

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MARIETTA, OKLA., YOUTH WINS NATIONAL ORATORICAL HONORS

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, a 17-year-old constituent of mine, a resident of Marietta, Okla., Mr. Donnie Paul Minyard, has won national honors in another oratorical contest, one of many such firsts he has collected during the past several years. Donnie Paul first gained national recognition as an orator when he won first place and a \$2,000 scholarship in a contest sponsored by Optimist International in Los Angeles, Calif., in 1970. Last month, he won third place and a \$3,000 scholarship at the American Legion National High School Oratorical Contest held in Weirton, W. Va.

Donnie Paul began winning honors in speech contests 4 years ago when he competed in a beginner's speech tournament at Lawton, Okla. Since that time, he has won 55 medals and many trophies. In addition to the national trophies, Donnie also has won first place in the National Forensic League State Competition in men's extemporaneous speaking. He was the first contestant from a Class B school to win that contest in about a decade.

A senior in Marietta High School, Donnie has a straight A average and hopes to attend Oral Roberts University in Tulsa beginning this fall. His parents are Mr. and Mrs. O. E. Minyard of Marietta.

I am happy to share with you copies of Donnie's winning orations in the Optimist International and American Legion oratorical contests:

YOUTH, FULL PARTNERS IN A BETTER
TOMORROW

A few years ago, a small nation—eager for prestige—found itself blessed with 4 of the finest runners the world had seen. They and everyone else fully expected them to win the relays in the Olympics and bring home to their country some of the honor and prestige for which it so hungered. Careful training and many hours of practice were carried out. The day of the race finally arrived—the first three runners each brought the baton to the other runner well ahead of the opposition—yet when it came time for the hand-off between the 3rd runner and the anchor man the baton was fumbled and dropped. The anchor man recovered quickly but not in time to win the race. Did the 3rd runner stumble? Did the 4th runner start sooner than expected? Or were they distracted by something along on the sidelines? No one is quite sure—maybe it was all three things—the important thing was that their goal was not accomplished.

Here in the United States as the decade of the 70's begins we are faced with an almost identical situation. It's almost time to share with the 4th generation of Americans the baton of leadership. The first three generations have excelled—they have brought our nation to this point—well ahead of other nations. But the fact remains that if the timing is off—if the preparation and training are inadequate—if we lose sight of our objective then the entire nation will suffer. Therefore, it becomes imperative that youth and

adults work together as a team, as partners, to accomplish those goals of a better tomorrow.

Youth has much to contribute—unbridled energy, vitality, and enthusiasm that is characteristic of those starting on something new. A seemingly innate desire to be "a part of the action"—and the time to do it—and finally ideals and dreams untarnished and undimmed by age. Yet those of you who come into day by day contact with young people or who follow their activities in the news media are well aware that youthful energy and vitality can generate destruction as well as enthusiasm—that desire to be a "part of the action" can lead to a brashness and situations whence there can be no return—and those youthful dreams if not viewed with the harshness of reality can become the nightmares of the world of tomorrow.

But young people are indeed fortunate for that baton of leadership is not passed on to them alone. It is passed to a generation that includes men and women of all ages—a generation that has within it the wisdom and tolerance that is necessary to temper and strengthen the energy and vitality of youth—a generation that has within it the experience to evaluate objectively in the light of history those dreams and ideals of the young—so that we will not be destined to relive some of those trying experiences of the past.

Yes, this generation must truly be a partnership that commands the best qualities of both the young and adult societies—a partnership where each plays his unique role—resulting in the distinct advantages derived from both groups. A partnership which will be the focal point around which a better tomorrow will revolve. A partnership that will not fumble as the baton of leadership is passed to us.

But as we approach this fourth generation of Americans the relay analogy as most analogies is not completely comparable. The 4th lap of a relay is usually the last—and certainly if the 4th generation of Americans is the last one then our civilization will have ended much too soon. For we have much to offer the world—and if it ends then tomorrow will certainly not be a better one.

So it is our responsibility—yours and mine—to form the partnership and work in such a strict way that the 5th generation of Americans will find that we too have moved civilization forward to bigger and better things—and we utilize our talents of tomorrow's partnership. Let's heed the words of the poet Louis Untermeyer in his poem "Prayer":

Open my ears to music
Let me thrill to spring's first flutes and
drums
But never let me dare forget
The bitter ballad of the slums
From compromise and things half done
Keep me with stern and stubborn pride,
And when at last the fight is won,
God, keep me still unsatisfied.

Yes, we can never afford to be satisfied that all that can be done has been done, or that nothing can be done. With that in mind, with God's help—tomorrow will be better as today's youth is accepted as full partners in working toward that goal.

THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION, FOUNDATION OF
FREEDOM

On the evening of the seventeenth of June, 1858, an angular and homely-clad figure rose by a table in the Hall of the House of Representatives in Springfield, Illinois. Standing before a cheering audience, he was the spokesman for a new cause, and events

still in the future were to make his words famous. He began his speech slowly with frequent emphasis on particular words. This man, Abraham Lincoln, had not proceeded far into his famous address when he uttered the words "A House divided against itself can not stand." And only three short years later, as if fulfilling a prophecy, the nation was plunged into a civil war. A civil war that ripped and tore us asunder. Yet as a nation we survived. We survived because our country was built on a foundation that was solid and sure. It was a foundation based on the idea that a government under a constitution was better than a government by the whim of man. Yes, we have survived for over one hundred and eighty years as a democratic republic subject to change as needed.

Yet, today there are fast growing forces that seem bent on destroying the present system. The drummers are drumming, the demonstrators are demonstrating, and documents and buildings are being burned and bombed. Internal unrest and dissension are approaching an all time high, and the time has come for us to decide if our constitution is flexible enough to meet the needs of the changing times or should we abandon it and let nature take its course.

Finalizing a decision on whether to retain or abolish the Constitution requires us to examine the pages of history to determine how other nations have fared without a constitution.

Remember, if you please, the stories of the glories of an Ancient Greece, a democracy without a Constitution. But a democracy that has long since disappeared. Remember the grandeur of a Roman Republic, a republic without a constitution that decayed from within and collapsed at the hands of the barbarians. Remember a modern Germany without a Bill of Rights to protect individuals that took the lives of thousands of Jews. And, finally, remember a modern 20th-century Soviet Union without a constitution that has purged itself of thousands of people for voicing an opinion or supporting the wrong political candidate.

What does this imply? One of two things. First that a democracy such as Greece and Rome can not endure without a written law, and second that autocracies such as Germany and the Soviet Union can endure but the lives of freedom-loving individuals are at stake.

Obviously, we need to retain our Constitution, a document written and published so that every citizen knows and understands his rights and the role of the various levels of government. A Constitution that can stand up to the glaring inspection of all foreigners. Perhaps the best evidence that the Constitution has withstood this inspection is the fact that the United States is the only country in the world where people are waiting in lengthy lines to get in. The lines are lengthy because they know that here they can voice their opinions without fear of government repression. They can worship God as they choose or not worship at all. Also, they can go to the polls and cast a secret ballot or stay home if they wish. Freedom of choice, the right to life, liberty, and property are phrases that are trite and taken for granted in America although they are seemingly impossible dreams to the rest of the world.

Yes, our Constitution has stood the test of time and the inspection of the rest of the world, but what of those destructive forces within? Well, if our Constitution is going to stand, we must do something more than "standing up and being counted." We must activate those Constitutional articles so that no one can say that they are merely words and phrases. But activating these articles is

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RESERVE COMPONENTS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to bring to the attention of the Senate and all Americans an address delivered by Lt. Gen. Harris W. Hollis, Chief of Reserve Components, Department of the Army, and a native South Carolinian, to the members of the South Carolina Department of the Reserve Officers Association at Fort Jackson on April 29, 1972. It was a pleasure for me to be present for this occasion which reflected the true spirit of Americans.

Mr. President, it was refreshing and encouraging to hear such an inspiring address for America rather than against it. South Carolina is proud to claim General Hollis. He is an outstanding representative of South Carolina, who like other patriotic and dedicated South Carolinians of our great State, believes in the reality of the world in which we live and not in the fantasy of protecting a free America through weakness. General Hollis personifies a statement he made in his address:

This State and its people have never shirked from wholehearted commitment to the defense of the Nation.

Thirty centuries of recorded history demonstrate the philosophical thesis of General Hollis' address that weakness invites aggression and war. America must not be lulled into believing that free nations can survive without a strong defense and the will to use it. This strength relies heavier than ever before on our Reserve components as vividly presented by General Hollis. America's future may well depend on our Reserve Forces. Our country must support this vital element of our defense if we are to survive as a free nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that General Hollis' address be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

SOUTH CAROLINA AND NATIONAL DEFENSE
Remarks by Lt. Gen. Harris W. Hollis

Let me take you back a bit.

We follow where the Swamp Fox guides,
His friends and merry men are we;
And when the troop of Tarleton rides,
We burrow in the cypress tree . . .
The true heart and the ready hand,
The spirit stubborn to be free,
The twisted bore, the smiting brand—
And we are Marion's men, you see.

We follow where the Swamp Fox guides,
We leave the swamp and cypress tree.
Our spurs are in our coursers' sides,
And ready for the strife are we.

The Tory camp is now in sight,
And there he cowers within his den.
He hears our shouts; he dreads the fight;
He fears, and flies from Marion's men.

How long has it been since you have heard these lines, written by William Gilmore Simms?

In my mind's eye I can still see Miss Margaret Saye as she read aloud to first and second graders in 1926 at Oakley Hall, in

Chester County. She read with a view to instilling in us a sense of pride in Carolina and America. In that gentle spinster's sure way she was instilling, too, something about those ideas and ideals of man that make him more than mere beast: his long quest for justice in a faulted world; his spirit of freedom; his sense of obligation to do something about these things; the elements of inspiration and leadership requisite to move men to great purpose; and of the buoyance, the confidence, the basic charity that are also needed in our striving for a better estate. Miss Margaret was counselling us in the grand design. I see this now.

It is good to be back in South Carolina and to celebrate with you the proud fact that we are Carolinians.

South Carolina, in the almost 200 years of this nation's existence, has contributed mightily to national affairs. Its noted statesmen, its soldiers, its public servants and other countless good and solid citizens, besides Francis Marion, have made their marks. Just the other day we paid final honors to a latter day giant, James F. Byrnes. I won't presume to recite state history to a crowd of native sons and daughters, except to say the obvious to this Department of the Reserve Officers Association: This state and its people have never shirked from wholehearted commitment to the defense of the nation.

Today we ponder our traditional stance in these matters, and its relative worth, as South Carolina moves beyond its tricentennial epoch into a challenging era.

A popular bumper sticker reads, "Make love, not war." But is it not true that, since the dawn of history, man has been tempted to "make love and war"?

One of the words used much these days is "relevant". The youth of this nation, if one is to believe the printed word, views each action, each goal, in terms of relevance to the individual. In their seeking of a better way of life, any tradition, any dogma, any chart for the future must answer the question: "Is it relevant at this instance?"

At this instance ours is a globe of exploding populations and unsatisfied aims and hopes; an estate of frustrated dreamers and "get-rich-quick" international gamblers. The stresses and strains are all around us—in the Far East, in that bridge across three continents, the Middle East; in the aspirations of those within the Western Hemisphere who would export revolution throughout; in Europe where an uneasy equilibrium of power is juxtaposed between a growing and ambitious complex of Soviet armed force and that of the nations of the free world—where a balance of power favorable to our interest is the keystone of our security in the decades ahead; indeed a must. The potentiality for mischief and conflict in these times looms large.

In such an environment is our military power and the way we have organized it relevant?

Let's put it to the test. Are strong and ready U.S. armed forces—active and reserve—really relevant now in man's striving for a better world? Let's look at the proposition, not in a partisan or chauvinistic way, but as thoughtful Americans. In some respects I risk preaching to the choir; but I will run the risk.

Well-meaning individuals in our nation today, placing their trust in a belief that nonviolent arbitration alone is the way to solve all our ills, are, with moralistic fervor, demanding again the war "be outlawed"—that armaments be drastically reduced. The thought of armed force is painful to them. They do not see a need for significant American military power. Rather, they perceive that we can have a "greening", noncompetitive America and keep it safe from the wolves, without the use of this power, if one but listen to them. I do not agree with

From Compromise and things half-done,
Keep me with stern and stubborn pride.
And when at last each fight is won,
God keep me still, unsatisfied.

Yes, we should never be willing to compromise our freedoms to our enemies. For if we do many will feel that those who have died defending our country will have died in vain. But in another sense, if we compromise our freedoms and end up losing them, only our dead will be victors. For only our dead will be free.

this reasoning, as attractive as it may sound. To me, it is a new and tenuous search for the golden fleece; it is a dream of things that never were. It would be a boon if such could be, but alas, it is in the nature of man himself, and not in arms, that war has its origin.

We Americans—many of us—have never been too keen on history—and we have mis-calculated more than once because we did not read the signs clearly.

For example, World War II came about because we did little to stay what was developing in Europe and Japan in the Thirties. Our attitudes prior to that war were dominated by absolutist thought—even then our universities produced some students who swore not to help the United States should it find itself at war. (Although, parenthetically, they did not ask that the other side "send more missiles to shoot down American planes.") In those days we failed to recognize that rivalry among nations accompanies life. We passed Neutrality Acts; we kept ourselves weak; we preached out against the world—to no avail. We did not aim to check and balance by countervailing power the contending power we saw developing. Had we moved with credible power in 1936, that war might have been avoided. But we had not anticipated nor laid up that power; we tempted the aggressor to make war. He did.

And what were the results of our simplistic outlook? Let me recall with you: almost 300,000 U.S. dead and millions of others, and billions of national treasure expended. One might reflect today, "How moral in their effects on man were those attitudes which brought on that holocaust, when less cataclysmic means might have stopped the aggressor earlier."

General George Marshall noted that war is not the clear choice of those who wish passionately for peace, but rather the option of those who are willing to use violent measures for political profit. He said:

"We finish each bloody war with a feeling of acute revulsion . . . and yet on each occasion we confuse military preparedness with the causes of war and then drift almost deliberately into another catastrophe . . . Until it is proved . . . a solution has been found to . . . (eliminate) war, a rich nation which lays down its arms as we have done . . . (before) will court disaster."

For awhile Marshall was heeded but a retreat into weakness in the last Forties soon tempted North Asian communist powers to assault Korea—and once more we were involved in a war we might have deterred with our power, had we had it. We tempted the aggressor again.

Between Korea and now our national policies have been oriented more to the realities of world-wide conflict than before. We have seen, some of us, that instances of non-intervention can be just as immoral, perhaps even more so, than intervention. After all, the Good Samaritan intervened. Would he have been more moral had he not? The problem is not so simple; the world is a complex ganglion of interacting forces in which good and evil are many times mixed.

But in our frustrations with the latest phase of the struggle, some would draw strained conclusions about America's need to use responsibly its power in maintaining justice, political community and order within the world.

We have seen this week new antiwar demonstrations; angry young men from the universities and their affluent professors taking to the streets with banners and slogans, certain of their own rectitude profuse in their condemnation of those who disagree, and full of passion, moralistic fervor and idealism. In an era when public problems have never been more complex, when the dimensions of these matters are such that one could devote many months of study and

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

striving before making categorical judgment we see, sadly, the attempts of those who would take decisions made in council and overturn them in the street. But one should take heed. "We have been so cocksure of so many things that were not so," Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes admonished, that we ought to see that "certitude is not the test of certainty". When passion runs tyrant to the mind, it is hard for reason to flourish. We human beings have more than once in history applauded an imitation and hissed at the real thing.

