which has exhausted our space, but barely scratched the surface), CBS television stations stand wide open to challenge on their license renewals, and we urge concerned, public-spirited citizens—as well as the FCC—to respond. CBS, in our view, has forfeited its access to the nation's airwaves. The time has come to turn it off.

Mr. Speaker, television has become one of the most important forms of communication for information on the events of the day. Because the strength of our democratic system is based on a well-informed population, I greatly fear the consequences of activities such as those of CBS News. Furthermore, I am afraid that television news will suffer a serious credibility gap if these unwise and unfair techniques continue.

#### MOST DANGEROUS GARBAGE— NUCLEAR WASTE

#### HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, A subject of hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, mentioned in an arti-

cle which appeared in Newsweek, regarding a repository for radioactive wastes, prompted a letter from a concerned constituent, Mr. Raymond F. Gallagher, of Youngstown, Ohio. I am pleased to insert this letter in the RECORD:

DEAR MR. CARNEY: This is in reference to an article that appeared in Newsweek magazine on March 29, 1971. It deals with nuclear waste and a planned repository in Lyons, Kansas. As busy as you must be, take the time to read it. This waste is described as the "most dangerous garbage in the knowledge of mankind," and for years has been of great concern to the Atomic Energy Commission. As the article states, "hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent just in studying the problem." Rep. Chet Holifield says: "The experts tell us this is the safest place in the world to put these wastes," (Lyons, Kansas), and he does not feel satisfied with the experts' opinion.

I have no scientific background, but I have often wondered about this very problem. If there is no safe place in this world to dispose of this waste, why not dispose of it elsewhere, for that matter, why not send it back where it came from—to the sun. Could it be that such a solution has been overlooked?

It would be costly, but in the long run, maybe cheaper and safer. The expense could be shared by private industry as well as the government. Other countries are concerned with the same problem, and just might be interested in a joint effort to rid the world of a material so dangerous to humans.

I'm sure that some of our high priced engineers who are presently out of work, would be glad to design a rocket that could accommodate these lethal cylinders. If we can send a rocket around our solar system, I'm sure that we could dispose of this waste in an area of space that is radioactive. This may be impossible and pure science fiction thinking. You may know something about this matter already, but I thought it would be worth a few minutes of my time. Since you are closer to people who would know, why not ask?

Sincerely,

RAYMOND F. GALLAGHER.

#### QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE CALLEY VERDICT

#### HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, based upon the telephone calls and telegrams I have received since the decision to convict Lieutenant Calley was announced, I know that sentiment is running high in Tennessee's Third District in favor of a different verdict and sentence for this soldier.

Some messages I have received have been most provocative in their application to the broader context of responsibility for individual acts in time of war. I offer the text of one of the telegrams I received as a case in point. It reads:

Are we also going to court martial Harry S. Truman, the bomber crews who dropped bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and all the bomber crews who dropped bombs on cities on the continent in World War I and II? Let us not forget Korea also.

Does not this suggest that when it comes to placing blame in anything as complex as a defense policy and a mili-

tary operation implementing that policy, there is difficulty singling out any one individual?

Lieutenant Calley may have been the wrong man in the wrong place at the wrong time—there but for the grace of God goes any young officer now serving his country in combat. They are all prone to errors of human judgment, just as are their superiors.

I wish I knew where to place the blame so corrective action could be taken to avoid any duplication of the My Lai incident in the future. As I have stated publicly, "If our whole military system is at fault, we must change it. In any event, we must not allow scapegoats to shoulder responsibilities along the way, rather than place the burden where it should legitimately rest."

Until someone makes the decision we all seek, my constituents and other concerned Americans are going to pose questions of this kind, and all of them deserve consideration.

#### LIEUTENANT CALLEY

#### HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, Lieutenant Calley has been convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment at hard labor. Under military law, he could be paroled after 7 years.

However, several other participants in the My Lai incident are still facing trial before military courts martial, and Lieutenant Calley's lawyers will appeal his case. Therefore, it is not advisable for public officials to comment in detail on his case in order to avoid interference with the continuing legal processing of the My Lai charges.

If the courts do uphold Lieutenant Calley's conviction and sentence, that decision will not mean that he is solely responsible for the My Lai massacre. It is my hope that the President, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, will take this into account when he is called upon to consider granting Executive clemency.

It is clear that Lieutenant Calley was participating as a lower echelon officer in a plan of attack that had been ordered and approved all the way up the chain of military command in Vietnam. The involvement and responsibility of these men cannot be shrugged off. Our military machine in Vietnam has consciously employed a war policy that employs wanton destruction and brutality in its day-to-day operation. Lieutenant Calley was simply following through on a policy his superiors and his experience had taught him was right, leading to the total destruction of that tiny hamlet and its civilian occupants.

More people than Lieutenant Calley are implicated by this tragedy in Vietnam. There must be a congressional investigation to determine the extent of the responsibility for My Lai and any other incidents of its type. We cannot allow

the burden of our misadventures in Vietnam to fall so heavily on the shoulders of just one man.

#### THE CYPRUS QUESTION—A BRIEF ANALYSIS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, early in April 1955, the question of justice for the people of Cyprus became a reality. At that time, the Cypriot Greeks defied the British authorities who had occupied the island since World War II, staged a revolt on behalf of self-determination, and proclaimed Cyprus an independent Republic.

One of my constituents, Mr. Ernest J. Vardalas, chairman of the Justice for Cyprus Committee in Chicago, has written an analysis of the causes for this revolt and its effects on the Cypriot people and the people of the world over the last 16 years.

I bring Mr. Vardalas' timely report to you on the eve of the anniversary date of the revolution in order that my colleagues may share his depth of understanding of this question.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vardalas' analysis follows:

#### THE CYPRUS QUESTION—A BRIEF ANALYSIS (By Ernest J. Vardalas)

That little known but sunny island paradise tucked away at the eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea called Cyprus, and the less understood controversy surrounding it, became the object of headline news recently after a short period of relative calm and obscurity.

Why is this picturesque and charming home of the mythological goddess of love and beauty, Aphrodite, in contention once more?

What are the basic causes and effects underlying the externally created problem that Cyprus has come to be known for the past fifteen turbulent years?

With other far-a-way places like Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and the Middle East vying for public attention and concern, the average American knows very little about Cyprus and tends to be even less concerned about events there, although the island, because of its proximity to the Middle East, could play an increasingly more important role in the future as the war of attrition between Israel and the Arab states shapes into a new confrontation between the super powers in this part of the World. Indeed, it is this maneuvering by forces serving the interests of foreign powers that have contributed to the creation of the Cyprus "problem."

The island of Cyprus, the third largest in the Mediterranean, with an area of 3,572 square miles, has a population today of just over 600,000. Of this, 80% are Greeks and 18% Turks. Descendants of the old Ottoman army of occupation who chose to remain in Cyprus rather than return to Turkey when the island passed into British hands, the Turks are dispersed over all parts of the island and had, during the past one-hundred years, lived side by side with the Greeks peacefully and amicably. There are no compact geographical Turkish areas. And being predominantly of an agricultural economy the proportion of land ownership between Greeks and Turks is, by area: 82.9% Greek,

17.1% Turkish, and by value: 86.8% Greek, 13.2% Turkish.

Colonized by ancient Greek sea farers and traders more than 3500 years ago, Cyprus has retained its Hellenic character, language, religion, culture and traditions throughout its long history despite war, invasion and harsh alien rule by such foreign aggressors as the Assyrians, Persians, Egyptians, Romans, Franks, Venetians, Turks, and Britons, who for various periods of time detached the island from Greece, subjugated the Greek Cypriots, and exploited its land and its people for the benefit of the colonial power.

The last colonial power, Britain, repeatedly reneged on its promises to grant the people of Cyprus self determination, and following the rejection of many peaceful appeals made to London after World War II by Cypriot leaders to grant the Cypriots the right of plebiscite so that they would be permitted to decide their own future and guide their own destiny, just as other British colonial peoples were granted this right, the people of Cyprus in frustration, desperation and anger took up arms to achieve the freedom that was being denied them.

So on April 1, 1955 the Greek Cypriots began their protracted guerrilla type warfare against the British colonial forces on the island and the Turkish Cypriot mercenaries whom the British hired to aid them defend their crumbling colonial empire in Cyprus. This British use of Turkish mercenaries against the people of Cyprus brought in another foreign power into the picture, Turkey, who although renounced all rights to Cyprus under the Treaty of Lusanne of 1923, was now presented with an opportunity to regain a foothold in Cyprus once more under the pretext of "protecting" the small Turkish Cypriot minority, most of which did not ask for protection and did not participate in the Greek Cypriot liberation movement.

Four years of fierce and bloody struggle, which witnessed the legendary bravery and sacrifices of the Greek civil populace against the superior British armed forces and their mercenaries culminated in political compromise granting limited national independence to the people of Cyprus without achievement of their age-old hope and aspiration for Enosis (Union) with their motherland Greece.

#### THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE REPUBLIC

Cyprus was proclaimed an independent state on August 16, 1960, on the basis of an Agreement concluded in Zurich in February, 1959, between the Greek and Turkish Governments and adopted by the British Government.

When Archbishop Makarios was invited to London in February, 1959, for the purpose of signing the Agreements on behalf of the Greek Cypriots, he expressed great misgivings and raised a number of objections to several provisions of the Agreements. His efforts, however, to bring about at least certain changes were of no avail.

In the circumstances, the only alternatives open to him were either to sign the Agreements as they stood or reject them entirely. The second alternative would have meant to indefinite postponement of independence and continued strife. For all practical purposes, therefore, there was no choice but to sign the Agreements.

The Constitution of the Republic of Cyprus, stemming from the Zurich and London Agreements, was put into force without being approved either by the people of Cyprus directly or in the Constituent Assembly by representatives duly elected for the purpose. Thus, the Constitution did not emanate from the free will of the people, but was, in fact, imposed on them.

At the same time as the Constitution was approved by non-Cypriot powers, other treaties entangling and strangling Cyprus independence was also imposed upon the people of Cyprus by these non-Cypriot powers such

as granting Britain, Turkey and Greece to retain military bases and station troops on the island without the consent of the Cypriots themselves.

#### THE CONSTITUTION AND WHY IT WAS WORKABLE

The most glaring example of injustice and inequity was the Constitution imposed upon the people of Cyprus.

The Cyprus Constitution proved unworkable, not only because certain provisions were impossible to apply or difficult to implement, but because the whole underlying concept was wrong, being based on the principle of "separation" between Greek and Turk. The result of the "separation," which runs right through the Constitution and all its organs, prevented the smooth functioning of the State. Nothing could have been better designed to foster conflict, frustration and bitterness.

The people of Cyprus, in spite of the overwhelming predominance of the Greeks, were considered as constituting two communities, the Greek and the Turkish, and, disregarding their great numerical disparity, were placed on the same level as far as the exercise of political power was concerned. The Turkish minority was given such extensive rights as to be in a position to paralyze the State, to thwart the will of the majority and to block progress.

With a view to helping remove some of the obstacles in the way of the smooth functioning and development of Cyprus, President Makarios called upon the Turkish Cypriots on November 30th, 1963 to come, sit down and reason together and submitted specific proposals for amending the Constitution. He also notified the Turkish government of his proposals, but before the Turkish Cypriots had commented on these proposals, the Turkish government rejected the talks and the proposals outright.

#### EVENTS SINCE DECEMBER 1963

The separatist concept of the foreign imposed Constitution and the other treaties such as the Treaty of Guarantee and Alliance (which do not guarantee Cyprus' independence nor ally it equally with its neighbors) prevented the smooth functioning of the State and encouraged interference by Turkey in the internal affairs of Cyprus.

Following Turkey's out-of-hand rejection of the Archbishop's call and proposals, armed Turkish Cypriots aided by the regular Turkish army contingent on the island fanned out occupying several large areas scattered in widely separated parts of Cyprus for the purpose of providing landing areas for a possible Turkish invasion aimed at partitioning the island by force.

After December, 1963, Turkey, sometimes on the pretext of her purported right under the Treaty of Guarantee and sometimes on other pretexts, repeatedly threatened armed intervention in Cyprus and on several occasions committed aggression by land, sea and air. In August, 1964, Turkish jets indiscriminately attacked Cyprus villages and towns in the northwestern part of the island, killing and maiming unarmed civilians, including women, and children, with napalm incendiaries, bombs and machine gunning.

In pursuance of their aim to create compact Turkish areas in furtherance of the ultimate object of separation of the island, the Turkish leadership moved Turks from their homes and villages into "Turkish enclaves" and for years prevented them from moving outside such areas. The Turks have, since then, prevented the Greeks from entering such areas, even though the Turks themselves are completely free to move, and do in fact move all over the Island.

#### RECOURSE TO THE UNITED NATIONS AND MEDIATION EFFORTS

The Cyprus Government, under the pressure of Turkish threats about an imminent



invasion of the Island, took the matter to the United Nations since the Cyprus question is primarily a question of application of universally accepted principles provided under the U.N. Charter.

The United Nations repeatedly dealt with the Cyprus issue, both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly. Under a Security Council Resolution in March, 1964, a Peace Force was sent to the Island (originally for three months, but following repeated extensions, it is still in the Island) to help restore normality. A Mediator, Dr. Galo Plaza of Ecuador, was appointed by the Secretary General to study the question and make recommendations as to its solution. His report to the Secretary General was submitted in March 1965.

In his report, the Mediator stated that the problem of Cyprus cannot be resolved by attempting to restore the situation which existed before December, 1963, but that a new solution must be found which must be consistent with the provisions of the United Nations Charter. In particular, he recommended, the solution must be capable of satisfying the wishes of the majority of the population and at the same time of providing for the adequate protection of the legitimate rights of all the people.

Attempts were made from time to time to take the initiative and the problem away from the United Nations. The position of the Cyprus Government is that Cyprus, being a member of the United Nations, regards that body and none other as the proper forum for the discussion and solution of the Island's problems.

During the various phases in the history of the Cyprus question, The Turks put forward differently worded positions in regard to the solution of the problem. Whatever the various formulas, however, there ran through them all the theme of division of the Island. This was sought by proposals for direct partition or for "federation" envisaging removal of populations and setting up of two distinct administrations. Recent proposals have been for "regional administration."

The disastrous effects of federation or any form of division that might be applied to the Island were underlined by many authorities on the subject and by objective observers. It should also be noted that there is no precedent in existence where populations in a unitary state have been moved for the purpose of creating separate areas in order to apply a federal system. Where federal systems have been introduced there had already been in existence separate territorial entities which were brought under a federal system for the purpose of creating a single State. As far as is known, the opposite process of using "federation" as a means of division has never been applied.

The argument is sometimes used that the Turks of Cyprus must be treated differently from other minorities because their language, religion, customs, and national aspirations are different from those of the Greeks of Cyprus. This of course is not a valid argument since those differences are the very characteristics of a minority in any country. Nor is the existence of a minority in close proximity with the country from which it derives its ethnic origin a peculiar phenomenon of Cyprus, creating rights to special political privileges.

The Turks say that they seek division in Cyprus in order to create conditions under which Greeks and Turks may live in peace in the Island. But far from bringing about peace, such a solution, by keeping the two elements of the population separated instead of bringing them together, would, for many reasons, including administrative difficulties, be a source of constant friction between them which might develop into antagonism and fanaticism and be a source of perennial trouble.

The impartial observer can reach no other conclusion than that any form of separation would not be practicable in the case of Cyprus and that, were it to be applied, it could only lead to incalculable distress for both Greeks and Turks and for their economic and social stagnation.

The idea of federation in Cyprus was examined as long ago as 1956 when the Island was still a British Colony by no less an eminent constitutional expert than Lord Radcliffe who, in his "Constitutional Proposals for Cyprus," came to the definite conclusion that federation for Cyprus was out of the question for the simple reason that there were not the prerequisites for such a form of Government.

The United Nations Mediator, Dr. Galo Plaza, was also categorical about it. In his report he stressed:

"To my mind, the objections raised (against federation) also on economic, social and moral grounds are in themselves serious obstacles to the proposition. It seems to require a compulsory movement of the people—concerned—many thousands on both sides—contrary to all enlightened principles of the present time, including those set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights."

Dr. Plaza further says:

"It is essential to be clear what this proposal implies. To refer to it simply as 'federation' is to oversimplify the matter. What is involved is not merely to establish a federal form of government, but also to secure the geographical separation of the two communities. The establishment of a federal regime requires a territorial basis and this basis does not exist. In an earlier part of this report I explained that the island-wide intermingling in normal times of the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot populations. The events since December, 1963, have not basically altered this characteristic; even the enclaves where numbers of Turkish Cypriots concentrated following the troubles are widely scattered over the Island, while thousands of other Turkish Cypriots have remained in mixed villages."

Since June, 1968, following recommendations by the U.N. Secretary General, talks have been going on between the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots to find a solution to the Cyprus problem.

The holding of such talks have become possible thanks mainly to the normalization measures taken by President Makarios' Government over two years ago and despite the security dangers involved, lifted all restrictions and abolished all check points. Thus, the Turkish Cypriots are completely free to circulate all over the Island. Unfortunately, however, the Turks still prevent Greek Cypriots from entering areas which the Turkish leadership claims to be under its control. This attitude of the Turkish Cypriots is not calculated to contribute to the normalization of the situation.

The Cyprus Government has all along advocated co-existence of the Greeks and Turks of Cyprus and unity in all aspects of the functioning of the State. To this end, its proposals aim at:

(a) creating a unitary State with a Constitution adopted by the people of Cyprus in a universally accepted manner, based on democratic principles and the principles of the United Nations Charter and eliminating the factors of separation and division and outside interference;

(b) ensuring that all citizens of the Republic should enjoy equal rights irrespective of race, community or religion, human rights for all citizens being incorporated in the Constitution;

(c) Ensuring autonomy to the Turkish Cypriots with regard to matters pertaining to education, culture, religion, and personal status.

The Turkish Cypriots also talk of a unitary state, but as repeatedly underlined by official statements from Ankara, they seek "regional autonomy" under the heading of "local government."

It has emerged during the talks that there are points on which the differences are not so great, whereas in others the divergence of views is more substantial.

As President Makarios has stated, the Greek Cypriots have displayed a spirit of goodwill and will continue the talks in the same spirit. They have submitted constructive proposals in the hope of finding a peaceful and workable solution. They have even made several concessions. But, there are limits and a line beyond which they cannot retreat. The Greek Cypriots will in no case accept a solution creating a kind of state within a state and, generally, a solution running counter to the concept of a unitary state.

## GENOCIDE TREATY THREAT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Senate subcommittee's action in approving the Genocide Convention for a Senate vote can lay groundwork for some thought-provoking possibilities of prosecutions—especially since the subcommittee rejected an amendment that U.S. citizens could not be extradited to another country to stand trial for alleged acts of genocide.

Such legal protections of the individual as *ex post facto* and statutes of limitations have been known to be ignored under international law where political ideologies are involved. Since we in the House do not get a vote, we can but hope that our colleagues in the Senate will awaken to a fuller understanding of the Pandora's box they may be opening if the treaty is passed.

For example, who would be ready to have former President Harry S. Truman extradited to Japan to be tried for genocide for having given orders to drop atomic bombs on that country?

How many World War II bomber pilots might the Germans like to try for leveling their cities?

In fact, had we been under the Genocide Treaty before the Calley trial, it is quite possible Lieutenant Calley would have been tried in North Vietnam or in Russia. And, as far as that goes, President Nixon should certainly understand that under the Genocide Treaty, he might be made to stand trial in North Vietnam or somewhere in the Middle East for some of his orders. And even Henry Kissinger and officials in the State Department should be concerned as accomplices.

Think of the trials that may result from Operation Keelhaul in which authorities, either British, American, or both, made a deal with the Russians to forcefully repatriate citizens of captive nations back to Russia following World War II where they were promptly given peace and justice—many by execution.

As far as past actions or the time

interval, it seems to make little difference to some of our Communist friends; for earlier in the month six Ukrainians were executed for what was said to be Fascist collaboration 30 years ago during World War II.

This is the second term that I have proposed H.R. 391, a bill to prohibit the deprivation of constitutionally secured rights to U.S. citizens under color of any statute, treaty, order, rule or regulation implementing decisions of the United Nations. I think that the need for such civil rights legislation is more pressing today than ever before in view of the threat posed by the Genocide Convention. Especially is this true considering the concerted move by internationalists to develop their theory that treaty law supersedes the U.S. Constitution and could nullify the Bill of Rights.

I include a newsclipping and the text of H.R. 391 at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 31, 1971]  
GENOCIDE BAN APPROVED, 10 TO 4, BY SENATE UNIT

The international convention against genocide won 10-to-4 approval from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee yesterday, but faces an uncertain future when it reaches the Senate floor.

Critics of the 1948 treaty—already ratified by 75 nations—have charged that it diminishes U.S. sovereignty, might be used as the basis for accusing U.S. officials of committing genocide against Negroes, American Indians and Alaskan natives, or could force extradition of U.S. citizens to stand trial in foreign countries.

Fear that the treaty may be used to raise genocide charges against U.S. forces in Vietnam appears to be one important element of the extradition dispute.

If the extradition issue can be solved, the treaty would have an excellent chance of passage. Committee Chairman J. W. Fulbright (D-Ark.) said he hoped that objections still remaining to the treaty—which was first sent to the Senate by then President Truman in 1949—could be cleared up in the implementing legislation now being drafted.

Before approving the treaty, the committee rejected, 7 to 6, a proposed reservation by Sen. John Sherman Cooper (R-Ky.). It would have provided that U.S. citizens couldn't be extradited to another country to stand trial for alleged acts of genocide unless the Secretary of State determined the citizen would be guaranteed all the constitutional rights of an accused under U.S. laws.

Sen. Jacob K. Javits (R-N.Y.) explained that the proposed implementing legislation will spell out that U.S. courts could exercise jurisdiction in such genocide cases, even where the alleged crime had been committed outside the United States.

The treaty has long been opposed by the American Bar Association, which narrowly reaffirmed its position late last year.

The most outspoken opponent in the Senate is Sam J. Ervin Jr. (D-N.C.), who has said he agrees with the ABA that the treaty is "full of holes" and would really do nothing to prevent genocide. Ervin has charged the treaty would lay U.S. citizens open to foreign or domestic prosecution for ill-defined crimes with ill-defined legal safeguards, and would widen the jurisdiction of the International Court over the United States.

The treaty defines genocide as acts intended to destroy, in whole or part, a national, religious, ethnic or racial group. It makes genocide committed by rulers, officials or individuals whether in wartime or peacetime an international crime, and provides that

persons shall be tried in the state where such acts were allegedly committed.

The treaty was adopted by the U.N. General Assembly Dec. 9, 1948, by a 55-to-0 vote, transmitted to the Senate by President Truman in 1949 but has never been sent to the floor. President Nixon asked the Senate on Feb. 19, 1970 to approve it. The committee reported it last year, but too late for action.

The decision on when to bring it to the Senate floor for a vote rests with Majority Leader Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.), who probably would withhold it if he thought it would be subject to a filibuster or would fail to obtain the needed two-thirds vote. The Foreign Relations Committee approved it yesterday with several "understandings" and "interpretations" designed to clarify specific points and meet some of the objections.

In yesterday's 10-4 vote, Fulbright, and Javits voted yes, along with Frank Church (D-Idaho), Stuart Symington (D-Mo.), Claiborne Pell (D-R.I.), William B. Spong (D-Va.), Gale McGee (D-Wyo.), Edmund S. Muskie (D-Maine), Clifford Case (R-N.J.) and Hugh Scott (R-Pa.). Opposing it were Cooper, John J. Sparkman (D-Ala.), George D. Aiken (R-Vt.), and James B. Pearson (R-Kan.).

On the 7-to-6 vote, Fulbright, Church, Pell, Muskie, Javits, McGee and Scott voted to kill Cooper's proposal, while Sparkman, Spong, Aiken, Case and Pearson supported Cooper.

The committee took no action on the 1925 Geneva Protocol barring poison gas and germ warfare. This treaty is in controversy because the administration insists that approval won't bar it from continuing to use tear gas and herbicides in Vietnam.

#### H.R. 391

A bill to amend section 242 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit deprivation of rights under color of any statute, treaty, order, rule, or regulation implementing decisions of the United Nations

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 242 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 242. Deprivation of rights under color of law

"Whoever, under color of any law, statute, treaty, ordinance, regulations, or custom (including any order, rule, or regulation issued by the President to apply measures which the Security Council or General Assembly has decided, or may decide, pursuant to chapter 41, or any other chapter, of the Charter of the United Nations, are to be employed to give effect to its decisions or resolutions under such charter, or otherwise), willfully subjects any inhabitant of any State, district, Commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or to different punishments, pains, or penalties, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both."

#### GENERAL PRACTITIONERS NEEDED IN THE COMMUNITIES

#### HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I am very deeply concerned about the shortage of general practice medical doctors in

countryside America. I have introduced legislation providing for financial assistance for students planning on going into general practice and for medical schools to provide more training in this field.

While the total number of doctors of medicine shows a steady increase from year to year, the number in general practice shows a sharp decline and the number of specialists shows a corresponding increase.

The specialists locate in the large population centers so it is very obvious that there is a shortage of medical doctors in the countryside.

My concern in this area was considerably deepened this week when I received a number of letters and telephone calls from our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District about general practitioners being drafted into the armed services.

Mr. Speaker, there are vast areas in our congressional district where we have no doctor at all. There are other areas where one doctor must spread his services over six to eight communities in a day and night struggle.

The welfare, the very lives, of our countryside residents is dependent upon the accessibility of a medical doctor.

I urge that directives be issued to all local selective service boards requesting them to balance the health needs of the local communities with the needs of the Armed Forces before calling our medical doctors up for service in the Armed Forces.

#### NATIVE CLAIMS, YES—PIPELINE, NO

#### HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining a group of concerned House colleagues in sponsoring legislation to settle the Alaskan native land claims.

Congressional attention to this matter has been shabby. The lack of congressional action to resolve this question speaks of a gross insensitivity which too often characterizes the House and Senate.

The bill which I am cosponsoring would resolve the native claims question by providing Alaskan natives with 60 million acres of land and \$500 million with a 2 percent overriding royalty on income from future mineral development in Alaska.

I cosponsor this bill wholeheartedly. It may be the most critical civil rights proposal which will face the 92d Congress. But I wish to set forth one corollary reservation, I am sincerely hopeful that speedy settlement of this question will not hasten approval of the hot-oil pipeline across Alaska.

I view the settlement question totally apart from the pipeline proposal to which I am opposed at the present time and urge the House to deal expeditiously and justly with the claims of the Alaskan natives.



## CONGRESSIONAL NEWSLETTER

## HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, this week I am mailing to my constituents my first newsletter of this Congress. In it I report some of my major activities since I issued my last newsletter in October 1970. Among the issues I have discussed are the welfare hotel crisis in New York City and its relationship to the efforts of many of us in the Congress to secure full Federal assumption of the welfare burden; the drug crisis, and the Federal privacy bill I have introduced to respond to the threat to individual liberty posed by Government collection activities.

I would like at this time to insert in the RECORD the full text of my newsletter. It follows:

CONGRESSMAN EDWARD I. KOCH REPORTS  
FROM WASHINGTON

DEAR CONSTITUENT AND FELLOW NEW YORKER: Last year, with other Members of Congress of the New York City delegation I made two tours of Harlem and the South Bronx to see the drug traffic on the streets and to visit two adolescent centers maintained by Odyssey House.

Talking with teenagers in one of the adolescent centers was so meaningful for me that I suggested to Dr. Judianne Densen-Gerber, founder of Odyssey House, that we bring the children to Washington and invite all of the Members of Congress to a breakfast where they could talk with the children and recognize that the Federal government has not faced up to this problem with adequate legislation and funding.

The breakfast was held on March 10 and more than 100 Members of the House and Senate attended. The representation was bipartisan and I sensed the occasion made clear to the Members that a greater effort to get adequate funding must be undertaken.

Last year the Congress authorized \$43 million in new funds for drug treatment and education programs under the Comprehensive Drug Act for Fiscal Year 1971. But, the Congress failed miserably in appropriating funds to meet this authorization—only \$6.5 million was appropriated. For Fiscal Year 1972, the Drug Act has authorized \$102 million—but this will be only empty rhetoric if the cash is not appropriated.

Recently I visited Fort Bragg in North Carolina which has one of the few military drug treatment facilities. I was told that in a survey done of the 82d Airborne Division, 3% of the men were found to be "confirmed opiate users." It is well known that some men coming back from Vietnam are drug addicts—and yet even identifiable addicts are being discharged when their two year term is up. While the Army surely would not return to the community men afflicted with contagious TB, it knowingly discharges active heroin addicts. I have recommended that such persons must be committed to either a Veterans Administration Hospital for treatment or placed under the care of some civilian rehabilitation center.

There is a regulation in New York City that requires welfare recipients who are identified addicts to receive treatment. But, this regulation in the majority of cases is ignored. There are now at least 15,000 addicts on welfare and the number is increasing every month. Similarly convicts who are identified as heroin addicts upon incarceration should be treated while in prison; if prisoners do not receive rehabilitative treat-

ment in jail—as is usually the case today—I have recommended that upon release, they be required to undergo treatment.

It will take millions of dollars to operate comprehensive treatment programs but the Congress must find the funds. The total of drug addiction is a tragedy not only for the youth whose life is crippled but for all of us whose homes are robbed and lives threatened by drug addicts not receiving treatment.

## GOVERNMENT FILES AND CITIZENS' RIGHTS

The revelations in December of Army surveillance of public officials in Illinois emphasized the need for the Congress to scrutinize the information collection activities of the Federal government. It is well known that the government gathers tremendous amounts of information on individuals and that cross referencing and retrieval is being made more efficient each year. This collection of data, which for many individuals covers personal aspects of one's life, cannot help but pose a threat to personal privacy and individual liberty. The time has come for the Congress to develop some safeguards to defend the public against the improper intrusion of computer technology.

I have reintroduced my bill (H.R. 854) to give the average citizen the means to resist the advance of a "dossier dictatorship" and to protect himself against malicious and false information in government files.

My bill would require all government agencies maintaining records on an individual to:

(1) notify the individual that such records exist.

(2) notify him of all transfers of such information.

(3) disclose information from such records only with the consent of the individual or when legally required.

(4) maintain a record of all persons given access to such records.

(5) permit the individual to inspect his records, make copies of them and supplement them.

Exceptions to this requirement would be made in instances of national security and when information is temporarily withheld for the purposes of criminal prosecution.

My bill now has 97 House co-sponsors and has been introduced on the Senate side by Senator Birch Bayh of Indiana. I also have introduced a similar bill to open the files of the House Internal Security Committee.

On February 23rd Senator Ervin's Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights commenced hearings entitled "Computers, Data Banks and the Bill of Rights." I was the second witness before the Committee. I presented my bill to the Senators and urged that in addition to giving persons access to their government files, its implementation would necessarily reveal patterns of government operations which are detrimental to individual liberties. Furthermore, it would deter government agencies from compiling dossiers containing dubious and speculative information, as well as information that is of such a personal nature that it infringes on an individual's privacy.

## WELFARE HOTELS

The administrative structure and the laws governing our present welfare system are in shambles. The system is not working, and there is no better illustration of this fact than the "welfare hotel mess" here in New York City.

Late last fall I discovered that the City was paying enormous rents, ranging up to \$800 per week, to quarter welfare families in hotels used as emergency housing. Some of these families were placed in these hotels after their homes were destroyed by fire and the Department of Social Services would not approve apartments they had found because the rent was too high. For example, one family with whom I spoke paid \$1600 per month to the Broadway Central Hotel because the Department of Social Services said

they could not legally pay a \$200 per month rental for the apartment they had found.

My office researched this problem and found that there is no legal limitation on the allowable rent for a welfare family's home. The Administration then conceded that the ceiling was in fact an administratively set guideline that could be waived in individual cases or completely altered to adjust more realistically to the present situation.

The taxpayers have every right to be outraged by this mismanagement of public funds; we are all in a sense victims of this policy. But the most tragic victims are the welfare children.

During the past several months, I have personally visited a number of the welfare hotels and spoken with the families. In some cases, the hotels themselves are filthy, dilapidated and dangerous; many children are out of school and roam the halls; it is not uncommon for 6, 7, 8 or more members of a family to be in one room. Four children died in accidents in these hotels within a one month period.

On January 16th of this year, I joined with Manhattan Borough President Percy Sutton to hold a joint Federal-State-Municipal hearing on welfare hotels. Legislators from all levels of government heard extensive testimony from governmental officials responsible for Social Service Programs and concerned citizens in an effort to find specific legislative and administrative remedies for this situation. My conclusion based on the testimony given is that the City could do far more to provide real emergency service for those families in need at far more reasonable costs.

On January 24th, the Mayor reacting to the public furor aroused by the continued revelations of this wasteful welfare hotel policy, and reacting particularly to the fact that one such family was placed in the post Waldorf-Astoria, announced that the City would curb the use of hotels for housing families.

The next day I wrote to the Mayor to reiterate proposals I had made that would immediately make thousands of habitable apartments available not only for welfare families but for the middle class as well. These proposals include imposing a vacant apartment tax on all rental units intentionally withheld from the housing market for 90 days and allowing the City to compel the leasing of vacant apartments that have been withheld for six months.

It is obvious that the City cannot afford to continue supporting such a large and ever increasing welfare budget. Full federal assumption of welfare costs represents the only long term solution and I am cosponsoring such legislation in the Congress. It becomes increasingly difficult, however, to persuade other legislators of the need for this reform when they see the City of New York squander so much money in such a wasteful fashion that embitters tax payers and welfare recipients alike.

## NEW COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT

I have a new Committee assignment. I am now a member of the Banking and Currency Committee. That Committee has jurisdiction over mass transit.

Since coming to Congress in 1969, mass transit has been one of my primary concerns. Two years ago I introduced a bill to create a \$10 billion mass transit trust fund to do for mass transit what the Highway Trust Fund has done for highways. As a result of the support for my bill we were able to pass legislation in the 91st Congress which provided \$3.1 billion for mass transit—far too little but much more than ever before.

This year I have introduced a Single Transportation Trust Fund bill which would place all of the moneys now collected for highways and airports into a single trust fund to help

each locality provide a transportation system that best suits its particular needs.

I am also the original sponsor of legislation that would provide Federal subsidies for mass transit systems which are finding it difficult to maintain proper service because of operating deficits. Surely this is true in New York where the Transit Authority is faced with a \$100 million deficit and we all are faced with the having to pay higher fares. I will be leading the fight on my Committee for operating subsidies.

My Committee also has jurisdiction over housing. Though every level of government bears part of the blame for our housing crisis, it is clear that the Congress and the President are the main culprits. They have refused to appropriate and spend the needed moneys that my Committee has authorized each year pursuant to the 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act. I will do whatever I can while working on the Committee to press for Congressional and Administration action—it's time they stop promising and start building.

#### MARIHUANA COMMISSION

On January 30th the President announced his nine appointments to the Presidential Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse—whose establishing legislation I first introduced in April 1969 and which subsequently was passed by Congress last fall.

The Commission's "blue ribbon" report will be particularly helpful in giving guidance to states like New York which are now considering changes in their drug laws.

#### MURRAY HILL TENANTS

On January 2nd, the Uniform Relocation and Land Acquisition Policies Act became law. It provides a uniform program of relocation payments and displacement housing for tenants. Most important to me was the special section entitled, "Displacement by a Specific Program"—the program being the prospective construction of a post office on the government's Murray Hill property in our district.

I took an active part in the drafting of this new law because shortly after being elected to Congress in 1968, I was asked to help a group of Murray Hill tenants who were then being threatened with eviction to make way for the postal facility's construction—and most important, they were not going to receive any relocation assistance.

We were successful in getting the construction plans suspended and eviction stopped, giving the Congress time to legislate. The special section I secured gives Murray Hill tenants suffering hardship from displacement:

Up to \$500 in moving assistance.

A sum of up to \$1000 a year for four years that is needed for the displaced person to rent a dwelling that is decent and safe.

Both of these categories of assistance are included in the general provisions of the law. However, had the special section for Murray Hill tenants not been included, all those tenants who moved onto the property after its acquisition in 1963 would have been excluded from the rental assistance benefits.

The Uniform Relocation Act establishes a single relocation policy for all federal programs and fills the gaps—such as in the Murray Hill case—in which no assistance has been given.

#### HELPING PRE-KINDERGARTEN TEACHERS

The wheels of the federal bureaucracy move slowly and so too often its regulations become out of date. One such case I found last year was the Department of HEW's refusal to give National Defense Student Loan cancellation benefits to Head Start and other pre-kindergarten teachers in New York's elementary schools.

The law allows up to 50% cancellation of a NDEA loan of the borrowing student, if he or she goes into teaching. For three years pre-kindergarten classes have been included in many of New York's elementary schools with certified teachers conducting their classes. But these teachers were being denied cancellation benefits under HEW's old regulations.

After arguing for several months that pre-kindergarten education now occupies an essential place in elementary education, I was successful in obtaining the Department's agreement to extend cancellation benefits to teachers of the public schools' pre-kindergarten classes. The Department even ruled that these benefits would be retroactive and would extend to teachers in private schools meeting state standards.

This established a new policy for the nation—one which hopefully will give increased status to pre-kindergarten teaching and encourage more young people to enter this important new field of education.

#### TRAVELING OFFICE

My store front office at 1491 Second Avenue (78th Street) is no longer operating. Instead I have established a traveling office that takes me to different areas of the Congressional District to meet with constituents every Friday.

Every month I will be at a new location. My schedule for the next two months follows:

April: Greenwich House, 27 Barrow Street, 9 a.m. to 10 a.m.

May: Stephen Wise Free Synagogue, 30 West 68th St., 9 a.m. to 10 a.m.

Your comments on this newsletter and any proposals you might have on any subject are of interest to me. Please write to me c/o House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515.

If you need assistance, call my New York City office at 26 Federal Plaza on 264-1066 between 9 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekdays.

Included in the newsletter are three photographs. The captions on these photographs read as follows:

In the past several months I have made a number of visits to jails in the City. On January 18th I went to the Kew Gardens jail in Queens. Accompanying me was Corrections Commissioner George McGrath.

At the Broadway Central Hotel in January.

Community leader Shanley Egeth and I met with the Murray Hill tenants to tell them about the special benefits in the new law and to help in their application for relocation assistance.

#### MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

#### HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 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 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

#### BATES MANUFACTURING CLOSES ITS HILL DIVISION

#### HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said lately about the depressed state of the American economy. In New England, the textile and shoe industries face especially difficult problems—problems generated by a sluggish economy and heightened by the ever-increasing flow of foreign textile apparel, and footwear imports which are threatening to make two of the region's most vital industries extinct.

In the New England textile industry, there have been 45 mill closings in the last 2½ years which have affected 10,563 employees. Conditions have been equally alarming in other sections of the country. In the Middle Atlantic States, for example, 24 mills employing 1,887 workers have been forced to close their doors since the start of 1969. And in the South, there have been 45 mill closings affecting 12,416 workers during the same period. Total mills closed in these eastern sections of the country in the past 27 months: 114. Total employees forced to seek other work: 24,866.

The most recent of all these textile-plant closings, I am sorry to say, occurred just this morning in Lewiston, Maine, at the Hill Division of Bates Manufacturing, Inc. Regarding this regrettable action, I call my colleagues' attention to the statement issued by a Bates executive, Mr. H. L. Gosselin.

#### MR. GOSSELIN'S STATEMENT

Operations at the Hill Division of the Bates Mfg., Inc., will, by a decision made today, be permanently terminated effective immediately.

Much as we regret having to make this decision, it is necessitated by the flood of uncontrolled foreign imports which have destroyed almost all the markets for Hill goods and have made operations at that plant unprofitable.

Some of the machinery at Hill will be transferred to the Bates Division in Lewiston and to the Edwards Division in Augusta.

A considerable number of the 575 Hill employees affected have already been provided employment at our two other divisions. More will be given opportunities as job openings occur.

Bates will cooperate with City and State officials in endeavors to utilize the space at the Hill Division to provide the community with job opportunities.

We regret the necessity of closing Hill, but mills such as Hill simply cannot compete with the uncontrolled flow of imported textiles coming into this country. In fact, this year imports were the highest on record.

We commend and express our appreciation to the Members of the Maine Congressional Delegation for their continued efforts to obtain remedial action and we urge once again immediate enactment of textile quota legislation which is the relief we have been seeking for over 15 years.

We want to emphasize that the closing of Hill is due entirely to conditions caused by imports. It is no reflection upon the nearly 600 employees and supervisors of the plant



and local union officials whose cooperation and efforts throughout the years have been excellent.

Mr. Speaker, I know many of the Hill Division employees, and I know that they cannot find any solace in the kind of rhetoric which promises an upturn in the American economy. For months there have been promises of a brighter economic picture, but the layoffs have continued and the families of many thousands of American workers face an uncertain future.

I believe that this Congress has a responsibility to the American public to provide an impetus to our economy. As a sound beginning, I would suggest, as I have on numerous past occasions, that Congress provide relief for our textile and footwear industries from unfair, low-cost foreign competition. In my judgment, viable shoe and textile import quota legislation is long overdue. We need look no further than Mr. Gosselin's statement and the disturbing statistics enumerated above for the stark evidence of this great need. I sincerely believe that such legislation can and will help stop what now clearly appears to be the slow death of two of this country's most important, most vital, and most responsible industries.

**SENATOR RIBICOFF'S STATEMENT  
ON THE LATE L. MENDEL RIVERS  
DISTASTEFUL**

**HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I was in South Carolina at the time Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF made a statement concerning the late Honorable L. Mendel Rivers. I believe I was as close to Congressman Rivers as any living man during his last years here in Washington and it was very distasteful to read in the press an account of the statement made by Senator RIBICOFF.

Never in my life have I ever made a statement concerning any person when it was impossible for him to defend himself. It seems to me that Senator RIBICOFF could have made his statement before the passing of my good friend, the late Congressman Rivers. I, of course, can see no reason for any Senator, or in fact, for any person, to make a statement of this nature after a person has passed away as it proves nothing.

I realize nothing I could say will change this statement concerning the late Mendel Rivers; however, I want Senator RIBICOFF and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to know that I consider Senator RIBICOFF's statement to be very distasteful, ungentlemanly, and could be interpreted as cowardly.

It is very seldom that we hear of any Member of Congress making a statement concerning anyone who has passed on to his forever resting place and I hope this will be the last such incidence on Capitol Hill.

**WHY WE CANNOT WIN THE WAR**

**HON. JOHN E. HUNT**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is again timely to draw attention to the so-called humanists who detest the killing in Vietnam so vehemently that their conduct may well be recorded in history as being responsible for prolonging the killing, and denounced as the reason why we did not win the war. The latest move toward the objective of peace-at-any-price via a total and unconditional withdrawal of American troops is the compulsion of the anti-Nixon, anti-Vietnam would-be leaders to insure that the Laos invasion by South Vietnam forces will be labeled a failure. Led by none other than the habitual soothsayer of doom in the other body—whose real gripe may be that he does not have the power of the President—the proclamation is reported in today's papers that the military objectives, outlined in still-classified testimony by top administration officials last month, were not realized in Laos. The only possible purposes to be served by this doubt-casting publicity are to embarrass the true leaders of both the United States and South Vietnam and to award yet another propaganda victory to the enemy, in the hope, perhaps, that the United States will just give up and go home.

I believe the following editorial, appearing in the Paterson News of March 20, 1971, is one that everyone should read carefully in light of the condemnations of the President over the Laos venture and the renewed vigor of some politicians in proposing legislation that would tell the enemy that the United States would be out of Vietnam by a specified date:

**WHY WE CAN'T WIN THE WAR**

Chalk up a major political victory for the peace-at-any price leaders of this country in what is being described as the rout of the South Vietnamese. If the South Vietnamese are driven out of Laos, and thereafter from Cambodia, these gleeful politicians and would-be presidents will not want to appear to gloat, but they will proceed ponderously to condemn and berate President Nixon for having committed a grave blunder which they will point out is further evidence of the urgent need for the United States to withdraw from Indo-China.

They will, however, ignore the fact that their constant and raucous attacks on the South Vietnamese rulers, their alleged graft and corruption, the impropriety of further involvement of American forces in the war, the insistence that we pull out finally and for all time, have continued to give new strength, courage and purpose to the enemy in North Vietnam and their allies the Viet Cong, to whom they were virtually saying "Keep fighting and you won't have to lick us, we'll soon be running away."

Isn't it apparent even to these rabid anti-Nixonites that they have given renewed strength and confidence in victory to the enemy which includes the Soviet and Red China all of whom are now entitled to feel that the whole war will fold up if they just continue to hold out, keep fighting and ignore the peace conferences in Paris. To them, it is

patent that the United States is a Louse divided—that they forced Lyndon Johnson out of the presidency and will do the same to Richard M. Nixon whom they despise as an implacable enemy.

All these political maneuverings are not in themselves the grievous malaise which afflicts this country. It is the shocking undermining of our troops in the war front; of our military leaders, of all our hopes of rescuing the South Vietnamese to whose aid we first went back in the days of President Kennedy, through the terms of President Johnson and now Richard Nixon.

America can no longer proclaim its unanimity against a common enemy. A small band of bedraggled and bearded way-out youths can start a demonstration at a meeting at which the President is a speaker and command worldwide attention, with the headlines shrieking "Rebellion Against the President." And these demonstrators will be hailed as heroic American youths by the political spouters who hope to ride to the White House on the rapid oratory of men who certainly do not hate their country but are yet serving the cause of the enemy.

**LEGISLATION TO REPEAL CERTAIN  
SECTIONS OF TARIFF SCHEDULES**

**HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to repeal section 806.30 and 807 of the U.S. Tariff Schedules. While I have already introduced legislation to repeal section 807, I feel it is now necessary to cover both provisions in the new bill since both provisions are being abused. These provisions permit the export of American goods overseas for the purpose of assembly and fabrication. They have become the vehicle for pirating away jobs of American workers in the textile, electronic, and electrical equipment fields.

Under the provisions of the law, goods are returned to this country with the American product duty free and only the labor costs in any foreign manufactured item subject to duty.

From 1966 to 1969, imports under these items rose from \$953 million to \$1.8 billion. Through 1970, I am certain that the volume was even higher. Unfortunately, the computer at the Census Bureau fails to report the figures for January 1970, and no one in the administration has seen fit to calculate total imports for the year 1970.

What is more, these items were the subject of a Tariff Commission's report issued in September 1970. To date, the administration has not commented on the impact of these items on the economy, although both the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Senate Finance Committee have urged them on several occasions to do so.

I am hopeful that these items will be acted upon because I believe that they are rooted in this Nation's international trade problems.

LEGISLATION TO CURB  
PORNOGRAPHY

## HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, last year Congress made a major contribution to the peace of mind of the citizens of this country when it enacted as part of the Postal Reorganization Act provisions which strengthen our ability to protect the privacy of our homes from unwanted sexually oriented materials. These new provisions, as you know, permit a person at any time to notify the Postmaster General that he does not want to receive, and if he has children under 19, that they do not wish to receive, any sexually oriented advertisements in the mails. The Postal Service is keeping a current list of such persons, and mailers are prohibited from sending or causing to be sent any sexually oriented advertisement to any person whose name has been on the list for more than 30 days, title 39, United States Code, sections 3010, 3011.

Congress thus extended the protection provided by the 1967 law permitting a householder to notify the Postmaster General that he has received pandering advertisements and does not wish to receive further mail from the particular sender, title 39, United States Code, section 3008.

With these two weapons a citizen may take steps to halt or prevent sexually oriented mailings from entering his home. While I applaud the enactment of these laws, I believe that all of the burden should not rest on the citizen to take affirmative action. More of the burden should fall to the mailers to eliminate objectionable material from their mailings, particularly to children.

For this reason I am cosponsoring two bills which should accomplish what I believe are the dominant concerns of the majority of the people of this country on this subject—the protection of minors from exposure to sexually oriented material and the application of community standards to the question of obscenity.

H.R. 6930 would prohibit the sending through the mails to minors of certain sexually oriented material harmful to them. If the matter described in the bill as harmful to minors were deposited in the mails for delivery to a residence in which a minor resides, it would have to be sealed completely in an envelope or wrapper personally addressed to an adult residing at that residence or it would be presumed to have been intended for delivery to a minor—and in violation of the law.

Other provisions of H.R. 6930 would make jury decisions on the issue of the obscenity of questioned material binding on Federal appellate courts. This bill would not only result in obscenity rulings more in keeping with particular community views but would also relieve the burden of appellate review of so many decisions on the question of obscenity.

H.R. 6929, the other bill I am cospon-

soring, would prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation to minors of sexually oriented matter harmful to minors.

Violators of these provisions would be subject to a heavy fine or imprisonment.

Last session Congress considered a number of bills to regulate obscenity and pornography. Two of these bills were passed by this House but were never taken up by the Senate. Interest in further measures to regulate pornography and obscenity continues and the need has not vanished.

Early action on these bills will hopefully serve to aid their enactment and will be appreciated by citizens throughout the country who depend upon us to aid them in the struggle against inundation by offensive matter. Perhaps more importantly, enactment of these bills will be a step toward protection of our individual right of privacy—a right which seems in greater peril daily.

ALEXANDRIA CITY COUNCIL OP-  
POSES DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
COMMUTER TAX

## HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, referring to the prospects of a request by the District of Columbia government to the Congress to impose the so-called commuter tax on the citizens of Virginia and Maryland who work in the Federal City, I should like the House to take note of a resolution proclaimed by the city of Alexandria, Va. The resolution follows:

## RESOLUTION No. 13

Whereas, officials of the government of the District of Columbia have proposed that a "reciprocal income tax" be levied on the commuters and other non-residents who earn their living in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas, this reciprocal income tax would adversely affect 280,000 suburban residents; and

Whereas, the revenue needs of the City of Alexandria are as acute as those facing the District of Columbia; and

Whereas, while the District Government would obtain 51.6 million dollars in additional revenue under this arrangement, the State of Virginia would lose 17 million dollars; and

Whereas, this loss of revenue could reduce the State of Virginia's ability to provide local and State services to its citizens in such vital areas as education, health and welfare; and

Whereas, such a tax is unfair since the District of Columbia now receives direct financial support from the Federal government; and

Whereas, residents of Virginia already pay sales and other taxes on purchases made in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas, residents of Virginia and all other American taxpayers already rightfully support the District of Columbia through Federal taxes; and

Whereas, the City Council of the City of Alexandria recognizes that the District of Columbia, like most American cities, is in

desperate need of additional revenues to meet the pressing and legitimate needs of its citizens; and

Whereas, the primary responsibility for the plight of the District of Columbia rests with the United States Congress; and

Whereas, the unique character of the District of Columbia as a federal city, governed in most major respects by the Congress of the United States, mandates that its revenue needs be met, to the extent that they cannot be met locally, by the taxpayers of the United States as a whole and not by taxpayers of Maryland and Virginia.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Alexandria, Virginia:

1. That the City Council of the City of Alexandria on behalf of its citizens, joins other jurisdictions in Virginia and Maryland in urging the House District Committee to oppose the District Government's reciprocal income tax.

2. That the City Council of the City of Alexandria on behalf of its citizens urges its representatives in Congress and the members of its delegation to the Virginia General Assembly to join in opposing this commuter tax plan and, in lieu thereof, to support a higher federal payment, or other appropriate relief, to meet the pressing revenue needs of the District of Columbia.

3. That copies of this resolution be forwarded immediately to the Chairman of the House District Committee, Senator Byrd, Senator Spong, Representative Broyhill, and the members of our delegation to the Virginia General Assembly.

REVENUE SHARING WOULD BE  
DEFICIT SHARING

## HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the portions of the WTOP editorial aired on March 24th and 25th are also applicable to the concept of so-called revenue sharing, which, if reality were to be recognized, would be deficit sharing.

In any case, the lesson of responsible government is here in these words from WTOP:

The internal upheaval now underway in the United Givers Fund could be the best thing that ever happened to it.

Two fundamental things are being challenged: The organizational structure of the UGF family, and the ways in which the huge charity money-pile is being sliced.

For many years, the organization has been fractured. Collections have been handled by the UGF office and disbursements have been done by the Health and Welfare Council. They are entirely separate bodies, and there has been rivalry and confusion.

One agency would be better. At the very least, the UGF then would be directly accountable to the people from whom it collects for the ways in which its collections are used. . . .

In our opinion, the allocation priorities—viewed overall—need some substantial re-ordering. The great annual outpouring of this community's gifts is not finding its way well enough into the places of greatest need. . . .

Exactly what the new priorities should be is something to be hammered out by the community at large. A plausible first step toward doing that is to seek the early union of the UGF and the HWC organizations.



## FACTS ARE STUBBORN THINGS

## HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, in response to criticisms by the distinguished majority leader of the other body and some of his colleagues, the Interstate Commerce Commission on March 17 provided the Congress with a series of responses in pamphlet form to the criticisms made of that Commission. I have read with considerable interest the Traffic World editorial of March 29 entitled "Facts Are Stubborn Things, ICC Says." This well-reasoned editorial response to ICC's defense is worth reading and I include it in the RECORD of today:

## FACTS ARE STUBBORN THINGS, ICC SAYS

Having read the Interstate Commerce Commission's eight "summary statements on major problem areas" and its letters (identically worded) transmitting those statements to the chairmen of the Senate and House committees in Congress that have ICC-regulated transportation matters in their jurisdiction, we run into the question, "What will the critics of the Commission say about those statements?"

One answer that seems probable to us is that the critics—at least those among them who are axe-grinders or are prejudiced against the ICC—will say that in each of the "summary" booklets the Commission has stated its own side of the case but has not told "the whole story." For instance, one or another of those critics might say, the Commission says nothing about its having muffed the ball in Docket Umpty-ump, where it paid little attention to the weight of the preponderant evidence and came up with an arbitrary decision, one that subjected the losers in the case to undue hardships that it took years of litigation to correct.

Well, it can't be denied that mistakes have been made occasionally by this and every other regulatory commission in the federal government. But we have never heard of any proof or serious claim that a mistake in an ICC decision was not an honest one.

The Commission has now given the members of Congress a long-needed and well-presented assortment of statements defending its actions or policies with respect to eight principal subjects or areas of regulation, as to which attackers of the ICC have done most of their viewing-with-alarm. Recorded in these eight pamphlets are the problems faced, the actions taken and the administrative difficulties (including legal limitations of its authority) encountered by the Commission in the exercise of its regulatory functions with respect to: (1) Passenger service and discontinuance; (2) small shipments; (3) household goods transportation; (4) freight car shortages; (5) mergers; (6) diversification and conglomerates; (7) rate increases, and (8) budgetary support.

Smallest of the pamphlets (the page size of each is 5 inches by 9 inches) is the one titled "Budgetary Support"; it could well have been titled "Inadequacy of Budgetary Support." It shows that if the size of the Commission's average employment figure bore the same percentage relationship today to the total annual revenues of the ICC-regulated carriers that it bore in 1939, the Commission would now have more than 14,100 employees, instead of only 1,662. (The ICC-regulated carriers' revenue total in 1939 was \$5,650,300,000 and the ICC employment average in that year was 2,567. The fiscal year 1971 revenue total of the ICC-regulated carriers is estimated to be \$31,800,000,000 and

the ICC employment average, excluding about 430 employed in functions transferred to the Department of Transportation, is 1,733.)

Appropriately, the Commission addresses to the Congress this question: "Is it realistic to expect the Commission to perform at the level of standards at which the public, the Congress, the Administration and this Commission would like to see today's surface transportation problem regulated, with a staff considerably smaller than we had in the 1930s?"

Largest of the "summary" pamphlets (28 pages) is the one titled "Passenger Service and Discontinuances." In this presentation of its views the Commission voices doubts that the taxpayers will approve large expenditures for preservation of the conventional passenger train for intercity service, in view of a showing that, although commuter operations are well patronized and generally recognized as being necessary to the public well-being, only one-half of one per cent of the intercity travel is by rail. The Commission sees a prospect, however, that "in dense population corridors . . . superspeed passenger trains could be feasible and profitable."

Such a system, primed with public funds, the ICC says, "might well be combined with an austere, conventional, but comfortable service reaching into other sections of the country, to meet the reasonable needs of the foreseeable future. A promise of more than that would be at odds with reality. 'Facts are stubborn things.'"

Those last four words were written something like 250 years ago by a character yeapt Alain Rene Le Sage, according to our volume of Bartlett's "Familiar Quotations."

A point emphasized repeatedly, as it should be, in the Commission's summary statements is that Congress has failed, year after year, to do anything very significant toward remedying the deficiencies of law and financial resources that are largely responsible for the Commission's troubles and for its exposure to attacks by people unfamiliar with its problems.

With regard to freight car shortages, however, the Commission makes these comments that we don't believe have been uttered by this agency before and that probably should have been made long ago:

"... The hard truth is that a grave question exists whether this Commission or any government body ever could or ever will be able to fully solve the freight car shortage by informal persuasion, power or force."

"More laws and/or more 'jawboning' will only be as fingers in the dike. Concrete remedies are the only things now that, in our opinion, will really give material relief to the current situation and for the increasing need in the years immediately ahead."

The Commission chides the shippers for ineffective utilization of the freight cars and chides the railroads also for the same reason. On the latter score, it notes that "today, a typical freight car moves about one-tenth of the time" and "nearly half of its potentially productive time is spent lying idle in an empty condition."

We endorse the Commission's statement in its letter of transmittal of its summary statements that most critics of the ICC have been prone to criticize situations without giving much consideration to basic causes or important contributing factors. It pleases us to see this agency making an energetic and well-planned effort to defend itself. There may be disagreement among its friends as to the Commission's suggestion that all its legislative recommendations to Congress should be given priority consideration, but we, for our part, certainly concur in its assertion that the regulatory agency "must have resources, personnel and facilities commensurate with the magnitude and importance of the Congressional mandates imposed upon it."

## MR. PRESIDENT, THE JURY IS IN

## HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD a sermon by the Rev. George F. Regas, rector of the Pasadena, Calif., All Saints Episcopal Church, concerning our involvement in Vietnam.

I find this sermon to be moving and very timely, and I am sure that Members of Congress will benefit by its message. It follows:

## MR. PRESIDENT, THE JURY IS IN

In a nationwide televised press conference March 4, President Nixon addressed himself to the extension of the Indochina war into Laos and Cambodia by South Vietnamese troops and American air power and called on the American people to stand behind him "while the jury is still out." He asked the people "not to harken to the drumbeat of television commentary which takes a pessimistic view of the war."

I respectfully say that the President is wrong. The jury is not still out. They rendered their verdict long ago and a majority of the country is pessimistic and conscience-sick about the Indochina war.

The jury has spoken in almost every corner of the globe and called the Vietnam war a colossal misadventure. Gunnar Myrdal, in his monumental study of Southeast Asia, "Asian Drama," points out that we got into Vietnam originally because we sensed that communism would fill the power vacuum left by French withdrawal, and that we believed we could show the Vietnamese a better way than communism. We claimed to be the defenders of freedom, honoring our commitment to support a free nation against aggression from within and without. That is a generous interpretation of our initial involvement.

But now, as we look at what our presence has in fact accomplished over this last decade, as we consider—

The bombed-out and devastated villages. The millions of refugees (nearly one-third of the population of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia),

The staggering number of civilian casualties,

The use of vicious and indiscriminating antipersonnel weapons,

The devastation of crops and fields, The political corruption and America's part in sustaining a regime the people would never support,

The forfeiture of political freedom for dissenting views in South Vietnam, looking at the monstrous results, many of us find it impossible to justify this kind of suffering and destruction in the name of democratic principles. Are the Vietnamese really better off dead than Red? And who made Americans the gods that should decide their fate?

Oh, the physical destruction and suffering of Vietnam! But there is also the death of the spirit and the erosion of conscience in this land of ours. Something has happened to America because of Vietnam, and our basic decency as a people can no longer be taken for granted.

Mr. President, the jury is in. The cost is too great; the suffering among the peoples of three of the poorest nations in the world and the continued loss of American lives can't possibly be justified.

Many experts from every part of the political spectrum admit we should not be in that war. Right, left, centrist; many agree. It isn't a partisan jury, sir.

Yet the war goes on. Death continues to reign and we are given assurance that an

expansion of the war is really a deescalation and a way to hasten the withdrawal of our troops. Seeing what we've done to Vietnam looking straight at that ravaged land, we say bombing of Cambodia and Laos is necessary to protect freedom and safeguard Southeast Asia from communism.

The jury is in! We won't listen to the same phony rhetoric America has heard for a decade from its leaders at every stage of this country's long, misguided plunge into the Southeast Asia morass. The contradiction between what is being said and what is being done has reached the point of sustained insult to the intelligence of the American people.

Surely the jury is in! Vietnam is a colossal mistake and a tragic commentary on America's belief in sacredness of every person in the sight of God and his right to self-determination.

Mr. President, if we are silent, it is not because we are waiting for the jury's return. It is only because the scandal of Vietnam no longer scandalizes us. We've heard the bodycount so frequently, watched the television's reports of the suffering so long, and allowed the political rhetoric to mesmerize us that now we are numbed, anesthetized and silent.

And that is not a mark of patriotism but of spiritual death—moral decay. How devastatingly cogent are those words of Jesus: "What does it profit a man if he gains the whole world and loses his own soul?"

I saw a poster recently that seared my conscience:

"Dear Mom and Dad: Your silence is killing me. (In Vietnam, at home, on campus.)"

In profound love for my country and with respect for my President—I say we must protest the war!

In the name of all that is holy, all that is honorable, all that is decent, all that is noble, we must say, "Stop the war now!" No longer will we concur with a continuation of such massive violence. We must find ways to speak, for the Christian church could make a stunning contribution to the world if it could say the right words.

Pastor Martin Niemöller's confession carries warning for us all:

"In Germany, the Nazis came for the Communists, and I didn't speak up because I was not a Communist. Then they came for the Jews and I did not speak up because I was not a Jew. Then they came for the trade unionists and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a trade unionist. Then they came for the Catholics and I was a Protestant so I didn't speak up. Then they came for me . . . By that time there was no one to speak up for anyone."

This parish must speak up and protest the war—our very soul depends on it. We are not at liberty to stick with safe and manageable subjects while the world convulses with violence and slaughter. And if the unity of this parish depends upon silence in the face of an extension of the war then it is a church whose unity is spurious to begin with. Our oneness lies in a faithful obedience to the Jesus of love and mercy, not in a tacit agreement to keep everyone on board while waiting for a conflict-free consensus before raising our voice.

I ask you now to center your mind and heart on four aspects of my protest:

1—The war has ravaged Vietnam mercilessly and eroded the conscience of America.

It isn't necessary to visit Indochina to appreciate the horror of the war. The bare statistics will suffice. The tonnage of bombardment is now approaching three times the total bombs used by the American military in all theaters in World War II.

53,544 American soldiers dead.  
120,563 Saigon government soldiers dead.  
1697,342 N.L.F. and North Vietnam soldiers dead.

South Vietnamese casualties estimated at

over 1 million; North Vietnamese as probably more.

In Cambodia, after only a few months of war, there are an estimated 1 million refugees out of a population of 6 million.

I won't go on into the endless horrors and atrocities caused by both sides. If only each of you would read just one book on the Vietnam war—any book—and realize all of this suffering comes from a war which the majority of Americans feel is a tragic error for our country.

And I grieve for all of us who have been brutalized and numbed by this war. I have found reading the news reports of Lt. Calley's trial for his part in the My Lai massacre a staggering experience.

"I was ordered to go in there and destroy the enemy. That was my job that day . . . I did not sit down and think in terms of men, women and children. They were all classified the same, and that was the classification that we dealt with—just as enemy soldiers."

"I felt then, and I still do, that I acted as I was directed and I carried out the orders . . ."

"Our job was to destroy everyone and everything in the villages . . ."

"I never sat down to analyze it; men, women and children. They were enemy and just people . . ."

I grieve for Lt. Calley because of what this war has done to his humanity. How could he say he never thought about it; just followed orders? I grieve for what war has done to us all. In Calley's painful story, it is war that stands revealed as the true monster. What that war is doing to many William Calleys growing up in America is immeasurable.

In Houston, on Oct. 27, 1967, Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker said that ". . . peace demonstrators are a bunch of bums. The U.S. should bomb the ports, dams and population of North Vietnam. That's what airplanes are for. You're not fighting human beings over there—you're fighting two-legged animals. The people are just slaves. That's all war is for is to kill and win, to destroy, to defeat the population of your enemy."

Surely, the words of Jesus shout to America: What does it profit a nation if it gains the whole world for democracy and loses its own soul? God have mercy on us for what the war is doing to the soul of a nation; for in many ways it is inflicting its dehumanizing shrapnel into all of our hearts.

The blind distortion of national priorities has produced deep estrangement and polarization in American society. How can we accept passively a society that now spends nearly 70% of its tax dollars on wars and their aftermath and the preparation for future wars? A committee report to Congress estimated the cost of the Vietnam war, if it ended in 1970, would be \$350 billion. And the poor, hungry and oppressed around the globe cry out for a chance to live.

One should understand why some of our citizens are so morally outraged at such a gross distortion of priorities. The case of the Berrigan brothers is an example. I know both Berrigan brothers personally and yet I am uncertain of their guilt in Hoover's conspiracy charges. We must await the trial.

However, their actions of pouring homemade napalm on draft records at Catonsville, though grotesque to some and unacceptable to others, did one thing. Robert McAfee Brown of Stanford University says it dramatized, in unforgettable fashion, the grotesque moral priorities that have been erected in America and what has happened to the collective conscience of our nation: We are outraged when paper is burned at draft boards, and we are not outraged when children are burned in the villages of Vietnam.

That statement is oversimplified, but it can't be dismissed without it tearing at your conscience.

Yet in spite of all this, Mr. Nixon says he will place no restraints on further bombing,

except to rule out the use of nuclear weapons; that we will not be defeated in Indochina; and that he wouldn't speculate on whether South Vietnamese would invade North Vietnam on their own!

The verdict is in! Will you remain silent? 2—If the church attempts to follow Jesus, it will raise its voice in moral outrage.

I am fully aware that I could be wrong in urging this parish to protest the war. I speak to you humbly acknowledging how often I have failed in my own discipleship.

There are no easy solutions and there are no neat black and white distinctions on the morality of war. If we make the mistake of thinking there is all black on one side of the issue and all white on the other, we will be wrong nine out of 10 times. I intend to reach out and put my arms around all who strongly disagree with this sermon, for we can live together in Christian love.

Yet we cannot allow this to immobilize us. The integrity of the church's message depends on raising our voice against a war no one wants being allowed to destroy our soul.

The Christian faith says the jury is in. We don't need to see how the devastation of Laos and Cambodia is going to affect the war; we believe that life is sacred everywhere. Everyone bears in his body the image of his membership in the human family and the image of the living God. How many Vietnamese is one American worth? One, five, forty, a thousand?

The Vietnam war is a sin against the human family; its dehumanization has left its scar on us all that will remain for years. The brutality of Indochina is reflected by the callousness in the streets of America. When life is cheap anywhere, it is cheap everywhere.

If this parish remains silent in the face of all that continues to brutalize us, what is there, then, to validate our Christian way of life?

When the great author, Albert Camus, was asked to address a Roman Catholic order, he told them bluntly that they were not practicing what they preached. Listen to him!

"What the world expects of Christians is that Christians should speak out, loud and clear, and that they should voice their condemnation in such a way that never a doubt, never the slightest doubt, could rise in the heart of the simplest man . . . that they should get away from abstraction and confront the blood-stained face history has taken on today."

3—What can America do if it is not to lose its soul?

First, America must repent. I think Sen. Fulbright was wrong when he said the great society of America has become a sick society. Eric Fromm says that this is another way of excusing ourselves since sickness is something that happens to one involuntarily and for which one cannot be held accountable. Fromm asserts that American society is not sick but immoral. Our sickness is really sin. I believe he is right.