Remember the angry crowd before Pilate, "Crucify him! Set Barabbas free!"

Yet we must not downgrade the idealism of youth—idealism is after all a great thing. We must be understanding and charitable. Our challenge is to help them idealize the reality, rather than making of reality a fantasy.

I dare say if we do that, these young people would come to realize that strategic decisions call for seasoned judgment, experience, a widened knowledge of the world and a sound historical perspective. Hopefully, they will come to understand that superficial browsing in newspapers and catching snatches of commentary and lecture in the public media are not the same as the experience one needs, for example, when removing a patient's sick lung or when deciding on the grave issues of war or peace.

The thought of these things is enough to make one feel humble.

Dr. Paul Ramsay, Professor of Religion at Princeton University, in his book *The Just War*, reasons eloquently that "Peace and justice are not linked by an invisible hand, nor can political life endure without the use of force"—possibly armed force. "You are not likely to win at the conference table," he says, "anything that it seems evident you could not win on the battlefield, or are not resolved to win." And Pascal observed that "justice and might must be wedded together so that whatever is just may be powerful and what is mighty, just."

In these things we should try to avoid the fetters of wishful thinking. Yet, it is not altogether easy to train our thoughts to the stern realities that have been man's historical lot since time immemorial.

For more than thirty centuries of recorded history sanguinary war has accompanied man's existence.

When Americans are sick of war and long for peace, we would rather the problems of the world go away. We, some of us, would put these aside, and the historical, perspectives as well, and live today doing our own thing", watching our own "Laugh In" in a kaleidoscopic way—in an instant interval—and not remember the past.

Some would say that our past history is an improper basis upon which to make judgments in a world of expanding pace and accelerated knowledge; that to look to the past is sheer madness in a world of vastly new experience. The revisionist historians tell us that even our understanding of that period must be reinterpreted in the light of the new doctrines and ideology—and some would even leave out the facts in their haste to redo history and the world. But if we must not be mad, should not our respect for history be at least pious? After all, the philosopher has warned: "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."—George Santayana.

Where does all this fit in? I think it fits in where our forefathers placed it; to wit:

"There is a rank due the United States among nations that will be withheld if not absolutely lost by the reputation of weakness. If we desire to avoid insult . . . we must be ready to repel it. If we desire peace, one of the institutions of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."—George Washington.

We cannot play games with national defense. No one knows this better than the soldier-statesmen here.

It is in this context of political reality that military power and the mission of our Reserve Component forces for which I share responsibility, take on new meaning and new criticality, and let me turn to this now.

They are vital to our long term well-being. To get them ready we are moving forward on a broad front.

We are issuing new, modern equipment, including aircraft, reversing the mid-Sixty trend when much of the Reserve equipment, but not the Reserves themselves in meaningful numbers, were mobilized for the Vietnam conflict. We are looking anew at our training methods; and we do have some problems. The flood of incoming equipment presents maintenance and security challenges. Increased readiness for these combat units requires close-in training areas. Not unexpectedly we are having trouble getting volunteers. Six years ago the number of enlistees under the six-year Reserve program were large—some motivated by the draft—others filling to 100% the Selected Reserve Force units of that time. These enlistments are being terminated this year—just as we entered an essentially no-draft environment.

An intensified recruiting and retention system designed to attract young men of all races has been organized and in the Army National Guard the strength seems to be improving. The US Army Reserve, however, is encountering somewhat more trouble. We are asking Congress for some inducements—but even this will not fully satisfy the issue.

Admittedly, we have been late getting started in these matters, but let's not kid ourselves—the problem is more profound than that. Given the way many are thinking, will we be able to man the force? Will we be able, in a no-draft environment, to attract quality youth to our ranks?

The Reservist must be convinced that the time and efforts he devotes to the Reserve Component units is important, is worthwhile to him and essential to his nation. We in the military must demonstrate these truths to him by our leadership and excellence. Others, too, must help.

I think we need to take a stalwart view of the matter. I know that many people do. I know that some do not. As I go about the country, I am from time to time asked the question, "Do you really think the Reserves can perform the mission which the Secretary of Defense has set out for them?"

That is a pertinent question. It is made all the more pertinent when one considers that by 1974 about 45% of the strength of the Army will reside in the Reserve Components. It is pertinent when one considers that about one and a half billion dollars were appropriated for the Army Reserve forces in 1972, and something under two billion is asked for 1973. The question is not only pertinent, the business at hand is serious, very serious.

My answer to that question is "Yes, if we want to. If the American people want to." It is more a question of national will than national capability. We have the means. Perhaps a better question to ask is, "Do we want to?" Are we willing each to contribute sincerely to these enterprises in appropriate ways? We should stand up before our mirrors and ask ourselves this. Those of us who have children should ask it of ourselves in recognition that these very children are hostages to the fortunes of tomorrow. Our young people are our most precious assets. My encounter with them has been exciting and heart-warming. They are influenced by our attitudes, our leadership, our goals, our capacity for hard work and sacrifice, our state of energy in pursuit of these goals.

I do not accept the view that the sturdy people of this land cannot do this job. We can do it if we all put our shoulders to the wheel and keep a gleam in our eyes.

We can do it, if the opinion makers and the state, city and county fathers—at large—stress the importance and honorable nature of the task of the citizen-soldier.

We can do it, if the employers throughout the land recognize that their larger interests are served by a program which encourages their employees to participate in the Reserve Component program.

We can do the job, if there is a widespread understanding that with our modern equipment, now being delivered, we need places to train—and that our installations and training areas are important to that end. It is paradoxical that some would have these taken away for other uses, at the very time when the government is emphasizing more than ever the role of Reserve forces.

We can do this job, if all of us get our sights lined up on what is really important to us. I would certainly include in this that program which keeps us free and reasonably safe in a competitive world.

We can get our Reserves ready and strong if we all understand how important it is for each of us first to decide that we are going to do it; to decide that the matter is indeed important and must be done.

"The commands of democracy", said Woodrow Wilson, "are as imperative as its privileges."

I have unbounded faith in the American people, young and old.

When the issues are clear, I believe that they will overwhelmingly want to insure, in company with South Carolinians, that our powder is dry and our defenses sure. Keeping the Reserve Components strong is a part of that sure way.

As Americans see ahead their freedom worth enjoying, they will surely see it worth defending, and worth perfecting; so that justice, liberty, order, and the pursuit of happiness may be more fully realized—at home and for men of good will everywhere.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

important role in Members of Congress for Peace Through Law. Under his chairmanship during the 91st Congress, the MCPL grew in size from 62 members to 105. He also was responsible for changing the nature of the organization from a study group to an action group. In addition, Brad has served as congressional adviser to the U.S. delegation at the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference in Geneva, and has served as a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, and director of the Pan American Development Foundation.

Yet, despite his deep involvement with foreign affairs, Brad Morse never lost site of his district and its problems. As a fellow member of the Massachusetts delegation, I can testify to Brad's tireless devotion to those problems which affect our area of the country. On the oil import quota, on the problem of unemployment, on the problem of pollution, on the energy crisis. Brad Morse's presence was felt in the Congress. The citizens of the Fifth District will have lost an effective and respected voice in Congress, but I am sure that they, too, are happy and proud about Brad's new post.

Finally, in addition to being a good Congressman, Brad Morse has also been a good friend, and I will miss him after he leaves. His constant good humor, cooperation, and good sense has added a measure of enjoyment to my own job. It has been a pleasure to work with Brad and I will miss him, but I'm sure he will keep in touch and let us know about the good work he is doing at the U.N.

These civilian technicians are an essential part of the National Guard. They respond in emergencies with the same sense of dedication and commitment as those who serve in the military, and they are vital to the defense of this Nation.

Their service to the country should be fully recognized. This legislation will do that.

NATIONAL CIVIL RIGHTS WEEK FOR THE DISABLED

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues National Civil Rights Week for the Disabled beginning today, May 5 through 13.

I am proud of the leadership shown by these New York groups: Disabled in Action, Disabled in Coalition, Spina Bifida Association, National Association for the Physically Handicapped, Pride, and HSO in securing equal rights for physically and mentally disabled Americans.

National Civil Rights Week for the Disabled is the first concerted, structured effort to raise the collective consciousness of America, to come before our fellow citizens with the neglected needs and bypassed problems of generations of disabled Americans. It challenges the humanity and imagination of the legislators and private citizens whose indifference and inertia has created a crisis in social justice within our society.

Mr. Speaker, I invite Members and staff to join with us in observing May 5 as National Advocacy Day for the Disabled to be marked by a mass march from the Washington Hilton Hotel to the Capitol west front. The march begins at 9:30 a.m. and will conclude with a rally at the Capitol at 11:30 a.m.

The executive president of one of the New York groups, Disabled in Action, is Miss Judy Heumann. Miss Heumann had polio as a child and has been confined to a wheelchair ever since. A graduate of Long Island University in Brooklyn, she tried to obtain a teaching position and was turned down, because of her disability. She refused to yield to this discrimination and sued the Board of Education to permit her to teach. She won the suit, and was given a position at P.S. 219 teaching art and music to disabled children.

This remarkable woman, who has served as a model for other disabled persons, has been one of those responsible for working for the rights of the disabled. She considers the disabled to be the most discriminated-against minority in the country. Miss Heumann is one of the founders of Disabled in Action, which is an organization run by and for the disabled with the goal of securing full human rights for the disabled citizens of America.

TRIBUTE TO BRAD MORSE

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, after 11 years of dedicated and distinguished service in the House, my good friend and colleague from Massachusetts, Brad Morse, is leaving to become the Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs at the United Nations. This post was last held by the late Dr. Ralph Bunche and I am confident that Brad will be able to perform the duties of Under Secretary General with the same competence and wisdom that earned Dr. Bunche the respect and admiration of the world.

Brad's main area of interest has always been foreign policy. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs Brad has contributed his broad knowledge, expertise, and good sense to the committee's deliberations, earning the respect and friendship of members from both sides of the aisle.

Brad Morse has always been in the forefront of the House of Representatives in the quest for peace. He was one of the earliest Members to advocate a peaceful settlement to the tragic conflict in Vietnam. He has played an active and

EQUITABLE RETIREMENT CREDIT FOR NATIONAL GUARD TECHNICIANS

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I wish to register my strong support for S. 855, which the Senate approved yesterday by a voice vote. This bill will correct certain inequities in crediting the service of National Guard technicians toward their civil service retirement.

I am a cosponsor of the bill, which was introduced by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON).

Mr. President, a retirement program was established by the 90th Congress for the 41,000 National Guard technicians. The program has helped the Guard to retain the services of very valuable technicians who are often subject to attractive employment offers from private industry with better retirement and fringe benefits.

At present, National Guard technicians receive only a 55-percent credit toward their retirement for years of service prior to 1969. Enactment of S. 855 will eliminate this discriminatory feature and accord them full credit for past service.

MRS. EVA FERGUSON

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I noted with interest an article in the April 30, 1972, issue of the Clarion Ledger-Jackson Daily News on the impending retirement of Mrs. Eva Ferguson, my high school mathematics teacher.

Mrs. Ferguson has devoted 43 years to classroom teaching and administration. She taught me mathematics at Utica High School and was not only a source of knowledge, but a source of inspiration to all of her students.

As Mrs. Ferguson enters this new phase of her life, I join all of her former students in wishing her good health and happiness.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the aforementioned article:

FOREST HILL HONORS MRS. EVA FERGUSON

(By Billy Skelton)

Mrs. Eva Ferguson is a woman who has spent many hours of her life convincing school children that they could do something they did not think they could do.

That is learn mathematics.

Mrs. Ferguson, assistant principal at Forest Hill High School who will retire in June after 43 years as a school teacher and administrator, spent more than 25 of those years teaching math.

Asked how she helped pupils intimidated by the subject, Mrs. Ferguson said it was mostly a job of convincing them that they were capable of doing the work.

In algebra classes, she learned that many difficulties were caused by the fact that the students were not reading the problems.

So, she taught them to read to understand.

After that she helped them work the problem, if they needed aid, and as soon as possible she put them on their own to do the work without help.

"I didn't have just too many failures," she said.

FOUND ABILITIES

One secret of her success may be that she attempted to find something every child could do.

Overcoming their fear of failure, the children overcome the subject.

She has found the method of convincing a student of his ability has been effective in other areas of school work, including things that come to her attention as a principal.

Mrs. Ferguson, who looks nowhere near retirement age, believes that any teacher "who works at it" can eliminate many of the failures in classwork.

The community of Forest Hill will honor Mrs. Ferguson with a program Monday night to begin at 7:30 in the Shellie Bailey Coliseum. "Everybody is invited," Principal Joe Walker has announced.

She has found administration—Mrs. Ferguson became an assistant principal in 1955—a little more difficult than teaching.

Although she has found some of the same problems with teachers that she has with students—"They both forget, and are tardy sometimes"—she said there are some methods that can be used with pupils that can't be used with teachers.

Which has she enjoyed most, being a teacher or principal? She likes both equally, she asserted.

ENJOYED WORK

"I really have enjoyed the years I have worked with teachers," she said. "They have

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

worked so beautifully with us. However, I miss the close feeling with the children."

She still deals with children, but more often than not, perhaps, in the problem area.

Mrs. Ferguson would still be a school teacher in Mississippi if she had to start all over again.

"I have loved my work," she stated. "I have had the best bosses in the state and the most delightful children."

Former pupils of Mrs. Ferguson are scattered around the world.

The teacher-administrator hasn't ventured far from her native Florence, where she was born and raised. She obtained her Bachelor's degree from Blue Mountain College, and she has taken post graduate courses at Mississippi College, Peabody College and Millsaps College.

Her first year as a teacher was spent in Mendenhall in 1929-30 when she taught college algebra at Simpson County Agricultural High School during a session when an attempt was made to expand the institution into a junior college, an attempt that was subsequently abandoned.

TO HINDS COUNTY

The next year she came to Hinds County as a teacher at Utica High School, and she's been teaching in the county ever since.

Thirteen years at Utica were followed by three years at Liberty Grove (a former county school which is now Watkins Elementary School in the Jackson Municipal Separate School District) and 26 years at Forest Hill.

Commenting on changes in the schools over the years, Mrs. Ferguson said "I didn't know the term, code of dress," when I started as a teacher. As she said it a boy was seated in her office because he had on a shirt that did not meet school requirements.

She welcomes the individualization of instruction—in fact, she welcomed it in her own classroom by instituting the basic method many years ago.

Mrs. Ferguson said she changed somewhat her instructional methods yearly, as she required, for one example, less work by students at the blackboard and put more of them to work on problems individually.

Desegregation has brought about more changes, and she commented that it has put a much heavier pressure on administrators. Her way of coping with these problems has been to generalize, "to try to be very fair."

What will she do when the school bell rings next year?

"I don't know," she replied. "I just don't know. I guess I'll stay home and be a housewife, something I've missed out on a lot all these years."

LOOK TO TRAVEL

Mrs. Ferguson's husband, Howard Ferguson, is a retired Illinois Central railroad clerk, and she thinks they will use their retirement years to travel, first in the states and possibly later abroad. Disney World may be their first stop.