What is called for isn't guilt but repentance. So long as we try to justify the horrors perpetrated in Indochina, so long as we continue to talk about saving face and keeping our honor, so long as we figure the cost of the war is a little too much and perhaps it was a mistake to get in so deep—the soul of the nation will continue to be eroded and within the grip of death.

There is one way left that leads to new life—repentance. The word of God judges this nation; and it can bring healing, too. What a rebirth could come to the greatest, most powerful nation in the history of the world if she said: "I was wrong! God have mercy!" The death of pride would be the rebirth of integrity.

Second, we should protect the lives of our soldiers but we must come home immediately. Let the President set a clear timetable of withdrawal. We will leave Southeast Asia



and if the Thieu-Ky regime can't stand on its own, then let it fall. Integrity won't allow us to keep the Thieu-Ky government in power through American guns and dollars.

We know that government is corrupt and ruthlessly suppresses political dissent. When the political oppression of South Vietnam was mentioned recently, the response of one of our ambassadors was, "We do not condone it."

Billions of American dollars put that government in power and sustain it. If we came home the Vietnamese themselves might find a way to bring peace to that tragic land.

Third, we must pay the price for peace. Everyone wants peace—but so seldom have we been willing to use the great reservoirs of this nation for healing. "And nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." To have that vision and pay the cost of its fulfillment—what a great moment that would be in the history of civilization.

4—The church should mobilize its resources to end the war.

In a recent "Peanuts" cartoon, the setting is a baseball game. Charley Brown is about to pitch when his teammate, Lucy, suggests that he aim to hit the batter. Charlie reacts violently: "It wouldn't be right . . ."

There follows a long discussion with all Charlie's teammates joining in. Everything under the sun comes into the debate: "What about the children's crusade? Was that moral? What about those awful movie ads you see nowadays? Define morality . . ." Finally, in despair, Charlie Brown says, "We never win any ball games, but we sure have some interesting discussions!"

We've talked enough. I call upon this great parish of All Saints to take a step larger than we ever thought we would. I ask for a massive mobilization of the parish by establishing a "Peace Operation Center."

The protests of young radicals have made their mark but fallen short of any major reformation of the war system. My hope is to radicalize the Establishment—myself included—and take middle America and give its goodwill and desire to build a world of peace clearer focus and more effective power.

America is searching its conscience; the church is struggling for its soul, the integrity of its message and the courage of its convictions. We must not back away from this challenge.

This parish is small against the magnitude of the problem; yet I believe profoundly in the power of just a few who have caught the vision of a peaceful world.

I am confident that there are thousands of in Pasadena and Los Angeles today willing to contribute their lives to the healing of the world. One of the high marks of the '60s was the response given to the Peace Corps.

The late President Kennedy proposed a corps organized to bring light and knowledge to the underdeveloped nations of the world. Hardly had the announcement of the Peace Corps come from the lips of President Kennedy than there were four times the number of volunteers as could be sent.

Find all the faults you wish with the Peace Corps; but it still means this: Americans have a hunger to do something with hope and heart and love in it, something more than animal. We shall seek to provide the channel.

#### BURKHARDT EARNS MEDALS IN VIETNAM

#### HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, a fine young man from Maryland, Sp4c.

William R. Burkhardt, was recently decorated for his Vietnam service. I would like to congratulate him and to share his outstanding record with my colleagues by including the following article in the RECORD:

#### BURKHARDT EARNS MEDALS IN VIETNAM

Spec 4 William R. Burkhardt of Edgewood has recently been awarded the Bronze Star Medal and the Army Commendation Medal.

He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. John C. Burkhardt.

The Army Commendation Medal was presented for service from Sept. 12, 1970 to Jan. 6, 1971 for his "achievements, professionalism and devotion to duty" while serving as chief clerk for the Office of the Surgeon in Vietnam.

The Bronze Star Medal was presented for "outstandingly meritorious service in connection with military operations against a hostile force in the Republic of Vietnam" from June, 1970 to Feb., 1971.

#### ANNUITY SYSTEM CHANGE

#### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Service Commission has proposed legislation to remove an inequity with respect to cost-of-living adjustments in civil service retirement annuities.

Accompanying the request from Chairman Hampton of the Commission was a draft of proposed legislation. I am introducing this legislation today, with the ranking minority member of our committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CORBETT), as well as the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. WALDIE), and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), of the Retirement Subcommittee as cosponsors.

The legislation proposes to alleviate the administrative bottleneck on civil service retirements which occurs each time the cost-of-living procedure is invoked.

Whereas normally there are some 5,000 civil servants who apply for retirement each month, I am told that when a cost-of-living factor occurs the number of retirements may increase to as many as 25,000 at one time as employees seek to benefit from the cost-of-living annuity increase.

A related example is the situation that faces the Board of Education for the District of Columbia on May 31, when a large number of teachers are taking their retirement under a procedure similar to that in the Federal Retirement Act.

The retiring teachers will be going off the regular payroll 2 weeks before the end of the school year, requiring the school system to make arrangements for rehiring these same teachers as substitutes in order for them to complete the school year with their classes.

The Civil Service Commission's proposal provides that a person who retires after the effective date of the cost-of-living increase in annuities shall receive no less an annuity than if he had retired prior to the cost-of-living change.

For the information of the Members, I am including with my remarks the text of the letter to the Speaker from Chairman Hampton requesting the legislation:

MARCH 25, 1971.

HON. CARL ALBERT,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Commission submits for the consideration of the Congress, and recommends favorable action on, the attached legislative proposal which provides that the immediate (not deferred) Civil Service Retirement annuity of an employee or Member of Congress retiring after the effective date of a cost-of-living annuity increase shall not be less than his annuity would have been if he had retired and had been eligible for annuity on the effective date. Similarly, the proposal provides that the annuity of an employee's or Member's widow(er) commencing after the effective date of a cost-of-living annuity increase shall not be less than it would have been if it had commenced on the effective date.

Whether an employee's annuity will be greater computed on the basis of (1) service and salary up to the effective date of the most recent cost-of-living increase, plus that percentage increase or (2) all service and salary up to the date of actual separation, without a cost-of-living increase, depends on factors which vary with the individual. Assuming a normal pattern of past and future salary increases, and a 5 percent cost-of-living increase, an employee would need 3-10 additional months' service, depending on his total years of service, for his annuity without the cost-of-living increase to equal the amount he could get if he had retired on the effective date of the cost-of-living increase. Under the proposal, an employee would in all cases receive the larger annuity.

The present cost-of-living adjustment provision, found in 5 U.S.C. 8340, provides that an employee must retire and his annuity must commence on or before the effective date of a cost-of-living annuity increase in order to have it applied in the computation of his annuity. The reasons for the proposed change are:

(1) The present provision produces the anomaly of an employee who retires soon after the effective date of an increase receiving less annuity than an employee, with the same service beginning date and high three-year average salary, who retires on or before the effective date, even though the employee who retires after the effective date has more service. A similar anomaly exists in computing a survivor's annuity because the survivor of an employee who dies on or before the effective date of a cost-of-living increase receives the increase, but the survivor of an employee who dies after the effective date does not receive it.

(2) We are concerned about the way the large number of retirements triggered by cost-of-living adjustments affects the administration of the Civil Service Retirement System. The present cost-of-living adjustment provision "bunches" retirements immediately before the effective date of every cost-of-living annuity increase by accelerating the retirements of employees who had been planning to leave within six months or so after that date. The last such increase, effective August 1, 1970, for example, produced about 19,000 retirements in addition to the 5,000 or less that occur in a normal month. Despite the Commission's plans to cope with such a peak load, work is disrupted and annuity payments are seriously delayed when so many retirements that would otherwise have been evenly spaced over a period of several months occur at the same time.

(3) Agencies throughout the Government are also adversely affected because an inordinate number of employees decide to retire immediately before the cost-of-living an-

nulty increase. Many of these people, if they are willing, must be reemployed as annuitants to complete the projects on which they were working.

Enactment of the draft bill would (1) eliminate the anomaly between annuities that commence on or just before the effective date of a cost-of-living increase and those that commence shortly after that date; (2) moderate the peaking of retirements immediately before cost-of-living increases become effective, with an estimated savings of \$250,000 in administrative expenses now charged against the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund for processing the peak workload that accompanies each cost-of-living adjustment; and, (3) reduce the disruption in the work of agencies throughout the Government caused by many employees suddenly retiring at the same time, with many leaving work projects incomplete.

To the extent that employees delayed retirement by a few months, they would (1) pay contributions to the Fund for a longer period, and (2) not receive any annuity for those months—a combination necessarily resulting in more money in the Fund. On the other hand, to the extent that employees who would have retired after the effective date of the cost-of-living increase anyway receive a higher annuity than they would have received if they had retired on the effective date, more money would be paid out of the Fund.

The additional annuity benefits which would be provided by the draft bill for each cost-of-living annuity increase authorized on or after its enactment would increase the unfunded liability of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund. Assuming, for example, that the draft bill is enacted and that then a 5 percent cost-of-living annuity increase is effective June 1, 1971, the unfunded liability of the Fund would be increased by \$9.2 million. The annual interest on this \$9.2 million would be \$300,000.

Under 5 U.S.C. 8348(g), the Secretary of the Treasury, before closing the accounts each fiscal year, would have to credit to the Fund, as a Government contribution, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the following percentages of all interest on the unfunded liability existing at the start of each fiscal year: 10 percent for 1971; 20 percent for 1972; 30 percent for 1973; 40 percent for 1974; 50 percent for 1975; 60 percent for 1976; 70 percent for 1977; 80 percent for 1978; 90 percent for 1979; and 100 percent for 1980 and for each fiscal year thereafter. No payment would be required for fiscal year 1971, since the liability would be incurred after the start of that year. The Secretary of the Treasury would, at the end of fiscal year 1972, have to pay into the Fund 20 percent of the \$300,000 annual interest resulting from the assumed June 1, 1971 cost-of-living increase, plus, at the end of each subsequent fiscal year through 1980, the above-mentioned graduated percentages of the annual interest, so that the full \$300,000 annual interest amount would be paid at the end of fiscal year 1980 and each fiscal year thereafter.

Each additional cost-of-living annuity increase authorized subsequent to fiscal year 1971 would have a cumulative effect on the retirement Fund's unfunded liability and the annual interest thereon. If, for example, there is one cost-of-living annuity increase of 5 percent in each fiscal year 1971 through 1980, the unfunded liability would be increased by a little over \$92 million, and the annual cumulative interest payment due the Fund from the Secretary of the Treasury at the end of fiscal year 1981 would be a little over \$3 million.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection from the standpoint of the Administration's program to the submission of this draft bill to Congress.

A similar letter is being sent to the President of the Senate.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT HAMPTON,

Chairman.

## MOUNT CARMEL MEDICAL CENTER AT PITTSBURG, KANS.

### HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, on last Sunday, March 29, more than 5,000 Kansas people gathered in the relatively small city of Pittsburg, Kans., to witness and participate in the dedication of a new hospital and health facility, the Mount Carmel Medical Center.

It was a proud moment for me, and even more momentous for the dedicated Sisters of the St. Joseph Order whose unselfish devotion and perseverance helped make this sorely needed facility a reality.

It was a good deal more than a half-century ago when a few of the good sisters came to Pittsburg, a small coal mining town, which was desperately in need of nursing and other medical attention. The miners and their families were ministered to without regard to their race or religious affiliation, and very often without regard to the ability to pay. The old institution, built brick by brick through small contributions was a haven for the injured and the afflicted and I well remember as a small boy the affection and respect in which it and its nursing sisters were held by every resident of Pittsburg.

Last week, the new building was formally dedicated, replacing the old structure which had long outworn its usefulness. That new building and all that it represents is the fulfillment of the dreams, the hopes, and the hard work of Sister de Paul, the administrator of the old facility and now the administrator of the new center. Working closely with her superior, Mother Joachim, Mother General of the Sisters of St. Joseph at Wichita, these two ladies made the new Mount Carmel a reality, a working institution that will serve the people of Pittsburg and the surrounding area.

Present for the dedicatory ceremonies were the Governor of Kansas and a number of other dignitaries, including the Bishop of Wichita, the Most Reverend David M. Maloney, D.D. who made the dedicatory address. I insert the program for the dedication, listing the participants, and the text of the dedicatory address by Bishop Maloney be printed as part of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

#### DEDICATION OF MT. CARMEL MEDICAL CENTER

Invocation: Reverend Leo Meteko, Chaplain; Mt. Carmel Medical Center.

National Anthem: Lakeside Junior High School Band; Paul Cox, Director.

Daniel Scott Muller Memorial: Raising of the Flag, Pershing Rifle Color Guard; Reading of Inscription, Lieutenant Colonel James E. Weber.

Blessing of the Building: Most Reverend

Bishop David M. Maloney, D.D., Bishop of Wichita.

Master of Ceremonies: Edward T. McNally; President, McNally Pittsburg Mfg. Corp.

Official Greetings: The Honorable Frank DeGasper; Mayor, City of Pittsburg.

Acknowledgments: The Honorable Joe Skubitz, U.S. Congressman; The Honorable Robert Docking, Governor, State of Kansas; Frank Gentry, Executive Director, Kansas Hospital Association; Mother Joachim, Mother General, Sisters of St. Joseph, Wichita, Kansas; George E. Nettels, Jr., Chairman, Board of Trustees, Mt. Carmel Medical Center; D. H. Wood, M.D., Chief of Staff, Mt. Carmel Medical Center; Robert W. Royer, Principal Member, Hewitt & Royer, Architects, Kansas City, Missouri; Archie W. Smith, Vice President, Universal Construction Co., Kansas City, Missouri; Mrs. D. D. Latty, President, Mt. Carmel Guild; Sister de Paul, Administrator; Mt. Carmel Medical Center; Richard Swanson.

Guest Speaker: Most Reverend Bishop David M. Maloney, D.D.

Benediction: The Reverend Donald Lehmann, President, Ministerial Alliance.

Cutting of Ribbon: Governor Robert Docking.

#### ADDRESS BY BISHOP DAVID M. MALONEY, D.D.

My dear Fathers, Sisters, Doctors, Nurses, and our honored guests and friends, Governor Docking, Congressman Skubitz:

It would seem fitting on this occasion of the Dedication of this new Mt. Carmel Medical Center to offer our congratulations to all who have had part in making it a reality. I believe that all here will agree with me that our congratulations should go first to the Sisters. It is their dedicated work which has made the continuance of medical care in Mt. Carmel Hospital a community reality, as it is a community service, in this Pittsburg area for the many years past. In expressing our congratulations to them, I also express our thanks for the service they and their Sisters in Religion have given to the people of this region and to the Church in Pittsburg. We extend our congratulations also to the doctors and nurses and medical personnel, as well as to all of the men and women who serve this Mt. Carmel Medical Center and the hospital for the realization of hopes that have been cherished for several years now. The accomplishment of plans to erect this Center will make it possible for all of you to serve the Pittsburg area in your profession and vocation with greater effectiveness. We congratulate you. I think, too, that we should offer congratulations to all of the people of the area, particularly to the devoted men and women who have given their time, their encouragement, and their contributions to the realization of this Center. To all of you together, as a community, I offer my congratulations and the assurance of my prayers that God will bless what you have achieved, and that the curing guidance of His Holy Spirit will remain with all who work in this medical center in the years ahead.

It seems fitting as we dedicate Mt. Carmel Medical Center that we direct our thoughts for a moment to a few ideas (obviously we cannot cover all ideas that would be relevant), to a few ideas concerning the care of the sick in such a Catholic Center.

I think the first of such ideas would be to consider for a few moments the Christian attitude toward the fact of suffering. It is the glory and nobility of the medical profession in all of its aspects that it serves the suffering. And, we must recognize in all frankness that suffering has always been, and it now remains, a mystery to the human mind. There will be many times when those of you who serve the sick stand baffled before this mystery, and your powerlessness in encountering it. Thank God for the advances that have been made in medicine, in the care of the sick. They have done much



to alleviate distress. But we do remain, always, with the fact of suffering. And we remain also with the fact that it is a mystery.

We should not think, however, that it is a mystery without purpose. Part of the heritage Christianity received from the Old Testament is the wonderful Book of Job. It is the purpose of that Book to lead men to meditate upon the mystery of suffering as seen in the perspective of an infinitely powerful, and an infinitely good Creator. The inspiration to be found in that Book remains a source of spiritual treasure for all who approach it prayerfully.

It is in the life and person of Jesus Christ, however, that we find the most effective teaching about suffering. Mind you, even seen in the light of Christ, suffering remains a mystery. But it is by no means a mystery without purpose, if we reflect that it was precisely through suffering that Christ was to enter into His glory. He, Himself, took pains to explain that to the two disciples who met Him on the road and walked with Him to the town of Emmaus. We can read about it in the 25th Chapter of St. Luke's Gospel. St. Paul, the Apostle, throws further light upon the Christian attitude toward suffering. He recalls to us the fact that Christ suffered and thus achieved our salvation. And he promises us a share in the glory and rewards of Christ. But he tells us, too, quite plainly, that if we are to share in those rewards, we must be ready to share in Christ's suffering. (cf. Rom. 8:17) Seen in its relation to Christ, as a Christian must see it, we can understand then that suffering, while it is a mystery, is not without purpose. And we find that purpose in the example of Christ our Master rather than in any detailed explanation. It is part of those things we take on faith because our hope is in Christ.

It seems pertinent, to remark today on the dignity of the medical profession, and also upon the dignity of the men and women you serve in that profession. Those of you who are engaged in the care of the sick as religious Sisters know that in your service of those who suffer, you serve Christ best. To all of you, I would urge that you cherish the realization of the value of profession, the vocation in life you have chosen to follow. It has a glorious and a noble history. Men and women like you through the centuries have brought solace and comfort to their fellow men in the times when it is most needed. You in your lives continue to do that very thing. Therefore, I say to you, cherish a certain holy pride, a justified pride in your profession, in what you do in life. There must inevitably be for you times of discouragement, as there are for all men. Your work must encounter difficulties and failures, as does the work of all men. Your high hopes, the things that you would like to do and to achieve, will in part at least elude you. But remember this happens to all men. In no way does it diminish the value of your contribution to your fellow men. And that realization, coupled with the results of your work that you will see so often in the lives of your fellow men, should make your life rich and rewarding.

If I may suggest one thought, it would be this. Never forget that you work with the help of God. Your efforts to serve life and to eliminate pain are based upon the pervading providential work of Almighty God. The healing that you effect is, as you would be the first to say, very much dependent upon the operation of those laws which God the Creator has put into the world and specifically into that wonderful thing which we call the human body. I would prefer to say the human person. I think, again, that most of you will agree with me that it is a mistake, particularly in medicine, to see man as anything but a united person, having in himself matter and spirit—matter and spirit so closely interacting in man's life that they cannot be separated. It is the whole man

that you serve. And you serve him best by recognizing his spiritual reality.

That leads me to the third consideration I would offer today. It is this. Always remember the human dignity of the men and women you serve. You will see such persons often at their very weakest, at those times in life when they are at their worst, by human standards. You will see them in the times when their dignity is least apparent. It is then that you must remember they are human persons, endowed by their Creator with that dignity which our age is coming more and more to value. Recognize in them, in whatever condition you find them, their basic human personality. Remember they are your equals before God your Creator. Remember that in serving them with such respect, you contribute to the service of mankind in the best traditions of the medical profession. This is true whether you are a doctor, nurse or assisting personnel.

We must all of us remember that such human dignity, the inviolability of the human person, comes from God. It exists prior to and independent of any civil government. It cannot be affected by, nor taken away by, any form of human government. When civil powers try to do that, to alienate the dignity of the individual, we call it, and we are right in calling it, tyranny.

It is no news to you, of course, when I recall that much of the ethics of the medical profession are drawn from and based upon that fundamental fact. The human person is inviolable. Serve him with a constant realization of that truth.

It is then with deep respect for the work that you do, and with great gratitude to the Sisters of St. Joseph, that I assure you of my pleasure in being with you today and that I offer you my congratulations and the promise of my prayers.

May God bless you.

#### A DOLLARS-AND-CENTS OBJECTION TO THE GENERAL REVENUE SHARING PROGRAM

**HON. CHARLES W. SANDMAN**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, my objections to the general revenue sharing program of the administration are not based on philosophical or frivolous reasons. Rather, my opposition is based strictly on dollars and cents.

Some simple arithmetic proves this proposal is a bad deal for my district and for my State of New Jersey.

I calculate it will cost the taxpayers of my district almost \$10 million in income taxes to pay for the \$6 million my four counties and 44 municipalities are supposed to get back, according to Treasury projections.

The difference of \$3,744,217.58 between what taxpayers will have to pay for what their local governments get back gets lost somewhere in the Federal aid pipeline.

You do not have to be too bright to figure out this is a bad deal, any way you look at it.

My figures are based on the fact that New Jersey taxpayers currently pay \$1.62 for every dollar the State gets back from Uncle Sam in various grants-in-aid programs.

Twenty-one other States, all in the northern area of the Nation, will be similarly "shortchanged" under the administration's \$5 billion general revenue plan.

Another fact, on which my figuring was based, is that though it seems fashionable to say this program will be financed with new money somehow disconnected from taxation, the truth is this \$5 billion program will sooner or later have to be paid for by the taxpayers.

To merely say there will be no increase in taxation to pay for Federal programs such as this because we're asked to "pay for" it by increasing the national debt is ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, a large portion of my four-county district in southern New Jersey is designated as economically depressed by the Government. Unemployment runs as high as 17 percent in one area of seasonal employment.

Yet these sections are the ones hit hardest by this unfair money-changing scheme.

To make matters even worse under this general sharing plan, taxpayers in my district would have to pay an additional \$10,185,209 in income taxes as their share of what the State government would receive in shared general revenues.

For this, presuming the State actually passes through the money it receives to the people in the form of benefits and services, the people of my district would benefit in an estimated dollar amount of only \$6,291,219. Again, the difference of \$3 million gets lost somewhere along the line.

When I revealed last month that to get the \$154 million in Federal revenues to be shared with the State, counties, and municipalities it would cost the taxpayers of New Jersey some \$250 million, some eyebrows were raised in my State.

Even some of the State, county, and municipal officials who had been drooling over the prospects of this financial windfall are now beginning to realize that the taxpayers who elect them and me will be the ones to suffer under this scheme.

And though it is politically more desirable for Uncle Sam to do the dirty work of collecting increased taxes, many of these officials in New Jersey now know that, armed with the facts, the voters will not be fooled by this deception.

To further bring the point home, once I discovered the \$100 million discrepancy on the State level and the \$3.7 million in lost funds on my district level, I calculated what taxpayers in each of the 44 municipalities and four counties in my district will have to pay for what they get back. This information has been provided to county officials, mayors, and the New Jersey media.

Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, I will insert in the RECORD a detailed breakdown of the allocation of the Federal tax burden by State. As prepared by the respected Tax Foundation, Inc., this data gives not only a percentage figure on the relative tax burdens of the 50 States and the District of Columbia, but it also shows the tax burden for each dollar of Federal aid received by each State.

In all honesty and fairness, each of my

distinguished colleagues should, I feel, reveal to your constituents what the tax bill would be if general revenue sharing is enacted.

It is true that only a half-dozen States will be seriously shortchanged by these calculations, but these are the States where the greatest need for increased State and municipal revenues exists.

I recognize the necessity, under our

Federal system, for the more populated, industrialized States such as New Jersey to pay into the Federal Treasury more than we get back thereby, in effect, subsidizing the other 30 States.

But this "Federal aid pipeline" should be limited to specific Federal programs of national importance such as defense, research, welfare and the like.

When it comes to direct aid to State

and local governments, Mr. Speaker, I draw the line and say the distribution formula should correlate more closely with what the States and localities pay into the Treasury.

For the RECORD, I insert the breakdown of the burden to taxpayers in the four counties and 44 municipalities in my district for what they would receive under the general revenue sharing plan.

#### A COMPARISON OF THE COST TO TAXPAYERS IN MUNICIPALITIES OF THE 2D DISTRICT (NEW JERSEY) OF GENERAL REVENUE SHARING

[Prepared by U.S. Representative Charles W. Sandman, Jr. (R-N.J.), Apr. 1, 1971]

	Shared revenue <sup>1</sup>	Burden to taxpayers <sup>2</sup>		Shared revenue <sup>1</sup>	Burden to taxpayers <sup>2</sup>
<b>I. Atlantic County municipalities:</b>					
Absecon City	\$58,207	\$94,295.34	Woodbine Borough	\$5,036	\$8,158.32
Atlantic City	1,406,361	2,278,304.82	Upper Township	6,401	10,369.62
Brigantine City	90,895	147,249.90	Subtotal	821,473	1,330,786.26
Buena Borough	17,923	29,035.26	<b>III. Cumberland County municipalities:</b>		
Buena Vista Township	11,095	17,973.90	Bridgeton City	114,451	185,410.62
Egg Harbor City	39,260	63,601.20	Commercial Township	6,230	10,092.60
Egg Harbor Township	47,795	77,427.90	Fairfield Township	6,828	11,061.36
Galloway Township	37,005	51,848.10	Hopewell Township	5,206	8,433.72
Hamilton Township	44,039	71,343.18	Lawrence Township	11,607	18,803.34
Hammon City	99,772	161,630.64	Maurice River Township	8,705	14,102.10
Linwood City	65,632	106,323.84	Millville	275,588	446,452.56
Margate City	163,441	264,774.42	Upper Deerfield Township	10,242	16,592.04
Mullica Township	10,412	16,867.44	Vineland City	467,365	757,131.30
Northfield City	66,742	108,122.04	Subtotal	906,222	1,468,079.64
Pleasantville	104,722	169,649.64	<b>IV. Salem County municipalities:</b>		
Somers Point	62,645	101,484.90	Oldmans Township	4,267	6,912.54
Ventnor City	56,927	92,221.74	Penns Grove City	19,630	31,800.60
Subtotal	2,382,873	3,852,154.26	Pilesgrove Township	6,401	10,369.62
<b>II. Cape May County municipalities:</b>			Pittsgrove Township	20,654	33,459.48
Cape May City	62,645	101,484.90	Salem City	60,341	97,752.42
Lower Township	26,202	42,447.24	Upper Penns Neck Township	35,931	58,208.22
Middle Township	49,502	80,193.24	Upper Pittsgrove Township	5,121	8,296.02
North Wildwood	26,458	42,861.96	Woodstown City	53,854	87,243.48
Ocean City	353,852	573,240.24	Subtotal	299,399	485,026.38
Wildwood City	224,806	364,185.72			
Wildwood Crest Borough	66,571	107,845.02			

<sup>1</sup> Amount municipalities would receive from Federal Government. Source: U.S. Treasury Department.

<sup>2</sup> Amount taxpayers in municipalities would be assessed on income taxes to pay for shared revenues to their municipality.

#### THE COST TO TAXPAYERS IN THE 2D CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT (NEW JERSEY) OF GENERAL REVENUE SHARING

[Prepared by U.S. Representative Charles W. Sandman, Jr. (R-N.J.), Apr. 1, 1971]

	Shared revenue <sup>1</sup>	Burden to taxpayers <sup>2</sup>		Shared revenue <sup>1</sup>	Burden to taxpayers <sup>2</sup>
<b>I. District summary:</b>					
A. Total 4 county governments	\$1,640,284	\$2,657,422.04	C. Subtotal	\$1,167,558	\$1,891,443.96
B. Total 44 municipalities	4,408,967	7,136,046.54			-1,167,558.00
C. Subtotal	6,049,251	9,793,468.58			723,885.96
		-6,049,251.00			
D. Total lost in Federal pipeline		3,744,217.58			
<b>II. Atlantic County summary:</b>					
A. County government	689,610	1,117,168.20			
B. Total to 17 municipalities	2,382,873	3,852,154.26			
C. Subtotal	3,072,483	4,969,322.46			
		-3,072,483.00			
D. Total lost in Federal pipeline		1,896,739.46			
<b>III. Cape May County summary:</b>					
A. County government	346,085	560,657.70			
B. Total to 9 municipalities	821,473	1,330,786.26			
<b>IV. Cumberland County summary:</b>					
			A. County government	375,957	609,050.34
			B. Total to 9 municipalities	906,222	1,468,079.64
			C. Subtotal	1,282,179	2,077,129.98
					-1,282,179.00
			D. Total lost in Federal pipeline		794,950.98
<b>V. Salem County summary:</b>					
			A. County government	228,732	370,545.84
			B. Total to 9 municipalities	299,399	485,026.38
			C. Subtotal	528,131	855,572.22
					-528,131.00
			D. Total lost in Federal pipeline		327,441.22

<sup>1</sup> Figures for fiscal year 1972 provided the Department of the Treasury.

<sup>2</sup> Based on current \$1.62 average taxation from New Jersey required to secure each \$1 in Federal grants-in-aid.

#### ELWOOD L. BEAN RETIRING; EXPERT ON WATER PURIFICATION

#### HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the man who converted Philadelphia's notorious "chlorine cocktails" into good-tasting water some 25 years ago is retiring this week after 30 years of service.

Elwood L. Bean, a nationally recognized authority on water purification who has been chief of water treatment since 1953, will be honored at a farewell dinner Wednesday, March 31, at 6:15 p.m. in the Philadelphia Engineers' Club, 1317 Spruce Street. Many public officials and engineers will attend.

Bean, who is 70, has been responsible for operation of the city's water treatment plants, as well as for research on water quality. He supervised 250 sanitary engineers, chemists, and plant operators.

Bean has long been recognized as an expert on water treatment and water quality. For the past 10 years, he has been chairman of a committee set up by the American Water Works Association to establish quality goals for potable water. The goals developed by this committee have been adopted by thousands of water utilities, and this has led to an upgrading of water quality in many communities.

Water Commissioner Samuel S. Baxter said that Bean's knowledge has been invaluable to Philadelphia. He said:



He turned water treatment here into an advanced science. Much of the improvement in Philadelphia's water in the past 15 years can be traced to Mr. Bean's expert knowledge and counsel.

In the 1940's, Bean headed a small study committee which drew up criteria for the new water treatment plants that Philadelphia subsequently built. These plants are among the most modern in the country.

Bean came to Philadelphia in 1940 with much experience behind him. For 10 years he had been in charge of water purification at Providence, R.I., and he managed several water plants for New England Water, Light & Power Associates.

In Philadelphia he faced a serious challenge. The city's water was evil smelling, bad tasting, and bacteriologically unsatisfactory. One of Bean's first acts, when he was made principal assistant in charge of laboratories in 1947, was to correct the chlorine dosage and to use carbon for the first time to reduce tastes and odors. Other chemicals were subsequently added, and the new treatment plants eventually gave him the tools he needed to upgrade the city's water.

Bean has been active outside his job. He has written more than 40 technical articles, which have been published in engineering magazines or presented to engineering societies. He is also the co-author of a book, "Water Purification Control," published in 1966.

The U.S. Public Health Service and the Federal Water Quality Administration named him to national advisory committees on water standards, and he has also advised the National Sanitation Foundation on treatment equipment for small water utilities. Much of his voluntary service, however, has been with the American Water Works Association.

A member of the American Society of Civil Engineers and the Water Pollution Control Federation, Bean is a registered professional engineer in both Pennsylvania and Rhode Island.

His education has been extensive. He studied engineering and business for 4 years at Brown University, 1926-30, and later took engineering courses at St. Joseph's College, Drexel, and Princeton University. He completed courses in public administration at Fels Institute of Local and State Government.

Bean lives at 3249 Disston Street. He has a son and daughter-in-law and two grandchildren, who live in Hawaii.

#### ILO COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INVESTIGATES ALLEGED VIOLATIONS OF ILO CONVENTIONS BY GREECE

**HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in view of the growing interest in the operations of the International Labor Organization, I would like to draw attention to the recent report of an ILO Commission of Inquiry investigating alleged violations of ILO conventions by

Greece. This case has been of interest to many Americans, including members of the AFL-CIO as well as Members of this House, who have raised questions regarding the capacity of the U.N. system to implement its standards, particularly those standards of the ILO embodied in the International Labor Code.

During the 1968 session of the International Labor Conference a group of workers filed complaints alleging that Greece was not securing effective observance of two ILO conventions which it had ratified—convention No. 87 on freedom of association and the right to organize, and convention No. 98 on the right to organize and collective bargaining.

Acting on the complaints the ILO governing body in March 1969, appointed a three-man Commission of Inquiry, which held four sessions in Geneva between July 1969, and October 1970. The commission had originally intended to visit Greece in the course of its investigation, but when the Greek Government withdrew its cooperation in the inquiry, objecting on procedural grounds to the calling of a particular witness, this was abandoned. The commission has recommended that "as soon as the Government of Greece is satisfied that freedom of association is fully restored—it should invite the ILO to send to Greece a fact-finding commission or similar body which will be able to complete the task which this commission has had to leave undone."

The three members of the commission were:

Lord Devlin, United Kingdom: Privy Councillor, High Court Judge in the Queen's Bench Division, 1948-60; Lord Justice of Appeal, 1960-61; Lord of Appeal in Ordinary, House of Lords and Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, 1961; Judge of the Administrative Tribunal of the ILO, chairman of the commission.

Jacques Ducoux, France: Councillor of State; member of Factfinding and Conciliation Commission of Freedom of Association which examined the trade union situation in Greece in 1966.

M. K. Vellodi, India: former Prime Minister of the State of Hyderabad; former Secretary of State and Secretary of the Ministry of Defense of India; and former Ambassador of India to Switzerland.

#### FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS: GOVERNMENT ACTIONS

The commission's findings are divided into two categories; the first concerning actions taken by the government following the coup d'etat of April 21, 1967, which the government contended were temporary measures justified by the existence of a state of emergency, and the second relating to legislative decrees promulgated in May 1969 which were intended to form a permanent part of the law of Greece relating to trade union matters.

The commission found no evidence that a state of emergency existed in Greece in 1967 or that there were exceptional circumstances such as would justify temporary noncompliance with ILO conventions. Temporary measures, which included dissolution of trade

unions and confiscation of assets, detention, arrest, interrogation, and dismissal of trade union officers, general interference in trade union matters, and the control over establishment of new unions, were found to constitute breaches of convention No. 87.

Provisions of legislative decrees Nos. 185 and 186 dealing with requirements for holding trade union office, the limitation of remuneration of trade union officers, qualifications for collective bargaining, and the financing of trade unions were found to constitute breaches of conventions Nos. 87 and 98.

#### DISSOLUTION

The evidence presented to the committee established that approximately 250 workers' organizations had been dissolved by administrative authority. The government, while contending that the organizations were Communist controlled, offered no evidence of the extent of political activity in any one of the organizations. The commission concluded that on this basis there could be no finding that any of the dissolved organizations had allowed its proper objects to be perverted to such an extent that it could no longer be regarded as an organization "for furthering and defending the interests of workers" within the meaning of article 10 of convention No. 87. The commission, therefore, concluded that the government acted in breach of article 4 of convention No. 87 which provides that "Workers' and employers' organizations shall not be liable to be dissolved or suspended by administrative authority."

#### DETENTION, ARREST, INTERROGATION AND DISMISSAL OF TRADE UNION OFFICERS

The commission determined that article 3 of convention No. 87 which provides that "Workers' and employers' organizations shall have the right to draw up their constitution and rules to elect their representatives in full freedom to organize their administration and activities and to formulate their programs," and that "The public authorities shall refrain from any interference which would restrict this right or impede the lawful exercise thereof," prohibited public authorities from depriving trade union officers of their freedom in order to put an end to their trade union activity. The commission was presented with proof that 122 trade union officers had been in detention for more than 23 years and that in the majority of cases the detained persons had been afforded no opportunity to present a defense. While the commission was not of the opinion that it could go so far as to conclude that a presumption of innocence drawn from these detentions without initiation of any court proceedings constituted a breach of convention No. 87, the commission did conclude that the proof of government interference in the functioning of trade unions was so conclusive in other respects as to put the burden of proof on the government to explain the circumstances in which military orders of dismissal and replacement of union officials were made. In the absence of any such explanation the commission felt justified in inferring that widespread dismissal of trade union leaders was not confined to Communists or politically active trade

unionists and that such removals from office constituted a breach of article 3 of convention No. 87.

#### GENERAL INTERFERENCE BY THE AUTHORITIES IN TRADE UNION MATTERS

The commission determined that adequate evidence existed to establish that between April 1967 and the end of 1968 police presence at trade union meetings restricted and impeded the free discussion of legitimate trade union matters. The commission also found that the resignations of trade union officers whom the authorities wished removed were forced and that lists of candidates for office were checked by the authorities in order to approve or remove names of individuals. These actions were found to constitute an infringement of article 3 of convention No. 87.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW UNIONS

The commission found that in the months following the revolution a new union, especially one intended to replace a dissolved union, could not be established without previous authorization and control by the military authorities. The commission concluded that interference of this nature contravened both article 2 which provides that "Workers and employers without distinction whatsoever, shall have the right to establish and, subject only to the rules of the organization concerned, to join organizations of their own choosing without previous authorization," and article 3 of convention No. 87.

#### LEGISLATIVE DECREES

In its examination of legislative decrees Nos. 185 and 186 the commission considered to what extent, if any, legislative provisions went beyond the legitimate protection of the public interest and interests of trade union members against indiscriminate or wrongful use of authority by trade union leaders.

#### REQUIREMENTS FOR HOLDING TRADE UNION OFFICE

The commission found that the provision of legislative decree No. 185 requiring that to be elected to a trade union office a candidate must have worked for a total of 600 days and not less than 50 days in each of the 6 years prior to the date of elections imposed a requirement running counter to article 3 of convention No. 87 establishing that workers' organizations shall have the right to elect their representatives in full freedom.

#### REMUNERATION OF TRADE UNION OFFICERS

Section 10 of legislative decree No. 185 limited the remuneration which trade unions might pay to members of their executive committees, their staff and legal advisers. The commission found no evidence of abuse in payment of salaries which might have justified such a provision. The commission accepted the argument that such limitations might prevent unions from freely engaging staff and legal advisers and might be detrimental to the efficient running of the trade union organizations. The commission concluded that the limitations on remuneration constituted an infringement of article 3 of convention No. 87 which provides that public authorities shall refrain from any interference which would restrict or impede the lawful exercise of right to organize union activities.

#### COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The commission found that the membership requirements imposed by legislative decree No. 186 which must be met before any trade union could enter into negotiations on a collective agreement had the practical effect of reducing substantially the number of organizations capable of concluding collective agreements. The commission further found that the requirement relating to absolute independence and the activities developed by a union was vague and afforded no precise criteria for objective implementation.

The commission concluded that these provisions were not in harmony with article 3 of convention No. 87 and article 4 of convention No. 98 which provides that "measures appropriate to national conditions shall be taken, where necessary, to encourage and promote the full development and utilization of machinery for voluntary negotiation between employers or employers' organizations and workers' organizations, with a view to the regulation of terms and conditions of employment by means of collective agreements," as they restricted the right of trade unions to organize their activities and could have an effect contrary to promoting voluntary collective bargaining.

#### FINANCING OF TRADE UNIONS

The Commission found that provisions of legislative decree No. 186 concerning a system of financing for trade unions through a workers' fund constituted State control which interfered with the kind of financial independence necessary for the enjoyment of the guarantees laid down in convention No. 87.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

In accordance with article 28 of the ILO constitution the Commission was required to make such recommendations as it might consider proper regarding the steps which should be taken to meet the complaint.

The Commission made general observations on freedom of association in Greece, as it found it to be and as it hoped it would develop in the future. The Commission made detailed recommendations putting forward proposals for improvements in those provisions contained in the legislative decrees which it found to be contrary both to the spirit and to the letter of conventions Nos. 87 and 98.

The specific recommendations called for:

Repeal of the present requirements for holding trade union office, and those concerning pay of union officials, staff, and legal advisers;

Review of legislation on strikes to make it more flexible, with the assistance of ILO experts, if the Government so desires;

Extensive recasting of provisions concerning collective bargaining, including the definition of trade unions qualified to negotiate, again with the possible assistance of ILO experts;

Reform of the system of financing trade unions;

Regular reports by the Government of Greece on action taken to give effect to the Commission's recommendations; and

Invitation by Greece of an ILO fact-finding group when the government con-

siders that freedom of association is fully restored in spirit as well as in letter.

#### THE REPLY OF THE GREEK GOVERNMENT

On January 14, 1971, the Greek Minister of Labor, on behalf of his Government, addressed a letter to the director-general of the ILO accepting the findings of the ILO Commission of Inquiry and confirming in detail a previous preliminary statement of the representative of the Greek Government to the ILO governing body.

The Minister of Labor's letter stated:

In accordance with the provisions of Article 29, paragraph 2, of the ILO Constitution, I have the honour to inform you of the Greek Government's views on the recommendations contained in the report of the Commission of Inquiry appointed under Article 26 of the Constitution of the ILO to examine the complaints concerning the observance by Greece of the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise Convention (No. 87) and of the Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining Convention (No. 98).

I wish first to recall the statement made by the Greek Government representative to the ILO Governing Body (181st Session, sitting of 18 November 1970), which set out the Greek Government's views on the matter, and, with respect to each of the Commission's recommendations, to state the following:

"1. Repeal of Section 9 of Legislative Decree No. 185/1969 (Requirements for the holding of trade union office): The Government of Greece has already decided that the Ministry of Labour shall prepare a draft legislative decree concerning occupational associations, which will contain special provisions on the matter, in accordance with the terms of the above-mentioned statement of the Greek Government representative to the ILO Governing Body.

"2. Repeal of Section 10 of Legislative Decree No. 185/1969 (Remuneration of trade union officers, staff, etc.): Following the statement made to the ILO Governing Body, action has been initiated to settle the matter by legislation with a view to repealing the above-mentioned section.

"3. Amendment of the Provisions of Sections 3, 4 and 5 of Legislative Decree No. 185/1969 (Right to strike): Despite the statement in the Commission's Report (paragraph 275) to the effect that the provisions of Legislative Decree No. 185 which concern the right to strike do not constitute a violation of Convention No. 87, the Greek Government has no objection to making these provisions more flexible.

"4. Amendment of the Provisions of Legislative Decree No. 186/1969 concerning Collective Bargaining: The study of this matter has been completed and the Greek Government has included in its work programme for 1971 the reform of the legislation on collective bargaining with a view to eliminating any contradictions between the provisions of the national legislation and those of international Conventions.

"5. Financing of Trade Unions: The Greek Government accepts the Commission's view that, despite the improvement introduced by section 10 of Legislative Decree No. 185/1969, the system that has been applied for the past thirty years is not entirely appropriate and will take the necessary steps to settle the matter from the legislative point of view.

"6. Information concerning the Application of Section 6 of Legislative Decree No. 185/1969 (Dissolution of trade unions—dismissal of trade union officers for action against the State, etc.): The Government will provide the ILO with information concerning the application of Section 6 of Legislative Decree No. 185/1969, in accordance with Article 22 of the ILO Constitution.

"Lastly, I would again point out that



the Greek Government considers that the communication of this additional information finally disposes of the matters raised by the Commission of Inquiry. It will continue to provide to the ILO, in reports submitted under Article 22 of the ILO Constitution, necessary information on the steps taken to bring its national legislation into fuller conformity with the provisions of Conventions Nos. 87 and 98, as suggested in the Commission's report (paragraph 279, p. 57).

"I have the honour to be, etc.

"P. S. MANALOPOULOS,  
"Minister of Labour."

#### SUBSEQUENT ACTIVITY

At its most recent session concluding March 5, 1971, the ILO governing body decided to continue to keep under review the efforts of the Greek Government to implement the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry.

This case is another example of the durability of the constitutional machinery of the ILO—machinery available for the supervision of the application of conventions and recommendations adopted by the organization. In this regard, this House can note with deep satisfaction that former Chief Justice Earl Warren has recently been appointed by the ILO to its committee of outside experts responsible for a key role in this constitutional process of the ILO. This 19-member committee—known as the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations—meets every year to examine the reports which member states are required to submit to the ILO on their implementation of the international social and human rights standards developed by the organization during its 50 years existence.

This committee of experts is composed of outstanding personalities serving in their independent capacities. Its members, who come from many parts of the world, include a number of other Chief Justices, past and present, as well as a former prime minister and former ministers of foreign affairs, labor, and justice. Chief Justice Warren's contribution to this committee will be of great benefit to the workers of the world.

#### THE PRESIDENT AND THE HEALTH SECURITY ACT OF 1971

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, health care is beyond all doubt the most important domestic issue on the American scene today. As one of the prime sponsors of the Health Security Act of 1971, I am completely convinced that the system of national health insurance provided for in this legislation is the only way we can overcome the critical health crisis that presently exists, and fulfill the Nation's avowed commitment to the fundamental principle that health care should not be a matter of privilege, but a matter of right for every American of every age.

The American labor movement has

long been in the forefront of the fight for this right. It is the principle for which the late Walter Reuther formed the Committee of One Hundred for National Health Insurance. It is the principle on which the UAW and the AFL-CIO, with the support of all organized labor, developed the Health Security Act of 1971.

Without the strong role organized labor has played in this effort, we would not be in the position we are today—on the threshold of turning this country around from the inadequate and costly health care system now privileged only to that portion of our population who can afford to pay its high costs, to a system of the best possible quality of comprehensive care for every American and at a cost he can afford.

Since the health care issue has in the last year or so become "an idea whose time has come," a number of alternative proposals has surfaced to do something about the failing health services in America. This year, Congress has received President Nixon's proposal for a National Health Insurance Partnership. Since it is the President's plan, it must perforce lend itself to careful study and consideration.

The AFL-CIO, which played a vital role in the development of the Health Security Act of 1971, recently undertook to examine the President's proposal. Their director of social security, Mr. Bert Seidman, earlier this month participated in a Labor News Conference, presented as a public service by the Mutual Broadcasting System. Important questions were asked and answered about the President's partnership plan as opposed to the Health Security Act.

Mr. Speaker, the importance of health care makes it imperative that we in the Congress learn as much as possible about all alternative plans presented to us, especially about the administration proposal. Therefore, I wish to insert here in the RECORD the transcript of the Labor News Conference, as well as the digest of the program prepared as an AFL-CIO news release. The program tells us a great deal:

#### AFL-CIO LABOR NEWS CONFERENCE

MARCH 17, 1971.

The Administration's medical and health care plan is like a "jigsaw puzzle" that can't be put together, "because so many pieces have been swept under the rug," organized labor's top social insurance expert declared today.

AFL-CIO Director of Social Security Bert Seidman stressed that the Nixon plan provides neither the "incentives or controls" needed to encourage a better organized and more efficient medical care delivery system and to hold down costs. The result, he said, would be a "big bite" out of the "ordinary family's income," while the system would fall short of providing the kind of comprehensive, quality care that Americans need.

The union spokesman called for passage of the National Health Security bill now pending before both the Senate and the House of Representatives, which "would cover a larger percentage of the costs of medical care than any other proposal that has been made" and protect all Americans, regardless of the nature of their employment. Seidman appeared on the Labor News Con-

ference, an AFL-CIO produced public affairs interview broadcast Tuesday at 9:35 p.m. (EST), on the Mutual Broadcasting System, and heard in Washington, D.C. over WAVA-FM.

Pointing out that the Administration's plan would deny coverage to part-time employees, domestic workers and agricultural workers, Seidman warned that there would be a very real danger that a great many "low-income people . . . who have a desperate need for medical care" would be left unprotected. He added that even those workers covered by the Administration's plan would have such heavy "out-of-pocket costs" that they would not be able to get the kind of "across-the-board, quality care" that they need.

Seidman said that the National Health Security bill, which has bi-partisan sponsorship in Congress and is the "number-one legislative objective of the AFL-CIO," stands a good chance of enactment in the current Congress. He predicted, "if the Congress does not respond to the needs of the American people for across-the-board, quality medical care," it will be "the most important issue" in the 1972 campaign.

Reporters questioning Seidman were Judith Randal, medical writer for the Washington Evening Star, and Jerome Brazda, editor of Washington Report on Medicine and Health.

MARCH 16, 1971.

#### LABOR NEWS CONFERENCE

Subject: National Health Security.

Guest: Bert Seidman, director of the AFL-CIO's Department of Social Security.

Reporters: Judith Randal, medical and science writer for the Washington Evening Star; Jerome Brazda, editor of Washington Report on Medicine and Health.

Moderator: Frank Harden.

MUTUAL ANNOUNCER. The following time is presented as a public service by this station and the Mutual Broadcasting System.

HARDEN. LABOR NEWS CONFERENCE. Welcome to another edition of LABOR NEWS CONFERENCE, a public affairs program brought to you by the AFL-CIO. LABOR NEWS CONFERENCE brings together leading AFL-CIO representatives and ranking members of the press. Today's guest is Bert Seidman, director of the AFL-CIO's Department of Social Security.

The American labor movement has long fought for the guarantee that Americans of every age and circumstance shall have all of the very best health and medical services and treatment that they need. The AFL-CIO firmly believes that a system of comprehensive national health insurance is the surest way to achieve that goal. In the view of the AFL-CIO, the National Health Security bill now pending in both the Senate and the House of Representatives is the only truly comprehensive program to assure quality health care for all Americans. Here to question Mr. Bert Seidman about the National Health Security bill, how it differs from other proposals, and prospects for enactment of such a program in the 92nd Congress, are Judith Randal, medical and science writer for the Washington Evening Star, and Jerome Brazda, editor of Washington Report on Medicine and Health. Your moderator, Frank Harden.

And now, Miss Randal, I believe you have the first question?

RANDAL. Mr. Seidman, the chief alternative at the moment, to the Health Security bill is the Administration's package of health reform proposals. What, in your opinion, is wrong with them, from the standpoint of the average working American?

SEIDMAN. From the standpoint of the average American worker, Miss Randal, the diffi-

culty with the Administration's proposals is that they are not going to provide adequate health care, are going to require the worker and his family to pay far too much for health care, and there will not be proper incentives or controls in the program.

If I had to sum it up, I would say that the Nixon Administration's proposals are like a jigsaw puzzle—a jigsaw puzzle that you can't put together, because so many pieces have been swept under the rug.

BRAZDA. Then, what is right about it?

SEIDMAN. Well, a couple of elements of the Nixon proposal are worthwhile.

The most important are, first of all, emphasis on expanding what are called "health maintenance organizations," which are what we have called, for a long time, "prepaid group practice plans."

Of course, the labor movement has been for this a long time, and we welcome the fact that President Nixon now recognizes that health maintenance organizations can make an important contribution to improving medical care. But, on the other hand, the President's proposal does not really provide the resources that are necessary to expand the health maintenance organizations to any appreciable extent.

There are one or two other aspects that are pretty good, from our point of view.

One is, it would eliminate the premium that older people have to pay under Medicare. This is also something that we have advocated for a long time.

Both of these provisions are much more adequately dealt with in the Health Security bill.

BRAZDA. Mr. Seidman, it seems inescapable that national health insurance is going to be a major subject before Congress this year. And, of course, there is your proposal and the Administration's proposal. There are some others, too, which are being advanced by various Congressmen. The American Medical Association bill, for instance, has more than one hundred sponsors in Congress. I wonder if you could briefly go over the other major plans—the AMA's, the insurance industry's, the American Hospital Association's—and tell us what your feelings are about these, whether you think there is anything useful, or whether you think they should be totally disregarded?

SEIDMAN. Well, Mr. Brazda, I think that the two major proposals before the Congress are the Health Security bill, which is S. 3 in the Senate and H.R. 22 in the House of Representatives, and the Nixon proposals which, at the present time, have not yet been introduced as bills.

These are the two major proposals.

There are other proposals. There is the proposal of the American Medical Association to provide tax credits for people to go out and buy private insurance.

There is the proposal of the insurance companies themselves, which, as you might expect, also involves the purchase of private health insurance, and in many respects, is similar to the proposals of the President.

There is a very interesting, but rather complicated, proposal of the American Hospital Association, which would rely on something called a "health care corporation," which would provide medical care to people.

But, I think the two main proposals are the Health Security bill, which the AFL-CIO is supporting, and the Administration's proposal.

RANDAL. To get back to the Administration's proposal, Mr. Seidman, you say that one of its chief disadvantages is it would be too expensive for the average person or average family. Could you make that specific—give us some examples?

SEIDMAN. Yes, I can Miss Randal.

I've tried to estimate what it might cost an average four-person family in a year under the Administration proposals—and I'm now referring to what they call the National

Health Insurance Standards Program, which is a program that would require employers to provide private health insurance for their employees.

The employees would, however, have to pay 35% of the premium costs. In addition, they would have to pay for their medical expenses—out-of-pocket—or doctor's bills. For example, \$100 for each of the first three members of their families—up to \$300 per family—25% of all medical expenses up to \$5,000, and the cost of the first two days of hospitalization.

Now, I have added all of these up. I'm not going to give the separate figures—but, if you had an ordinary family of four people, and they had a ten-day hospitalization during the year—for one member of that family—I figure that the total expenditure for that family—during that year—out of their pockets—not covered by this program—could run to \$1800.

You can see what a bite that would be out of the ordinary family's income.

RANDAL. I notice too that the Nixon plan depends upon private insurance plans to get the mechanism rolling, and that they have also proposed that the insurance industry be regulated on a federal basis. Do you think this is a practical possibility?

SEIDMAN. I don't think it is a practical possibility at all.

Private insurance companies have a long record of being completely unconcerned with the money being spent, through them, by workers and their families, and others, for medical care.

They have paid no attention to the costs. They have paid no attention to the quality.

Now, I don't know what kind of regulation the Administration has in mind, because it hasn't spelled anything out.

There are two thousand companies in this country that are providing medical insurance of one kind or another.

There are literally hundreds of thousands of employers.

I really don't understand what kind of regulation the Administration has in mind. But, I don't see how it could possibly be effective.

Therefore, one of the real disadvantages of the Administration's proposal—in addition to the fact that it would leave so much of the cost of medical care completely uncovered—is that it would be very ineffective in controlling the costs of medical care, or in providing incentives for higher quality medical care.

BRAZDA. Mr. Seidman, wouldn't your bill actually eliminate the existing health insurance industry?

SEIDMAN. I don't think it would eliminate the health insurance industry. Some parts of medical care are not covered by even the Health Security bill.

The Health Security bill would cover a larger percentage of the costs of medical care than any other proposal that has been made. It would cover 71% of the family's health expenditures. There would be no deductibles—no co-insurance—as there is in all the other proposals.

But, it would not, for example, in the early stages, cover the adult dental care.

It would not cover certain types of long-term care in nursing homes, beyond a certain limit.

It would cover prescription drugs, only under certain circumstances.

All of those types of medical costs could be covered by private insurance.

Private insurance could play another role as the fiscal agent of groups of doctors, if they wanted a private insurance company to do that.

But, private insurance companies would not, under the Health Security bill, be carriers of medical insurance. That is, they would not provide insurance the way they do at the present time, nor would they be

the agents of the government, as they are under Medicare.

BRAZDA. Your idea, actually, in getting rid of insurance carrier concept that now exists in Medicare is to eliminate one middle-man, is it not?

SEIDMAN. It is to eliminate a middle-man, who has been very, very ineffective, from the point of view of the consumers of medical care.

RANDAL. I think everyone agrees, where health care is concerned, that one of the problems is that we have poor distribution of facilities and personnel—actual shortages, in some cases. How does the Kennedy proposal—the Health Security bill, as you call it—compare with the Nixon proposals on tooling up to take care of the unmet needs?

SEIDMAN. The Health Security bill is aimed at two principal objectives.

In the first place, Miss Randal, as we have been saying, it would finance a very large part of the total health care expenditures of American families.

Secondly, and equally important, it is aimed at expanding and improving the resources—and the manpower and facilities—need to provide the medical care that it would help to finance. The major way of doing that is through a feature of the bill called the Health Resources Development Fund, which would be a fund set up for the purpose of supplementing other programs involved in expanding the training of health manpower, improving health care resources, encouraging innovation in the organization and delivery of medical care, development of prepaid group practice plans, and other types of improvement and expansion of the health care delivery system.

BRAZDA. Mr. Seidman, let's go back to that family you cited a minute ago which ran up the big bill under the Nixon Administration's plan with a ten-day hospitalization. How would they fare under your program?

SEIDMAN. Well, under our program—in the first place—they would pay nothing toward the premium cost, except that they would pay what they are now paying for Medicare.

That is, they would pay the 1% of wages that the average worker is now paying for Medicare, and that would go for this program.

There would be no deductibles. In other words, if they went to the doctor, the bill would be paid by the program, not by the individual. The same would be true if he went into a hospital.

There would not be the \$100 per person deductible—up to \$300 per family.

There would not be the 25% of medical expenses—up to \$5000.

There would not be the first two days of hospitalization to pay for.

In addition to all this, the program would cover a larger proportion of total health care expenditures of the family.

So, the family we are talking about, instead of paying the kind of money that we are talking about here, would be paying far less. I haven't done the exact figures for the same family, but I would say, in the neighborhood of perhaps \$200 or \$300, instead of the \$1800 that we are talking about here.

BRAZDA. Then, who is going to pay the difference—someone has to?

SEIDMAN. That is correct, the program would be financed by the payment, as I have already indicated, of 1% of the worker's wage.

The employer would pay 3½% of the worker's wage.

Self-employed people, and people earning income other than employment-type income, would also pay into the program.

Fifty percent of the costs would be met from general revenues—that is, from the regular resources of the federal government.

BRAZDA. Where do you think that money would come from, Mr. Seidman?

SEIDMAN. It would come from our general



tax-stream, and, since we have a tax system, at the federal level, which is closest to the principle of ability-to-pay, the program would be financed in the most equitable way that we can have, under our present tax system.

Of course, the AFL-CIO is for making the federal tax system more equitable, but it is more equitable than any other taxes that we have.

RANDAL. Mr. Seidman, the AFL-CIO has helped promote other public issues with dollars, and staff, and resources. Are you planning to do the same with the Health Security bill? If so, when do you plan to begin, and, what kind of resources do you hope to devote to it?

SEIDMAN. Well, the AFL-CIO has already begun a drive—an all-out drive—for enactment of the National Health Security bill.

As long ago as last Labor Day, AFL-CIO President Meany said that national health security would be the number-one legislative objective of the AFL-CIO. Our Executive Council, just last month, reiterated that.

The AFL-CIO will be publicizing this program all over the country—through meetings, through publications, through the labor press—which goes to the millions of members of organized labor and their families—through appearances and speaking before all types of community organizations, many of which are very much concerned with health care problems.

In short, we will be conducting an all-out drive for achievement of national health security at the earliest possible date.

RANDAL. Another question—not from the worker's point of view. The small businessman who has a marginal profit is going to find this harder to pay for than the company that has many thousands of employees. For this reason, he might decide that if he hired part-time help, instead of full-time help, he might avoid paying this cost. Do you see this as a danger?

SEIDMAN. I think this is a danger, Miss Randal, under the Nixon Administration's proposal.

Everyone in the country would be covered for medical care under the National Health Security bill, and there would be no such danger under that proposal—people would be entitled to the health services, regardless of the kind of employment they had, or indeed, if they had any employment.

But, under the Nixon Administration's proposal, employers of part-time help, of domestic workers, of agricultural workers, I believe, would be exempt from coverage.

I really don't know how those people would get medical care at all, under the Nixon Administration's proposal, although, they are, generally speaking, low-income people, and have a desperate need for medical care.

RANDAL. Wouldn't they be entitled to medical care under either the Family Health Insurance plan proposed by the Administration or Medicaid—or, not in all cases?

SEIDMAN. They might be entitled to care under these programs, but, under the Family Health Insurance plan, for example, if a four-person family had an income of more than \$3,000, they would have to begin paying for whatever would be provided.

Besides, it wouldn't cover across-the-board medical expenses.

I doubt very much that those families could afford to pay for the medical care that they would have to pay for under the so-called Family Health Insurance program.

Medicaid has been a very inadequate program. If the Family Health Insurance program were to cover the families—the poor families—Medicaid would then cover, as I understand it, under the Nixon Administration's proposal, the elderly, the disabled, and the blind. Those people certainly have been having a very difficult time getting their needs met under Medicaid.

I see no reason that that situation would improve.

BRAZDA. Mr. Seidman, we have a new Congress this year. National health insurance is rapidly becoming a major domestic political issue. Next year, we have a presidential election. What is your feeling about the possible timing of passage of legislation? Do you think it will come during this Congress? If so, this year or next year?

SEIDMAN. Mr. Brazda, I have no crystal ball, but the AFL-CIO sees no reason why the Congress should not be able to enact the National Health Security bill in this Congress.

I don't know if they will enact it during the year 1971, but we have every reason to think—and we are very optimistic—that the National Health Security bill will be enacted in this Congress.

If the Congress does not respond to the needs of the American people for across-the-board, quality medical care during this Congress, there is no doubt in my mind that this will be one of the most important—if not the most important—issue in the 1972 presidential campaign.

I should mention that several of the Democratic candidates—those who are mentioned as Democratic candidates—for President, have already announced that they are co-sponsors of the National Health Security program.

RANDAL. If only parts of the proposal are passed, which of any of the proposals made do you think are most likely to be enacted into law?

SEIDMAN. It is very difficult to answer your question, but, I would say that the Congress would be very derelict, if it only passed only a piece-meal type of bill.

We need a comprehensive, national health care program, which could be provided only by the National Health Security bill.

HARDEN. Thank you, Miss Randal, and thank you, gentlemen. Today's LABOR NEWS CONFERENCE guest was Bert Seidman, director of the AFL-CIO's Department of Social Security. Representing the press were Jerome Brazda, editor of Washington Report on Medicine and Health, and Judith Randal, medical and science writer for the Washington Evening Star. This is your moderator, Frank Harden, inviting you to listen again next week. LABOR NEWS CONFERENCE is a public affairs production of the AFL-CIO, produced in cooperation with the Mutual Broadcasting System.

MUTUAL ANNOUNCER. The preceding program time was presented as a public service by this station and the Mutual Broadcasting System. The opinions expressed are solely those of the participants.

#### DR. MICHAEL DE BAKERY SPEAKS ON MEDICAL RESEARCH

#### HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago the most distinguished heart surgeon in our country, Dr. Michael DeBakey, appeared as a guest on the Dick Cavett Show and had several things to say about medical research which I would like to share with my colleagues in the House. In the discussion which I am placing in the RECORD today, Dr. DeBakey points out how little we are doing in the United States in medical research. Indeed, he suggests that we are actually going backwards—doing less than we were in 1966. It would

appear from his comments that the widely advertised \$100 million for cancer research in the new budget may be a cruel delusion because they are funds which are not new, but come at the expense of important research in other fields. The following is a transcript of that portion of the show in which Dr. DeBakey discussed these matters. The Kaye who is also a participant in the discussion is Danny Kaye, also a guest that evening:

#### DR. MICHAEL DEBAKEY SPEAKS ON MEDICAL RESEARCH

CAVETT. Dr. DeBakey, I wanted to ask you if—how encouraged you are about the fact that the state of the union message included a hundred—hundred million dollar appropriation or a suggested hundred million dollar appropriation anyway, for cancer research? Is this a step in the right direction?

DEBAKEY. Yes, of course it is. Unfortunately, when I—after I looked at the 1972 President's budget for medical research, I was not so encouraged because it's pretty much taken out of the hide of the rest of the program so that all the other programs are going to suffer even more and I think it's most unfortunate that in stating that he's—that the President stating that this administration was going to give a hundred million dollars for cancer research without saying that the research in the other fields—take heart, for example—would suffer because of this is, in a sense, to mislead the public into believing that they're going to do much more for medical research and I think this is most unfortunate. (Applause) You know, the thing that astounds me is the lack of appreciation on the part of the administration, not only this administration but others in the past as well, of the importance of health to our people. Now as far as each individual is concerned, health becomes an extremely important thing only when you lose it, you know. As long as you've got it you assume—you take it for granted but when you lose it then it becomes extremely important and there's nothing of greater importance. If you've got cancer it doesn't make any difference what else is going on in the world; cancer is the most important thing to you. If you've had a heart attack the heart is the most important thing to you, you see? Now the only answers that we can get to solve these problems is gonna come from research. Everything that—every advance that we have made today that we think is an advance in taking care—in doing better—and we've done a great deal better, there's no question about that, in meeting many of the problems, we've wiped out many diseases—comes from research. Every single one of them. So that the one thing you can be sure of: you're not going to get the answer to heart disease without research. You don't know when you'll get it with research. And yet, to show you the priorities that we put upon research, particularly as far as our Federal dollar is concerned, we give \$400 per capita in this country, for every individual in this country \$400 goes for defense. Forty dollars goes for highways. Ninety cents goes for heart research. Doesn't that astound you?

CAVETT. It's appalling. And you hear of labs closing. . . .

DEBAKEY. That's right, that's right. And we're doing more—I mean we're doing the amount of research in terms of the funding for medical research in this country today of our Federal dollar—after all, this is the taxpayer's dollar, it's the public and the taxpayer that's puttin' this money out—we're doing less research, on account of the money that's being given, today than was done in 1966.

CAVETT. So it's going backwards.

DEBAKEY. We're going backwards. And the President's budget for '72 will provide less

research than for all other things except the cancer, if the hundred million dollars goes into cancer, for everything else will be less than it was last year.

CAVETT. Are you saying then, or am I reading this between the lines, that this is more of a political move than it was one that benefits people?

DEBAKEY. Well, I'm not trying to interpret anything. I'm trying to explain it to the public. I think it's important for the public to understand it.

CAVETT. It's such an appalling fact. Have you discussed it with the President?

DEBAKEY. No, I have not discussed it with him. I'd be glad to tell him what I think about it. (Laughter) Maybe he'll listen to this show and hear it. (Applause)

CAVETT. Would he take a phone call from you? He ought to.

DEBAKEY. I don't know.

CAVETT. Why don't you try within the next 48 hours and let us know what happened?

KAYE. Then he can get back on the show again. (Laughter)

CAVETT. I'd think that he would be most interested in this.

DEBAKEY. Well, I hope he will and I hope that he understands this. The thing that I'm—I don't really know whether he understands it himself what he's doing, you know. (Applause)

CAVETT. What would be the reason for that?

DEBAKEY. Well, I think the reason would be that he hasn't been given the information. After all, the President of the United States can't know everything about everything. He has to depend upon his people, you know. Now I don't know whether his people—I mean, his assistants and so on, are giving him the information and now here's—he said in the state of the union message that he was going to have an inflationary—I mean an expansion budget which, of course, simply means that we're going to have a deficit spending so he's going to do just what's been done before, he's gonna go back to deficit spending in order to expand the budget by \$20-billion. Well, why not expand health research? Why can't we get a part of that expansion? Why can't the people benefit from this?

CAVETT. I'd say the Pentagon advisers are more persuasive than the medical advisers.

DEBAKEY. Well, I agree. Maybe I'm wrong but I happen to believe that health should have a higher priority than it has and if you see the sick people that I see every day you'd feel just as strongly as I feel about it because I see people with the loss of health every day and they don't have any constituency, they don't have anybody voting for them for more health.

CAVETT. What can the individual do?

DEBAKEY. Well, I think lots of individuals are doing things about it, you see, and this is what's important and I think it's important that more and more people—and the thing that's very encouraging to me is to see more young people involved and interested in this and it's very encouraging.

## VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

### HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, we are all prone to take for granted the tremendous amount of time and energy given

by our paid and volunteer workers in our Veterans' Administration hospitals throughout the country. For those who have borne the battle it would be a lonely period of recovery if it were not for our volunteer workers who visit the hospitals and help the permanent staff of workers to bring comfort and meet the needs of our sick and disabled veterans.