Although she has been a career woman as well as a housewife, Mrs. Ferguson does not want to be a part of the women's liberation movement.

Combining marriage and a career has been easy, Mrs. Ferguson said, "because I have such an understanding husband. He has enjoyed my school work along with me."

The Fergusons are members of the First Baptist Church of Jackson, and Mrs. Ferguson is also a member of Delta Kappa Gamma, the Hinds County Teachers Association and the Mississippi Education Association.

Like many teachers, Mrs. Ferguson feels especially honored by the kind comments on her work by former (and current) pupils. A successful Delta businessman came by not long ago to tell her she was the best teacher he ever had, and on Easter this year a Forest Hill boy gave her flowers.

Her face glowing as she related these treasured experiences, Mrs. Ferguson said of the flowers: "I said to myself, why would a senior boy do such a thoughtful thing for an old woman like me?"

However, not a week goes by, she said, that she doesn't hear from her former students, many of whom come by for a visit.

"I know they think I'm hard—they call me 'Old Lady Ferguson,'" she said, "and I still use a paddle. But I think children want to be disciplined."

But she has not found anything to top the great satisfaction that comes from "knowing you have helped somebody else have a better life," she affirmed. "It's worth it all."

HON. J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the regret which Americans felt upon learning of the sudden death of J. Edgar Hoover extended beyond our borders because Mr. Hoover's dedication to the preservation of the freedom, security, and well-being of our people brought recognition to him on a worldwide basis. Indeed, under his direction for 2 years short of a half century, the Federal Bureau of Investigation became the outstanding federal investigative agency in the world.

Under his guidance which, admittedly was not without criticism, the FBI developed a force of dedicated and qualified men in the Hoover pattern, adopting the latest technological and scientific developments in the war against crime and to meet the continuing threats to the security of our people. I have noted with interest and understanding that in death he is praised even by those with whom he had traded criticisms in the course of his noteworthy career in the fight against crime.

It was my sad experience to report Mr. Hoover's death to many of his friends and, perhaps some of his adversaries, at a hearing Tuesday morning of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, of which I am chairman. Today we recessed another hearing of this subcommittee at which the principal witness was Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Romney, in order to attend the memorial services in the rotunda of the Capitol. J. Edgar Hoover has won high honor and appreciation from the Nation which he served.

J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI were active when the country needed their services—"gang-busting" in the 1930's; pursuing Nazi spies in the 1940's tracking Communist agents attempting to acquire the plans of the A-bomb in the 1950's; and during recent years organizations which threaten overthrow of the United States through force and violence.

J. Edgar Hoover effectively carried out his duties under eight Presidents and 16 Attorneys General. It is my hope that the FBI will continue in this fine tradition which is the legacy J. Edgar Hoover has

left to this country. We have truly lost a great American public servant to whom all of us owe a debt of gratitude.

U.S./U.S.S.R. COOPERATION IN SPACE RESEARCH

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I include a report from NASA covering the November 29 through December 6, 1971, U.S./U.S.S.R. joint space research meetings and the April 24, 1972, press release in the RECORD at this point:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, D.C., May 3, 1972.

Hon. JOHN R. RARICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RARICK: Enclosed (Tab A) is a statement on US/USSR Cooperation in Space Research.

Since this statement was prepared the reports from the November 29 through December 6, 1971, meetings were approved, as pointed out in more detail in the April 24, 1972, press release (Tab B).

If I can provide any additional information, please let me know.

Sincerely,

GERALD J. MOSSINGHOFF,
Deputy Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs.

U.S./U.S.S.R. COOPERATION IN SPACE RESEARCH BACKGROUND

Cooperation with the Soviet Union in space has been marked by three distinct phases:

1. From 1955 to early 1962, US overtures for cooperation evoked no response from the USSR.

2. In the spring of 1962, a Kennedy-Khrushchev exchange of letters led to technical discussions which produced four limited agreements for projects in satellite meteorology, communications, magnetic survey, and in space biology and medicine. Soviet performance in implementing these early and limited projects was disappointing, and it was obvious that Soviet leadership placed space cooperation low on its scale of priorities.

3. In late 1969, a new phase began when the President of the Soviet Academy responded affirmatively to suggestions from the Administrator of NASA that they meet to discuss expanded cooperation. This led to an agreement (October 28, 1970) to design compatible rendezvous and docking arrangements and to a second agreement (January 21, 1971) for the exchange of lunar samples, for exchanges on scientific results and objectives, for certain coordinated scientific activities, and on procedures for recommending additional cooperation in space science and applications.

CURRENT STATUS

Thus far, Soviet performance under the new agreements of 1970 and 1971 has been positive.

Rendezvous and docking

a. Three Joint Working Groups, meeting in Houston, June 21-25, 1971, considered the technical requirements for compatible systems including the general methods and means for rendezvous and docking, radio and optical reference systems, communications systems, life support and crew transfer sys-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tems, and docking assemblies. They agreed in principle or in detail on a number of technical solutions and requirements and identified a number of other problems which required additional development and discussion. They also agreed that studies should be made of the technical and economic implications of experiments that might be conducted to test the technical solutions for compatible systems and that a first such experiment might be the docking of an Apollo-type spacecraft with a manned orbital scientific station of the Salyut type.

b. The three Joint Working Groups met again in Moscow, November 29-December 7, 1971, and made progress toward completing the definition of technical requirements for compatible systems in future spacecraft, as well as in planning possible joint test missions.

Space science and applications

a. On June 10, 1971, representatives of NASA and the Soviet Academy exchanged approximately three grams of lunar material returned by Luna 16 for about 3 grams of lunar samples returned by Apollo 11 and the same amount returned by Apollo 12.

b. Joint Working Groups met in Moscow in August and October, 1971, to make recommendations for expanded cooperation under the NASA/Soviet academy agreement of January 21, 1971.

(1) The Working Group on Near-Earth Space, the Moon, and the Planets recommended continued exchange of lunar samples; rapid exchange of findings of special interest by the current U.S. and Soviet Mars probes; working seminars to consider scientific objectives, strategy, and results, and cross-calibration of instruments; and expert consideration of the principles of constructing a common lunar coordinate system.

(2) The Working Group on the Natural Environment recommended experiments in remote sensing of the environment at sites in the U.S. and the USSR, with each country carrying out the research at its own sites, and joint efforts in remote sensing of the ocean to relate satellite measurements to sea surface measurements.

(3) The Working Group on Space Meteorology recommended a review of the existing methods of temperature sounding from satellites, a joint experiment in methods of microwave measurement, assurance that ground stations for receiving cloud cover data from satellites (APT receivers) of both countries will be as nearly identical as possible, and coordinated meteorological rocket soundings along selected meridional zones in the Eastern and Western Hemispheres.

(4) The Working Group on Space Biology and Medicine began an exchange of data and results from the Soyuz and Apollo programs and recommended procedures for expanded exchange of information in space biology and medicine.

All of the above recommendations were confirmed by the principals, and steps to implement them are in progress. Both parties have sent the other reports on findings of special interest from their respective probes to Mars.

c. In accord with the agreement of January 21, 1971, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration is coordinating directly with the Soviet Hydrometeorological Service to improve the exchange of meteorological satellite data provided for in the Bilateral Space Agreement of 1962.

Joint review of space biology and medicine

The project for publishing a joint review of U.S./USSR experience in space biology and medicine, agreed between NASA and the Soviet Academy in 1965, lagged until 1969, when the Soviets took a renewed interest in it. Since then, there has been steady progress. The exchange of chapter materials is virtually complete, and authors have been assigned

to two-thirds of the chapters. Manuscripts for these chapters are to be finished by May 1, 1972.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, Washington, D.C., April 24, 1972.

U.S./U.S.S.R. REPORTS ON DOCKING

The Academy of Sciences of the USSR and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration have approved a second set of reports by Joint Working Groups on studies of compatible rendezvous and docking systems for manned spacecraft. The working groups met in Moscow, Nov. 29-Dec. 6, 1971.

Purpose of the meetings was to define technical requirements for the possible rendezvous and docking of US and USSR manned spacecraft. Compatible systems would permit emergency assistance as well as joint experiments. No decision has been taken that would commit either the US or the Soviet Union to a joint manned space mission.

The meetings took place under the NASA/Soviet Academy agreement of Oct. 28, 1970. A previous meeting was held at the Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Texas, from June 21-25, 1971.

Working Group 1 substantially completed general documentation on life support systems, coordinate systems, and constraints on spacecraft configuration. The Group agreed on objectives and preliminary documentation requirements for a possible test mission, as well as to exchanges on launch windows, certain program elements of a test mission, and communications channels which the respective control centers would require.

Working Group 2 listed guidance and control systems and onboard equipment of US and USSR spacecraft which would need to be compatible. Documentation on lights, docking targets and contact conditions, control systems and radio tracking has been nearly completed.

With respect to a possible test mission, Working Group 2 considered communications and tracking systems and agreed on docking contact criteria and on a docking target for installation in the center of the docking hatch. Additional work will be necessary on control stabilization requirements and their relationship to spacecraft size, and on the design, development schedule, evaluation and installation of the new docking target concept.

Working Group 3 agreed to a series of basic values for a compatible docking system, including the diameter of the tunnel through which astronauts and cosmonauts might pass. Further study is required for the development of a single joint concept. Also still to be agreed are programming and methods of conducting tests at various stages of development. The Working Group agreed to create a scale model of a docking system that would allow verification of the parameters and ensure compatibility at an early stage of development. It was agreed that the next meeting of the Joint Working Groups would be held in the United States. One such Working Group meeting was held at Houston in March.

THE LATE J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sadness that I learned of the passing of J. Edgar Hoover, the highly respected Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

He was a great patriot, and a man of unquestionable honesty and character. Through his tireless efforts and exemplary devotion to duty, the FBI, under his leadership of more than 47 years, became widely recognized as the most effective law enforcement agency in the world.

He was tough and strong at a time when toughness and strength were needed. He demanded the best of his agents and employees, and he got it. Mr. Hoover was the FBI, and he had the profound respect and admiration of the American people.

He was not only a courageous and vigorous crime fighter, but also a relentless foe of atheistic communism and other alien movements dedicated to subversion of our form of government.

He served this Nation with brilliant distinction under eight Presidents. J. Edgar Hoover symbolized much that was good about America. His loss leaves a void that will be extremely difficult to fill.

EMERGENCY NATIONWIDE MORATORIUM DAY

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today has been designated Emergency Nationwide Moratorium Day, a time for concerned Americans to express, in their own way, their opposition to our Nation's continued intervention in Southeast Asia.

The events of the past few days in Vietnam have demonstrated once again the utter futility of our long and costly effort to support the Government of South Vietnam.

President Nixon's claims of success for his Vietnamization program were dramatically refuted by newspaper accounts of South Vietnamese troops in headlong retreat, stealing cars, and trucks at gunpoint from fleeing civilians, and engaging in mass looting in the city of Hue.

Meanwhile, we continue to spend \$18,000,000 a day for a war that the overwhelming majority of Americans have long since come to oppose.

President Nixon continues to remind us that he is withdrawing American troops, but American dollars are still being poured into the war. The total cost of the air war alone last year was nearly \$2.8 billion. Every bombing mission of a B-52 costs the American taxpayers \$41,000. Every day, we spend \$7,000,000 for bombs, rockets, and bullets which are spreading death and destruction in both North and South Vietnam.

At the same time, our own economy stagnates. Our President vetoes money for education, he impounds money appropriated by Congress for highways, sewers, waterlines, urban renewal, and hospitals. Our educational system is collapsing, our health standards are deteriorating, our cities are crumbling, our water and air remain polluted.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

At the same time, millions of Americans cannot find jobs, and a whole crop of high school graduates this June will find few opportunities to use their education and talents.

Future historians will surely find this era of American history an unbelievable study of contradictions and futility: Problems begging to be solved, projects begging to be done; millions begging for employment, but the money that could make these things possible being wasted on a war that nobody wants; billions of dollars spent to devastate a tiny nation halfway around the world.

Mr. Speaker, on this Emergency Nationwide Moratorium Day, I join millions of my fellow Americans in renewing our plea to President Nixon—stop the bombing, stop the slaughter, stop the destruction; bring our boys home, and let us get down to the job of rebuilding America.

FBI STANDS AS LIVING TESTAMENT TO J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I join with Americans throughout the Nation to pay tribute to J. Edgar Hoover, whose death ends an era.

As the FBI's Director for 48 years, Mr. Hoover was responsible for developing the agency into an incorruptible investigative force whose reputation extends far beyond our borders.

Mr. Hoover himself exemplified the qualities of the tough but fair administrator. When he became Director in 1924, the FBI was mired in bureaucratic inefficiencies and was tinged with scandal.

With resoluteness and purpose, Mr. Hoover set out to make the FBI a law enforcement agency without peer. That he succeeded so well is evidenced by the record of the FBI since he assumed command in 1924.

I think that Mr. Hoover was a remarkable man who produced a remarkable record as FBI Director.

First, he proved that an individual could make a difference by taking the scandal-soiled FBI and turning it into a model of crime-fighting proficiency, free from corruption and graft, based on the integrity of its Director and agents.

Second, the FBI, under J. Edgar Hoover, successfully resisted political pressures that could have subverted the lofty role of the FBI to that of a national police force, beholden to the administration in office at any given time.

I think, also, we owe a great debt of gratitude to Mr. Hoover for his service during World War II. While those times now may seem far distant, the role of Mr. Hoover and the FBI was especially critical on the homefront while our military services and those of our Allies were engaged in the awesome task of defeating Hitler's forces.

The Hoover era has ended, but the FBI that he nurtured and built stands

May 4, 1972

as a living testament. I feel it would be appropriate, however, that the new FBI building be named after J. Edgar Hoover.

Mr. Hoover was a dedicated and proud American. We mourn his passing.

NIXON AND THE HANOI OFFENSIVE

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday James Reston wrote a perceptive article, which was carried by the Washington Evening Star, concerning the dilemmas facing President Nixon in Vietnam. I would like to insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

NIXON FACING HARDEST DECISION

NEW YORK.—President Nixon is now approaching another critical decision in Vietnam: What to do if the enemy stops the invasion before or after the battle for the former Vietnamese capital of Hue, and offers to make a deal while Hanoi is in control of a large part of the north of South Vietnam?

There have been some reliable indications through the embassies in Paris and Washington that Hanoi and the National Liberation Front will do just that, and such a pause in the fighting would put the Nixon administration and the Thieu government in Saigon in a very awkward situation.

So long as the Communist offensive goes on—and it is making alarming progress—Nixon's policy is clear. He has stated that he would do "whatever is necessary," short of using atomic weapons or sending the American expeditionary force back into the battle on the ground—"until the North Vietnamese stop their offensive in South Vietnam."

But he has left himself an out. He has not said that he would continue his air and naval attacks until they pull back of the demilitarized zone and get their troops out of South Vietnam, but only "until the invasion stops." What then if it stops, with Hanoi in substantial control of the north or even of Hue?

"The only thing we have refused to do," Nixon said in his last Vietnam policy statement on April 26, "is to accede to the enemy's demand to overthrow the lawfully constituted government of South Vietnam and to impose a Communist dictatorship in its place."

But when Le Duc Tho of the North Vietnamese politburo got back to Paris on April 30 to reopen the negotiations, he denied that he was demanding a Communist government in Saigon.