I am privileged to have the Marion, Ill., Veterans' Administration Hospital in my congressional district. At a recent ceremony in the hospital, 42 active volunteers in the Veterans' Administration Volunteer Service were honored. The ceremony was held in celebration of the 25th anniversary of the Volunteer Service on March 28. The outstanding hospital director, Mr. L. M. Frazier, Jr., Dr. C. J. Roska, chief of staff, Mr. T. E. Proffer, chief of the medical administration service, Mr. Pat A. Faragon, chief, pharmacy service, Mrs. Edna L. Wood, chief, nursing service, Mrs. Ida M. Welborn, chief, dietetic service, and Mr. Lee D. Jaeger, coordinator, PM & R service, presented awards to the following volunteers for their outstanding service from 100 hours to 10,000 hours.

Mr. Speaker, 25 years of service to veteran patients is a long time to be patriotic. I believe these constituents should be honored by the Congress, therefore, under leave previously granted me, I hereby submit the names, hours worked, and the organizations they represent for printing in the RECORD:

#### CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION, 100 HOURS (Lee D. Jaeger, Coordinator, PM&R Service)

Mrs. Birdie Abrams, Masonic Service.  
Mrs. Genevieve Boner, American Legion Auxiliary.  
Mrs. Mary Burgess, American Legion Auxiliary.  
Mrs. Viola Cox, DAV Auxiliary.  
Sister Mary Danielle, N.C.C.S.  
Mr. David East, V.F.W.  
Mrs. Dania Edwards, American Legion Auxiliary.

Mr. Everett Geurin, Masonic Service.  
Mrs. Louise Gillespie, Non-Affiliated.  
Mr. Clarence Hawkins, D.A.V.  
Miss Jo Ann Marlow, N.C.C.S.  
Mrs. Syble Nielsen, Daughters American Revolution.

Mr. J. T. Stanford, American Legion.

#### CERTIFICATE OF MERIT, 300 HOURS (Mrs. Ida M. Welborn, Chief, Dietetic Service)

Mrs. Birdie Abrams, Masonic Service.  
Mr. David East, V.F.W.  
Mrs. Olga English, American War Mothers.  
Mr. Arthur Enis, Masonic Service.  
Mrs. Faye Fox, Masonic Service.  
Mr. John Hausser, Masonic Service.  
Mrs. Laura Homer, Veterans, W.W.I. Aux.  
Mr. Charles Oldani, N.C.C.S.  
Mrs. Jessie Oldani, American War Mothers.  
Mrs. Eula Russell, Veterans, W.W.I. Aux.

#### CERTIFICATE OF OUTSTANDING SERVICE, 500 HOURS

(Mrs. Edna L. Wood, Chief, Nursing Service)  
Mrs. Birdie Abrams, Masonic Service.  
Mrs. Eva Boyce, American Legion Auxiliary.  
Mrs. Netta Corlasco, N.C.C.S.  
Mr. David East, V.F.W.  
Mrs. Olga English, American War Mothers.  
Mr. John Gualdoni, N.C.C.S.  
Mrs. Edna McGhee, American Red Cross.  
Mr. Charles Oldani, N.C.C.S.  
Mrs. Cecyle Pike, Masonic Service.  
Mrs. Ella Sims, Veterans, W.W.I. Aux.

#### CERTIFICATE OF DEVOTION TO VOLUNTEER DUTY, 1000 HOURS

(Pat A. Faragon, Chief, Pharmacy Service)  
Mrs. Ernie Fichtel, American Red Cross.  
Mr. John Gualdoni, N.C.C.S.  
Mrs. Dorothy Kingery, V.F.W. Auxiliary.  
Mrs. Donna Thompson, American Red Cross.

#### BRONZE PIN, 1750 HOURS (T. E. Proffer, Chief, Medical Adm. Service)

Mrs. Lena Archione, N.C.C.S.  
Mr. Charles Baumler, American Legion.

#### SILVER PIN, 2500 HOURS (C. J. Roska, M.D., Chief of Staff)

Mrs. Florence Clem, American Red Cross.  
Mrs. Helen Jackson, V.F.W. Auxiliary.

#### SILVER BOWL (HONOR AWARD), 10,000 HOURS (L. M. Frazier, Jr., Hospital Director)

Mrs. Myrtle Walker, V.F.W. Auxiliary.

## NATION'S WHEATGROWERS

### HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend to your attention in a speech made this morning at the annual breakfast of the Nation's wheatgrowers by Mr. Eugene Moos, president of the National Association of Wheat Growers.

Mr. Moos is a well-known and respected wheatgrower from Edwall, Wash., which is in the Fifth Congressional District, which I represent. He has been in a leadership position in agricultural activities for a number of years, serving as president of the Washington Association of Wheat Growers, as well as the national association, and he is the former president of Western Wheat Associates.

It is a great honor to have Mr. Moos as a resident of the Fifth District. His timely remarks give a candid and realistic appraisal of the situation which the Nation's wheatgrowers face today.

I include the speech as follows:

#### CONGRESSIONAL BREAKFAST SPEECH EUGENE MOOS, PRESIDENT NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WHEAT GROWERS

Secretary Hardin, Senator Bellmon, distinguished Members of Congress, representatives of Government, wheat growers and friends. It is my pleasure this morning to welcome each of you and also to express our appreciation that you would take time out from your busy schedules to be with us. Since NAWG is the legislative action body of the wheat growers, I wish to confine my remarks to current and pending legislation.

As the outset, NAWG would like to say thank you to each member of Congress present for your individual as well as collective effort in passing new farm legislation during the last session of Congress. I am sure that the Agriculture Act of 1970 did not meet all of your individual desires any more than it met all of the expectations of the NAWG, but given the time and the circumstances, the new Set-Aside farm program was the best farm program legislation available.

I make a point of the new Set-Aside program being the best legislation available given time and circumstances because somewhat like the International Grains Arrangement of 1967, this new Agricultural Act has to fit a set of circumstances somewhat different than those circumstances envisaged



while the legislation was being formed. What I am referring to of course is that the new set-aside program was designed as a market oriented program to maximize production efficiency as a means of improving producer income over the long term. However, before this income improving theory had a chance to function, the corn blight of 1970 tightened supplies of feed grains, drove all grain prices up and except for those producers directly affected by the blight—improved producer income. So in effect we now have a stronger grain prices and improved producer income in the grain producing areas from a marketing situation which in many ways is exactly opposite of what was envisaged under the set-aside program.

Mind you that I am not complaining about this, but I am concerned how we get from this short supply market situation to a longer supply situation without some severe market adjustment accompanied by a drop in producer income. If we can go from this one market situation to the other market situation necessary to expand markets without a significant price adjustment—fine, but if we can't—then everyone of us in this room has a problem and we should be giving it some thought.

Wheat growers are very happy with the improved prices but I doubt that very many really understand the marketing factors which created these higher prices. A great many of them only think in terms that finally a little better relationship is being restored between the cost of production and the selling price of a bushel of wheat. Finally a little light is beginning to shine through the dark cloud of cost-price squeeze hanging over their heads. Additionally, higher market prices mean to producers that they are a little less dependent on direct government payments as a means of staying in business. I say all of this just to point it out that it is going to be very difficult for producers to understand the need for going back to lower prices regardless of the situation.

With this concern in mind, NAWG just has to be alarmed at the ever increasing production flexibility being permitted under the set-aside program. This does not mean we are opposed to the principle of better farm management through program flexibility, but right or wrong, producers look to government to limit production in order to assure proper supply-demand balance.

NAWG appreciates the need of adequate supplies of grain to off-set the threat of potential corn blight damage this year, however, at the same time we have to be concerned about the threat of over production. It would be ironic indeed if this fall we had to mount a campaign to persuade producers not to utilize all the program flexibility available in order to protect their income levels. Ironic or not, if that is what the situation calls for—that is what we will try to do.

Turning to some of the legislative proposals being considered by the Congress this year, NAWG would like to make the following recommendations:

(1) **Agricultural Labor Legislation**—NAWG urges every effort be made by the House and Senate Agricultural Committees, working in close harmony with farm organizations, to draft and enact realistic and practical farm labor legislation. No one in agriculture is anxious for labor legislation to be imposed upon agriculture but that does not mean such legislation is not imminent. It simply means if agricultural interests do not respond, agricultural labor legislation will originate in the Labor Committee and will be influenced accordingly.

(2) **Rail Transportation Legislation**—Wheat producers have become increasingly aware of the fact that transportation costs are an integral factor in the farm-gate price they receive. The producer's cash price rep-

resents the terminal price minus the cost of moving his product to market. It's easy to see that increases in freight rates mean a consequent increase in the costs that the grower must absorb. Farmers want the railroads to have rates which cover the cost of transportation and provide a reasonable profit, but they don't want to be exploited. We cannot doubt the need of railroads for increased revenues, but more money is not the panacea for the carriers' problems. Rates have increased more than 30% in less than four years, still it is difficult to find evidence that rail operations have improved—on the contrary, service has declined and severe shortages of boxcars continue. We must have solutions to these problems.

(3) **Environmental Protection Legislation**—NAWG respects the need for regulation of the use of certain farm chemicals and pesticides hazardous to the environment. NAWG recommends that Congress only limit and regulate the use of those agricultural chemicals which have been clearly documented as being a threat to the environment.

(4) **International Wheat Treaty**—NAWG urges that the United States Senate ratify the wheat treaty recently negotiated in Geneva. This new treaty, while somewhat limited in scope, does provide a stabilizing influence to the world's wheat market while at the same time assuring United States wheat interests a fully competitive opportunity.

(5) **Government Reorganization**—Although the specifics of the President's recommendation concerning government reorganization are as yet not clearly understood by NAWG, I would have to say that even the most open-minded among NAWG find little comfort in such a recommendation. I suspect that NAWG will be very happy to let the members of the House and Senate Agricultural Committees speak for NAWG on this issue.

(6) **Special Revenue Sharing for Agricultural Development**—Here again NAWG does not want to prejudice a Presidential recommendation until more of the details are understood. There are some in NAWG who will need to be persuaded that State and Local Government can impartially appropriate federal funds to all agricultural interests.

Thank you.

#### CULLIGAN, INC.'S, UNIQUE "VISIT U.S.A." PROJECT

#### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, recently Culligan, Inc., which is located in the 13th District of Illinois, cooperated with the U.S. Travel Service in a unique and successful project which brought 824 people from 34 foreign countries to the United States, not only for an international company conference, but also for a better look at America.

The "Visit U.S.A." project, which was 5 years in the making, was organized to reward sales agents and employees for top performance and to enable employees to be on hand for the opening of Culligan's international headquarters in Northbrook, Ill.

Culligan went to great lengths to make the visit productive and pleasant for its overseas personnel. As each visitor arrived at his hotel room, he was handed instructions and itineraries printed in

his native language. For the tour of the new plant, a special illustrated guide was published describing each stop in four languages. All hotel, plant, and bus tour signs were duplicated in four languages, and simultaneous translation equipment was rented for the convention sessions.

Apparently, the effort paid off. The trip incentive was credited with increasing overseas sales by 20 to 30 percent. By visiting home headquarters, employees had a chance to really see how the company operated, to visit its large research center and to meet corporate officers. The company became real to them for the first time.

The Culligan employees stayed in this country 11 days and toured five cities. They visited in the homes of Chicago area families, went to a party where they learned about square dancing and the Charleston, and sampled a Texas-style barbecue. They got a glimpse of diverse aspects of American life, including a suburban New Jersey shopping mall and Chicago's underground street network.

Culligan's efforts in setting up the tour drew the following comment from Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans, who oversees the U.S. Travel Service:

Hopefully, Culligan's outstanding efforts in organizing a foreign employee incentive and vacation tour will provide an example to other multi-national companies with overseas branches, subsidiaries or affiliates.

I would like to join him in commending Culligan for this unique effort in not only building good employee relations, but in creating some much-needed good will for America.

#### A "VISIT USA" TOUR BOOSTS SALES, MORALE

Begg is a "Culligan man." Not the type that goes around installing deionizers; the executive type that's always getting involved with special projects.

Two years ago, Begg—who is an executive assistant at Culligan SA a wholly-owned Culligan subsidiary in Diegem, Belgium—was handed just such a special project: plan and organize a VISIT USA tour for employees who wanted to attend the grand opening of the company's new International Headquarters in Northbrook, Ill., in 1970.

The project soon snowballed. The VISIT USA invitation was broadened to include employees at other Culligan plants in Europe. Then it was extended to the company's foreign licensed distributors, dealers and sales reps as well.

Distributors started organizing contests for their sales representatives, promising a trip to the grand opening—and Culligan's 1970 world convention in Chicago—to the winner.

Begg found himself putting together an 11-day, five-city incentive and vacation travel package for Culligan customers, sales agents—and employees.

At first, "the complexity of this venture . . . frightened me a little bit," Begg confided to Roger P. Biver, Deputy Director of the United States Travel Service's Paris-region office. But "after learning that several other companies have organized similar trips, I saw a great challenge ahead of me."

That challenge included months of planning. Hundreds of contingencies had to be considered and prepared for.

So many company staff members became involved in the planning both in Europe and stateside, that employees jestingly referred to their employer as, "the Culligan Convention Company."

But, today, company officials are convinced

that all of the time and preparation that went into the tour, the grand opening and the three-day convention—including Begg's dual "trial run"—were well worth the effort.

Culligan President Harold Werhane sees the sales incentive portion of the travel program alone as "a way to increase sales, build a distribution network, stimulate greater effort by salesmen, secure new prospects and customers, introduce new products and achieve many other business goals."

After the incentive program was announced to the Culligan distributive force, the firm's overseas sales rose an estimated 20 to 30 percent, according to one company spokesman.

There were other visible—but less tangible—results:

Chicago Mayor Richard J. Daley proclaimed November 1-7 "Culligan International Water Week."

The company's foreign employees and distributors had a chance to meet corporate officers and become familiar with the U.S. headquarters—including its giant research and development center. "The company became real to them," says a public relations man. "Not just a vague abstraction."

For many Culligan employees and dealers, the United States became real, too. Several tour participants visited with Chicago area "Americans At Home" families. Everyone attended a party and learned about square dancing, the Charleston, Dixieland, rock, barbershop quartet singing, Texas barbecues, hot dogs, hamburgers, beer, pop corn and potato chips. As a group, they saw typical U.S. tourist attractions—and others not so typical: the enclosed, temperature-controlled Cherry Hill (N.J.) Shopping Center near Philadelphia; Harlem and Chicago's underground street network.

The idea for Culligan's combination world conference/headquarters opening/sales incentive and vacation tour took root five years ago when the company began planning the new headquarters.

Shortly before, a group of 40 Culligan stateside dealers and their wives had flown to Belgium for the opening of the firm's new Diegem plant near Brussels. Today, company officials credit the dealers who made that trip with planting the seed for last Fall's program.

"When the Belgian people heard about the new plant in the U.S., there was no stopping them," says Culligan's Director of International Operations, Don Hintz.

"Nearly every employee in the Diegem factory was interested in seeing our opening and some of the U.S. to boot. Most of the people who wanted to come probably wouldn't have had another opportunity. So we started investigating to see what would be involved in bringing our factory employees over."

Initially, the company decided to sponsor—but not underwrite—a charter flight to the states. Despite evidence of strong employee interest, Culligan executives figured they would have less than a full plane load of participants.

That's when someone came up with the idea of inviting Culligan distributors and dealers who belonged to the World Water Society, an affinity group dedicated to water quality improvement.

No one threw cold water on the suggestion, so the firm announced its VISIT USA program to eligible distributors in Europe, the Middle East and Africa. That was the beginning of the sales incentive part of the program.

Meanwhile, the company established a payroll deduction plan for employees not involved in the incentive program to help them set aside the estimated \$460 trip cost.

At the company's 1969 European convention in Athens—about a year before the 1970 opening and the world convention were

scheduled to occur—Culligan began promoting the VISIT USA tour.

The firm's European house organ, Hey, Culligan Man News, published in three languages, came out with a picture of the new International Headquarters building on the cover.

Sample itineraries for Culligan people departing from Italy, Switzerland, Belgium and France were distributed to delegates. So were United States Travel Service-supplied tour folders on Washington, Philadelphia, New York, Chicago and Niagara Falls.

In a few weeks, enough people had signed up to fill three Boeing 707s. Eventually, a fourth jet was added.

Tour planners found that language problems would be enormous. The Pan Am jet departing from Brussels was to carry passengers of 25 different nationalities, for example.

Under one plan developed to cope with the language situation, each visitor was to be handed two envelopes when he arrived at the Conrad Hilton Hotel in Chicago—one was to contain a key to his hotel room and all instructions translated into his language, the other, convention-related information such as schedules, programs and special bus directions.

All hotel, plant and bus tour signs had to be translated and prepared in four languages. An illustrated, quadrilingual plant guide explaining each station on an 18-stop Culligan International Headquarters tour had to be written and printed.

Simultaneous translation equipment had to be rented so the convention proceedings and sales presentations could be communicated to participants who didn't speak English. Special interpreters had to be hired.

"Details are so important," says Culligan Merchandising Manager Bill Gallup, who served as General Chairman for the Convention. "They can kill you if you don't plan. It is the forgotten hours of preparation that make affairs like a world conference come off."

When the combination Visit USA tour, grand opening and conference finally did come off last Oct. 29–November 8, 832 Culligan employees, licensed distributors, dealers, salesmen, engineers, architects—even plumbers—from 34 foreign countries, participated.

(More than 1,500 Culligan dealers and key personnel and their wives from the U.S. and Canada, and more than 100 American Culligan employees, also attended the convention and headquarters dedication.)

Nearly everyone was pleased with the result.

Said Secretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans: "Hopefully, Culligan's outstanding efforts in organizing a foreign employee incentive and vacation tour will provide an example to other multinational companies with overseas branches, subsidiaries or affiliates."

#### GEORGE MEANY DELIVERS ADDRESS BEFORE SHEET METAL WORKERS ASSOCIATION

#### HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, in an address delivered at a testimonial dinner honoring Edward F. Carrough, president emeritus of the Sheet Metal Workers International Association on March 12, 1971, eloquently paid tribute

to an outstanding trade unionist, and at the same time gave a penetrating analysis of the economics practiced by this administration. His remarks have special relevance to the problems facing the construction industry and the pressures being applied to provide palliatives that seem to be of questionable value.

Mr. Speaker, Edward F. Carrough and George Meany are products of my home borough, the Bronx, in New York City. And while it is called the Borough of Universities, it also provides an atmosphere that gives its natives an exceptionally pragmatic and incisive view of the world. Mr. Meany epitomizes such adroitness and I offer his remarks for the RECORD today.

The address by Mr. Meany follows:

ADDRESS BY AFL-CIO PRESIDENT  
GEORGE MEANY

I am delighted to come here this evening to pay tribute to an old friend. Two or three nights ago I was sitting watching the late, late show on television and there was an old picture on. I had seen it before but I was interested—I kept watching it. And every once in a while as I was watching, I kept thinking of Eddie Carrough. I kept looking at the picture and said, "why does this picture remind me of Ed Carrough?"

None of the characters in there were like Ed Carrough. Then suddenly it came to me. It wasn't the content of the picture, it was the title. It was known as "The Quiet Man."

Well, Eddie and I are old friends. We came from the Bronx. If you don't know where it is, it is up this way. When I was a kid, it was known as the borough of the drunks, but it was still quite a nice place.

I am delighted to come here to pay tribute to an outstanding leader of the American trade union movement at the local level and at the international level. To me he represents the finest type of trade union leader, who recognizes that the business of a trade union is to advance the interest of its members with a sense of responsibility to the industry of which it is a part and to the community in which it resides.

I am delighted to pay tribute to him as a fellow construction worker. I am a construction worker and I share with Eddie Carrough a sense of pride in the contributions that the construction workers of this country have made to the American way of life over the last 80 years.

The construction trades unions have been a major factor in the development of the American trade union movement and they have been a major factor in protecting the interests of all American workers in war and in peace.

So it is somewhat odd to see today that the construction workers are the target of a vicious campaign of misrepresentation on the part of some people who, in an effort to distract attention from their own failures, are holding construction workers responsible for all of the nation's troubles.

We are told by some Administration apologists and by some of the eggheads and spokesmen for the new left that we in the construction industry are responsible for inflation, for unemployment, for high interest rates and any other economic evil that you can think of.

Well, there is no question, ladies and gentlemen, that this country is in trouble—unemployment at the highest level in many, many years, for all areas and for all occupations—not just the guys in overalls but the professional men, the scientists, the technicians are also the victims of unemployment. We see our great American cities deteriorating into great American slums. As far as I am concerned, there is no question where the blame rests.



So let us look at the facts. Let's look at the record. Let's discard rhetoric and baloney.

January, 1969, when President Nixon was inaugurated, was the 95th month, according to official records, of continuing economic expansion in this country. This long period of economic growth got underway in March of 1961 and was still continuing eight years later, in January of 1969, when Richard Nixon was inaugurated.

By January, 1969, the number of unemployed in this country was down to 2.7 million or 3.4 percent of the labor force. This was still not a perfect record, but it was the lowest unemployment rate in 16 years.

Then came a new Administration with new ideas. Then came the so-called Nixon "game plan", the brainchild of Dr. Arthur Burns, an extraordinary economist, an egghead of unusual brilliance, who, for eight years had been the most severe critic of the economic policies of the Kennedy-Johnson Administrations. With the election of Nixon, his big moment had come.

Well, the plan, as put forth by Dr. Burns and President Nixon, the product of this great brain, was to slow down the economy, to restrict the money supply, to tighten up on credit, to curb inflation, to bring down prices. And this was going to be done without increasing unemployment.

And let me repeat that again—without increasing unemployment.

They even put it in writing. President Nixon wrote a letter to me in February of 1969 in which he spelled out the plan and very specifically said that this plan was going to be put into effect without causing more unemployment.

Well, what happened? Let's take a look at the record again.

Very quickly, in 1969, housing starts dropped from a yearly rate of 1.7 million in January of 1969 to 1.2 million starts in April of 1970. And by August, 1969, industrial production began to decline and by December of 1969, after more than eight years of national economic expansion, the total national economy was declining.

It took the Nixon Administration policies only a few months to turn the national economy around, after eight years of general economic advances, to a situation where we were in a general recession.

Interest rates shot up to the highest level in 100 years, causing a tremendous burden on small business and a tremendous blockade insofar as housing was concerned.

Government construction projects were postponed. And what about unemployment? By the end of 1969, 2.9 million were unemployed, 3.6 percent of the labor force. In 1970 more of the same and by January of 1971, the unemployed totaled 4.9 million—2,200,000 more than when Nixon took office on January 20, 1969.

And what about inflation? What about the prices? According to official government figures, they went from  $4\frac{1}{2}$  percent raise in 1968 to 6 percent in 1971.

All in all, this record—the Nixon-Burns "game plan" for the country's economy—after two years, was a miserable and complete failure.

So now we have a "new game plan." We are going to psych the economy toward prosperity by the middle of 1972. Well, of course, 1972 is important. That is when we elect a new President.

And we are presented now with what can be called mini-expansion measures, pie-in-the-sky revenue sharing plus a barrage of optimistic rhetoric.

And what about the architect of this prolonged recession with its increasing unemployment, combined with the steady rise in living costs? What does Dr. Burns have to say now from his new ivory tower as chairman of the Federal Reserve Board? It is rather odd—if he had turned in this per-

formance in private industry, he would have been fired. If he had turned it in for the Soviet Union, he would have been sent to Siberia. But, here, under the Nixon Administration, he is kicked upstairs to the chairmanship of the Federal Reserve Board where he might possibly do us more harm than he did before.

What has he got to say in the face of this record of miserable failure? Does he explain what happened? Does he say mea culpa, mea maxima culpa, I am sorry? Oh no. He doesn't even say, "Sorry about that." He doesn't even talk about 1969 and 1970. He wastes no time on the past. He is a man for the future.

So he has a "new game plan." He has new ideas for the future. He knows how he can solve our problems and he has found a very convenient whipping boy in the process. And who would the whipping boy be? Surely you can guess. Organized labor, the favorite whipping boy for kept eggheads of big business from time to time over the years.

Let's take a look at the good doctor's suggestions for the good of the nation revealed in his recent speeches and statements.

In a speech in California in January he came up with these ideas for the nation's good: oh, nothing about the economy, nothing about the monetary and fiscal policies that failed. Number one, he said, repeal the Davis-Bacon law. Well, the Davis-Bacon law is predicated on a very sound principle that has been established in practically all of the states of this union—the principle that public money, the people's money, should be spent in a way to uphold decent wages and not depress wages. That's the principle in back of it. So he proposes we repeal it.

Secondly, he said that compulsory arbitration is the answer to the problems that confront us in important industries. So that means an end of the American free system because when you get to the point where government compels you to work for the private profit of some other private individual, then you have got to the point where free America is no more.

But this is what the good Dr. proposes.

And then he says amend the minimum wage law. We find, you know, in our unemployment figures that unemployment bears more heavily in certain areas and in certain portions of our population than in others. In other words, teenage unemployment is always higher, it seems, than the normal figure. Kids coming into the market have difficulty getting jobs. Negro unemployment is always higher.

But the good doctor has a cure for that. He said, let us amend the minimum wage law so that employers can hire teenage labor at a cheaper figure than the minimum wage law requires. This would take care of the teenage unemployment problem. What the hell it would do to their fathers who are getting the minimum wage, I don't know. And what this would do, if this same principle was applied to unemployment in the ghettos and unemployment for the blacks, I don't know.

And then, of course, he had something for business. A tax incentive. Give them a tax break. Let them write off the cost of new equipment and get a tax break from the federal government. And then the other day, testifying before the Senate Banking Committee, he said that the time had come—here is his cure for our problems—the time had come for Congress to take away some of organized labor's powers and stop subsidizing strikes.

He thinks it is a terrible thing that in some states hungry strikers are given food stamps. He thinks this is awful. And, in some states, they even pay them unemployment insurance. When you look at it, anyone who gets unemployment insurance, worked to put that money in the fund in order to draw that

unemployment insurance. That unemployment insurance money does not belong to the state and it doesn't belong to the employer. It belongs to the fellows who work hour by hour.

So the good doctor wants to take that away and he wants to take us back into the last century when industry's answer to the aspirations of workers for a decent wage and a decent standard was the starvation method—starve them out. And he stated to the committee that labor had become so powerful that members of the unions suffer from the union policies.

Well, I don't know about that one. I kind of think the members of a union kind of like the union policies. I have seen many places in this world and I don't know of any place where workers have a better share of the wealth that they helped to produce than they have here in the United States or America. When we drive on the outskirts of our great cities you see every house—the workers' homes—with a television antenna. When you drive up to the great factories, you see acres and acres of parking space filled with workers' cars, and realize that the workers in America share in the good things of life to a greater extent than workers do in any part of the world.

And then this gentleman, who never met a payroll in his life and who never worked with his hands for wages in his life, is telling Congress that unions are too powerful.

And then he went on to say, and get this one, I am sure you will understand this one—he said the apprentice system is medieval, it is archaic, it should be done away with. You know what that means? It names that he has adopted the idea of George Romney that what we need in this country is half-baked mechanics. That we need mechanics who are qualified to work on homes, on small houses, but not qualified as full fledged mechanics and, of course, they are not qualified for full-fledged mechanics wages. This is an idea that Romney had a year or so ago when he told us that he could train building trades mechanics to work on new homes and houses in a period of six months. They wouldn't be full-fledged mechanics, of course. So, I told him at the time, "well, you go in the black community and you tell the black boys that you have some ideas for half-baked mechanics at half-baked wages and see how you make out."

But, as far as I am concerned, as a building trades mechanic, as one who served an apprenticeship, as one who went to school at night while I worked as a helper right here in this city, I am here to tell Dr. Burns and George Romney that the building trades unions, if I know anything about it, are not going to give up their standards of skill in apprenticeship.

And then Dr. Burns told the Senate committee that the high cost of homes in this country can be attributed to labor alone. He said nothing about the inflated costs of land. He said nothing about the interest rate on homes which have doubled in ten years. He said nothing about the inflated cost of material. He said nothing about the fees, the point system and so on, that are charged to home buyers by the banking and real estate interests. No, the only matter that he was interested in was the wages of construction workers.

Well, I am not going to bore you with figures, but I am going to give you one figure that is significant. In 1959, according to a survey of the National Association of Home Builders, which represent home builders in every segment of this country, 33 percent of the purchase price of a house represented labor on the job. Ten years later, the price of the house was up because everything was up. Insofar as the purchase price was concerned, 18 percent represented on-site labor. So this

means that while the cost of housing has gone up, the cost of labor on housing, despite all this talk of high wages, has not gone up anywhere near what the cost of land, the cost of material and the cost of hiring the money has gone up.

I am sure we are going to hear a great deal of this sort of thing in the days and weeks ahead, not only from Dr. Burns, but from other Administration apologists who want to turn peoples' minds away, and their attention away, from the failures of this Administration. This is the purpose, this is as old as human history—when something goes wrong, it is your responsibility to point to something that is wrong somewhere off in the distance. This goes back to the decadent days of the Romans when the people were crying for justice and they stood up in the Roman Senate and they said, "Carthage must be destroyed." They wanted to distract attention from their own ills and their own evils. So this is true here.

The Nixon Administration is not defending the Nixon "game plan" of January, 1969 but they have given us a lot of rhetoric, a lot of stuff about revenue sharing, about how they are going to take care of the problems of the cities. All they are giving us are speeches, nothing of substance.

So, we are going to be the target and this is not new. Organized labor has been the whipping boy before. We have been around quite a few years. We have been shot at before. And I am sure we will survive and continue to do our job long after our critics have been gone and forgotten.

Organized labor's answer to this barrage of criticism will be to continue to serve the great mass of the American people whose mass purchasing power must be the basis for this nation's economic health, if it is to be healthy. We will continue to play our part in maintaining and enhancing the social and economic welfare of the American people—all of them—right down to the lowest rungs of the economic ladder.

And we, too, look forward to 1972. And we realize that it is an election year. And we realize it is an opportunity presented to us to make the political arm of the AFL-CIO, COPE, much more effective than it ever was before.

And in November of 1972, we will answer Dr. Burns and those who feel that the nation's future lies in a crackdown on labor.

And construction workers will play their part in this activity of the organized trade union movement.

And I am sure the Sheet Metal Workers, under the leadership of Edward J. Carrough, will play their part, just as they did under the leadership of Edward F. Carrough and they will effectively do their job as part of the American trade union movement.

So, again, I am delighted to come here, delighted to pay tribute to an old friend and to say to Eddie and Florence, many, many long years of happiness and health.

## ELECTRIC POWER TO FIGHT POLLUTION

**HON. CRAIG HOSMER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, how simple life would be if this Nation could simultaneously solve its electric power shortage and environmental problems by abolishing electric toothbrushes, can openers, and clothes dryers.

All power, they say, pollutes. Therefore, it is axiomatic that reductions in

the consumption of power will reduce pollution while simultaneously eliminating the need for more generating capacity.

How perfectly obvious—but how perfectly wrong.

Man's only real hope for overcoming many forms of pollution lies in that misunderstood weapon—electricity. To cut back on the production of power would only cripple our chances of cleaning up our air, water, and industrial waste.

One of the most eloquent cases I have ever heard for this argument was made by the much honored chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, earlier this week before the National Press Club.

Dr. Seaborg's talk did not receive wide attention despite the distinguished audience. Perhaps it is because reason is less a news story than hysteria.

But I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues this lucid explanation of why a cutback in electric power would do more grievous harm to the environment than power generation. His words are worthy of our attention.

An excerpt from his talk follows:

It is unfortunate that often those people who are so rightfully concerned with the environment have this one-sided outlook regarding the use of energy. They have been conditioned, because of man's abusive use of some energy, to believe that an energy-intensive society such as we have today in our advanced nations must inevitably "self-destruct." A limited view of history has hypnotized them into seeing energy only in terms of a means of ruthlessly extracting resources from nature, using them foolishly (and often unjustly) and then dumping them back into nature in amounts and places where she cannot handle them. The immediate reaction to all this is simply—stop it! Reduce the production of power. Return to the use of less power-intensive products. Use less power to produce fewer products to cause less pollution and we will all be better off. This is some of the reasoning offered.

But while there is always much to be said in favor of belt-tightening and improving efficiency, offering that approach as a panacea is unrealistic and unimaginative. And while we should not use the possibility of abundant energy as an excuse to try to support runaway population growth or ludicrous per capita consumption, neither should we believe that a power growth moratorium holds the solution to these social and economic problems. Changes in rational goals, public attitudes and private life styles may reduce the rate of growth of our energy consumption but those who believe we can reduce our total energy consumption fall to take into account three things:

We are going to have a significant increase in population over the next few decades even if we are successful in our population control effort.

The basic physical needs—and hence basic energy demands—of that population will be enormous because we are in the midst of a social revolution that will inevitably raise the standard of living for the world's underprivileged peoples.

Vast amounts of energy—energy-intensive industries—hold the key to saving, not destroying, the environment as we grow to meet the human demands ahead.

My first two points, I believe, are self-evident. My third one needs some elaboration. The basis for my claim is that, properly used, energy can create materials that substitute for the massive consumption of "natural" materials; that with new technologies—and intelligent, far-sighted plan-

ning—it can do so with less impact on less land, and that it can be used to conserve vast quantities of natural resources while allowing us to return to nature a minimum of waste in its most acceptable form. Much of this last claim has to do, of course, with recycle.

As you may know, we are now into the beginning of what might be called a "Recycle Revolution." Industry, government, the scientific community and the people are all in favor of this revolution. And I believe it may be the most significant step man has taken since he initiated the Age of Steam. But recycling involves far more than composting your leftovers, stacking your newspapers or returning your empty bottles and cans. If you have read about any of the new and proposed recycle plants lately you will realize that these are large technical facilities requiring considerable amounts of power. The same is true of our municipal sewage treatment plants and waterworks and the same holds for most pollution abatement facilities in the new and growing business of environmental control. It is simply a law of physics that to change the form and location of matter you must use energy.

Perhaps you also have heard the argument of one of today's outspoken ecologists that many of the "synthetic" products we use today are environmentally undesirable because they require a large consumption of energy to produce. Hence, he reasons we should return to the use of the natural product in place of its synthetic substitute. For example, it is stated that synthetic textiles demand a huge expenditure of industrial power while cotton is made by the natural energy of the sun. Therefore, why not return to the use only of cotton shirts and dresses? The point seems reasonable until you pursue it further, calculating the additional land area required to produce cotton equivalent to today's synthetic textiles, projecting the future demand on an all-cotton economy, and adding to this the environmental impact of all the fertilizer, the pesticides and the power of harvesting and processing machinery that would be required to sustain such a cotton agriculture. And you would have to consider that power unless you sought to eliminate the environmental effect of these mechanical labor-savers by going back to the days of "Uncle Tom's Cabin." I for one am not inclined to get us into such a "cotton-piekin" situation.

Of course we can still have a viable cotton industry coexisting with our synthetic textiles which are essential today and can be produced with a minimum of harmful impact on our environment at a cost most people would be willing to pay. The difference is that this latter approach requires a positive outlook, some imagination and the desire to put science and technology to work more creatively.

Among the other modern industries that some ecologists have criticized as being energy-intensive are cement, aluminum and plastics. But the extra energy used to produce these materials must be considered in terms of its trade-off for other environmental demands. For example, all these materials replace wood in a variety of ways. If we were to declare a moratorium on their use and return to using only their "natural substitute," think what an additional demand this would make on the forests we prize today as natural preserves and recreational land! There are numerous other examples. And I can cite many different ways that the elimination of energy-intensive applications would be more environmentally damaging and socially expensive in terms of today's demands.

This is not a defense of the desecration that has been caused by the abusive and thoughtless use of abundant energy. No one denies that this has taken place and we can still see it taking place now even as we are beginning to fight against it. But the problem today is that we are "hooked" on this historical hindsight in which we cannot—or



refuse to—see that new, less destructive and more creative ways of generating and using large amounts of energy are possible, among them nuclear power. It is for this reason that dedicated workers in the nuclear field are doubly disturbed when their technology is attacked by some proclaimed environmentalists. We in the nuclear community feel that we are pragmatic environmentalists—that we are working with a source of energy that can be the least harmful to the environment from a power generation standpoint, while providing the abundant power needed to solve the environmental and social problems of our time.

Let me explain why we believe this.

We must face the fact that to a growing extent electricity is the lifeblood of our modern civilization. Without it, in both our urban and rural areas, very little moves or works. I do not believe I have to elaborate on this, as we have had some startling real-life demonstrations of this in recent years.

In spite of the fact that we may be able, to some degree, to improve our efficiency in generating electricity and reduce our waste in using it, it would be unrealistic and perhaps even dangerous not to accept the projection that over the next 30 years our electricity demand will grow six-fold. In several densely populated areas of the country electric utilities already face a continuous touch-and-go situation in meeting local power demands. The reason for this projected growth, contrary to a popular notion, is not that we are merely adding numerous new electric-powered frills at home. These electric gadgets draw a negligible amount of power. In recent years it has been the growing use of air-conditioning that has accounted for the largest single increase in the residential use of electricity, as well as more families being able to afford the major electric facilities that are essential today.

A large portion of the additional electric power requirements that we will see in the future will be caused by a shift from other energy sources to the use of electricity to fulfill basic needs such as heating and cooling, industrial processing and transportation. And in most cases the shift will be away from energy sources far less desirable from an environmental standpoint. Abundant, economic electricity also can help industry and transportation introduce systems that are inherently less polluting—such as the electric steel furnace which serves the additional environmental function of making the recycle of automobile scrap more economic. We must also recognize that it is much easier to exercise environmental controls over a centralized source of power such as an electric generating station than over a million individual fires whether they are in homes, industrial plants or auto engines.

To meet our future power demands there is no doubt that a great number of large central station steam-generating plants will have to be built and operated. We can explore and develop other possibilities to some extent. In certain areas of the country we may be able to harness enough geothermal heat to meet some local and regional power demands. At a few coastal points we may be able to make some limited use of tidal power. And there may be some places where we could reliably collect and concentrate enough solar energy for local domestic applications.

But to believe that it is feasible, technically, economically or environmentally, to develop these energy sources to supply most of the huge additional electric generating capacity required across our country in the years ahead is sheer folly. We are still going to have to depend on the heat from fuels to supply by far the largest portion of our needed power.

## DISTINGUISHED CLERGYMEN SPEAK FOR PEACE

### HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday a number of our colleagues met at breakfast with a large number of distinguished clergymen of various faiths. Most of the clergymen are of the Washington area; however, a few were from out of town. Among the group were several who had just returned from extensive informal talks with all four sides at the Paris Peace Conference and with various scholars in Paris.

This was not a typical prayer breakfast. Rather, it was a strong effort to highlight the moral and other issues relating to our Nation's military involvement in Indochina.

Mr. Speaker, I believe our colleagues would like to share in access to the very meaningful and excellent dialog which occurred at the breakfast. I am fortunate to have the texts of two of the distinguished speakers, Dr. Herbert Meza of the Church of the Pilgrims (Presbyterian), 22d and P Streets NW., Washington, D.C., and the Reverend William A. Benfield, the moderator of the Presbyterian Church in the United States and pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Charleston, W. Va.

Under unanimous consent, I request that their exceptionally timely and meaningful remarks be printed in the RECORD.

I include the article, as follows:

#### REMARKS OF DR. HERBERT MEZA

It is my responsibility, along with Congressman Anderson, to give you a very brief sketch of how this breakfast has come about.

Two factors lie behind it. The first has to do with a malaise of powerlessness that has overtaken society. With so many wanting peace, why is it we are not any nearer to it? With so many consequences, despair, alienation, so much dissatisfaction, why can't we extricate ourselves from this madness? Why have the constitutional safeguards not been functioning? Why has Congress been ineffective? Why are we all, including the President, so powerless to do anything about it?

I maintain that something has happened to the very nature of government. Forces have been set loose that do not respond to the traditional agencies of correction. Impersonal forces have been let loose and our priorities and our national will seem powerless to effect them. Our society no longer seems under control. Running its separate course, we have all been reduced to helpless spectators.

Eugene Burdick describes this phenomenon in his book, *Fail-Safe*. The two forces man has created, science and the state, have become impersonal monsters that no longer respond to human initiative. They toy with us as the Olympian gods toyed with the Greeks.

It is the same affirmation Simone Weil made about France. "Society," she said, "is dominated by a vast machine in which men are continually being caught up and which nobody knows how to control."

Our own system of checks and balances is prey to the disease. James Madison designed

it in such a way that it simply won't move without vigorous leadership. But in Madison's time he had brilliant and courageous contemporaries and it never occurred to him that the time might come when leadership would be neutralized or lacking.

We are suffering from what the Bible calls "principalities and powers that rule this earth," and it gathers momentum in the absence of restraining leadership.

The second factor which has contributed to this breakfast, and hopefully others to follow, here and around the nation, is the factor of morality. The dimensions of this war's morality have not been fully explored. Should we not face them? There are representatives of the church, with privilege credentials, in the circles of government, who have not raised the proper questions, who indeed obscure the moral dilemma by lending their prestige to the state. An ecclesiastical curtain has been placed around this government and the voice of the church has not been truly heard.

It is our hope that together (congressmen and clergymen) we might explore these dimensions with the hope that we could provide American democracy with a fresh example of vigor and righteousness which would truly serve the cause of mankind and exalt the nation.

#### REMARKS OF REV. WILLIAM A. BENFIELD

Distinguished members of Congress, fellow clergymen, and guests, I am privileged to report to you on the recent Church Leaders Consultation on Vietnam.

Fifty of us, church men and women, from nine denominations and two interdenominational groups and from 20 states and the District of Columbia, spent the recent week of March 20-27, in lengthy conversations with the official delegations to the Paris Conference on Vietnam, the delegations of the United States, the Republic of Vietnam, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam. We talked with Ambassador Bruce, Ambassador Lam, Ambassador Thuy, and Madam Binh, as well as other members of the four delegations. Additionally, we had conversations with Vietnamese Catholic priests, Buddhist Monks, former officials and representatives of the Sihanouk government, French scholars and others.

We did not go to Paris as negotiators but we did go as people who are committed to our nation and concerned for its integrity; as people who share a loyalty to the God of justice, judgment, and mercy, God who demands that we love all our neighbors; and as people who anguish over what the war in Indochina is doing to our neighbors, our nation, and to us. We took no petitions or proposals. We went to listen and learn, that we could be more effective workers in helping to resolve the moral crises of the hour.

Within this context of purpose and after days of consultation, we 50 church men and women agreed unanimously on five convictions.

First, it is our conviction that the brutal war in Indochina must be stopped now. Millions have been killed or wounded. Homes, fields, and forests have been destroyed. A whole generation has known no peace, only devastation and death. Thich Nhat Hanh, the brilliant author of "Lotus in a Sea of Fire," put it in tragic vividness when in his poem, "Condemnation," he wrote:

Yesterday six Viet Cong came through my village;  
Because of this my village was destroyed,  
completely destroyed;

Every soul was killed.

I feel I am like that bird which dies for the sake of its mate

Dripping blood from its broken beak, and crying out;

Beware! Turn around to face your real enemies—

Ambition, violence, hatred, greed.

Men cannot be your enemies—even men called "Vietcong!"

If we kill men, what brothers will we have left?

With whom shall we live then?

Secondly, it is our conviction that no acceptable military solution to this conflict, including "Vietnamization," is possible. Each side firmly believes its cause is just and is determined to fight as long as necessary. Vietnamization, with its provision of arms for Asians to kill other Asians, will not resolve the political conflict underlying the war. Moreover, "changing the color of the corpses" is morally repugnant to us.

Third, it is our conviction that attitudes and methods of negotiation must change if a political solution is to be possible. Just as each side to the conflict believes that its cause is just and the other's unjust, so each side in the negotiations feels that its offer is reasonable and the other's unreasonable. Moreover, the very style of the negotiation talks, with no chairman, no mediator, no exchange of notes, and no private meetings, severely limits the possibility of genuine dialogue. It is our feeling that because the United States is the only party at the present time willing to talk to all delegations, it should give the peace talks a much higher priority and authorize its delegation to take creative initiative in facilitating negotiations.

Fourth, it is our conviction that a pledge by the United States to withdraw all of its troops from Indochina by a certain date would be a highly significant contribution to the negotiations. Both the date and manner of withdrawal ought to be negotiated.

Furthermore, it is our fifth conviction that the only way to secure the release of prisoners of war is through a political settlement and that the only way to secure that political settlement is to pledge to withdraw U.S. forces. We share with many others a deep concern for the prisoners being held by all sides and for their families and it is our firm conviction that the President's intention to leave a U.S. military force in Vietnam so long as U.S. prisoners are held is inevitably self-defeating.

There come those times in the life of a nation when it is called to express itself in unusual greatness of character. On some occasions in the past we have failed to respond, which has been to our shame. On other occasions we have acted with great moral courage. Such a call to greatness is now at hand and we can no longer accommodate ourselves to platforms of expediency.

We are the most powerful nation in the world. We are the richest nation in the world. But what is the role of the strong to be? If we want to continue to spend billions of dollars to be used in killing and suffering in Indochina, if we want to continue to neglect serious humanitarian needs at home and abroad, there is no better way than to continue on our present course of action. But now, in the midst of war-weariness, when cries grow louder every week, here at home, in Southeast Asia, and elsewhere—"stop the killing, stop the killing," we have the opportunity to assume a moral leadership that could affect international relations and provide a way to peace with almost unprecedented action.

In my own tradition the church does not dictate to the state nor does it ignore the state, but rather the church seeks to be the moral conscience of the state. As Christians, we are not to be observers of history, rather

we are called to change history. In days gone by, the church has not adequately exercised its prophetic voice concerning the insanity that is Vietnam. And many of us fear that the voice of religion heard in the White House has too often cried peace, peace, when there is no peace, and has witnessed to a comfortable God of the Nation who pleases us, rather than to the Lord of all Nations whom we must please. The church can no longer remain on the balcony of aloofness. It must get on the road of involvement which leads to peace.

In the light of such commitment and in this hour of crisis, we make these appeals:

1. We appeal to the President and to the Congress to declare immediately their pledge to withdraw unconditionally all U.S. military forces from Indochina in the immediate future.

2. We appeal to the President to add credibility to this pledge and to bring a major part of the killing to an end by directing all United States air, naval and ground forces in Indochina not to drop bombs or to fire weapons except in response to direct attack.

3. We appeal to our government to initiate immediately at the Paris Conference, negotiations on the timetable for the pledged withdrawal of all United States military forces.

4. We appeal to all of our fellow church men and women to join us in calling on the President and the Congress to take these steps immediately.

#### GROWERS PROMOTE WORLDWIDE SALES OF AMERICAN RAW COTTON

#### HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the National Cotton Council is truly one of the Nation's leading agricultural and business organizations. This group has been in the forefront in promoting worldwide sales of American raw cotton and has been a leader in every major effort to bolster the American cotton producing industry.

On March 19, 1971, Hon. C. R. Sayre, president of the NCC, delivered a splendid address before the Carolina Cotton Warehouse Association at Charleston, S.C.

Dr. Sayre very effectively called attention to the fact that farmers and ginners and other raw cotton people have a stake in curbing the flood of cheap, low-wage textile imports. Dr. Sayre pointed out that if textile producers are driven out of business in this country, the American cotton farmer will have lost his largest and most dependable market.

Following are excerpts from Dr. Sayre's outstanding address at Charleston:

Let's just think for a moment about some of the things we must do. In my judgment restraints on textile imports demand an all-out effort by the Council and the whole industry this year.

Frankly, I don't believe that farmers and ginners and other raw cotton people fully understand their stake in bringing textile imports under reasonable control. All too often they tend to look at these imports as a mill problem.

Gentlemen, I submit to you that if textile imports take over and dominate our domes-

tic market, the big losers will be the farmers and others who make their living from raw cotton. If we don't win on this issue, we can quickly and irretrievably lose our chance to build a larger and stronger cotton industry.

The domestic market is by far the biggest and most dependable we have. One reason it is dependable is that we are protected by a raw cotton quota of only 30,000 bales of upland cotton. In our domestic market, we don't have to compete against the growers of Mexico or Brazil. We know that American cotton is being used in the American market. And if that market grows, we have a wonderful chance to see our domestic consumption go up—particularly with the added effort we're putting into domestic market development.

But the growth in the domestic market can soon be cut off and the trend turned downward if imports continue to accelerate the way they've been doing for the last decade. Just 10 years ago, in 1961, total textile imports (including those made of cotton, man-made fibers, and wool) were equal to only about three-quarters of a million bales of raw cotton. The current level is about 2.6 million bales—or a rise of almost two million bale equivalents for the decade. Imports of cotton textiles amount to about a million bale equivalents—most, about 80 percent, made out of foreign-grown cotton.

At this time we still have some mild, voluntary agreements which tend to restrain the expansion in cotton textile imports. But the foreign mills are getting around these agreements by flooding our domestic market with goods made of blends and synthetics, which obviously compete with cotton.

Clearly, the whole domestic textile market in which we compete is under attack. It has already been badly disrupted. Its growth has been stunted. It will certainly start shrinking if import acceleration continues.

What we must understand is that this is a bigger threat to raw cotton people than to the mills. We stand to lose a very substantial part of our biggest and best market, and we can't afford it. The mills do have an alternative. It's not what they want, but they may be driven to it. They can always join the foreign competition. They can start shifting their investments to foreign countries where they can obtain low-cost labor and where they can buy cotton or any other fiber from whomever they please. Naturally, they would be planning to ship their textiles to the United States; and you can imagine what that would do to our domestic market.

So the Council has attached a top and urgent priority to resolving the textile import problem this year. We are putting together a grassroots campaign to support our Washington operations. You will be hearing more about this soon. It calls for a maximum effort from producers, ginners, and all others in our industry. We must handle this import problem if we are to hold and increase our momentum. If we all join hands, I'm confident we can get this job done.

We must recognize that our opponents, especially the Japanese, have used every tactic at their disposal to delay action and confuse and divide the American people. Every time there seemed to be some progress in the Congress, the Japanese have put forward some new proposal or changed the tempo of negotiations, which has led people to believe that they were serious about reaching an agreement. But nothing has been accomplished. The proposal in March 1971 by the Japanese Textile Federation to limit unilaterally its textile exports to the U.S. is obviously another tactical move that is totally unacceptable. The proposal has a single upper limit for all textiles, with no limits at all on individual categories. This would permit the Japanese to concentrate their exports in items that are especially strong in this country, like cotton denims and jeans,



put domestic producers out of business, and then move on to something else. This unilateral "restraint" would not take effect unless and until other leading exporting countries also agreed to do the same thing, and meanwhile the base period for these "restraints" moves forward and the base gets larger and larger. This proposal would undercut the LTA on cotton textiles, which, incidentally Japan is no longer a party to; would not include yarn; would not have the force of an international agreement; and would last only three years. Obviously, this would be a step backward instead of forward.

#### TRANSITION PERIOD ON CHINA POLICY

**HON. RICHARD T. HANNA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, it seems clear from presentations in Congress and the media that U.S. policy toward Communist China, and therefore toward free China, is being pressed into an unfortunate and dangerous adversary position. This position is causing extensive polarization around the question of the recognition of Red China and her acceptance into the United Nations.

What all this sudden furor of rhetoric fails to make clear, or even to recognize, is the importance of formulating a position that is based on an understanding of existing conditions in Asia. This is a transition period between old and new policy. The fact that we are in a transition period must be recognized above all else while we are formulating policy. Not to recognize the reality of the transitory environment we are now in could cause a serious error in our ultimate decision.

Let me clarify my use of the term, "transition period." No sensible or informed person would take the position that our policy should remain static and based upon the conditions which prevailed in the 1945-60 period. Unquestionably, there is abroad in Asia changes of such significance and facts of such operative dominance that some adjustment, some reorientation and reexpression of policy are and will be mandated. But one cannot leap from infancy to adulthood without some period of transition. Given the illusory nature of the assessments of mainland China's positions and conditions, it is clear that dynamic change there is still occurring. We must not unilaterally offer concessions on our relations with mainland China before knowing what we will be dealing with and thereupon foreclosing on important options and alternatives.

Although world opinion might consider the actions already taken by the United States far short of those suggested by certain elements in and out of Congress, an honest judgment would have to place the ball in China's court. Now the burden truly is on the Peking government to make some meaningful and constructive response to concessions and invitations already extended by our Government. I make this point inde-

pendent of and completely outside of considerations relative to the treaties we have entered into with free China and other surrounding lands. Also, I do not weigh the possible development of questionable attitudes on the part of other Southeast Asian countries surrounding U.S. liability. I speak solely of the long-term diplomatic, economic, and moral interests of the United States in that great area of the Pacific. We must not be impatient. We must not accelerate our position so far ahead of Peking's responses that we lose the benefit of the give and take which must be forthcoming if we continue to insist upon response before advancing further terms.

We face and must consider the realities of Asian timing and the intricacies of their political action and counteraction. Our experience in Asia should have taught us this lesson. We are not served by those who, by oversimplification, create a polarization of our position which destroys our flexibility and steals from us the benefits of the transitional period we are now in. We must fully exploit this period by encouraging and demanding responses and counterproposals from the other bargaining party.

I do not believe and have never espoused that our country should turn over its foreign policy to any other country or to that country's concerns. I would take that position whether or not the country involved were Israel, Vietnam, or free China. This is not to say that our own selfish but defensible interests, although shortsightedly interpreted as being in consort with the interest of some smaller nation, might not provide a sounder, more defensible posture for the long-term benefit of our country.

In short, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am quite disturbed that the sudden smoke from arguments for wider recognition of Red China obscure the ground we have prepared for our transition. This is a time which calls not for haste, but for extensive and patient negotiations with Red China. We should encourage that nation to respond constructively to those initiatives already presented by our country. An American rush can only result in an American rout in Southeast Asia. Patience, persistence, pressure—these qualities will bring meaningful progress.

#### AN INSPIRING EXAMPLE OF COURAGE AND PATIENCE

**HON. TIM LEE CARTER**

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my notice from Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, who in his early life lived in Butler County, Ky., and who served later in this body as a Member from the Louisville district, a heart-moving story appearing in the March 18, 1971, issue of the Green River Republican.

This old and greatly esteemed periodical has an interesting article, written

by Mary Jefferies, descriptive of the 10-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. Truman Annis, who live on a farm close to Logansport in that county. The author tells with dramatic power of the suffering which resulted when a few years before the little boy was run down by an automobile while riding his bicycle on the highway.

The injuries received by him have been of the gravest character, paralyzing him, and destroying his sight. The care given him by his parents has been of the most solicitous and constant character, consuming their modest means, but being finally rewarded by a gleam of recovery on the part of the suffering child.

The latter has become an historic case in medical circles and his brave and courageous attitude have been inspirational in humanitarian circles. I am deeply interested in the case, not only because of its medical aspects, but also because the example thus presented appeals strongly to humanitarian reactions common to the human race.

This extension is made only for the purpose of citing medical and inspirational effects thus shown. Relatives and friends of the little sufferer are giving needed aid to the parents.

There may be other like cases here and there in varying forms which occasionally appear, but I doubt whether any other case is more extreme in its results than that of this little boy who seems to have been robbed of everything but courage and patience.

The article in question is now made with leave accorded, a part hereof taken from the columns of the indicated publication of which Silas Barrow is the editor.

Butler County years ago was part of the old "Bloody Third" district, including some of my present congressional counties, and Dr. W. Godfrey Hunter served in the Congress from that historic district.

Here is the story:

10-YEAR-OLD JEFFREY ANNIS SEEMS TO IMPROVE WITH "PATTERNING" THERAPY  
(By Mary Jefferies)

Little Jeffrey Annis of Logansport was 10 years old on November 9 last year.

He doesn't ride a Butler County school bus, nor does he play basketball, plan Cub Scout projects, or do any of the things most ten year old boys do.

His days are spent learning "reflexive crawling" and undergoing other therapeutic measures called "patterning" that are designed to help healthy cells in his brain take over the duties of damaged brain tissue.

Jeff suffered severe brain damage when he was struck by a car while riding his bicycle on Highway 403, just a short distance from his home. The accident occurred around 5 p.m., March 6, 1967—his mother's birthday. Jeff's parents are Mr. and Mrs. Truman Annis of Logansport. He has an older brother, Paul, and one sister, Rita, who is a registered nurse.

Jeff's world is the family living room. It has been transformed into an efficient hospital therapy unit. Unlike so many rehabilitation centers, Jeff's room is a wonderful happy place where visitors are welcome. After a visit to Jeff's world, one leaves with a warm feeling and the words: love, faith, and courage, are remembered—along with a mental picture of a little boy with a big smile.

The tragic circumstances of that snowy afternoon in March may be half forgotten by

Butler Countians, but the accident has completely changed the lives of the Annis family. Naturally, there has been sorrow and despair in the course of the last four years, but also, there has emerged an unfaltering faith and a brand of courage that is an inspiration to friends and neighbors.

There were no broken bones when Jeff was thrown from his bike and only a minor cut on his wrist, but his head struck the hard surface blacktop, causing severe brain injury. He was rushed to a Bowling Green hospital and underwent emergency surgery to relieve intracranial pressure. The hours of waiting outside the operating room were an eternity for the Annis family . . . and this was just the beginning.

When word came, it was not favorable. Neurosurgeons gave little hope of recovery. Damage to the brain center was massive, leaving Jeff paralyzed and blind. There was nothing to do but wait.

The family waited . . . and prayed. There seemed to be no hope. A local physician, Dr. Richard Wan, sought consultations with specialists all over the United States. No leads were left unexplored, even though hospital costs mounted steadily. Meanwhile, as Jeff lingered between life and death, other problems arose. Pneumonia set in and doctors believed that he could not survive in his weakened condition.

The Annis family did not give up. They haunted the corridors near Jeff's room waiting and hoping for some improvement. Kindly hospital officials looked the other way when Truman Annis slept in the prayer room. After the crisis came, staff members could only say that Jeff had survived. There was no change in the original diagnosis.

A severe kidney infection followed. Just as his parents' hopes dimmed, little Jeff rallied . . . only to be racked by convulsions from the brain damage. Part of the brain which regulates body temperature had been affected and Jeff was plunged into the third crisis in less than a month.

During this heartbreaking period, the family waited for brief moments with Jeff. Even though his physical needs were taken care of by trained personnel, his father, Truman Annis, never left the hospital. When permitted, he was always at his son's bedside. There were times when Jeff, unconscious in a twilight world, would smile . . . and a father's faith was born.

The first three months were spent in the recovery room where specialized care kept him alive. Intravenous feedings and a respirator became a part of his everyday life. Later, a stomach tube provided nourishment for his little body, and his kidneys functioned with the help of an indwelling catheter.

While Jeff was being transferred to a private room, a nurse noticed that his lungs expanded without the aid of a respirator. When this was confirmed, he was given regular periods of "free breathing" and the use of the respirator was discontinued. Since private nursing care was needed, financial arrangements were made even though the small insurance policy that Annis held had dwindled. Hospitalization for Jeff lasted nearly five months and then he was transferred to Lakeview Nursing Home.

The world of medical terminology and hospital procedures is little known to a farming man, but Jeff's father made it his business to learn all he could about the devices used to sustain his son's life. He began a determined search for knowledge concerning treatment and care used in similar cases. Letters that requested information on the subject were sent to medical centers throughout the world. Annis made countless trips to neighboring states to talk with parents of children with similar problems.

Jeff was taken to the Kentuckian Center in Louisville for examination and treatment. Doctors in the metropolitan area became in-

terested in Jeff, and later visited him at the nursing home. Jeff was treated for muscle atrophy, a condition brought on by the months of inactivity due to paralysis.

Twenty-four hour nursing care was still required for Jeff when his parents took him home November 3, 1967, so Truman Annis learned to provide this. The living room was transformed into a hospital unit.

Wanda Baker of Logansport came daily to help out. A local chiropractor and family friend, Dr. Mirko Radovich, continued the treatment advised in Louisville. It was during one of these muscle therapy sessions that Jeff made his first audible sound since the accident. When Dr. Radovich shared the good news with the Annis family, it was a happy day for everyone.

The following months did not hold many happy days. Jeff fought an unending battle with infection, each new crisis seeming to weaken him even more. Work on the farm was neglected while the family took turns with Jeff's nursing care. Doctor bills and drug costs steadily increased, so Truman Annis and his son Paul worked harder to make ends meet.

A second bout with pneumonia weakened Jeff and sent him back to the hospital in December, 1969. This time he stayed only five days, but the medical expenses soared. Barbara Moore of Logansport came to help out with Jeff's care. Even with the insurance settlement, the family savings dwindled because of the financial burden. But Jeff still smiled, and his father's faith grew stronger.

Friends offered help, but there seemed little they could do except pray. Annis is sure that prayers are answered, because soon the stomach tube was removed and Jeff learned to swallow liquid feedings with the aid of an aseptic syringe.

Spring 1970 came and a new crop of corn and soybeans was planted. Truman Annis and Paul worked the farm in shifts so that one of them would always be able to care for Jeff.

It was about this time that an article appeared in a weekly news magazine (Grit) that told of work being done with brain injured children by a famed neurologist, Dr. Eugene Spitz, of Philadelphia. Annis made an appointment with Dr. Spitz's clinic and accompanied Jeff there on April 20. In Philadelphia, brain wave tests were given and studied. Mr. Annis was told, "It would be a shame not to give Jeff the benefit of patterning therapy." A chance meeting with a man from West Virginia gave Annis another ray of hope. He learned there was a facility for this treatment in Nashville, Tennessee, less than a hundred miles from his Butler County home.

Truman and Laverne Annis traveled to Nashville and visited the Institute for Neurological Development of 895 Murfreesboro Road. They learned of the work being done there with brain injured children and arranged to bring Jeff for examination and evaluation. After Jeff's first trip to Nashville, it became evident that the long trip by ambulance combined with the manual exercise treatments—were too exhausting to continue.

Don Griffin, director of the institute, told Annis of a new machine designed to do the work of manual patterning. Annis contacted Corban Company, Inc. of Staunton, Va. and arranged to have the machine shipped to his home in Logansport. Although production of the machine is limited (only 250 have been made). It was installed in the Annis home in July. Griffin drove up from Nashville to assist with the installation and stayed over until Annis could operate the machine efficiently. The cost of the unit alone was \$1200.00.

The strange looking apparatus is an assemblage of belts, pulleys, shafts, sprockets, bearings, and steel cable combined with an electric motor. It is kept ready at all times to exercise every joint in Jeff's body. There is a pivot for each body joint. These move

separately, but in perfect rhythm when the machine is in operation. If one part of Jeff's body becomes spastic and unmovable, the corresponding portion of the equipment will disengage from the motor drive and stop. When he is able to move again, the machine automatically goes back in the proper sequence.

Jeff's time on the patterning machine was limited at first. Sore muscles and bruised knees were factors that had to be considered. Use of the eleven feet long slide had to be discontinued, but other therapeutic procedures have been added. Jeff has grown stronger since patterning therapy began and, in many ways, he lets the family know he is ready for the treatment to begin.

Three people are required to do the patterning exercises and at least two are needed to assist in the follow up steps. Annis is on hand for each session. He receives help from other members of the family and from Mrs. Jean Jones, who comes in each day.

Jeff's day begins at 6 a.m. and he spends five minutes on the machine. His joints are moved by the apparatus in the same motions other children use in crawling. This is repeated every two hours, five times a day. Music from a record player accompanies each session. Popular tunes are his favorites. He breathes in a plastic bag (under strict supervision) once every hour. This helps his lungs expand and is part of treatment. His hands are brushed briskly six times a day and a can of frozen orange juice is rubbed over his palms. A vibrator connected to his bed is turned on six times a day after each treatment. Auditory stimulation is given with a loud air horn at regular intervals throughout the day. He reacts much the same way any child would. When four big spotlights are turned on, he shuts his eyes.

There is marked improvement in Jeff's condition. His general health is much better, as indicated by a greater resistance to infection. He is still given liquid feedings every two hours, but is now able to eat pureed or baby food and occasionally drinks a soft drink. Jeff tries very hard to communicate with his family and will hold up his left arm proudly when his brother Paul says: "Show us your muscle."

He loves company and is pleased when visitors notice the toy rabbit he holds in his hand. Oh, yes!—Jeff still smiles. And now, Truman Annis smiles, too.

#### GOVERNOR SHAPP APPEARANCE AT PRESS CLUB BIG SUCCESS

#### HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I was fortunate today to be in attendance when the Governor of my State of Pennsylvania, Milton Shapp, addressed the National Press Club.

The audience was composed largely of men who have put many years in the Washington mill. They have heard speeches and rhetoric day in and day out. They are old hands at listening, and conversely, old hands at picking the phonies from the genuine item.

On the basis of their response to Governor Shapp, today, I would say they spent a delightful hour with the real thing.

Governor Shapp talked about the fiscal problems that our State is experiencing and offered his own idea for the Federal Government alleviating the State worry load.



He proposed that the Federal Government do three things: First, generate new revenue for the States and cities, including block grants and a Federal takeover of the welfare program; second, a strong Federal action to stimulate economic growth, and third, an expansion of Federal programs for social progress.

I include in the RECORD the remarks of Governor Shapp and salute him on an excellent and forthright speech:

REMARKS OF GOVERNOR MILTON J. SHAPP AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, 1 P.M., WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 1971

With frequent regularity, the nation's Governors journey to Washington—individually or in groups—to meet with the President, confer with Cabinet officials, to lobby in Congress and address the National Press Club.

Often, the Governors are followed by—or preceded by—the Mayors of the nation's cities.

Invariably, the message is the same: the states and cities of America are in desperate financial shape and the federal government must bail them out with some form of revenue sharing.

Usually, the dialogue turns out to be a debate without particulars. Some Governors and Mayors support the concept of revenue sharing in principle. Others support the Nixon plan whatever that may be. Some are for other forms of federal help. Others are for the proposals of this or that Senator. The general theme though is consistent. The cities and states lack the broad tax base, must live within balanced budgets and thus are unable to finance their expanding needs.

Against this background of growing national debate, I am happy, if somewhat apprehensive, to be here today to address the National Press Club as the Democratic Governor of the nation's third largest state.

I say I am apprehensive because I am sure you are sitting there expecting to hear the same old pitch for revenue sharing in the same old way with minor modifications here and there.

Well, I've decided not to make the same old pitch because I don't happen to agree with it. The Nixon proposals simply do not apply to the problems of 1971 let alone for 1972 and successive years.

I build a successful business by making decisions based upon need and logic. I don't believe we can solve our governmental problems by continuing to make our decisions on the basis of politics.

Now don't misunderstand me. As Governor of Pennsylvania I would be glad to be the beneficiary of a windfall called revenue sharing.

Call it the Nixon Plan, the Muskie Plan, the Governor's Plan, the Mayors' Plan, or anyone else's plan, I'll take the money. Pennsylvania needs it.

Last month, in Pennsylvania, we enacted a new tax package featuring for the first time one income tax based on line 50 of the federal tax return. Coupled with some basic reforms and additional business taxes, that package will, for the first time in many years, place Pennsylvania on a solid financial basis. This is quite a step forward considering the fact that on March 1st we ran out of money; that we were on the brink of insolvency, facing a debt, projected until June of 1972, of \$1.55 billion.

Nonetheless, even with the passage of new taxes and the economies that we are introducing into the operations of government, we will barely meet our obligations for present programs in fiscal '71-'72, to say nothing about the need to finance many new programs of vital public need.

Take, for example, mass transportation in Pennsylvania. The Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority (SEPTA) which services Philadelphia and the surrounding counties, is in serious financial trouble. To modernize SEPTA and place it on a solid financial footing, between \$800 million and a billion dollars will be needed over the next five years.

That money can't come from Philadelphia, nor can it come from the state. Only last week, the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia warned that Philadelphia faces "fiscal chaos" in the 1970s. The report projected cumulative deficits for this one city alone totaling \$1.325 billion over the next five years.

The Federal Reserve report also made clear that projected amount of \$54 million which Philadelphia would receive annually would still leave a deficit of over one billion dollars in five years merely to continue to finance existing programs even if President Nixon's revenue sharing program was enacted.