"In South Vietnam," he said in a formal statement, "what we want is a government of national harmony . . . we in no way want to impose a 'Communist regime' in South Vietnam such as Mr. Nixon has fabricated, but our people are also determined not to permit the American administration to establish a puppet power in its pay."

Well, we have heard all this before, but with the enemy invasion cutting South Vietnam in half and threatening Hue, the alternatives before the President are hard and even ominous. The farther south the enemy penetrates, the closer the armies get together and the more they move into populous civilian areas, where the President has to risk hitting the ARVN and the South Vietnamese people.

He can insist on fighting the battle through, relying on the South Vietnamese and American air and naval power to smash the invasion and drive the enemy back of

the DMZ, or, if the enemy paused and offers to negotiate at Hue, he can agree to negotiate for a coalition government in Saigon, with the Communists and without General Thieu.

It is a hard bargain, but he is probably going to have to choose between fighting even harder while he withdraws his ground forces, or negotiating a new coalition government in Saigon. Nixon has been up against many hard decisions since he entered the White House, but this may be the hardest of all, especially since he has to try to reconcile the tough moral line he took at Secretary Connally's ranch in Texas with his mission to Moscow this month to negotiate "a generation of peace," which is his main presidential election argument.

In the middle of his first term in the White House, Nixon offered to negotiate a settlement on the basis of the hard political and geographical facts: Who was in control of what in South Vietnam. And now Hanoi seems to be testing that proposition.

Nixon gave three reasons in his April 26 statement for continuing the battle: "First, to protect our remaining American forces. Second, to permit continuation of our withdrawal program. And third, to prevent the imposition of a Communist regime on the people of South Vietnam against their will, with the inevitable bloodbath that would follow for hundreds of thousands who have dared to oppose Communist aggression."

Hanoi's answer to this, from Le Duc Tho in Paris, was that his government would guarantee the protection of the remaining American forces, and the release of the American prisoners, and that it didn't want to impose a Communist government on Saigon, but that it "demanded" the "immediate resignation" of Nguyen Van Thieu as head of the Saigon regime, and a change of policy in Saigon by a new coalition government, including the Communists.

Nothing could be harder for Nixon to swallow, but he may have to swallow it or fight even harder than before by the end of this month. The danger at the moment is that Hanoi is doing so well in the drive toward Hue that it may think it can smash its way to a military victory and not only demoralize and defeat Saigon but humiliate Washington.

Hopefully, they will not take this gamble, because nobody in Washington, or Moscow or Peking, let alone in Hanoi, can calculate what Nixon will do if he is trapped. This point has been emphasized through private channels to everybody on the other side, and apparently they have got the point.

So Hanoi will probably call for a cease-fire at Hue and proclaim an alternative "government" of South Vietnam there, and ask for a compromise settlement and a coalition government in Saigon without Thieu.

What then will Nixon do? This is the question that is being debated privately in Washington these days, and the answer may very well determine the outcome of the war and influence the presidential election in November.

HONORABLE J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1972

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks before I was born, in 1924, J. Edgar Hoover became head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—FBI. His death a few days ago has taken from the Nation one of its most dedicated public servants, a man I greatly admired.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The FBI was Hoover's life and it reflected his personality and character. It is the finest law enforcement agency in the world. I can attest to this first hand.

For many years of my life, in the 1950's, I served as an assistant U.S. attorney in the eastern district on Long Island. My job was to prosecute Federal crimes. My detective agency was the FBI.

Each day I would read and rely on reports of criminal activity by the FBI. These reports reflected the excellence of the agency. They were competent, effective, honest and set forth all the facts, both those against a defendant and those favoring him. They were factual and fair.

The agents themselves were men of great integrity and devotion to duty. They followed the lead of their chief, and he led by personal example.

The FBI stands today as a model of what a law enforcement agency can and should be. When Hoover took it over, it was a small, unreliable group of men. He turned that situation around. Each day we read sad stories of how a group of law enforcement officers in this city or that have been indicted for corruption. Their numbers are small but the effect of the stories is demoralizing. Over the years, in spite of the thousands of agents who have come and gone, the FBI has remained scandal-free. It has been the most honest and efficient agency of the Federal Government.

It has its enemies and detractors. Most are those who fear the FBI. Since I have held Federal positions, I too have been investigated by them and I know how thorough they are. I never resented this because I knew it was for the protection of the public in general. In many ways the importance of the FBI can be proven by a review of its critics.

The death of Mr. Hoover is not the end of an era. It should be the start of a tradition of excellence in Federal service based on honesty and dedication, not only for the FBI, but hopefully for our country as well.

EMERGENCY NATIONWIDE MORATORIUM DAY, THURSDAY, MAY 4

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, today thousands of Americans are gathering in their towns and cities and here in the Capital to protest the war in Vietnam and to urge the President and the Congress to put an immediate end to this senseless conflict. The American people can no longer tolerate the insidious rhetoric that has been handed to them since the inception of this war to justify our continuing involvement in Southeast Asia. We are seeing all too clearly the administration's withdrawal policy; as our ground troops were being slowly pulled out, the administration has been replacing them with massive air and naval forces. Escalating and intensifying

the air war, the administration leaned on the weightless argument that we must protect our remaining troops. We must protect our troops, but experts agree that the bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong will not have the desired effect. If the promises made 4 years ago by the President had been honored, there would be no U.S. troops in Vietnam to protect. I say, and the American people say, eliminate the administration's excuse for massive bombing raids and the destruction of more American lives; protect our POW's and withdraw all our forces now.

Mr. Speaker, the frustrating and distressing fact right now is that despite public outcry, despite congressional protest, the President persists in intensifying military operations in Vietnam at his own discretion and the Congress as a whole declines to challenge his authority. The Congress must assume the responsibility for ending the war now. We are Representatives of the American people and we cannot turn our backs on the American people's plea for peace. I urge my colleagues to join with me in meeting the efforts of so many concerned Americans; but even more essential, I urge them to heed the public's outcry and bring an end to our involvement in Southeast Asia.

J. EDGAR HOOVER: THE NATION'S "TOP COP," ESTEEMED NATIONAL HERO

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, today this Nation buries a man it has looked to for leadership for half a century. And it was not disappointed in any of those 50 years.

John Edgar Hoover, the Nation's "top cop" is dead. But the legend and the unsurpassed reputation he fostered and held for so long will live for many a year to come.

Never before has a civil servant been honored by lying in state in the Capitol Rotunda. But never before has this country seen a civil servant like Mr. Hoover.

The story of J. Edgar Hoover and of the agency he literally molded single-handedly into the greatest law enforcement power on earth is well known. The FBI "G-man" has been familiar to us since we were children.

But even more important are the high standards Mr. Hoover set for his law enforcement body—standards of education and of excellence unsurpassed, standards of honesty, forthrightness, and of freedom from the influence of any who would try to bend the law to their own desires.

Mr. Hoover has been the personal friend of seven U.S. Presidents. And it was his astuteness, his honesty, and his high ideals which won him those friendships.

He will be missed not only by our Chief Executives, but also by the Congress and

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

by this Nation. He wielded unprecedented power in a democracy, but he wielded that power with unprecedented integrity. That is what makes his shoes so large to fill.

But one of the marks of a great administrator like Mr. Hoover is that he can create an organization larger even than himself. I know that the high ideals of Mr. Hoover are thoroughly imbedded in the agency he headed and I know that those who must now try to follow him and to carry on their tasks without his personal leadership still will have the dictates and teachings of his life and his leadership to guide them.

Probably the greatest single force behind Mr. Hoover was his love for this country. I hope we can all in our own ways do honor to the memory of this great civil servant and the great love he had.

EULOGY TO JOHN EDGAR HOOVER,
DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of personal loss and deep sorrow that I rise to pay tribute to the late J. Edgar Hoover.

Although I was not always in agreement with Mr. Hoover's views, I knew him personally to be a man of unimpeachable integrity and courage. His loyalty to America, steadfastness of purpose, his strength of leadership and his competence, cannot be questioned.

J. Edgar Hoover's career as a public servant spanned 56 years—more than a fourth of our history as a Nation. Before two-thirds of America's present population was born, he was a significant force in national affairs. Under his direction, the FBI was transformed from an inadequate, scandal-ridden bureaucracy into what is recognized universally as one of the most efficient and incorruptible law enforcement agencies in the world.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Hawaii will long remember Mr. Hoover in gratitude for the unshakable position he took in defense of the loyalty of Americans of Japanese ancestry in Hawaii, at the outbreak of World War II. He thus prevented the mass incarceration of one-third of Hawaii's population, as proposed by certain elements in the Federal hierarchy. Moreover, when the tragic decision was made in 1942 to place those of Japanese ancestry living on the west coast behind barbed wire fences in what were euphemistically termed "relocation centers," it was arrived at over Mr. Hoover's objections.

Mr. Speaker, J. Edgar Hoover did much for America and leaves behind him what is now a part of our American heritage; he will long be remembered with respect and admiration.

I extend my heartfelt condolences to his bereaved family.

WHERE ANTI-COMMUNISTS STILL STAND FAST

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, a strange thing is happening in West Germany today—strange, that is, to those who assumed that because it has now become our official policy to seek accommodation with Communist governments, all other major governments and political parties in the West are sure to follow suit. Everyone wants peace, the argument goes, so now that we have abandoned our obsolete concern about Communist aggression and tyranny, nobody else in or near positions of political power will think about it any more.

Not so. There are nations in the world which must watch millions of their own former citizens—people who speak their language and share their historical experience and cultural traditions—suffer year after year under Communist rule. It is as though here in America we had to live next door to a Communist regime enslaving all of our people west of the Rocky Mountains. Nations in this position cannot forget what communism has been and, clearly, still is. There are four of them in the world today: South Korea, the Republic of China on Taiwan, South Vietnam, and West Germany. Their anti-Communists, unlike too many of ours, are standing fast.

A year and a half ago West Germany Socialist Chancellor Willy Brandt signed a treaty with the Soviet Union, subject to ratification by the West German Parliament. This treaty, immediately and enthusiastically hailed by the "pundits" whom apparently no evidence can ever convince that our differences with communism, are not negotiable, is far more than a mere "nonaggression pact" as it is usually termed in our news reports. It specifically legalizes the Polish Communist seizure of vast tracts of territory which throughout modern European history has been German, and by its language amounts to recognition of the legitimacy of the puppet Communist slave state established in East Germany by the Soviet Union after World War II, in flagrant violation of Soviet agreements on the administration of conquered German territory.

Based on these enormous West German concessions, we proceeded to make similar and equally indefensible concessions to the Soviet Union regarding the status of Berlin—see my newsletter 71-43. For a time nearly all U.S. commentators regarded ratification of the Brandt-Kremlin treaty as a foregone conclusion.

But the Christian Democratic Party in West Germany, Brandt's opposition, would have no part of the game of Ostpolitik—the "opening to the east." Ever since the text of the treaty was first announced August 11, 1970, the Christian Democrats have held firm against it. By doing so, they have given American anti-

May 4, 1972

Communists a much needed lesson in the benefits of being steadfast. Far from losing strength by opposing this "wave of the future," Communist style, the Christian Democrats in West Germany are gaining strength. Brandt's coalition government has begun to crumble. Three of its key members in the Lower House of the West German Parliament, the Bundestag, have already abandoned Brandt—primarily because of his treaties—to join the Christian Democrats, who fell two votes short of toppling the Brandt government in a trial vote April 27. If just one more member changes his position, Brandt's appeasement treaty is dead.

As a recent recipient of the annual award by the Federation of American Citizens of German Descent as their outstanding citizen of the year, I have been in touch with West Germany's Christian Democrats as they resolutely carried on their struggle, so important to the whole of the West. Their success has been most heartening. Many in West Germany are concerned that the President's forthcoming appearance in Moscow, at about the time that action on the treaty is expected in the West German Parliament, will tilt the closely balanced scales against our friends and in favor of the Communist side, as Henry Kissinger's second visit to Peking helped to tilt the originally close U.N. vote last October in favor of the expulsion of our Free Chinese allies.

J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, this Nation has lost one of its greatest and most faithful servants in J. Edgar Hoover. He was a man who truly believed in America and the ideals for which it stands. His entire adult life was dedicated to serving and protecting the nation he loved so much. He will be missed but he will not be soon forgotten.

In almost a half century of service, J. Edgar Hoover's leadership, unparalleled devotion to duty and ability established the FBI as the greatest law enforcement agency in the world. The American people came to respect the FBI for its aggressive pursuit of criminals, its aid to local law enforcement and its nonpolitical devotion to the Nation's security. The name J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI were synonymous and came to be recognized as meaning strong, effective law enforcement, and exceedingly high standards of professional and personal conduct.

In the 1930's when our Nation was beset with widespread gangland activities, it was through the efforts and courageous actions of Hoover and the FBI that law and order were returned to the streets of our cities.

Perhaps his greatest contribution came

nearly 20 years later when our country once again faced a serious threat. This time the threat was to our internal security from a growing Communist conspiracy. The FBI, under Hoover's leadership, devised and carried out a complete infiltration of the movement. Through these successful efforts the party was unable to make a move without the knowledge of the FBI. Even after this threat was checked, the FBI remained as a watchdog against any subversive activities that might undermine the national stability. When public concern waned, J. Edgar Hoover remained in the forefront, ever watchful over the national security.

Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments and contributions of the FBI and J. Edgar Hoover are many. They cannot all be listed here. J. Edgar Hoover was the FBI. The man and the agency were one. His efforts and accomplishments will be remembered so long as this Nation honors its heroes and its past. The Federal Bureau of Investigation will remain a vital guardian of our national defense as long as it adheres to the standards set by Mr. Hoover. He has laid down his shield, but the battle goes on. The honor we owe his memory demands no less than he himself gave.

THE LATE HONORABLE J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, Americans in all walks of life are mourning the passing of J. Edgar Hoover. As we in the Congress express our sorrow at the death of this devoted public servant, citizens across the country are expressing their tributes to a man who truly dedicated his life to the job he held for so long.

The story of J. Edgar Hoover's career is being told and retold this week, but what stands out is the complete honesty and integrity with which he pursued the goals he set for himself and for the Bureau. The FBI, under his direction, achieved a level of public confidence unknown to any other Government agency. That is the legend which this man has left to our Nation.

With his death we must now remember those ideals which J. Edgar Hoover accepted as basic and we must now assume the responsibility of preserving the kind of dedication to public service which his career illustrates. If we can produce that kind of public confidence in Government which he earned for the Bureau, we will have done a great service for our system of democracy. If we can learn from his accomplishments and bring about a new faith in Government, we will have achieved a monument to the life of this distinguished American.

A national figure has died and an era of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

law enforcement will be marked by respect for and faith in it, as Mr. Hoover had believed in it.

ANOTHER APOLLO EPIC

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert Hotz, editor of Aviation Week & Space Technology, contributed a significant editorial in the May 1, 1972, edition of that magazine. Mr. Hotz writes of the Apollo lunar landing program and the more recent success of Apollo 16. As he so well points out, Apollo has contributed much to our understanding of the moon, the earth, and the solar system in which we live. Yet the exploration raises as many questions as it answers and calls for a continued vigorous national space effort not only in exploration but in utilitarian applications. The editorial follows:

ANOTHER APOLLO EPIC

Another epic chapter in the history of man's exploration of the moon was written by John Young, Charley Duke and Ken Mattingly with their Apollo 16 spacecraft systems. Apollo 16 surmounted a variety of operational problems to complete successfully the first exploration of the lunar highlands, provide man with his longest and most mobile working period on the moon's surface and gather an increasingly rich harvest of scientific data.

The operational problems in lunar orbit that threatened to abort the landing provided another rare glimpse of the tremendous technical and operational depth that supports each Apollo mission. These problems and their successful solution also emphasized the wisdom of the experimental flight test program that brought the Apollo system to its present status as a reliable trans-lunar transport system. Data from the initial flight testing of the lunar module and command and service module in separate flight during the Apollo 9 mission provided the answers that were required to determine whether it was operationally feasible to complete the lunar landing of Apollo 16 after trouble developed with the service module propulsion unit guidance system.

About 200 technical people were mobilized on the ground in such widely separated places as North American Rockwell's Downey, Calif., facility, Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the Manned Spacecraft Center in Houston to check the Apollo 9 data and run simulations on various possibilities for Apollo 16. All of this was done with incredible speed and precision, while the Apollo 16 crew was making three orbits around the moon, to yield a decision to initiate powered descent to the surface on the fourth time around. Rocco Petrone, Apollo program director, also noted that the flight test data from Apollo 9 had provided the procedures that enabled the Apollo 13 crew to return safely to earth using the lunar module as a "lifeboat" during most of the mission after an oxygen tank explosion had disrupted the command and service module systems.

SCIENTIFIC INTEREST SURGES

By all traditional barometers—beach watchers at the Cape, network television time (only ABC ran very close to previous mission coverage) and working press—public interest in the Apollo 16 mission had waned. But

we hardly think these are the real measures of the program's worth. Nothing will ever surpass the emotional drama of Apollo 11. As the moon missions become more routine, they are diminishing as TV "boffo" almost in direct proportion to their increase in scientific value. Technical and scientific interest in Apollo is increasing by leaps and bounds as each new mission demonstrates dramatically the widening horizons of man's capabilities to explore the moon.

The precision performance of the Apollo system has given scientists the opportunity to put the lunar module down in specific areas of the moon to provide an extreme variety of data. From Neil Armstrong's "hover and take another look" maneuver before landing Apollo 11's Eagle to John Young's edging over a few hundred feet to avoid large craters before setting Orion down in the lunar highlands, the performance of the lunar module has been superb. Addition of the sturdy lunar rover on Apollo 15 and 16 provided an enormous increment of practical mobility for the lunar explorers. Each new Apollo crew appears to extend the ease and agility with which men can do their scientific work on the surface of the moon.

Performance of John Young and Charley Duke in maneuvering and working on the moon indicated how much hard practice in these peculiar techniques can enhance the useful work time. The additional equipment on board the Apollo command module has also opened another rich lode of scientific data. In the Apollo 15 and 16 operations with the crews well adapted to working in the lunar environment, the rover for surface mobility and the command module operating its own experiments from lunar orbit the Apollo program has reached its configuration for maximum scientific return per mission.

ENORMOUS DIVIDENDS

Most outside observers are unaware of the extremely close coordination that exists between the explorers on the moon and earthbound scientists in Houston. A closer-circuit television links the capsule communicator (capcom) to the scientific support rooms where several dozen scientists follow the mission. When anything unusual is found on the moon or further pursuit of a certain type specimen is desirable, they can flash a message to the capcom on the television link which can be relayed to the moon. Thus real-time scientific exploration is possible linking the brains and experience of the earthbound scientists to the actions of the astronauts on the moon.

It is of course a futile lament to note the false economy that canceled the three final Apollo missions after all the mammoth basic investment in facilities, spacecraft and operational techniques has been made. The additional funds required for Apollo 18, 19 and 20 would have returned enormous scientific dividends in relation to the modest investment they required.

With only one more Apollo mission to go, it is apparent that the five manned landings on the moon have upset most of the traditional theories about that body and produced just enough new information to whet an enormous new scientific curiosity to find the answers to the basic questions Apollo data have raised.

J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the passing of J. Edgar Hoover came as a shock to the whole Nation. This leg-

endary figure had reached such proportions in the minds of Americans that we had come to think of him as indestructible.

We saw him as a symbol of strength and integrity, while admiring the proficiency of the agency he headed from the time of its infancy.

No doubt, an able leader will be found to perform the duties of Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, but in the hearts and minds of the American people, J. Edgar Hoover can never be replaced. The Nation is deeply indebted to this man, and we shall miss him. While we mourn his death, we also feel a deep sense of gratitude for his life.

CONGRESSMAN ROUSH COMMENTS ON TAXATION AND THE WORKING MOTHER

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, just this week the House passed a bill to extend and expand the powers of the Civil Rights Commission and to empower that Commission to study the problem of sex discrimination in our society. Earlier this year the Senate concurrent in the House-passed equal rights amendment, which is expected to provide equality before the law for men and women.

But we all know that real equality for women in the working world cannot be achieved unless and until women are able to provide adequately for their children while they are working. Although both parents are responsible for the children, their everyday care in our society has rested mainly with the wife.

Today there are 32,933,000 women who are working and they constitute 38 percent of the work force. The latest figures we have on working mothers indicate that in March of last year there were 12,201,000 mothers in the work force with children under 18.

For many of these the Revenue Act of 1971, passed last December, contained a provision that may well contribute as significantly to equal rights in the marketplace as any legislation we have passed. I am referring to the section revising the dependent care deduction effective this year.

The deduction under this provision is available for expenses for gainful employment where the taxpayer's household includes a child who is dependent, a disabled dependent, or a disabled spouse.

In 1971 the maximum amount that could be deducted for dependent care—and the definition of dependent care was more restrictive—was \$600 for one or \$900 for two for the entire year. If the dependent, as usually, was a child, the deductions stopped after age 13. If a maid or housekeeper was hired, the taxpayer could only deduct the costs strictly attributable to care for the dependent. Moreover, the amount of the deduction had to be reduced by the amount by which the combined parents' adjusted gross income exceeded \$6,000.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

But, as of this year the full amount of expenses may be deducted up to a limit of \$400 a month for care in the home. For care outside the home, the deduction can be \$200 a month for one dependent, \$300 for two, or a maximum of \$400 for three or more. Thus, the taxpayer has the choice of employing someone in the home, or if the dependents are children, paying the costs of day care outside the home. And if a housekeeper is hired, the full amount paid, whether for housekeeping or strictly care of the child or dependent, may be deducted—within the above maximum—as long as part of the housekeeper/maid's time was spent in caring for a qualified dependent. More realistically the age limitation has now been raised to 15. The adjusted gross income has been raised to \$18,000 before there is a reduction in the amount of the allowable deduction.

I believe that this relatively unknown provision of the Revenue Act of 1971 is an important contribution to assuring women equal employment opportunity and to eliminating an unconscious but pervasive discrimination against working women who are mothers.

UNICEF PROMOTES COMPREHENSIVE CHILD DEVELOPMENT TO INTERNATIONALIZE CHILDREN

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, last December President Nixon vetoed the comprehensive child development plan as having "family-weakening implications," creating "a new army of bureaucrats," and committing "the vast moral authority of the National Government to the side of communal approaches to child rearing against the family-centered approach." President Nixon indicated that the American people should have a great national debate before facing the challenge of changing the traditional American childrearing custom.

Apparently this great national debate extends far beyond our country's borders and is in reality a great international debate.

Last month U.N. Secretary General Waldheim, addressing the Executive Board of UNICEF, had this to say about comprehensive child development for Sovietizing the child-parent relationship:

Until fairly recently, in most societies, the responsibility for child development rested entirely with parents or in the immediately surrounding community. This is still largely true, but it is changing. Within the framework of the two United Nations development decades, we are now embarked on a historic endeavour to eliminate poverty. With this new concept has come the realization that, if we are to break the self-perpetuating cycles of poverty at the family level and change them into upward spirals of progress, the process of child development has to be the concern of society as a whole—on the national and international level. From the very beginning, the leaders of UNICEF—both Board and Secretariat—clearly understood this, and I congratulate them for their foresight and their vision.

It seems quite in keeping with tradition that while Communist aggression continues against South Vietnam the U.N. does nothing. And while the people's attention is focused on the war, the U.N. leaders plot to take away the children of the next generation under the misguided apprehension that children without parents will be more susceptible to the U.N. one-world teaching.

According to Secretary Waldheim's comments, the children under comprehensive child development will be the international children of the future—children of the world. International children are now admitted to have been UNICEF's goal from its inception.

I include the text of Mr. Waldheim's UNICEF speech:

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL, MR. K. WALDHEIM TO THE UNICEF EXECUTIVE BOARD, APRIL 24, 1972

(United Nations Economic and Social Council, United Nations Children's Fund Executive Board 1972 session, Distri. General, E/1CE/619, 24 April 1972, Original: English)

Mr. Chairman, I welcome this first opportunity to address the Executive Board of UNICEF. Since the members of this Board are far more familiar than I with the details of UNICEF's activities, I propose to offer you today a brief glimpse of how I, as Secretary-General, view UNICEF and its work within the framework of the United Nations system as a whole, and within the even broader context of today's global challenges.

I am deeply aware of the extent to which UNICEF's tasks have evolved since its early days in Europe when it was concerned with emergency relief to children and mothers in a post-war situation. UNICEF is still very much concerned with emergencies, but the emphasis of its humanitarian activities has been shifted to long-range programmes for child development. In both areas, UNICEF's operations are now being conducted on a global scale.

Today, UNICEF's responsibility for providing emergency help has assumed vast dimensions. The conscience of mankind has been awakened to the point where there exists the determination to bring help to all, wherever and whenever emergencies occur. This large-scale response has been made possible by a number of scientific and technological developments. For example, we now learn of emergencies as soon as they occur thanks to a global network of communications and, additionally, we now have the physical means to deliver massive aid quickly. Also there are now special foods such as "K-Mix II", which UNICEF helped to develop and which was first used on a large scale in Nigeria and later in India for refugee children. I am told that this food, together with CSM, has made it possible to rehabilitate starving children who would otherwise have died. To cite another example, the development of lighter construction materials—especially plastics—now makes it much easier to airlift supplies quickly to disaster areas.

The larger challenge which we face today is an organizational one. World opinion has rightly concluded that the United Nations should play an important role in co-ordinating all phases of its response, from pre-disaster planning through emergency relief and on to rehabilitation. These activities should, of course, accord with and benefit from the special capacities of the international institutions of the Red Cross and other non-governmental organizations. Governments, of course, will continue to be the largest donors directly or through the United Nations. Let me point out that the performance of these tasks represents an essential test of the effectiveness of the United Nations system as a whole.

In the past year, UNICEF has demonstrated remarkably its capacity to respond quickly when emergency situations arise. I understand that in 1971 UNICEF responded to calls for help in some 20 countries. On the Indian subcontinent, where the most dramatic emergency situations occurred, UNICEF not only carried on its own programmes for child feeding, well drilling, etc., but acted for the United Nations system in purchasing essential supplies for transport, roofing and many other needs. It is particularly well equipped for such action by virtue of its world-wide purchasing, storage and delivery capacity, and its field staff who have the necessary "know-how" to assist Governments, not only in the crucial relief phase, but in the rehabilitation of essential services.

UNICEF, of course, is not the only member of the United Nations system concerned with these matters—there are also WFP, UNHCR, WHO, UNESCO and the United Nations itself—but the Children's Fund has a crucial role to play, for it is children and mothers who are usually the principal victims of any disaster. Because of its experience both as a supplier and in co-ordinating its work with other organizations of the United Nations system, UNICEF is particularly qualified to assist the newly appointed Co-ordinator for Disaster Relief. I wish to take this opportunity to express my personal appreciation to the Executive Board for the wisdom of its policies which have enabled UNICEF to operate so successfully. I hope that the Governments will continue to give UNICEF the mandate and the financial means to enlarge its future activities.

UNICEF's long-term assistance programmes are designed to help Governments provide for their children, at the very least, a minimum of basic health care, adequate nutrition at the crucial stages of growth and the basis for life-long education. In today's world and in the foreseeable future, these programmes make uncommonly good sense. We are constantly rediscovering the ancient truth that childhood is not static but that it is a period of rapid growth and change. Whatever is done or not done for a child in its crucial early years determines a life pattern which is almost irreversible.

Until fairly recently, in most societies, the responsibility for child development rested entirely with parents or in the immediately surrounding community. This is still largely true, but it is changing. Within the framework of the two United Nations development decades, we are now embarked on a historic endeavour to eliminate poverty. With this new concept has come the realization that, if we are to break the self-perpetuating cycles of poverty at the family level and change them into upward spirals of progress, the process of child development has to be the concern of society as a whole—on the national and international level. From the very beginning, the leaders of UNICEF—both Board and secretariat—clearly understood this, and I congratulate them for their foresight and their vision.

More recently a new dimension has been added to a task already staggering in its dimensions and complexity. I refer to the implications of accelerating technological change with its potential consequences for the human environment. We are just becoming aware of these frightening implications and the first global attempt to deal with them will be made at the Stockholm Conference. If certain technological developments remain uncontrolled, civilized life, as we know it on this planet, can be in jeopardy. If understood in time, these developments contain untold possibilities for the enhancement of everyone's life. Although the industrialized countries will continue to be first and perhaps most affected by advanced technology,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the developing countries do and will continue to experience the impact of such changes. Although no one can accurately predict what life will be like 25 or even 15 years from now as a result of these changes, we do know that the world will be more complex, more sophisticated and more fragile. Today's leaders thus face enormous responsibilities. One of them—perhaps the most important—is to prepare our children so that they are able to cope with world problems in their turn. They must be prepared to be participants in a society to which all can contribute and from which all can benefit. Society cannot expect that a young adult who has been ill-fed and unschooled will suddenly become an active and intelligent participant in the community. Preparation for responsible citizenship must start at the earliest possible age, and most important, it must be of far higher quality than at present.

Let me say in conclusion that UNICEF's long-term programmes must be seen in the larger context of society's present and future needs.

If UNICEF were conducting its long-term programmes on its own, its \$60-\$70 million per year in more or less regular income would be small. Since the Fund has a central and crucial role in the development of human resources, maximum effort must be made to enable it to reach its current income goal of \$100 million per year by 1975 and then to look beyond that figure. This implies a rise of only some \$11 million per year which is relatively small in relation to the large amounts that have been forthcoming in cases of dramatic emergencies. As my predecessor has said, the world can well afford to support to this modest extent the one United Nations organ so vitally concerned with children. What is more, it must begin giving more attention to the future of its children if that future is to be something even resembling what it wants.

I have been following the work of UNICEF for the last 17 years and I am personally aware of the great contribution it has made to the welfare of mothers and children the world over since its inception. I would therefore like to take advantage of this occasion to pay a personal tribute to the work of your Executive Director, Mr. Henry R. Labouisse, and his dedicated staff.

I thank you for this opportunity to share my thoughts with you and I offer you all good wishes for a most fruitful session and for continuing success in your efforts.

JOHN W. SMITH

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, John W. Smith was one of the great builders of the new South. He was a dynamic business executive in the great American tradition of private enterprise. "Jesse" Smith, as he was affectionately known, was one of the Nation's leading transportation leaders and played a crucial role in the development of the Southland. He joined the Seaboard Airline Railroad engineering department in 1924 and became president of the Seaboard in 1952. When Seaboard merged with Atlantic Coast Line in 1967, Jesse Smith was named chairman of the board of the new Seaboard Coast Line. He had

served as retired board chairman since 1970.