The Nixon proposal is nothing more than a red herring to obscure the real problems our nation faces and to give the illusion that the administration is concerned about the people's problems. Also, what is happening today is that public officials, focusing so strongly on the abstract concept of revenue sharing, have failed to perceive the vital inter-relationship of fiscal policy with economic and social policy.

You have often heard Governors, Mayors and Congressmen say that money alone will not solve our problems.

But too often that statement is accompanied by a single preoccupation with getting money alone.

I hope that we can stimulate a broader debate throughout the nation, one which would place equal priority on the need for economic growth and the demand for social progress.

Perhaps no other issue of modern times illustrates the three-fold problem of fiscal necessity, economic growth and social progress better than the welfare system.

During the next fiscal year, the welfare rolls in Pennsylvania are expected to exceed 900,000 cases.

In New York State, Governor Rockefeller announced last week a proposal to place a one-year residency requirement on welfare recipients, justifying his claim on the statement that his state faces an unusually serious situation under the terms of the Supreme Court residency ruling.

And in California, Governor Reagan has flatly and simply called for the elimination of three-quarters of a million people from the welfare rolls at a projected saving of \$700 million.

Each response has been in terms of money. Neither Rockefeller nor Reagan has spoken in terms of people.

I have proposed that the federal government take over the operation of the entire welfare system. I believe that the machinery of public assistance, designed to meet the crisis of the 1930's Depression, simply no longer applies to the problems of the seventies.

The rise in the welfare caseload represents a fiscal crisis of grave magnitude that cannot be handled by the states. The soaring caseload not only reflects uncontrollable state costs due to federal laws and court decisions regarding eligibility for welfare, but it is also indicative of a stagnant national economy.

It points up our social failure to provide meaningful programs of education, job training, and employment, for all our citizens, of wasting so much of our precious national resources in a senseless war instead of taking care of our people's real needs.

Therefore, I propose that government, on every level, begin to think in terms of a

three-cornered solution to our problems. One is the generation of new sources of revenue for our cities and states, which should include some block grant revenue sharing funds combined with a federal takeover of the welfare program.

A second is the need for positive federal action to stimulate economic growth.

Third, an expansion of programs for social progress.

My thoughts regarding the need for federal takeover of the welfare systems were presented to the Joint Economic Committee on January 22nd. I shall not expand on this concept here except to illustrate that under Nixon's revenue sharing proposals, Pennsylvania's state government would receive \$123 million next year but welfare costs alone will increase over \$150 million. And that we would presently save almost \$700 million if Washington took this load over. Many of our problems are caused by high unemployment.

Ten years ago, when John Kennedy became President, the economy faced the same type of stagnation which we are witnessing today—high unemployment, slow growth and sluggish production.

The Kennedy Administration demonstrated that the tools of the federal government could be used in a constructive manner to stimulate the economy. Public works, Manpower Retraining, Area Redevelopment, Aid to Education, new incentives for housing and stepped up urban assistance all were put to work to prime the economy.

Some of these programs in their particulars, would not necessarily be the ones we need today. But surely the federal government must adopt the principle of putting its vast resources to work for the cause of economic growth.

As Leon Keyserling recently pointed out, "unless reasonably full employment and production are restored within a reasonable time, all of the economic and social problems with which the states and localities are wrestling will be further aggravated to a degree which cannot be compensated for by revenue sharing." A program for revenue sharing would be but a part, and minor part at that, of the entire program needed by our federal government. There is urgent need to develop a long-range economic and social budget for the United States, properly quantifying broad production and employment targets.

I understand the President says he is now a Disciple of Keynes. He has presented his own version of deficit spending in the guise of a full employment budget. He claims that he is now prepared to use the tools of the federal government to get us out of the recessionary spiral we are in.

But once again, we see evidence that his words are not consistent with his actions.

Why is the administration holding back on billions of dollars already appropriated for education and urban programs and mandated from the highway trust fund?

Last weekend at the Democratic Governor's Conference in St. Louis, I said that while Nixon talks a good game about revenue sharing he was following instead a policy of revenue snaring.

I don't believe, we will see this unimaginative administration use the tools at its command with any sort of determination. I think we will see more words, fewer deeds and a lot of expressed hope that somehow the economy will improve itself. I might add this is a philosophy followed by all Republican administrations since 1924—all of which have evolved in deep recession or depression.

If we are going to stimulate the economy the administration must have to believe it can be stimulated. And it seems to be the peculiar failing of the present Administration that it has no faith in the potential of human ingenuity applying the tools of government to generate true prosperity.

Finally, as a third point, I want to talk briefly about the question of special progress.

Where will we be, as a nation, with all the revenue at our disposal unless we use it wisely for the benefit of all our people?

What good, indeed, will economic growth be unless it benefits not only the few at the top but the millions at the bottom?

The nation is quieter today than it has been.

But perhaps our misery has simply gone underground.

The poor are not always visible.

And the angry are not always shouting.

Sometimes both poverty and anger are transformed into quiet despair and invisible frustration.

Whatever the present mood, the fact is that America still has not lived up to its commitment to equal rights for all Americans, regardless of race, creed, or color.

Nor have we been sufficiently innovative in devising new approaches to learning for millions of people at the bottom of the ladder whose livelihood depends upon manual employment and other forms of low paying jobs, many of whom languish on welfare because they lack the skills and knowledge to hold jobs in our modern society.

A lot of jobs are disappearing because of the sluggish economy and because of automation.

In their place are other jobs but these require skills and training which still are not available to or earmarked for those most in need.

Is it any wonder that the welfare rolls increase when unemployment is so high and unemployability is so obvious?

During the recent crisis in Pennsylvania, we faced the possibility of laying off about five hundred people in custodial jobs in our Department of Property and Supplies. The move was intended to effect some economies. The plan was almost approved when the Secretary of Property and Supplies said to me: "Governor, you know what's going to happen when you lay those people off? They'll all be on welfare." I decided to use the same number of dollars to keep these people employed and our buildings clean. This incident points up clearly the predicament we are in.

Either we provide relevant training that leads to meaningful employment else we continue to witness the continued rise in the welfare rolls.

For a brief period during the sixties, it seemed as if the nation had finally captured the commitment to social progress.

But I believe it has been lost and must be regained if this nation is to survive.

And behind the national problem, of course, lies the international situation. Let's face it. We shall not succeed here in America until we end, once and for all, our involvement in Indo China. And we shall not succeed, even then, unless we transfer some of the huge defense budget into meaningful revenue sharing programs.

These, then, are the priorities as I see them and I would like to close this discussion with a brief statement of my own position on the specific question of revenue sharing so that you will have, on the record, the position of the Governor of Pennsylvania.

A month ago, when the National Governors' Conference met here in Washington, I made a four-point proposal for adoption which included the following items:

1. *Full federalization of welfare programs.*—The present costs of public assistance are uncontrollable by the states. These are mainly federally-established programs, but in those states seeking to provide a minimum standard of health and decency to people on welfare, the states alone or the states and their local governments together now bear the lion's share of the load.

During 1971, the Federal Government should assume all costs for welfare that exceed 90% of each state's costs for 1970.

Next, each year between 1972 and 1976, the Federal Government should assume an additional 20% of this welfare burden. Thus by 1976, the Federal Government would be paying 100% of all welfare costs for each state.

2. *State and city drawing rights.*—States and cities should be able to obtain in advance from the Federal Treasury or the Federal Reserve, under a program of special Federal Drawing Rights, monies that are due them under Federal grant formulas in any given fiscal year. This, in effect, will provide a fiscal shock absorber for state and local governments to permit better fiscal planning of their finances, and to prevent chaos when they run out of money. Most cities and states, unlike the Federal Government, cannot resort to deficit financing, even in case of dire emergency.

3. *Federally guaranteed loans for States and cities.*—Our states and cities today pay higher than prime interest rates because the lenders look upon states and cities as increasingly poorer risks. Yet, our states and cities must borrow billions upon billions over the next decade.

A Federal agency should be established to fully guarantee loans made by our cities and states. This would lower the interest rate on such borrowing and save many millions of dollars for state and local taxpayers. Such a guarantee plan for our steamship lines already exists under the Federal Maritime Act. Certainly our states and cities are at least equally worthy of support.

4. *Revenue sharing.*—The President's formula for general revenue sharing is inadequate. In calling for the reclassification of categorical grants into bloc grants, it is nothing more than a case of scrambling the same egg twice. Its distribution has little to do with per capita income or need, and its reward for "state and local fiscal effort" tends to reinforce the current regressive real estate and sales taxes.

I recommend a formula with incentives to encourage:

(a) states to adopt graduated income taxes;

(b) procedures for allocation of shared revenues to local governments to encourage consolidation of inefficient units.

I also recommend that general revenue sharing be a four-year authorization with annual appropriations rather than a permanent appropriation as a percentage of the personal income tax base as proposed by the President.

I am not calling for revenue sharing by itself or for federalization of welfare programs by itself. I am saying that the states and the cities need both in order to accomplish the needed fiscal relief. And we need both immediately.

If these four points were adopted into law, they would do much to place our states and cities on a more adequate financial base, provide incentives for reform and reorganization of our state and local governments, provide a more equitable distribution of Federal funds than either revenue sharing or federalization of welfare alone, and continue a federal-state-local partnership which has been creative and productive in many instances during the past 40 years.

America's economy can be stimulated. America's cities can be turned into thriving communities. And our states can be made to fulfill their constitutional duties to their citizens.

Our people can be assisted in their quest to live enriched lives.

We have the capital, we have the resources, we have the most innovative people in the world. We can resolve our problems if we

utilize all our great advantages in a logical and constructive way.

But, we cannot improve our lot if the Administration continues to hack out programs for public relations or political purposes and ballyhoo these concoctions as the salvation of the nation.

I place the Nixon proposal for revenue sharing in this category. It is not based upon realism. It won't make a dent in solving our fiscal problems.

Welfare takeover is a much more meaningful program. Federal assumption of welfare costs would relieve the states of enormous sums in their budgets so they in turn could relieve the cities of a larger share of educational costs.

But neither revenue sharing nor welfare takeover will solve our nation's fiscal problems. We desperately need major programs to stimulate the economy, programs that will offer real opportunities for our people to live more fruitful lives.

Until we take meaningful steps in this direction everything else we do constitutes nothing more than a holding action.

#### THE NAVAL AIR RESERVE 2-2-12-3 PROGRAM

#### HON. DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Capt. Sigmund Bajak, USNR, has written an informative article published in the January issue of U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, about the Naval Air Reserve 2-2-12-3 program which represents an important change in the Naval Air Reserve's combat readiness capability and which provides an excellent example in justification of the single force concept for the Navy.

Captain Bajak is no stranger to the Naval Air Reserve. He served as a carrier-based fighter pilot in World War II; he served again during the Korean war and upon a second recall to service from the Inactive Reserve served as commanding officer of VS 837, an air antisubmarine squadron. He is an active Reservist serving as a member of CNAResTra Flag Training and Staff Component and as chief staff officer for Air Reserve Staff R-1. He holds a bachelor's degree from Miami University—Ohio—and a master's degree from Yale University. He has been with the National Broadcasting Co. for the past 15 years and now serves as director of newsfilm, NBC News.

Because this article constitutes an excellent explanation of the 2-2-12-3 concept and because I believe it may have a bearing upon future legislation which the House will consider, I include it as a part of these remarks at this point in the RECORD:

#### TWO-TWO-TWELVE-THREE, THE BRANDNEW BALL GAME

(By Capt. Sigmund Bajak, U.S. Naval Reserve)

The 2-2-12-3 Program—two attack carrier wings, two carrier ASW groups, 12 patrol squadrons, and three transport squadrons—entails a dramatic reorganization of the entire Naval Air Reserve.



After World War II, the Naval Air Reserve became primarily a holding organization designed to maintain skills of its tremendous bank of trained pilots, ground officers, and enlisted men. The challenge of the Korean call-up and the response indicated some weaknesses of the holding philosophy and improvements were made. A Ready Reserve was created by the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, thus changing the Naval Air Reserve to a training organization. In 1955, the Reserve Forces Act provided a means by which the Ready Reserve would have adequate enlisted manpower through a special enlistment program commonly referred to as the "two by six" enlistment, i.e., two years of active duty plus four years at home in the Naval Reserve, or a total of six years. In 1958, the Selected Air Reserve Program was authorized to ensure the training of reservists to meet the requirements for immediate mobilization. This action tended to bring the Naval Air Reserve in closer contact with the Fleet. Reservists began to participate in Fleet activities such as Submarine Launched Assault Missile Exercises (SLAMEX).

Eighteen Naval Air Reserve antisubmarine warfare squadrons were called to active duty in the Berlin call-up of reservists in 1961. The abilities and dedication of the squadron personnel were outstanding, but discrepancies were apparent. For example, over a hundred aircraft service changes had to be made by the called-up squadrons on their S-2 Trackers to update them for active service. Immediately following their release from this call-up, after a year of active duty, many reservists helped provide support to the Fleet during the Cuban missile crisis. Naval Reserve planners again evaluated the performance of Naval Air Reserve units during these two crises, and again changes were made in the Naval Air Reserve organization and call-up procedures. Because of budget limitations and the war in Southeast Asia, little could be done to upgrade the hardware.

Beginning in 1965, the Naval Air Reserve provided airlift support to our forces in Vietnam using old C-54 and C-118 aircraft, but it was not until January 1968 that the Naval Air Reserve faced its next real challenge—the *Pueblo* call-up. The problems encountered in that call-up proved conclusively that the Naval Air Reserve did not have sufficient and proper hardware or training and support equipment to attain and maintain the required readiness for early deployment with the Fleet. Again, the changes which followed the call-up were organizational, involving primarily the realignment of personnel. Priority hardware squadrons were formed and placed under the operational control of the Commander, Naval Air Reserve Force, a second and new hat for the Chief of Naval Air Reserve Training. Neither additional or new hardware, nor training and support equipment were forthcoming owing to the demands of Southeast Asia operations.

In the fall of 1969, the General Accounting Office, guardian of the tax dollar and watchdog for the Congress, concluded two years of in-depth study of the Naval Air Reserve. The GAO reported:

Our review of certain Naval Air Reserve units at four Naval Air Stations disclosed serious logistics problems which have had an adverse effect on their readiness posture. In our opinion, these problems keep the Reserve Components from achieving their primary purpose; that is, to provide trained units and qualified persons available for active duty in the armed forces in time of war or national emergency. We concluded that it would be difficult for the Reserve to mobilize fleet operational squadrons for an emergency.

The GAO report also stated that 37 of the 39 squadrons in the Naval Air Reserve, within the Joint Chiefs of Staff readiness reporting system (C-rating system), were in unsatisfactory readiness status. This meant that 37 of the hardware squadrons were not combat

ready while the other two were only marginally combat ready. There was no rebuttal to the GAO report. The Navy acknowledged a lack of hardware and site-support equipment for the Naval Air Reserve with which to match sophisticated aircraft equipped with highly complex black boxes and systems. The Navy also knew that the Naval Air Reserve Command needed more than 44 million dollars to purchase and maintain training devices. Worse, Navy planners were aware that there was more than \$200 million of identifiable military construction deficiencies at Naval Air Reserve Training activities which a \$25 million annual military construction budget could never correct.

Organizational changes could no longer be used to make improvements in the Naval Air Reserve. The patriotic spirit and the dedication of members of the Naval Air Reserve had been stretched to the point reminiscent of the early days of the Naval Reserve.

The pattern of challenge, response, evaluation, and attempted improvement could no longer be applied. A dramatic change was needed in the Naval Air Reserve. If the change did not come, the Naval Air Reserve faced extinction in the 1970s.

In the late months of 1969, the Chief of Naval Operations, faced with the proposed loss of one attack carrier and her air wing, suggested that the Navy keep the carrier and decommission two air wings resulting in a force of 15 CVAs and 13 wings. The intent was to make up the difference between carriers and wings by using Marine Corps squadrons on board the carriers and concentrating the released hardware and support equipment into a single air wing of the Naval Air Reserve Force. The assets would be transferred directly from active duty to Naval Air Reserve squadrons. This was a substantial departure from previous Navy practices because it completely integrated the Naval Air Reserve Force squadrons into the Fleet. Thus began the 2-2-12-3 plan for the Naval Air Reserve Force of the 1970s.

The two attack carrier air wings, two carrier antisubmarine warfare groups, 12 patrol squadrons, and three transport squadrons (2-2-12-3) are a part of the tactical (flying) portion of the Naval Air Reserve for the 1970s. Many refer to it as the *new* Naval Air Reserve Force. It is new because it has been totally reorganized and restructured. It is a force because it has been removed from the training phase to a hardware squadron concept duplicating that in the Fleet. COMNAVAIRRESFOR reports directly to the Chief of Naval Operations. He is the only two-star air commander with forces who reports directly to the CNO. As CNAResTra, responsible for the training and support of his non-tactical units, he reports to the Chief of Naval Air Training, who in turn reports to the CNO.

The organization of the Reserve air wings and groups is similar to that of comparable units in the Fleet. Each wing or group is commanded by an air wing or group commander, an officer in the regular Navy who has been screened and selected for bonus command. The Reserve squadrons are commanded by a member of the Selected Air Reserve in the grade of commander. These commanding officers are supported on a daily basis by a complement of active duty reservists, commonly referred to as "Tars," who serve to train and administer the Naval Reserve. The organization calls for the four wing and group commanders of the carrier type aircraft to report directly to the Commander, Naval Air Reserve Force. The patrol VP and transport VR squadron organizations will be similarly designed to reflect active fleet structural make up.

Several assumptions were made in developing the 2-2-12-3 Program. These were: (1) that there would be space available at fleet air stations, (2) that the assets from the de-

commissioned active wing would be forthcoming, (3) that adequate support equipment and supply priorities would be provided the squadrons, (4) that required Fleet services would be available for training, and (5) that Fleet aircraft use and maintenance manning factors were also valid for the new Naval Air Reserve Force.

The objectives (based on these assumptions) were to provide the Naval Air Reserve Force with the same opportunity to achieve and maintain readiness of its squadrons as provided the Fleet. In addition, planning provided for the squadrons to use Fleet facilities, services, and other assistance.

One of the Reserve carrier air wings is located on the West Coast and the other on the East Coast. Each wing consists of a total of three attack and two fighter squadrons with appropriate detachments flying a total of 85 deployable aircraft. This organization corrects another deficiency pointed out by the GAO report which stated, "Naval Reserve fleet operational squadrons were not compatible for integration with the active forces."

The two Reserve antisubmarine warfare groups are located one on each coast. Each group has two helicopter HS and three VS squadrons, plus some detachments, for a total of 45 deployable aircraft. The 12 patrol squadrons are made up of 11 P-2 Neptune squadrons flying 132 deployable aircraft, and one P-3 squadron flying nine deployable Orions. The three transport squadrons will fly a total of about 30 aircraft and will be divided into a number of training units. For the first time in the Naval Air Reserve, the squadron organization will parallel that of the regular Navy. No longer will there be many small training units distributed over several locations which, on mobilization day, would form one regular size squadron. Instead, a complete squadron will be located at one specified location.

While the concept of the new Naval Air Reserve Force appears to have the general support of naval air reservists, the forced base closures that occurred during the early stages of implementing the reorganization have confused the entire reorganization picture to a significant extent. The closures of the naval air stations at Los Alamitos, Twin Cities, Olathe, Seattle, and New York were based on the necessity to reduce overall Department of Defense expenditures. As stated by Secretary Melvin R. Laird at the time they were announced, the overall reductions "were posed by the Congress and agreed to by the President." The base closures were actions forced upon the naval establishment as part of an overall defense cutback, and had absolutely nothing to do with the 2-2-12-3 Program. As it turned out, unwelcomed as the closures were, they forced the transfer of some Naval Air Reserve squadrons to Fleet air stations, thus immediately testing the assumptions of the 2-2-12-3 Program—with good results.

A closer inspection of the validity of these assumptions will be helpful. First, it was assumed that space would be available at Fleet air stations and this is proving to be true, though it has required Fleet units, already in cramped quarters, to move over. Reserve air squadrons moved into space at naval air stations located at Quonset Point, Patuxent River, Miramar, Whidbey Island, and North Island. Future plans call for units of the Naval Air Reserve to move into Fleet spaces at Point Mugu and Imperial Beach by the summer of 1971.

The second assumption for the 2-2-12-3 was that assets would be forthcoming from decommissioned squadrons. F-8K Crusaders, A-4C/L Skyhawks, E-1B Tracers, RF-8 Photo Crusaders, KA-3 Skywarrior refuelers, and P-3 Orions, all deployable, are becoming available to the new Naval Air Reserve Force. In addition, the Navy has provided a number of F-4 Phantoms so that the Naval Air Re-

serve Force could begin training in that aircraft.

The third assumption, that support equipment would be provided, has become fact at Fleet sites and supply priorities for the Naval Air Reserve Force have been upgraded. Fourthly, the assumed adequacy of Fleet services has also become a reality. The Reserve's detachment operating at its new home base at NAS Quonset Point in mid-April 1970 reported that the availability of Fleet services was the best ever encountered. The benefits of a Fleet training environment, more plentiful support personnel and equipment, and easy access to training sites were also evident.

The fifth assumption concerning validity of Fleet aircraft use and maintenance factors for the new Naval Air Reserve Force will not be known until the squadrons have had more experience. Further empirical adjustments of the maintenance work load to aircraft use will be made as experience is gained, and no serious problems are anticipated.

While the assumptions of the 2-2-12-3 appear to be valid, there is concern among the critics of the reorganization that the objectives of the program, to duplicate the organization and manning levels of the Fleet through increased participation by members of the Naval Air Reserve, will not be met. The critics point out that one of the major disadvantages of the 2-2-12-3 is the need for the reservists to travel longer distances to the training site. There may be justified concern that the Naval Air Reserve will suffer large personnel losses because of the refusal of reservists to travel to faraway training locations.

There are also fears that ultimately all of the naval air stations in mid-America will be closed and the Navy will no longer be represented except in cities on the coasts. Further, there is apprehension that the estimated 20,000 non-flying members of the Naval Air Reserve will begin dwindling in number in the years to come and that in the 1980s this number might be drastically reduced, thus depriving the Navy and the country of trained personnel required for rapid Fleet expansion.

Action is being taken to solve the travel problem which was recognized early in the planning of the 2-2-12-3 program. The Navy is trying to procure medium size jet transports and station them at NAS Alameda. One of their primary missions will be airlifting Reserve personnel to training sites. NARTU Lakehurst plans to charter buses to transport reservists from New York City to that air station. Further, the Navy has begun a program of chartering commercial jets to airlift patrol squadron personnel performing their annual active duty for training at Rota, Spain. In the future, the P-2 aircraft will remain at Rota and the Reserve air squadrons will perform back-to-back periods of active duty for training. Much training time will be saved with the new mode of jet travel available to these reservists.

Reservists from the Midwest have voiced fears about the elimination of naval air from the heartland of America. Top Navy leaders were quick to point out that the Naval Air Reserve will continue to train in the Midwest. Olathe is expected to have about 800 nonflying drilling air reservists and Minneapolis about 1,000. The Naval Air Reserve training detachments at these locations are part of the vital non-flying portion of the Naval Air Reserve organization under the leadership, management, and support of the naval air stations at Glenview, Detroit, Dallas, and Memphis.

The Navy can provide the resources, leadership, and management for the new Naval Air Reserve Force and the non-flying members of the Naval Air Reserve for a more active role in the Navy when needed. The early followers of Trubee Davidson's 1916 Yale Unit paid for their own gas and oil to

become proficient in naval aircraft in case their country needed them for service. In 1969—after 50 years in existence—it was clear that, in spite of the many organizational improvements made over the years, the Naval Air Reserve was not well equipped or combat ready. In 1970 and 1971, the Navy is implementing the 2-2-12-3 to have available on a moment's notice a well-equipped combat-ready Naval Air Reserve Force to deploy and fly side-by-side with the active duty squadrons. The Navy is confident that dedicated reservists will continue their tradition of loyal service despite personal inconveniences—especially now when their country and their Navy have a need for them to continue to be ready in the truest sense of the word.

## WARS SHOULD BE WON

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the following address was delivered by Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, U.S. Army (retired) at the 50th Annual Convention of the Military Order of the World Wars held October 22, 1970.

Particular attention should be called to General Lane's comments concerning our involvement in Vietnam.

The United States, instead of recognizing that peace could be preserved only by a decisive and punishing repulse of every aggression, accommodated the communist tactic. It submitted to the endless war of attrition, granting to the enemy an immunity from defeat which spelled our own defeat. There could be no other outcome to such warfare.

This, to my mind, is the key to the entire question of the current war. The enemy could only achieve victory by protracting the conflict and wearing the United States out while the United States could only win, and can still win, by shortening the war. We have the capability to shorten this war, to bring it to a quick end, by pursuing military activity designed to decisively eliminate the enemy's capability to go on fighting. To pin our hopes on diplomacy, when war itself is based on diplomatic failure, and deny our military the freedom of action which it needs to defeat the enemy has resulted in dire harm not only to the American soldiers, South Vietnamese forces, South Vietnamese civilians, and for that matter all the young North Vietnamese sent south to die by the Communist rulers, but also to our own Nation.

I highly recommend this article which appeared in the World Wars Officer Review of November-December 1970. The speech follows:

### WARS SHOULD BE WON!

AN ADDRESS TO 50TH ANNUAL CONVENTION  
MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WARS

(By Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, USA (Ret))

Admiral Dyer, Colonel Rockwell, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I count it a special privilege to address this honorable body on your 50th Anniversary and to commend your devotion to the purposes of the Preamble. You are doing a vital work in preserving the standards of

patriotic service and self-sacrifice on which this nation was built. These standards are today under attack not only by our enemies but by uncomprehending fellow-citizens.

I have not come merely to praise you but also to point out the larger task which is at hand and which so urgently demands our deepest concern. We are called to new exertions of heart and mind to stem and reverse the course of weakness and surrender on which this country is embarked. I ask this assembly of veterans: How can you approve a policy of accepting defeat at the hands of North Vietnam?

It may seem strange to veterans that I have undertaken to speak today about the military responsibility in war. Most of us were taught that diplomats start wars and soldiers end them. That truth, like many others, is today obscured by massive propaganda. We live in an age when error is exalted in the honeyed phrases of the peacemaker. We are now told that diplomats will end the war—by negotiation. We have been told this ad nauseam, for the past decade, while the war in Vietnam has continued to rage. It is time to identify the false claims of peace politics for the impostor which they are. Diplomats cannot negotiate the peace until the armed forces have first won the victory.

Let me first define clearly where we stand today. Clausewitz said that in war the first and most important of all strategic questions is to decide the kind of war you are in. If you do that correctly, all your energies will be directed toward resolution of the conflict. If you misjudge the question, all your energies will be misdirected and you may lose the war.

This is our great failure. We have refused to admit to ourselves that we are engaged in an epic war with the communist powers. This war has now continued for 52 years. The communist powers now command one-third of the world's people and are on the offensive. With our unwitting help, they have made the most rapid conquests in the history of the world.

What is an epic war? You are familiar with epic wars of history: between Greece and Troy, Rome and Carthage, Byzantium and the Ottoman Empire. These were conflicts of civilizations. They continued over generations or centuries, with interludes of "peace." On one side there was an expanding, conquering civilization; on the other a peace-loving, contented civilization. Always the conquering civilization prevailed. In this world, if you can't fight, you can't be free.

You did not read of the Trojans mounting expeditions to cross the seas and conquer Greece. No, it was the Greeks who crossed the seas to conquer Troy. The Greeks prevailed. That is why we have a Greek heritage, not a Trojan heritage, in our civilization.

So too, the citizens of Carthage gave their sons and daughters as hostages to Rome for good behavior; but the Romans destroyed Carthage.

Byzantium, Eastern Rome, which endured for a thousand years after the barbarians sacked Rome, finally fell to the Ottoman Turks. The Turks, starting as an obscure tribe in Anatolia, attacked the Empire and seized territory. The Byzantine rulers said: "It is better to make peace than to continue the war. We shall let them have the territory." Then the Turks renewed the attack and the process was repeated. The Ottoman Turks continued the attack for two centuries before Byzantium fell in 1453. In all the time, the rulers of Byzantium never understood the kind of war they were in.

The people of Byzantium were very like Americans today. They were Christian, mercantile, rich and peace-loving. They wanted only to hold what they had—and they lost everything. The leaders were killed, their wealth was seized, their women were sold



into slavery and their children were trained as Janissaries to fight for the Sultan.

Our epic war too is a clash of civilizations. The enemy is dedicated not merely to political conquest but to the destruction of our whole moral order. He will destroy our culture, our conceptions of truth and of freedom. He will make us slaves of the communist tyranny. This is an epic struggle not of people or territory but of good and evil. Communism is the tyranny of Satan.

This nature of the communist regime in Russia was early and correctly judged by the United States Government. In 1920, Secretary of State Bainbridge Colby wrote: "In the view of this government, there cannot be any common ground on which it can stand with a power whose conceptions of international relations are so entirely alien to its own, so utterly repugnant to its moral sense." Through Democratic and Republican administrations the United States maintained that principled position until 1933. Those were years of foreign and domestic tranquillity for the United States.

Then President Franklin D. Roosevelt decided that the era of confrontation was over and the era of negotiation should begin. He recognized the Soviet Government. Stalin undertook to cease subversive activities against the United States, but he never did. That was just one of the many promises he never kept. He knew the Americans would observe the agreement even though he did not.

Never at any time in these 52 years has the Soviet Union deviated from its war against the United States. Even when we were allies during World War II, Stalin regarded us as his mortal enemy. He cultivated every advantage which could further his continuing war against us.

The sometimes acclaimed moderation of Soviet policy exists only in the wishful thinking of American diplomats. There is not a word uttered by Lenin which Brezhnev does not fully endorse. There is not an action which Lenin could take today which Brezhnev is not taking. Soviet power and subversion are vastly more threatening today than they ever were under Stalin.

Our leaders refuse to address themselves to the war we are in. They see in the tactical maneuvering of Soviet diplomacy a change of policy where none exists. They think the conqueror can be appeased by the good-will of the victim. They pretend, after all the failures of five decades, that peace can be negotiated. They live in a world divorced from reality.

The wars in Korea and Vietnam are episodes in this continuing epic struggle. Because the communist leaders commanded inferior military resources, they could not strike for a quick victory. They could only wage wars of subversion and attrition to weaken the United States and to seize territory in marginal areas as conquest became possible. Protracted war became the instrument of conquest because it frustrated the free world desire for peace.

The United States, instead of recognizing that peace could be preserved only by a decisive and punishing repulse of every aggression, accommodated the communist tactic. It submitted to the endless war of attrition, granting to the enemy an immunity from defeat which spelled our own defeat. There could be no other outcome to such warfare.

In Korea and in Vietnam, the decisive factor was the sanctuary from our arms which American Presidents gave to the enemy. Red China could enter the war in Korea with assurance that its base in Manchuria would be inviolate. That is why Red China entered the war.

North Vietnam was granted sanctuary in Laos and Cambodia for its attack on South Vietnam. That gift of American Presidents made the defense of South Vietnam impossible. We sent half a million Americans to South Vietnam but we never expelled the

aggressors from the country. We couldn't under this handicap imposed by our Presidents.

Why have our Presidents refused to repel the communist aggression? Why have they refused to defeat the enemy? Are they afraid that Red China would enter the war?

The question for any leader committing his country to war is this: "What happens to my country if I enter this war?" If Red Intelligence informs Mao that if he enters the war, the United States will not bomb Red China because advisers will persuade the President such action would cause world war, Mao will be free to intervene. The cost to his country is only in the men committed to action.

But Mao knows that if he enters the war, he becomes a belligerent, subject to attack. If Red Intelligence informs him that the United States would then bomb Red China and probably support the return of Chiang Kai-shek to the mainland, there is nothing in Vietnam which could induce Mao to so risk his regime.

This is precisely what happened in Korea. Mao did not enter the war until he received assurances that President Truman would not bomb Manchuria. We gave the enemy the advantage he required to wage war against us.

The irrationality of our fears was illustrated in the Cambodia operation. In sixty days, we defeated the North Vietnamese, destroyed their bases and secured the friendly government of Lon Nol. Red China did not intervene. In consequence of ending the sanctuary, the war in the southern provinces of South Vietnam is virtually ended.

In the northern provinces of South Vietnam the war continues, with the enemy operating from his sanctuary in Laos. We still have 400 men killed in action each week, just as we did when Lyndon Johnson was President. But whereas we and South Vietnam each then suffered about 200 killed each week, we now bear 50 and they bear 350. We have transferred the burden to our small ally, but we have not reduced it. Is this the way the United States now wages war?

The war continues only because the enemy still has sanctuary in Laos. South Vietnam has the military forces to smash the enemy formations and bases in Laos. It is restrained by the United States.

Why does President Nixon compel South Vietnam to submit to this continuing toll of enemy aggression instead of allowing it to defeat the enemy and end the war? President Diem wanted to do that job and end that attack on his country in 1961, but President Kennedy refused to allow it. A decade of killing has been the consequence. What power holds our Presidents enthralled in such disastrous error?

With President Kennedy, it was the siren of peace. He thought he could settle the war by negotiation, without fighting. Instead of supporting the defenses of our allies, he assumed the management of the war. He strove vainly for peace. He made this an American war, terribly mismanaged. President Diem could have won the war without U.S. forces if he had been allowed to do so.

This is the record of the diplomatic management of war. We have wasted the lives of our youth and the substance of our people in futile conflict. We have subjected our ally to the devastation of a perpetual battlefield. We have enhanced the prestige and power of the enemy. We have undermined the morale and confidence of our own people.

Through the years, our military leaders have acquiesced in this diplomatic mismanagement of war. No senior officer has gone to the President and said: "I refuse to waste the lives of my fighting men in this senseless slaughter without purpose. Mr. President, if you insist on such war, I must ask for retirement. I shall carry this issue to the people and oppose your war policy." That is why it is

time to speak about the military responsibility in war. Do we who know the devastating consequences of error in war remain silent while our political leaders destroy the country?