Mr. Speaker, President Franklin D. Roosevelt once said that the South was the Nation's No. 1 economic problem. But today due in no small part to the efforts of John W. Smith, the South is the Nation's No. 1 area of opportunity. Jesse Smith was well known here in the Congress, and throughout the South where he played a leading role in the development of countless communities. He visited my own home in furtherance of industrial development efforts. Jesse Smith was a personal friend. His devoted wife Mae Appel Smith epitomizes the very highest traditions of Southern womanhood.

It is an honor for me to join with other members of our State delegation and with other Members of Congress who were friends of Jesse Smith in paying tribute to the memory of this great American. To Mrs. Smith, to his lovely daughter and to John W. Smith, Jr., we extend our deepest sympathy.

J. EDGAR HOOVER—ONE OF THIS CENTURY'S TRULY GREAT AMERICANS

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the death of J. Edgar Hoover leaves a void that can never be adequately filled. He will undoubtedly be ranked in history as one of the truly great Americans of this century.

For nearly half a century this man was a symbol of every attribute that is good, honorable, decent, and righteous. His life and his works provided fuel for character building, ambition, courage, patriotism, respect for law and order, in the lives of tens of millions of American youth. By leadership and example, there is no way of fully assessing the magnitude of his contribution to those decades of American history during which he served. He undoubtedly touched the lives and influenced the conduct of more people than any other one living man during this century.

Above all, he earned the title and was universally recognized as "Mr. Law Enforcement." His courage knew no bounds. He spoke out against evil when it raised its ugly head. He pulled no punches in exposing individual misconduct when it needed to be exposed. He commanded total confidence of eight Presidents under whom he served as chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

As would be expected J. Edgar Hoover had his critics, and even enemies, and for various reasons. A few broadsides were unleashed against him in the Congress. Crime syndicates had good reason to despise him. Poison pens were used by a few left-wing columnists to smear him and discount his usefulness. But surely the memory of this man will dominate a secure place in American history long

after these critics shall have been totally forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, as is true of many others, it was my happy privilege to have known Mr. Hoover personally. I recall with understandable pride that some 20 years ago he came to the radio recording studio on Capitol Hill, in response to my invitation, for a 15-minute interview—at a time when he was making few public appearances.

It was my privilege to attend a number of small dinner parties when he was present. That enabled me to know more about the man, his humor, his interest in people, and his joviality. I recall that I once asked him: "Mr. Hoover, what is the best technique to use in fighting American Communists?" His reply was, "Exposure. Turn the light on them; let the people know who they are and precisely what they are doing and what their purposes are."

J. Edgar Hoover is dead, but his memory will live and inspire people to pursue the better life for many generations yet unborn.

THE GENERAL AND THE KIDS AT YALE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we are still seeing instances on some of our college campuses whereby a loud minority of students have succeeded in preventing the appearance on campus of speakers who may not represent the misguided and distorted views of that small minority.

The latest incident occurred last month at Yale when General Westmoreland was unable to even reach the podium because of a massive wall of shouters and hecklers.

A column written by Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., appearing in the May 1, 1972, edition of the Peoria Journal Star describes the whole sorry picture in some detail and I insert the column in the RECORD at this point.

The column follows:

THE GENERAL AND THE KIDS AT YALE

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

You will recall that early in the month General Westmoreland, who is the chief of staff of the Army, went to Yale at the invitation of the students' Political Union. They took him to dinner, and they began to propel him towards the auditorium. But at that point an aide to the general reported that the massive wall of shouters and hecklers made it impossible for Westmoreland to speak, unlikely that he could accomplish anything by trying to make his way to the podium and just possible that he might be physically assaulted.

So the general pulled out of his pocket a politely-worded statement declining to go ahead with his speech, and inviting student leaders of the anti-free speech movement to visit him "in peace and dignity" in Washington.

The President of Yale, Mr. Kingman Brewster, pulled some boys-will-be-boys boilerplate from his book shelf, spliced it with a little lard on the general subject of academic

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

freedom, and went back to worrying about how hard it is for a black man to get a fair hearing in New Haven.

The student newspaper, frightened at being censorious, did a perfunctory editorial, and published a regular columnist, a young man of exquisite discernment who announced, "I think that Westmoreland is a war criminal," and argued that depriving Westmoreland of platform had been not a theoretical or philosophical or constitutional deprivation but a tactical blunder, because it prevented a Yale audience from acquiring firsthand knowledge of Westmoreland's criminal mentality.

All this proved to be too much for Eugene Rostow, professor of law, former under-secretary of state for political affairs, former dean of the Yale Law School. He addressed an open letter to the president of Yale and the fellows of Yale University.

He might as well have addressed it to his wife, for all the publicity it received. To be sure, the New Haven press gave it notice. But the Yale Daily News (as of this writing) seems to be taking not only the position that Yale students shouldn't hear Westmoreland, but that Yale students shouldn't hear distinguished professors who believe that Yale students should hear Westmoreland.

Mr. Rostow began: "In my considerable experience at Yale, I have never before known a situation that justified a direct appeal to the Corporation by students and by members of the Faculty." He went on to cite the commitment of the university to academic freedom, and criticized the president's statement as being inadequate because it "did not order an independent investigation to determine whether disciplinary proceedings against the students involved should be brought, or criminal charges preferred against those who, through the use of force, deliberately made it impossible to hold the meeting at which General Westmoreland was scheduled to speak."

Mr. Rostow then reminded Yale's officials that the student newspaper had carried notices that students would try to break up the meeting, and even so adequate preparations were not taken; and that no apology had been extended to General Westmoreland. "The weakness of your statement invites worse trouble. But it is to be deplored for a deeper reason. It does not begin to meet your responsibility to the laws of this community, and especially to the laws protecting academic freedom."

Unofficial Yale is taking the line that after all, Westmoreland didn't try physically to speak, and therefore, in a sense, his rejection was platonic. After all, isn't it true, one worldly professor with a copious memory points out, that Adlai Stevenson was heckled in 1956 by the students,—to the point where he couldn't speak, but after all, he tried for about ten minutes . . . Yes, it is true, and it is also true that the students should have been disciplined at that time, if indeed they were not.

What is wrong about the current situation is most cogently singled out by Eugene Rostow. It is less that students can behave like Nazi youth squads, it is that there is something less than a universality of disapproval of those that do. Name one person who came to the defense of the hecklers of Adlai Stevenson.

Perhaps it isn't so bad elsewhere. A freshman profile published in the Yale Daily News reveals that it is further left than most American universities. Sixty per cent of the freshman class considers itself "liberal," 14 per cent "far left"—as compared to 41 per cent and three per cent for the rest of the country. Twenty per cent of the freshmen think of themselves as "middle of the road," six per cent as "conservative,"—compared with 42 per cent and 14 per cent nationwide.

Somebody ought to write a book about the left-mindedness at Yale University. The trouble is nobody would believe him.

May 4, 1972

MORE NIGHTMARES FROM THE COMMITTEE BILL TO INCREASE THE MINIMUM WAGE—PART II

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I pointed out two substantive differences between H.R. 7130, the Education and Labor Committee's bill to increase the minimum wage, and the substitute bill, H.R. 14104, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. QUIE, and I will offer.

Today, I want to call your attention to three more defects of the committee bill. One will work against employing the unemployed, and not one of the three has anything to do with our goal of replacing the purchasing power that has been lost since the minimum wage scales were last increased.

REFERRALS BY PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES

Thousands of employers—for example, retail establishments doing less than \$250,000 gross business a year—are not required to pay the minimum wage. Yet the committee bill would prohibit public employment agencies from referring individuals in need of jobs to employers who do not pay the minimum wage.

This is a backward step. We should be expanding the use of public employment agencies, not restricting them.

ILLEGAL ALIENS

Do we really want everyone who does not "look American" or who speaks with an accent to have to produce proof of citizenship or legal immigration in order to get a job? That would be one effect of the committee bill.

Another of its practical effects would be to put housewives in the position of having to determine whether an individual is a legal or illegal alien.

If our laws with respect to the employment of illegal aliens are not adequate, the solution is in amending our immigration laws, not a criminal provision in a minimum wage bill. Immigration laws, incidentally, do not come within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor. They come within the purview of the Committee on the Judiciary, which over the past year has been, and even now is, involved in solving this problem.

RESTRICTIONS ON IMPORTS

If title III of the committee bill becomes law, Federal funds—be they in the form of loans, grants, subsidies, or guarantees—could not be used to purchase foreign goods.

That television equipment your school district wants for instructional purposes may well contain parts made in Japan. School officials had best not contemplate buying it with money acquired through the Federal Government.

If Federal funds are involved, the communications system or police car your local police department would like to order could not contain any imported parts—even if they cost much less than their American-made counterparts.

Do you have a penchant for fiction stories? Title III is a classic. It prohibits

imports from countries where the working conditions are substantially less favorable than those enjoyed by Americans performing similar work.

Is there any other country in the world where working conditions are as good and workers are paid as well as in the United States? Are workers in other countries covered by minimum wage laws? Are they protected by safety and health acts? Do they have comparable pension and social security benefits at a comparable cost? Obviously, all imports would be banned.

Our substitute bill does not include these three or any similar provisions. Its primary purposes are to provide a reasonable increase in the current minimum wage rates and to alleviate the disproportionately high unemployment among our young people by establishing a special youth differential wage.

A TOTAL PICTURE OF OUR OVERALL MINERALS AND ENERGY PROBLEMS

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, in late December 1970 the Mining and Minerals Policy Act was enacted. This law focused much needed attention on the role of minerals, mineral reclamation, and energy in the American economy. A key provision of the act requires the Department of the Interior to report annually on the state of the mineral industry in the United States. The first such report has now been issued by Secretary Morton and I bring it to your attention, and to the attention of my colleagues, as an important piece of work on an important subject.

As the report so graphically points out, a comprehensive minerals policy is a national necessity. In the past, except in times of war, we have tended to muddle along with respect to minerals policy, assuming, no doubt, that the steel and oil and gas and other mineral products that this Nation's economy requires in such large quantities would be found somewhere.

Such is not necessarily the case. Our expanding economy needs new mineral supplies far faster than new domestic sources are being developed or available, secure foreign sources can be tapped. It takes 4 billion tons of new mineral supplies a year—20 tons per person—to satisfy American demand. The energy we burn up in our machines is measured in quadrillions of British thermal units—69 quadrillion per year—to quote latest estimates—a figure too huge for most mortals to comprehend. Interior Department specialists say, however, that to get an equivalent amount of work done with human labor, every citizen in the country would need a staff of 300 servants, all willing to work 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

During the two decades from 1950 to 1970, demand for energy in this country doubled. During the same period, de-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

mand for metals tripled. There is every reason to believe that demand will continue to grow. By the year 2000, the Interior Department estimates that U.S. demand for minerals of all kinds will be three times what it was in 1970. If domestic output then is no more than it is today, we may have to import more than \$60 billion worth of minerals annually—six times the present import rate.

These figures, though startling, tell only part of the story of impending mineral problems in the United States. For one thing, most of the rich, easy-to-recover minerals sources have already been found in this country; miners face the prospect of working leaner and leaner ore deposits.

Another limitation on minerals and energy supply stems from the public's continuing concern for the environment. Minerals and fuels producers face increasingly strict regulation as to where and how they can recover and process the resources they extract from the earth.

Even the prospects for importing minerals are not all bright, because the competition for foreign mineral supplies is getting keener as other nations throughout the world continue to demand more and more raw materials to raise their living standards. These and many other factors are cited in the Interior Department report as reasons why we must have a strong domestic minerals industry.

Although the Mineral Policy Act is relatively new, the first report cites many sound opportunities for implementing our mining and minerals policies. While it does not contain specific recommendations, which are to be submitted after further study, it does point out broad general areas of possible improvement.

It suggests that there must be continued cooperation between Government and industry. While a cooperative spirit has characterized relations between the Government and the minerals industry there is room for improvement. Reliable data on mineral reserves, for example, are requisite to the forming of mineral policy. Some mineral industries volunteer such data, others do not. The Government, in turn, influences industrial climate through its authority over taxes, patent law, antitrust decisions, and foreign trade negotiations. As Government officials work for the benefit of all citizens, it must be recognized that a healthy mineral industry is one of the essentials to our economic growth.

One development that could well foster better relations between Government and industry, the Interior Department suggests, would be implementation of the plan to establish a Department of Natural Resources, a recommendation for Government reorganization made by President Nixon in 1971. Under this plan, major responsibilities for energy and mineral resources would fall within the Department of Natural Resources. Federal energy and mineral resource policy would be largely integrated, and policies developed with a clear understanding of its overall implications.

Whatever else is done in the way of mineral policy it appears essential that the technology of mineral recovery and utilization be improved. Most scientists

agree that there is still plenty of mineral wealth left in the ground. Man has, after all, only scratched the surface in his quest for minerals. His deepest oil wells go down only 5 miles, his mine shafts no more than 2 miles—only a small fraction of the nearly 4,000 miles to the center of the earth. The treasures are undoubtedly there, but it will take sophisticated prospecting tools to find them.

The same thing is true in other phases of the mineral industry. Excavation of mineral ore today largely reflects mechanization of mining methods introduced long ago. New mining techniques are needed, techniques that will improve the safety records of the men in the mines as well as the efficiency of ore extraction.

The various states of mineral processing likewise must be improved. Smelting methods must respond to the growing needs to prevent environmental degradation. Mills and refineries, too, need to devote more attention to research and development; since World War II, many important advances in metallurgy have come from Europe. Aside from the petroleum field, research in the minerals industries during the past quarter century has not been what it should be.

Congress has already taken note of this and is acting to provide for Government support of university mineral research and education programs. Pending legislation in this area, it is believed, will do much to preserve or revive interest in mineral engineering programs on the Nation's campuses.

The Secretary of the Interior's first annual report on the state of the mineral industry in the United States establishes one thing beyond doubt: The importance of the role that mineral wealth plays in the economy and welfare of a modern society. America's mineral industry has made possible comforts and convenience for all that earlier generations of men could only dream about.

One other thing that the report makes clear, however, is that we must modify our mineral policies to fit present realities. Secretary Morton and his staff have taken the first step toward that goal through the preparation of this excellent report.

It is important that Congress get a total picture of our overall minerals and energy problems and I believe this report will be a real aid to all of us in our consideration of policy matters affecting our extractive industries. I urge all of my colleagues to read it and use it as an excellent reference in your day-to-day activities involving our mineral resources.

J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in mourning the passing of a great American, J. Edgar Hoover, but also in voicing my concern about the

tremendous void Mr. Hoover's death has created.

Mr. Hoover's was a vital job, one which he performed for scores of years with an expertise and understanding uncommon in most men. He commanded loyalty and respect and became a legend in his own time.

Mr. Hoover's successor faces no small task in carrying on the leadership qualities and persuasive abilities of the late FBI chieftain. The American public owes a debt of gratitude to J. Edgar Hoover. I pray his successor has the courage and stamina to continue his fine and dedicated service to this Nation.

J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1972

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a great career in law enforcement.

J. Edgar Hoover's outstanding leadership not only directly improved the Nation's law enforcement profession but also was an inspiration to all dedicated law enforcement officers throughout the country.

Over the years, J. Edgar Hoover demonstrated by his actions and his way of life that he loved his country. He was proud to be an American and despised those who wanted to overthrow our free, democratic system of government which was established by our forefathers nearly two centuries ago.

I would like to emphasize one particular aspect of the Federal Bureau of Investigation which he built into such a fine, respected organization. That is the training program. Law enforcement officers from throughout the Second Congressional District, representing State, county, and city governments have benefitted from this fine training program. Not only has the basic FBI Academy here helped individual officers, but it has also proven an example for various State and local training programs all of which have markedly improved the quality of our law enforcement over the past several years.

I am proud, during the nearly 14 years that I have served in the House of Representatives, to have given my full support to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its programs including its appropriations.

Just recently I completed my annual legislative poll among the constituents in the Second Congressional District and I would note their No. 1 concern is that of law and order. It is indeed a concern of all our people but I think we can be thankful here today for the progress that we have made over the years and the personal contributions of J. Edgar Hoover. Had it not been for the dedication and ability of this man the crime situation would have been far worse today.

I agree with my colleagues that the real monument to his memory is the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FBI, which he built. He had tremendous power but he also had a tremendous respect for individual rights and freedoms. I, too, feel that it is very appropriate that legislation has been introduced to name the new FBI Building the J. Edgar Hoover Building, a visible, lasting tribute to a great man.

Mr. Hoover, over the years, made a genuine and tremendous contribution toward effective law enforcement and to the professionalization of law-enforcement officers. He will long be remembered for his integrity, his patriotism, and his ability. All of us will miss him and we all mourn the passing of this distinguished American.

HAVE WE LEARNED ANYTHING FROM KENT STATE?

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago today, four youngsters were shot to death and nine wounded, one seriously, by Ohio National Guardsmen during a student protest at Kent State University.

The killings further incensed students across the country who already were seething over President Nixon's decision to invade Cambodia. More campus riots and demonstrations followed the Kent State incident.

The tragedy of May 4, 1970, has been compounded by the unwillingness of the State of Ohio, or the Federal Government, to investigate the Guardsmen, or their officers, for these shootings.

Indeed, the State of Ohio convened a grand jury which merely blamed the disorder on students and absolved the National Guard of any wrongdoing in the deaths of Allison Krause, Sandra Scheuer, Jeffrey Miller, and William Schroeder.

A Federal district court later ordered the grand jury's report to be physically destroyed for its lack of content and obvious bias.

The FBI carried out the only exhaustive, definitive analysis of the incident.

However, the FBI was less than cooperative with me and 19 other Members of Congress who requested this study so that the many doubts surrounding what happened on the dreadful day could be told to the Nation.

Not only was our request for the study refused, but only when this Congress recessed for the summer in August 1971 did the Justice Department announce it would not comply with our demands that a Federal grand jury be convened to investigate the killings.

In the meantime suits and counter-suits have been filed against the State of Ohio, the Methodist Church, the parents of the four students, and a citizen by the name of Peter Davies, who with the assistance of the Methodist Church published his own theory on the killings.

The Davies study, which I put into the RECORD on July 22, 1971, holds that the

May 4, 1972

four dead and nine wounded students were the victims of a conspiracy by members of the Ohio National Guard to take the lives of student demonstrators.

I think it is significant that James Michener, author of his own book on the Kent State incident, should now embrace the Davies theory. This development was reported in the New York Times on May 1.

Frankly, I was ashamed of the actions of the Justice Department in the Kent State affair. I think with this issue, the Federal Government had an opportunity to show young people that there is a sense of justice in Washington concerning the activities of the young, the angry, and the alienated.

Even after the Justice Department ignored those of us who petitioned them, the administration had a second opportunity to show its sense of justice.

Student representatives from the university came to Washington to see President Nixon, carrying with them the names of 12,000 Kent State students who asked that he overrule the Justice Department and convene a Federal grand jury. But President Nixon refused. And the stench of political expediency still lingers like a shroud over the affair.

Have we learned anything from the incident at Kent State?

There is little doubt that campus disorders occurred less frequently following that day. Some attribute this to the willingness of public officials to shoot the young rather than reason with them.

I hope the truth is that both youngsters and those of us in authority realize that bullets and violence are not answers to the frustrations that are manifest in public protests.

However, the reason that students took to the streets at Kent still persists—the war in Southeast Asia.

How in good conscience can the President expect to fool the electorate with his thinly veiled political campaign to bring our involvement in Vietnam to a halt just before the November elections?

Here is a man who won the Presidency on his promise to end the war. Yet today's papers tell of new missions to Vietnam to see if our allies need additional weapons. These weapons drag with them the American "advisers and volunteers" who must educate the Vietnamese in their use. Weapons mean air support and "protective reaction" bombing that mean more American dead.

It seems those with the power to end the war will not listen.

I hope I am wrong. I hope these young people have not died in vain.

L. PATRICK GRAY ACTING DIRECTOR OF FBI

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I noted with pleasure this morning's news reports that President Nixon has decided to appoint Assistant Attorney General

L. Patrick Gray III as Acting Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

This decision by the President indicates that he fully intends to keep this most important Federal office outside the field of partisan political debate. I salute this decision by the President. In the remarks which I delivered 2 days ago following the death of J. Edgar Hoover, I emphasized the importance of efficient, effective management of this law enforcement organization. Those of us in the Congress, and the country in general have had our fill of the politically motivated squabbling in the Senate Judiciary Committee over the confirmation of Acting Attorney General Kleindienst.

Assistant Attorney General Gray, a retired Navy captain and experienced attorney, I am sure will serve our country in the great tradition of the late Mr. Hoover.

HOW SOCIALIZED MEDICINE IS BEING MADE AN ACCEPTABLE PROGRAM

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, HEW has issued an Executive order, promulgated in the Federal Register of April 18, 1972—vol. 37, No. 75—proposed regulations requiring all “hospitals, facilities for long-term care, out-patient facilities, rehabilitation facilities, and public health centers” to budget and provide free services for “persons unable to pay,” up to 5 percent of operating costs or 25 percent of net income, whichever is the higher figure.

Authority for this HEW “ordered charity” which must be carried on by private medical facilities is cited as 42 U.S.C. 291c, 78 stat. 451.

No one understands better than those of us in Congress that nothing is free; someone must pay, or there is no service. Federal giveaway programs simply return something to the people that the Federal Government has first taken away from them.

In this instance, the intended free medical services for “persons unable to pay” will but constitute a new use tax on the paying patient—otherwise, the medical facility will face certain bankruptcy.

Any additional increase in free health benefits can but reduce the number of paying patients and proportionately increase the discontent with the high cost of private medical services.

Carried to its ultimate conclusion, we must realize that the American people will again be exploited by Government-inflated costs of medical services, which will in turn force the people to cry for more and more Government-subsidized health services—and eventually the people will demand socialized, or federalized medicine out of sheer desperation.

Then, as if the hospitals and medical service institutions will not be subject to enough inflationary pressure resulting from these proposed regulations by HEW, this House will consider legislation next

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

week raising the standard for minimum wage in this country to \$2 per hour.

Whether such legislation would simply increase or decrease the number of people now on the welfare rolls is certainly debatable; but that such an increase in the minimum wage standard will raise the cost of medical services in private hospitals by as much as \$12 to \$14 per day is not debatable.

It is evident that the Federal Government is setting in motion the processes to destroy private, traditional medical service facilities and replace them with socialized medicine—“free” for all the people, paid for by those who work and contribute to this society, but controlled and rendered ineffective by Federal bureaucrats. The pressure from above now awaits pressure from below. The trap is set for socialized medicine.

I ask that the HEW-proposed regulation and its purported legislative authority follow my remarks.

The material follows:

MEDICAL SERVICES FOR PERSONS UNABLE TO PAY: NONDISCRIMINATION

Public Health Service

[42 CFR Part 53]

PROPOSED STANDARDS FOR DETERMINING COMPLIANCE

Notice is hereby given that the Administrator, Health Services and Mental Health Administration, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and subject to the approval of the Federal Hospital Council, proposes to revise § 53.111 of Title 42, CFR, entitled “Services for persons unable to pay.”

The principal purpose of the revision is to establish more specific standards, guidelines, and procedures for determining compliance with, and enforcing, assurances to provide a reasonable volume of services to persons unable to pay therefor previously given by recipients of, or to be given by applicants for, assistance under Title VI of the Public Health Service Act as amended (42 U.S.C. 291 et seq.).

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments, suggestions, or objections regarding the proposed revision of 42 CFR Part 53, Subpart L, to the Health Care Facilities Service, Parklawn Building, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20852, within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice in the Federal Register. Comments received will be available for public inspection at Room 9-05, Parklawn Building, between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday.

This proposed revision of Title 42 CFR 53.111 is issued under authority of section 603 of the Public Health Service Act as amended, 78 Stat. 451, 42 U.S.C. 291c.

It is therefore proposed to revise 42 CFR 53.111 to read as set forth below.

Dated: April 12, 1972.

VERNON E. WILSON,
Administrator, Health Services
and Mental Health Administration.

Approved: April 15, 1972.

§ 53.111 Services for persons unable to pay.
(a) *Applicability.* The provisions of this section apply to every applicant which heretofore has given or hereafter will give an assurance that it will make available a reasonable volume of services to persons unable to pay therefor.

(b) *Definitions.* As used in this section:

(1) The term “facility” includes hospitals, facilities for long-term care, out-patient facilities, rehabilitation facilities, and public health centers;

(2) The term “applicant” means an appli-

cant for, or recipient of, a grant, a loan guarantee or a loan under the Act;

(3) “Fiscal year” means the fiscal year of the applicant;

(4) The term “operating costs” means the actual operating costs of the applicant for a fiscal year as determined in accordance with cost determination principles and requirements under Title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395): *Provided*, That such “operating costs” shall be determined for the applicant’s entire facility and for all patients regardless of the source of payment for such care: *And provided further*, That in determining such operating costs there shall be deducted the amount of all actual or estimated reimbursements, as applicable, for services received or to be received pursuant to Title XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 and 1396);

(5) The term “net income” means the net income of the applicant determined in accordance with the applicant’s usual accounting methods provided that such methods are consistently applied and are compatible with accounting principles generally accepted in hospital and related fields;

(6) The term “reasonable cost” means the cost of providing services to a specific patient determined in accordance with the cost determination principles and requirements under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395) and Subpart D of the regulations thereunder (20 CFR 405, 401 et seq.);

(7) The term “uncompensated services” means services which are made available to persons unable to pay therefor without charge or at a charge which is less than the reasonable cost of such services. The level of such services is measured by the difference between the amount charged for such services and the reasonable cost thereof;

(8) “Reasonable volume of services to persons unable to pay therefor” means a level of uncompensated services which meets a need for such services in the area served by an applicant and which is within the financial ability of such applicant to provide.

(c) *Assurance.* Before an application under this part is recommended by a State agency to the Secretary for approval, the State agency shall obtain an assurance from the applicant that there will be made available in the facility or portion thereof to be constructed or modernized a reasonable volume of services to persons unable to pay therefor. The requirement of an assurance from an applicant shall be waived if the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the State agency, subject to subsequent approval by the Secretary, that such a requirement is not feasible from a financial viewpoint.

(d) *Presumptive compliance guideline.* An applicant which, for a fiscal year, budgets for the support of, and makes available on request, uncompensated services at a level not less than the higher of 5 percent of operating costs or 25 percent of net income shall, subject to the provisions of paragraph (h) of this section, be deemed in presumptive compliance with its assurance.

(e) *Compliance reports.* (1) Each applicant shall, not later than 120 days after the end of a fiscal year, unless a longer period is approved by the State agency for good cause shown, file with the State agency a copy of its annual statement for such year as required by section 646 of the Act and § 53.128 (q), which shall set forth its operating costs and the amount of uncompensated services provided in such year. The provision of a level of uncompensated services in such year which equals or exceeds the level established pursuant to paragraph (h) of this section for such year shall constitute compliance with the assurance. If the level of services provided was less than the level of uncompensated services established pursuant to paragraph (h) of this section, the applicant shall

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

May 4, 1972

submit with such statement (i) a justification therefor, showing that the provision of such lower level of uncompensated services was reasonable under the circumstances and (ii) a description of the steps it proposes to take to assure the availability and utilization of the level of uncompensated services to be established for the current fiscal year, which shall include an affirmative action plan, utilizing available media of mass communication as well as other appropriate means, to bring to the attention of the public the availability of such uncompensated services and the conditions of eligibility therefor.

(2) Each applicant shall file with its annual statement a copy of that portion of its adopted budget for the current fiscal year relating to the support of uncompensated services in such year. Such budget for uncompensated services shall be based on the operating costs of the applicant for the preceding fiscal year and shall give due cognizance to probable increases in operating costs. If the budget statement does not conform to the presumptive compliance guidelines, the applicant shall submit with its statement (i) a justification therefor, showing that such lower level of uncompensated services is reasonable under the circumstances, and (ii) a plan to increase such uncompensated services to meet the presumptive compliance guideline or such other level of uncompensated services as may have been established or as it requests the State agency to establish in accordance with paragraph (h) of this section.

(3) The applicant shall also submit such additional reports related to compliance with its assurance as the State agency may reasonably require.

(f) Qualifying services. (1) In determining the amount of uncompensated services provided by an applicant, there shall be included only those services provided to an individual with respect to whom the applicant has made a formal written determination prior to the provision of such services that such individual is unable to pay therefor under the criteria established pursuant to paragraph (g) of this section except that such determination may be made after the provision of the services where (i) there has been a change in circumstances, e.g., the patient's financial condition has changed or the cost of the services provided is greater than anticipated, (ii) an emergency or an urgent need for services has precluded a determination of the patient's ability to pay therefor or (iii) the applicant has for other good cause been unable to complete its investigation and determination prior to the provision of the services: *Provided*, That a statement of such good cause be made a part of the applicant's written determination.

(2) There shall be excluded from the computation of uncompensated services:

(i) Any amount which the applicant has received, or is entitled to receive, from a third party insurer or under a governmental program; and

(ii) The reasonable cost of any services for which payment in whole or in part would be available under a governmental program (e.g., Medicare and Medicaid) in which the applicant, although eligible to do so, does not participate, but only to the extent of such otherwise available payment.

(g) Person unable to pay for services. (1) The State agency shall set forth in its State plan, subject to approval by the Secretary, criteria for identifying persons unable to pay for services, which shall include persons who are otherwise self-supporting but unable to pay the full charge for needed services. Such criteria shall be based on the following or similar factors:

(i) The health and medical care insurance coverage, personal or family income, the size of the patient's family, and other financial obligations and resources of the patient or

the family in relation to the reasonable cost of the services;

(ii) Generally recognized standards of need such as (a) the State standards for the medically needy as determined for the purposes of the Aid for Families with Dependent Children program; (b) the current Social Security Administration poverty income level; (c) the current Office of Economic Opportunity Income Poverty Guidelines applicable in the area; or

(iii) Any other equivalent measures which are found by the Secretary to provide a reasonable basis for determining an individual's ability to pay for medical and hospital services.

(2) A copy of such criteria shall be provided by the applicant, upon request, to any patient or former patient of the applicant and to any person seeking services from the applicant.

(3) The State agency shall provide a copy of such criteria to any person requesting it.

(h) Level of uncompensated services. (1) The State agency shall set forth in its State plan procedures for the determination for each applicant of the level of uncompensated services which constitutes a reasonable volume of services to persons unable to pay therefor.