We know the influences of custom and example which deter senior officers on active duty from such forceful address to the Commander-in-Chief. The compulsion to support even a policy destructive of the Constitution is very great.

But those of us who are veterans bear no such restraint. We are citizens experienced in war. We know beyond any question of doubt that it is destructive of our national interest to fight as we have fought and to withdraw as we are withdrawing, in Vietnam. Why have our veterans been silent as Presidents have followed a war policy so disastrous to our country? The silence of veterans is the one factor which has made this suicidal policy politically feasible.

I asked a past commander of the American Legion how that organization could condone such disastrous war policy. He said that the Legion always supports the President. Will it support a President who leads the country to destruction, I asked?

Why are veterans silent about policies on which they are presumably our best informed citizens? American labor does not accept presidential dictation about labor policy. Civil rights leaders do not accept presidential dictation about civil rights policy. American pacifists do not accept presidential dictation about war. All these elements of our society believe they have an obligation to guide policy in fields of their competence and interest.

That is the nature of our society. According to our Declaration of Independence, we the people have created government to serve us. The President is our servant, not our Emperor. It is our duty to guide him.

Who has a better right to speak up for sound war policy than the veterans of our country? You know the reality of war and of sacrifice. Your buddies have given their lives to preserve our civilization. Why then do veterans stand mute while militant radicals use political power to intimidate the President?

The posture of our veterans' organizations in support of the President, is a renunciation of their patriotic duty. It enables the President to accede to the pressures of militant radicals while retaining veteran support. If you really want to support your President, you must become a force for sound policy in public affairs. You must demand a policy of strength consonant with our power and responsibilities. You must oppose and condemn policies which entrap us in no-win wars, even when these policies are proposed by Presidents. You must insist that we never give sanctuary to an enemy aggressor.

It is no exaggeration to assert that the tragic toll of war in Korea and in Vietnam reflects the failure of our veterans to speak up for our fighting men. No President could have submitted to these wars of attrition against the open opposition of our veterans.

I call on The Military Order of the World Wars to accept its full obligation of service to our country. Renounce the policy of silent submission to presidential decisions. Tell the President that his peace policy is a costly delusion. Demand that he support our allies in Southeast Asia in defeating forthwith the North Vietnamese aggressors and driving them back to their home bases. By your example, you can set a new standard of veterans' service to our country.

I said in opening this talk that I came to summon you to new and greater endeavors. What could be more compelling today than your duty to guide our people out of the morass of two decades of phony peacemaking into an era of sound war policy—and peace?

LIEUTENANT CALLEY: JUSTICE  
UNSERVED

**HON. ROGER H. ZION**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, the conviction of Lt. William L. Calley, Jr., on charges of murdering 22 civilians at the obscure hamlet of My Lai has not served the cause of military justice or the higher standards of justice that should be applied to an American soldier fighting an enemy in the field.

I know nothing of Calley the man, nor of Calley the officer commanding men at the Quangnai Province hamlet on March 16, 1968. I cannot say what sort of officer he was in the course of his duties and I cannot say whether he was fit to serve as an officer in the U.S. Army in the first place. The point to note is that the Army so chose him to serve in this capacity, and in so doing, accepted any human limitation he brought to his job. When our Nation accepted William Calley's service, it accepted responsibility for his actions in the field and his interpretation and response to the orders of his superiors.

Another man leading the fatal raid into My Lai might have interpreted his orders in a different manner. Or he might not have reacted differently. It is futile speculation to dwell on "what might have been." It remains a fact that Lieutenant Calley was entrusted with this particular mission, having been commissioned an officer "by act of Congress" and entrusted by his superiors with a command responsibility in a combat zone. If Calley was not fit for this command, it was for the Army, not Calley, to so determine. If an American officer is not fit for command, either psychologically, mentally, or physically for the rigors of command, his unfitness is the responsibility of the organization that trains him and orders him into a combat situation.

I do not know if Lieutenant Calley behaved "improperly" at My Lai. I do not know we must define "improperly" in reference to a particular standard. A higher morality will someday pass judgment on the actions of Lieutenant Calley at that wretched jungle hamlet. But that eventual judgment is not and should not be the concern of the American people or of military judicial tribunals. Lieutenant Calley was a man interpreting the orders of his superior officers in accord with his own judgment. Calley, under our military system, was not only permitted discretionary authority to interpret the means of executing the orders of his superiors but, as an officer, he was required to exercise that authority.

I believe the old and traditional mores of warfare do not apply to the situation in Southeast Asia. Vietnam is like no other war in our history. The enemy does not appear before our troops arrayed in a particular uniform or marching under the banner of his Nation. Rather, he moves stealthily in the jungle shadows,

arrayed like every other human figure in the countryside, wearing the "black pajamas" which defy distinction between friend and foe.

Battle lines in the traditional sense do not exist in this war. The enemy may, at any given time, be before you, behind you, around you, facing you, or fighting for the moment beside you disguised as a friend. When combat troops enter a Vietnamese village they encounter the blank faces of villagers who may represent truly innocent villagers or may be highly trained North Vietnamese or NLF "regulars." What prior experience or training can prepare an American soldier to differentiate between friend and enemy? I know of none. Time and time again, American GI's have made a fatal error in judgment when confronted with the smiling countenance of an old man, a young woman, or even a child in one of these nameless villages, and has paid for his error with his life.

Lieutenant Calley lived, moved, and commanded in such a world. He had been the witness to the awful slaughter of fellow officers and men. He knew that behind each native visage could lurk the mind and the deadly intent of the enemy. Calley received definite orders to "secure" My Lai and he exercised his authority to interpret those orders, "securing" My Lai in the most positive manner open to him. He was "hired" by his superior officers, by Congress and by the American people to do just that. Will he now stand alone, the sole figure to shoulder the burden of his action? I hope not, for justice demands another course. Calley's action may not have been the action of another man in similar circumstances but it was Calley's decision and we gave him the authority to so decide. His guilt must be the collective guilt of command, no more and no less, and he must not be called upon to pay the penalty of a free individual alone responsible for his actions.

I believe the American people, as evidenced by their immediate expressions to their representatives in this Congress, acutely feel that an injustice has been done to Lt. William Calley. Few of my colleagues will fail to feel the full weight of this opinion. Though unskilled in the law, the average American carries an inbred, strong sense of justice which has been outraged by the conviction of this soldier. We had better heed this voice because it accurately defines much of what is wrong in Vietnam and in our Nation today.

GOVERNOR GILLIGAN CALLS FOR  
KEY MEETING ON RAILPAX

**HON. JACK F. KEMP**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in reading a telegram I just received from Henry W. Eckmart, Chairman, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, March 31, 1971.

HON. JACK F. KEMP,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

I have been requested by Governor John J. Gilligan to convene a meeting of the responsible State authorities in regard to rail passenger service. We are particularly interested in the New York to Chicago route via Buffalo, Erie, Cleveland, Toledo, South Bend, and Gary. We are also interested in service from Detroit to Toledo. I have therefore made arrangements for a meeting on April 2, 1971, at 10 a.m. at the Hollenden House Hotel, East Sixth and Superior, in Cleveland, Ohio. I would like to invite you to attend this meeting to explore the various possibilities and opportunities for obtaining this service.

I am inviting Representatives of New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois. These States have 146 Representatives in the U.S. Congress, which is almost exactly one-third of the membership. I would certainly like for you to attend our meeting if at all possible. We will hope to have an evaluation of the situation after that meeting.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted we are making progress. Next week I will introduce a joint resolution authorizing additional appropriations to the Secretary of Transportation for the purpose of providing additional intercity rail passenger service around the Nation and for the purpose of research and development in the field of high-speed ground transportation. I will ask for cosponsors and anyone that wants to call my office today can get on the bill. I will follow up with a letter this week with more detail on my bill.

With cooperation at the Federal and State levels I believe we can revive a sick railroad system, and I look forward to a productive session in Cleveland.

JUDICIAL-SOFTHEADEDNESS

**HON. JOHN E. HUNT**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, the epitome of judicial-softheadedness is now a matter of record in the decision of a three-judge Federal court in New York that recently ruled the United States cannot refuse entry to an alien on the grounds that he preaches the violent and forcible overthrow of the Government.

The Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit might proclaim that it has struck another blow for "freedom" under the guise of the first amendment rights, but it would have to do so tongue in cheek. The American people, I dare say, are getting more than a bit short of patience as they can literally observe the continuing deterioration of their rights and freedoms because a certain segment of the judiciary preaches from its ivory tower that individual freedom can now be taken to include the "freedom" to further the goal of the forcible overthrow of the Government by an alien. To declare that this alien's pronouncements of anarchistic doctrines are harmless academic exercises, as the



three-judge court majority has in effect done, is to distort reality for the sake of adding another pillar of matchsticks under the amorphous first amendment rights.

I had thought, and still feel, that the State Department officials were a little fuzzy in their nonpolicy with respect to the admission of undesirables of the likes of Bernadette Devlin, but when the State Department concurs in the exclusion of an alien such as occurred in the New York case, then I take note that such individual is more than an idle threat to the best interests of our country.

District Judge John R. Bartels must be given everlasting credit for his vigorous, but futile, dissenting opinion in the New York case in which he admonished the majority by declaring that:

In the hierarchy of priorities, the imperative of national security in dealing with aliens must prevail over limited restrictions upon First Amendment rights. . . . (T)he loss of thousands of lives and the expenditure of billions of dollars attest to the fact that the Federal Government has reached the judgment that the continuing worldwide growth of the Communist movement as practiced in its tyrannical form is inimical to the best interests of this nation." Amen!

It is quite evident that a not insubstantial portion of the judiciary refutes this judgment of the Federal Government, expressed through the Nation's elected representatives, and would stretch the first amendment to the point of making "expression" absolute by any means short of pulling the trigger once the gun is aimed at our head. It must be comforting to other aliens who might be bent on speeding our demise to know that the doors to our country has been opened to them by the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. I certainly trust that the Government will appeal the decision to the U.S. Supreme Court where there are signs that sound judgments may be replacing the blind idealism of recent years.

#### U.S. TROOP WITHDRAWAL FROM GERMANY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in explaining why I held serious conscientious reservations as to voting favorably for H.R. 2476 to extend the draft when it expires on June 30, 1971—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 12, 1971, pages 6328-6329—I pointed out that I could find no moral, ethical, or legal justification for drafting men for military service in an army of occupation 27 years after cessation of armed hostilities. In such prolonged service, the men are reduced to the role of mercenaries, performing at best the mission of serving as political pawns, or honorary hostages, to pacify foreign diplomacy.

A good example illustrating the use of American servicemen as political pawns almost 3 decades after the end of World War II, is West Germany, where approximately 215,000 American troops are stationed today.

It is reasonable and proper for the inquiring American taxpayer to ask just why we must continue to draft American men to be stationed in Germany. Is it that Germany is a hostile nation? Balance of payments? Or other reasons? In a provocative article, Dr. Austin J. App suggests a logical answer to this question and points out the utter fruitlessness of the involvement of American forces in Germany, as well as the hypocritical position of the United Nations regarding self-determination and human rights for the German people.

It appears that now is an appropriate time for withdrawing our troops from Germany.

I insert Dr. App's article as published in Truth Forum of March 1971:

[From Truth Forum, March 1971]

WHY U.S. TROOPS ARE NEEDED IN GERMANY

(By Austin J. App, Ph. D.)

Most Americans would like to see American soldiers come home from wherever they are stationed on foreign soil. Naturally they are more and more critical, too, about U.S. troops in Germany. In the Morgenthau era of 1944-49, the cry was, "Keep Germany occupied forever." But now the cry is increasingly, "Why do we have to protect the Germans now? Let them do it themselves."

Neither the government nor the news media ever explain to the man in the street, why the Germans cannot defend themselves; why we must keep our troops there, not only to protect what's left of Germany, but what's left of free Europe. But in U.S. News & World Report, February 8, 1971, the "Foreign Affairs Expert" Herman Kahn, in an interview entitled, "Why U.S. Must Stay in Asia," incidentally gave an illuminating comment on why our troops are still in Germany. Herman Kahn is the director of the Hudson Institute, author of *The Emerging Japanese Super-state—Challenge and Response*, and co-author of *Can We Win in Vietnam?* When he was asked why we Americans should have to bear so much of the current burden of the defense of Europe, he answered that it is because the victors "want to keep Germany non-nuclear." He said:

"That makes Europe difficult to defend. The moment you make Germany nuclear the defense of Europe gets relatively easy even without us."

What he here said was really what historians and strategists have often said, and what the Huns and Turks experienced—that Germany is the defense of Europe against Asia—or there is no defense!

In that statement Herman Kahn was also probably the first "expert" to tell the American people U.S. troops must stay in Europe because the victors still do not allow Germany to defend itself. They are ready to use her as cannonfodder, but not to invent and employ the modern weapons which her enemies developed largely out of the researches of her scientists! Herman Kahn did not add the corollary that a nation who other nations forbid to arm effectively is not really independent but is in effect a satellite of the nations which control her defense!

GERMANY MUST REMAIN NONNUCLEAR SO THAT HALF OF HER LANDS ARE SURE TO BE LOST FOREVER

When Dr. Kahn was asked why it is so important to keep Germany non-nuclear, he said what Americans have never so far been

encouraged to realize. He said that if Germany gets strong it is likely to want to change its borders. Asked "Why?", he gave a forthright answer that should make any American ashamed to expect Germany to recognize the Oder-Neisse boundary and that should make any German who is prepared to recognize it feel like a traitor. Here is what Herman Kahn, Director of the Hudson Institute, from 1948-61 Director of the Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park replied:

"Everybody else is reasonably satisfied (regarding boundaries) except for the Germans, who have a real problem."

"Imagine that New England in the United States were occupied by Russians and Poles. That's a comparable situation. Prussia, Pomerania, Silesia, and Brandenburg—the center of German history—are occupied by Russia and Poland. Almost half the cities you read about in German history now have Russian and Polish names. And the rest of Germany is divided, with almost a third of it still held down by a foreign army of occupation."

This paragraph expresses the frightful bankruptcy of America's two crusades in Europe for self-determination. And now Anglo-American governments, instead of at least demanding the liberation of this one-half of Germany from Soviet Russia and Poland, and insisting that its expelled native populations get their homes and homeland back, instead make sure that what is left of Germany remains too impotent to demand self-determination and justice herself! While they moralize about human rights and self-determination in the UN, they make sure that, where these should urgently be applied, in Germany, they are effectively denied. Then they express a pharisaic fear that what is left of Germany might submit itself to Soviet Russia in return for reunification and territorial justice!

#### LIMITING THE POWER OF THE FEDERAL COURTS

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, for many years the Federal courts have been at war with our Constitution—and what is worse, waging that war in the name of the Constitution.

In case after case, legal precedents that have stood as long as our Republic have been overthrown, State and Federal laws struck down, convicted criminals freed, and practices such as prayer and Bible reading in public schools, which had been followed for decades or centuries, suddenly declared illegal.

It is absurd to claim the Constitution as a warrant for this kind of upheaval. The men who drafted our Constitution were hardly so totally misunderstood until the Warren court appeared on the scene. Rather, what we have witnessed is the all but open substitution of the personal desires and beliefs of Federal judges for the clear language of the Constitution and the laws.

To most Americans it has seemed that there was no remedy for this abuse of power. Federal judges are appointed for life. Impeachment, even if possible, could only remove objectionable judges one by one. Constitutional amendments, in ad-

dition to being very difficult and usually slow to pass, could only overturn one decision at a time, and would be subject to the same sort of "reinterpretation" that the Federal judges had been giving to earlier laws and Constitutional provisions.

But there is a remedy. The framers of our Constitution never intended that the Federal courts should be a law unto themselves. They wrote into the Constitution itself a specific and very important limit to the power of the courts. Article III, section 2 of the Constitution provides as follows:

In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a state shall be party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all the other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.

This particular provision of the Constitution applies not only to the Supreme Court but to all Federal courts, since they are established under the same authority that prescribes the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. That authority is a vote of Congress. Congress has, therefore, the power to specify the kinds of cases which may be heard in Federal courts, and the kinds which may not be heard there.

On March 22 I introduced H.R. 6501 in the House of Representatives. This bill would take entirely out of the Federal courts all cases in the following categories: first, welfare eligibility; second, drug abuse; third, pornography and obscenity; fourth, abortion; fifth, prayer and Bible reading in public schools; sixth, challenges to criminal convictions in State courts on the basis of pre-trial procedures by State law enforcement officers. These are the six areas in which the Federal courts have most drastically abused and exceeded their rightful authority in recent years.

The effect of my bill would be to transfer all cases in these areas to State courts. While many State judges have also abused and exceeded their authority, at least in California we have a remedy at the polls: any judge can be voted out of office when his term expires. Whatever the fate of this particular bill, my hope is that it will stimulate my colleagues in Congress to let Federal judges know in no uncertain terms that their power is not unlimited, that they are not unreachable by an aroused public opinion.

#### REORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

#### HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I admire today the President's courage to attempt what almost everyone in Washington is saying cannot possibly be done. He has just submitted a message proposing that we totally reorganize the executive branch of the Government, freeing

it from antiquated forms and practices. He asks that we look at Government purposes and tomorrow's needs rather than at outdated methods of organization.

Is he asking the impossible? Is he asking us to ignore political realities? I think not. We are the ones who determine political realities. There will be pressures from opposing interest groups on all points, of that there is no doubt. But we must in our own minds decide what best represents our constituency interests. We do not represent isolated interests, but the American people.

How are the American people served by Government today? Not very well. And that ought to be our primary concern. In the next 30 years there will be 50 percent more Americans than there are today—an additional 100 million people.

Can Government, as organized today, properly deal with the work represented by such an increase? Of course not. And the only body with power in this country to change the system is right here.

I appreciate the research done by the administration in preparing the fine reorganization proposals for four new departments handling domestic affairs. I feel certain that contrary to Thomas Jefferson's claim, the lawyers within this Congress will be able to do business with one another and begin resolving the organization quagmire of Government.

#### THOUGHTLESS CRUELTY

#### HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on November 10, 1950, Pope Pius XII issued the following pronouncement:

The animal world, as all creation, is a manifestation of God's power, His wisdom, His goodness, and as such deserves man's respect and consideration. Any reckless desire to kill off animals, all unnecessary harshness and callous cruelty towards them are to be condemned. Such conduct, moreover, is baneful to a healthy human sentiment and only tends to brutalize it.

I was reminded of this declaration while reading a letter received from a constituent, M. V. Neale, of Youngstown, Ohio. Miss Neale's concern is to be commended. I am pleased to insert her letter in the RECORD:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CARNEY: I wish you could introduce a Bill to stop the use of the steel jaw trap, which is used widely by hunters. They are killing off our wildlife in a slow, cruel way. The poor animals, beavers, otters, rabbits, etc., caught in these vicious traps try to chew off a leg or paw to get free or the agonizing pain and usually bleed to death—unless the hunter returns to finish it off, which is seldom. They put out these traps for anything that comes along. Last year in Youngstown, a beautiful collie dog was missing for three weeks and she finally limped home with her front paw still in the trap—nearly severed. Her foot had to be amputated and she had lost 25 pounds. She belonged to Brenda DeLuga of 4464 Lanterman Rd. They never knew who set the trap or how their dog got free of it, to be able to drag herself home.

I like what Albert Schweitzer said about this, "There slowly grew up in me an un-

shakable conviction that we have no right to inflict suffering and death on another living creature unless there is some unavoidable necessity for it."

I never had a fur coat. I could not, in good conscience wear anything that came from the suffering of animals. So you see why I hope you or someone will introduce a bill to outlaw the steel jaw trap.

Sincerely yours,

M. V. NEALE.

#### CALLEY VERDICT

#### HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, as most Americans, I was shocked by the severity of the verdict in the Calley trial, and I am deeply concerned over the deleterious effect this decision might have on the morale of our fighting men.

War is an ugly, vicious, and insane type of activity, but sometimes necessary to preserve freedom. People are killed in war. A pilot who drops bombs on targets may and probably does kill innocent women and children. Should he be brought to trial? Obviously not.

It is unfair, as far as I am concerned, to judge a soldier in the cool tranquility of the domestic scene for actions he performed under the intense maddening pressure of death of fellow soldiers, ambush, booby traps, and exploding shells. Obviously we can never condone atrocities, but we should view this from the perspective of the soldier on the ground of enemy territory, not back here in the United States.

I have been to Vietnam and I have talked to our fighting men. I have witnessed the unbelievable tension under which they fight a war that they did not cause, performing duties they did not initiate. I have been told of mothers advancing toward American soldiers with an infant in her arms boobytrapped with explosives to kill the soldiers when she gets close enough.

I have been told of other incidents: American soldiers who make friends with little children and give them candy and play games with them are blown into eternity when the same children release the trigger on a hand grenade when in the midst of these soldiers.

We do a disservice to our men to measure them by the same standards we measure civilians in a domestic atmosphere. The Vietcong use women and children as fighters in Vietnam and do not afford their lives the same kind of respect as Americans do.

Does the Calley trial now mean that an American fighting man must stand defenselessly and allow such a person to kill him and his companions? The incident at My Lai is unfortunate from every point of view and I abhor atrocities as much as anyone, but I cannot banish from my thoughts the feeling that Lieutenant Calley has been made a scapegoat to expiate the collective guilt we all feel over the atrocities.

I have written to President Nixon urging him to grant clemency to Lieutenant Calley.



# NELSEN URGES EQUITABLE TAXATION OF SINGLES

## HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, since the passage of the Tax Amendments of 1948, married couples have been able to take advantage of a provision in our laws which allows them to file a joint return. Because of the graduated income tax, this usually results in a significantly lower total tax bill. At this time, a single individual who has a dependent cannot take advantage of this income-splitting provision.

Our society is changing and there are a growing number of people who put off marriage until later or who have lost their spouse, and yet who must support a child or other dependent. It is unjust for our Government to discriminate against these individuals, and for this reason, I am introducing today a bill which would extend to single persons the income-splitting provision.

The effort to make our taxes equitable will probably never end but this particular bill will clear up one of the most obvious inequities in our tax laws today.

For the reference of the Members, I include the text of my bill in the RECORD at this time.

H.R. —

A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to rates of tax on individuals) is amended—

(1) by striking out subsections (b) and (c);

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as (b); and

(3) by striking out so much of subsection (a) as precedes the table therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—There is hereby imposed on the taxable income of every individual, other than an individual to whom subsection (b) applies, a tax determined in accordance with the following table:"

(b) Section 2 of such Code (relating to definitions and special rules) is amended—

(1) by striking out subsections (a) and (b); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (a), (b), and (c), respectively.

(c) Sections 511(b)(1) and 641 of such Code are each amended by striking out "section 1(d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 1(b)".

(d) Section 6015(a)(1) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

"(1) the gross income for the taxable year can reasonably be expected to exceed \$10,000 (\$5,000, in the case of an individual subject to the tax imposed by section 1(b) for the taxable year); or"

(e) The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1971.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate shall prescribe and publish tables reflecting the amendments made by this Act which shall apply, in lieu of the tables set forth in section 3402 of the Internal Revenue

Code of 1954 (relating to wage withholding), with respect to wages paid after December 31, 1971.

## ANALYSIS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

## HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a thoughtful analysis of the United Nations appeared in the Washington Post of March 30. As part of my remarks I will include the article by Robert Estabrook.

President Nixon has reiterated his commitment to the United Nations, and by his appointment of our former colleague, the Honorable George Bush, he has brought to the U.N. an effective and articulate spokesman.

I commend the Estabrook article to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 30, 1971]

A REPORTER'S PERSPECTIVE ON LEAVING AFTER 4½ YEARS—THE U.N. IS STILL THE WORLD'S FOREMOST FACE-SAVER

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

UNITED NATIONS.—Four and one-half years at the United Nations ought to endow a correspondent with a little perspective beyond the immediate impression that he has been trapped in a revolving door. Nothing would be easier than to yield to impatience over the hypocrisy, the gooey platitudes and the endless torrent of words. Nevertheless, I leave the U.N. still believing that it is indispensable—although in a different sense from what I once thought.

The U.N. is often judged by the wrong criteria, thanks in part to the lingering effects of the "one-world" delusion. It is blamed for not producing miracles, and it receives inadequate credit for its genuine accomplishments.

People who are looking for crisp, clearcut solutions from the international organization are unlikely to find them. They are not in the nature of a body that must somehow merge the often competing interests, jealousies and pretensions of 127 different member-countries. The light-hearted motto I once saw above an editor's desk, "Eschew Obfuscation!", would not find much response at the U.N. Much of the time the only remedies that are possible are fuzzy solutions.

But the distinctive contribution of the United Nations in the political sphere is to provide the means and cover for nations to get together when they do want to find diplomatic solutions—and to serve as a combination insulator and safety valve in dangerous situations until negotiation is practicable. The U.N. is the world's foremost face-saver.

It also, to mix the metaphor further, is the best available bridge between races, ideologies and stages of economic development. It affords the best coordinating mechanism for efforts to preserve the environment, ranging from pollution abatement to controlled exploitation of the seabed. And, just possibly, it may provide a way for Communist China to be knitted into the family of nations.

The U.N. is sometimes denigrated for its inability to produce ready remedies for sharp differences between the United States and the Soviet Union—as, for example, over Vietnam. But such criticism is unfair. The United Nations charter provides no very satisfactory recourse for disagreements between the superpowers.

Actually, the impotence of the U.N. over

Vietnam stems largely from the fact that neither the Soviet Union nor France has wanted to have the issue discussed in the Security Council. And this in turn has reflected the fact that another interested party, mainland China, is not a participant.

Incidentally, Soviet tactics at the U.N. are often quite different from what they are in bilateral relations when Moscow is cultivating the appearance of good relations. Here, despite occasional cooperation with the U.S. on such items as peacekeeping and disarmament, the Soviets leave no doubt that the cold war is still on and the United States is public enemy number one.

In the Middle East, the U.N. did not prevent a war in 1967, and has not produced a settlement now. It is easy to blame the institution and its top officials for the withdrawal of the U.N. emergency force on the eve of the 1967 conflict at the demand of Egyptian President Nasser.

What sometimes is not taken adequately into account is the tenuous situation of UNEF in the first place because Israel never permitted the international force to operate on its side of the border. This fact contributed to the debacle when Egyptian forces overran U.N. positions and India and Yugoslavia announced that they would withdraw their contingents.

An extremely dedicated man, Gunnar Jarring, has given several years of what ought to be the golden time of his personal and professional life trying to elicit an agreement between Israel and Egypt. That he has not yet succeeded is hardly news; the relevant question is how much worse the situation might have been but for the catalytic efforts and Job-like patience of this 63-year-old Swedish diplomat.

Accomplishments through the U.N. are often less dramatic than the failures. But when there has been a will to avoid major confrontations, U.N. machinery has often provided a way, as in the peacekeeping efforts going back to Kashmir. Discussion in the U.N. has sometimes defused explosive issues, such as the Pueblo case. Arrangements worked out through U.N. bodies have helped crystallize action to deal with international dangers, such as the hijacking menace.

Some 80 per cent of the expenditures through the United Nations system go for economic and social projects. The U.N. Development Program presided over the almost legendary Paul Hoffman is among the most effective multilateral economic efforts. The U.N. Children's Fund under another talented American, Henry R. Labouisse, has made an important impact in distressed areas with relatively little money. Other working programs in population control, food, health and disaster relief all attest to U.N. efforts to strengthen the common bonds of humanity.

Yet undeniably the U.N. has gone through a bad path in the last few years. The seeming decline of interest in the United States is a phenomenon repeated in other large countries. At least some of the American disillusionment stems from the disappearance of the so-called automatic majority in the Security Council and General Assembly.

Once the U.S. pretty much had its way, it retains the veto in the Security Council (and the fact that the U.S. cast its first veto last year on a bad resolution about Rhodesia seemed to me a good thing because it thereby abandoned a phony claim to superior virtue). But in the Assembly on some issues it has difficulty mustering a "blocking third." Communist China is surely coming in soon, whether or not the U.S. likes it.

Apart from such considerations, however, the 127-member General Assembly has sometimes behaved with blatant irresponsibility. There is very little correlation between the oratorical fervor in the Assembly and the distribution of real power in the world. Some of the newer Afro-Asian members, keenly attuned to colonial and racial

issues, echo Communist charges about U.S. "imperialism."

Yet when all the criticisms are in, the Assembly does provide an immensely important forum in which aggrieved nations can speak out on issues of apartheid and development. To the extent to which the rich nations are susceptible to qualms of conscience, the Assembly helps focus on hope rather than mere frustration and despair. Efforts are under way, also, to rationalize the Assembly's procedures.

There is less reason for dissatisfaction with the 15-member Security Council—although because of Soviet interference it has seldom given Israel a fair shake. From sterile confrontations, the Council has turned increasingly to behind-the-scenes efforts to compose differences before it votes. This sometimes results in what appears to be ridiculously mealy-mouthed resolutions. But sometimes it also prevents open breaks. The addition of Japan and Italy to the Council this year has given it added weight of big-power responsibility.

For whatever reason, the Nixon administration severely aggravated the problem of declining interest in the U.N. by its low-profile policy which prevailed until early this year. The tendency to use the U.N. only on tangential matters combined with hyper-secrecy to encourage public boredom.

Now the new American ambassador, George Bush, is working hard to reverse this pattern on the quite supportable thesis that as the United States mission takes on more importance, interest in the United Nations also increases. Bush has already won respect. But the long-range success of his efforts will depend precisely upon the degree to which he can keep President Nixon interested—and can demonstrate that he speaks for the President.

Important reasons that the United States needs to maintain and expand this interest are coalescing during 1971. Not only are major decisions imminent on issues ranging from China to the environment, but Secretary General U Thant has made clear that he wants to retire at the end of the year. Many

principal executives, a number of them Americans, are expected to retire with Thant.

A key part of the effort to harmonize relationships with China, and to reconcile other divided countries, will take place in the United Nations. Thus the selection of a Secretary General for the next five years will have a strong bearing on the degree of stability the U.N. is able to maintain during what is bound to be a turbulent period.

Beyond this, the selection of a new Secretary General and his major colleagues offers an opportunity to shake up procedures, infuse new blood, gain control of the burgeoning bureaucracy and perhaps to reinstate the sense of dedication that falls victim to the torpor of an institution becoming set in its ways. It may be the last practical chance to overhaul the machinery for another decade.

On all of these accounts, an alert, active and expanded American interest in the United Nations is crucial. The United States must be prepared to assert itself or watch its influence diminish by default.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, April 1, 1971

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Be of one mind, live in peace and the God of love and peace shall be with you.—II Corinthians 13:11.*

Almighty God, our Father, in this quiet moment of prayer do Thou bless us with an experience of Thy power, changing our doubt to faith, our darkness to light, and our weakness to strength. Grant that when we become troubled in spirit and discouraged in heart we may look up and becoming conscious of Thy presence find relief from our fears and release from our frustrations.

In our relationship to one another, help us to be more understanding, more tolerant, more friendly and in so doing add a bit to the harmony needed in our land. May we so live our own lives that others, seeing us, may be persuaded to do good to those about them.

In the spirit of Him who made goodness live, we pray. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

### CORRECTION OF VOTE

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to make a statement.

The recorded teller vote on the Whalen amendment—roll No. 38—at page 8824 of the RECORD for March 31 shows that the amendment was defeated by a vote of 198 to 200. That is correct.

However, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT), is recorded as having voted in the affirmative. That is not correct. I voted in the negative, deposited a "No" card in the proper box, and the official roll made up from those cards by the tally clerk so shows my vote. The

Government Printing Office is responsible for the error.

In addition, the official roll shows the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), as "not voting." The Chair knows this to be a fact, for he has ascertained that Mr. LONG was in his home State on yesterday and did not vote. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows Mr. LONG as also voting in the affirmative.

The Chair asks unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected to show that on the recorded teller vote—roll No. 38—the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT), voted "No" and that the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LONG) did not vote.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and, of course, I will not object—I was in hopes that the teller vote taken yesterday would be the first in this session, so far as I know that would not be subject to correction well after the vote was taken. I think I am correct in saying that in every teller vote of record thus far taken in this session there has been a change.

I would hope that some system can be worked out whereby we would know, at the end of the teller vote and after there is opportunity for Members to change their votes on the floor of the House, that we would have an accurate vote printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These errors can lead to serious consequences one of these days on a close vote.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to make a further statement. The tellers' record was correct, and the clerk's record was correct. The error was made in the Printing Office, and, of course, we did not get the RECORD at the time to correct it yesterday.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, whatever the reason, we did not have this difficulty on teller votes under the old system. I say again that I hope this can be corrected.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the RECORD will be corrected.

There was no objection.

### THE FIRST ANNUAL CENTRAL NEW YORK MAPLE FESTIVAL

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, last weekend, I spent some of the most pleasant time in recent years attending the first annual Central New York Maple Festival at Marathon, N.Y. The festival, which drew over 7,000 people, was the product of 10 years of planning and organizing. While it was definitely a community project, a large share of the credit for the festival must go to Walter Grunfeld, the enterprising and dynamic editor and publisher of the independent newspapers of Marathon and Tully.

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the reasons the festival was such a success, and one of the reasons why I am taking time today to mention it here in the House, is that in the hurly-burly of modern America we seldom take time out of our hectic lives to reflect on the virtues of a simpler day gone by, and the festival afforded just such an opportunity. Set in the beautiful countryside of central New York, the maple festival was a galaxy of Americana. There were homemade pies and homemade handicrafts, and most of all homemade maple sirup. It might sound corny to some, but to me it was a most enjoyable experience—and it was educational. There were displays depicting the colorful history of central New York; and there were social events designed to provide a carefree get-out-of-your-rut atmosphere; but most of all, Mr. Speaker, there was a community spirit which is so desperately lacking in many of our towns and cities across the country today.

I want to salute all of those interested citizens who put the festival together and encourage them to continue their efforts.

### PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I missed two recorded votes. Had I been present and voting, I would have