(2) The State agency shall for the purpose of making such determination, review, and evaluate the annual statement, the budget and the related documents submitted by each applicant pursuant to paragraph (e) of this section, by applying the following criteria:

(i) The financial status of the applicant, taking account of income from all sources, and its financial ability to provide uncompensated services;

(ii) The nature and quantity of services provided by the applicant;

(iii) The need within the applicant's service area for the provision, without charge or at charge which is less than reasonable cost, for services of the nature provided or to be provided by the applicant; and

(iv) The extent and nature of joint or cooperative programs with other facilities for the provision of uncompensated services, and the extent and nature of outreach services directed to the needs of underserved areas.

(3) In accordance with its findings made after such review and evaluation, the State agency shall, within 60 days after receipt of the annual statement and related documents required by paragraph (e) of this section, for each fiscal year of an applicant which begins following the expiration of 90 days after the effective date of this regulation:

(i) Establish a level of uncompensated services for each applicant which may be equal to or less than the presumptive compliance guideline: *Provided*, That if the State agency determines, in accordance with subparagraph (2) of this paragraph, that (a) there is a need in the area served by an applicant for a level of uncompensated services greater than the level proposed in the applicant's budget statement, and (b) the applicant is financially able to provide such greater level of uncompensated services, the State agency shall establish such greater level as the level applicable to the applicant; and

(ii) Accept or modify a plan submitted pursuant to paragraph (e) of this section:

(4) The State agency shall notify the applicant in writing of the level of uncompensated services which it has established for the applicant for the fiscal year. At the time of notifying the applicant, the State agency shall also publish as a public notice in a newspaper of general circulation within the community served by the applicant the rate that has been established, a statement that the documents upon which the agency based its determination are available for public inspection at a location and time prescribed, and that persons wishing to object

to the rate can do so by writing to the State agency within 20 days after publication of the notice.

(5) The applicant or any person or persons residing or located within the service area of the applicant, or any organization on behalf of such person or persons, may submit to the State agency within 20 days of the publication and sending of the notice objections to the rate established by the State agency for the applicant. Such objections may be supported in writing by factual information and argument. The State agency may, if it believes that determination of the objections will be assisted by oral evidence or by oral argument, set a public hearing on the objections and shall give notice of such hearing to all interested parties and to the public. If no hearing is set, the State agency shall give public notice of the receipt of the objections and shall make the objections and their supporting documents available for public inspection and comment. The State agency shall rule promptly upon the objections in writing, stating its reasons for sustaining or overruling them, in whole or in part, and establishing finally the rate of uncompensated services either the same as, above, or below the rate previously established, as may best accord with all of the evidence on file with or heard by the State agency.

Notice of the final determination shall be mailed to all parties who filed objections or who participated in the proceedings leading to the redetermination.

(6) Within 20 days of receipt of written notice of the final determination of a State agency after ruling on objections to the rate established by the State agency, the applicant or any other interested person or organization may submit to the Secretary a written request for review of the State agency determination. Such review shall be made upon the record of the State agency determination which shall be sustained if supported by substantial evidence and is not otherwise arbitrary or capricious. If the Secretary or his designee determines that the rate established by the State agency is unsupported by the evidence in the record or is otherwise arbitrary or capricious, the Secretary or his designee shall, upon the basis of the record or upon other evidence or information which is before him or which he may obtain, establish a level of uncompensated services which he determines, in accordance with the criteria set out in subparagraph (2) of this paragraph, is appropriate.

(7) The level of uncompensated services established for an applicant under this section for any fiscal year shall constitute a reasonable volume of services to persons unable to pay therefor with respect to such applicant for such fiscal year.

(1) *Evaluation and enforcement.* The State plan shall provide for evaluation and enforcement of the assurance in accordance with the following requirements:

(1) The State agency shall, (i) at least annually, perform evaluations of the services provided in each facility with respect to which Federal assistance has been provided under the Act, to determine whether such assurance is being complied with; and (ii) establish procedures for the investigation of complaints that such assurance is not being complied with.

(2) Evaluation pursuant to subparagraph (1) of this paragraph shall be based on the annual budget of each facility for uncompensated services and on financial statements of such facilities filed pursuant to section 646 of the Act and § 53.128(q), and on such other information, including reports of investigations and hearing decisions, as the State agency deems relevant and material.

(3) The State plan shall provide for adequate methods of enforcement of the assur-

ance, including effective sanctions to be applied against any facility which fails to comply with such assurance. Such sanctions may include, but need not be limited to, license revocation, termination of State assistance, and court action.

(j) Reports. (1) The State agency shall, not less often than annually, report in writing to the Secretary its evaluation of each facility's compliance with the assurance, the disposition of each complaint received by the State agency, proposed remedial action with respect to each facility found by the State agency to be not in compliance with the assurance, and the status of such remedial action.

(2) In addition, the State agency shall promptly report to the Regional Attorney and Regional Health Director of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the institution of any legal action against a facility or the State agency involving compliance with the assurance.

[FR Doc. 72-5966 Filed 4-17-72; 9:31 am]
§ 291c. General regulations

The Surgeon General, with the approval of the Federal Hospital Council and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall by general regulations prescribe—

* * * * * State plan requirements; assurances necessary for approval of application

(e) that the State plan shall provide for adequate hospital and other facilities for which aid under this part is available, for all persons residing in the State, and adequate hospitals (and such other facilities) to furnish needed services for persons unable to pay therefor. Such regulations may also require that before approval of an application for a project is recommended by a State agency to the Surgeon General for approval under this part, assurance shall be received by the State from the applicant that (1) the facility or portion thereof to be constructed or modernized will be made available to all persons residing in the territorial area of the applicant; and (2) there will be made available in the facility or portion thereof to be constructed or modernized a reasonable volume of services to persons unable to pay therefor, but an exception shall be made if such a requirement is not feasible from a financial viewpoint.

July 1, 1944, c. 373, Title VI, § 603, as added Aug. 18, 1964, Pub.L. 88-443, § 3(a), 78 Stat. 451, and amended Sept. 4, 1964, Pub. L. 88-581, § 3(b), 78 Stat. 919.

DEATH OF J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Nation mourns the death of the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation since 1924. Mr. Hoover was not only a fearless and incorruptible law enforcement officer, but he was also a loyal and dedicated American whose aim in life was to support, defend, and sustain our great Republic in the lofty principles upon which it was founded.

Mr. Speaker, for some years there has been under construction on Pennsylvania Avenue in the city of Washington a building to house the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Mr. Hoover was dedicated to the final completion of that building, and he looked forward to the time when

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

that building would house the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I am today introducing a bill in the House of Representatives that the building be named after Mr. Hoover.

CENTRAL CITY FOODS MOVES TO PROFIT

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, a serious problem facing inner city residents is the lack of supermarkets. More and more we see the large food retailers leaving the inner city as their operation costs mount.

This trend must be stopped if inner city residents are to have a plentiful supply of quality food products available at reasonable cost. I am proud to say that one of this country's leading efforts to stop this trend is in my district.

Central City Foods in St. Louis, owned by the citizens of the community it serves, has just celebrated its third anniversary of service to the inner city. I have had the privilege of a long association with Central City Foods and its president, Mr. James E. Hurt.

Surviving economically while providing the community with a quality food source and employment opportunities is, however, no easy job for Central City Foods. That is why I have recently begun working with the U.S. Department of Labor in an effort to secure a grant to help Central City Foods train its employees in entrepreneurial skills. Such a training experience will provide Central City Foods with the upwardly mobile workforce which is essential to its continued success. Such training will also provide the employees with expanded employment horizons and an opportunity to upgrade their position.

We are hopeful that the U.S. Department of Labor will be able to assist Central City Foods in this project.

So that my colleagues may learn more about Central City Foods, I insert a St. Louis Post-Dispatch article on the firm's development at this point in the RECORD: [From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Apr. 30, 1970]

CENTRAL CITY FOODS MOVES TO PROFIT

(By Curt Matthews)

Central City Foods, Inc., the supermarket that opened a year ago at 3500 Franklin Avenue as the city's most ambitious example of Black Capitalism, ended its first year of operation with a loss.

However, James E. Hurt, president, points out that the market has been running ahead of projections in sales and is moving steadily toward sustained profitability.

"We told our investors not to expect a profit for the first three years," says Hurt. "Although we've had month-to-month operating profits, there were unusual start-up promotion expenses and costs related to hiring and training inexperienced help that were factors in our loss for the first 12 months."

Hurt noted that the company spent \$35,000 on promotion and advertising last spring when the market opened. He also pointed out that the store's work force, drawn from the

nearby black community, was largely without experience in supermarket operation.

\$200,000 CAPITAL

Central City Foods opened April 9, 1969, on the fringe of an area considered to be part of the city's decaying inner core. The 15,000 square foot area store, representing a capital investment of \$200,000, is affiliated with National Jet Food Corp. of Baltimore, a black-controlled food distribution business.

The break-even volume for Central City Foods was estimated at about \$35,000 a week when the store was built. Hurt says that early last fall the store surpassed that volume and in recent months has been doing about \$43,000 to \$45,000 a week. Total sales the first year amounted to more than \$2,500,000.

"The apparent key to profits is our ability to control and stabilize employment," Hurt says. "Although we recognize that one of the aims in building this store was to provide jobs for people who needed them, we have at times been overstaffed."

The store currently has 37 employees including four nonblacks. At times last year, employment was as high as 60. Hurt estimates that with increased volume in the coming year, employment will stabilize at about 45.

"The greatest problem we faced in our first year was trying to keep personnel costs in the line in view of our policy of hiring inexperienced help," Hurt explained.

EMPLOYEES NEEDED TRAINING

Less than half of the store's original staff had ever worked in a supermarket before joining Central City Foods, a factor that Hurt says added significantly to the overall operating costs in the first year. Hurt says the store has tried to maintain salary expenses at about 9 per cent of gross sales.

"Like most supermarkets we operate on a very narrow margin of profit on sales—about 1 to 1½ per cent," Hurt points out.

The most encouraging aspect of the first year of operating for Central City Foods, according to Hurt, was the steady increase in sales from month to month and the support given the business by the community—particularly church groups in St. Louis County. Forty-six church groups and organizations have pledged support of the supermarket by periodically shopping there.

The importance of this support is symbolic rather than economic, Hurt points out: "Most of those groups only shop here once a year but their support is important in that it contributes to our eventual success."

"STANDS ON OWN FEET"

Hurt stresses that he wants the business to stand on its own economic merits and has therefore not aggressively sought special shopping groups such as the churches. Realizing the importance of good relations within the business community, he comments, "We don't want to take business from other stores by reason of our location or the character of our store."

Central City Foods, Inc., was formed in 1967 by a group of Negro ministers and businessmen with Hurt as president. He is also president of Employes Loan and Investment Co. and is a vice president of the Gateway National Bank, a black-owned and managed bank.

Original financing for the market was raised through a stock offering at \$10 a share. The firm has about 2000 investors, many of them living in the immediate neighborhood of the store.

Noting this point as one reason the market has had a low rate of pilferage and loss, Hurt says, "You have to realize that this is a different kind of corporation. Many of our customers are also stockholders."

PROFIT ONLY A SYMBOL

The investors in the supermarket, although told in advance that the store may

not return a profit in its first three years, may not have to wait that long. Hurt says his primary goal in the second year of operation is to boost sales to \$60,000 weekly and put the store in a firm profit position.

"Profit is important only as a symbol of what a black-owned and operated enterprise can do," Hurt says. "We're not trying to prove to white people that this operation can be successful—we're trying to prove it to black people."

For this reason, Hurt says the store will maintain its identity as a black enterprise and not seek to be absorbed as "just another business."

Hurt's secondary goal for Central City Foods in the coming year is to open a second store in the Central West End.

CONGRESSMAN CRAIG HOSMER'S WASHINGTON NEWS NOTES

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have distributed to many organizations within my congressional district my monthly "Washington News Notes" letter. For the information of my colleagues, the May issue follows:

CONGRESSMAN CRAIG HOSMER'S WASHINGTON NEWS NOTES

MAY 1972.

More about those tennis shoes.—In the April "News Notes," we reported on a new political book which describes Congressman Craig Hosmer as being a "kindred spirit" with "little old ladies in tennis shoes." We lightly noted that Craig didn't even own any tennis shoes.

Well, he does now! Charles Furgason of 9851 Jamaica Circle, Huntington Beach, promptly sent Hosmer a star-spangled, red, white and blue pair of size 10½'s. He suggested that "if you're going to represent Orange County, please do it properly."

The heroin hotline.—As part of a massive nationwide push to clean up drug traffic, the Federal Government has established a new "Heroin Hotline." Here's how it works:

If you have any information or knowledge about anyone who is selling Heroin, you may call toll-free from anywhere in the Continental U.S.—24 hours a day—and report this information. All information and identification are kept strictly confidential.

The hotline number is (800) 368-5363. As citizens we all have a responsibility to help crack down on drug pushers.

The 'Pep' Program.—A new pamphlet, "The Public Employment Program—Bringing Together Jobless Workers and the Public Work to Be Done," is available from the Labor Department. The "PEP" program is financed with Federal funds, with \$1 billion being spent this year to create new jobs in the field of public service. State and local governments handle the planning of the program, which has concentrated on finding jobs for veterans and youth. In some areas, police departments are taking on several "PEP" aides, freeing officers for outdoor law-enforcement work.

'Nein' on Proposition 9.—Congressman Craig Hosmer has spoken out forcefully against Proposition 9 on the June 6 primary ballot, the so-called Pollution Initiative. He says that it would wreak environmental and economic disaster on California, wiping out thousands of jobs and turning the state into another Appalachia.

Responsible business, labor and environmental groups statewide are lining up in opposition to the measure. Hosmer says that

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

writing environmental protection legislation is tough enough even when you know what you're doing. It takes a careful balancing of often competing social goals. He adds that "lynch mob justice" is no way to go about it.

Transpo 72 Opens This Month.—Families planning visits to Washington this Spring should plan to take in Transpo 72 at Dulles Airport. The show opens May 27 and runs through June 4, featuring more than 500 displays of the most modern and futuristic transportation equipment from around the world. A variety of entertainment programs also are on the schedule. It'll be great fun for all.

Douglas 5, Boeing 0.—McDonnell Douglas recently won a big new Navy jet transport contract for its Long Beach plant. The \$25.3 million pact is for the first five of an estimated 33-plane fleet of multi-purpose transports called the C-9B. The company, the area's largest employer, won the bidding over Boeing Co. of Seattle, giving a big boost to our local economy.

How Big Is Big Business?—A recent study shows that some U.S. corporations have net sales rivaling the gross national product of many substantial countries. For example, General Motors had sales of \$18.8 billion for 1970, which is more than the GNP of Pakistan, and South Africa and just slightly less than Switzerland, AT&T, Standard Oil (N.J.) and Ford all outrank Denmark, Austria and Indonesia. Sears Roebuck had \$9.3 billion in sales, while Greece has a GNP of \$9.0 billion.

Interestingly, IT&T, which has been accused of meddling in the internal political affairs of Chile, had \$6.4 billion in sales, compared to Chile's gross national product of \$6.3 billion. Maybe IT&T should just buy the country.

It's About That Time.—Fred Nelson of Huntington Beach reminds us that absentee ballots for the June 6 primary election will be available from May 8 through May 30. If you won't be able to go to the polls on Election Day, be sure to request an absentee ballot from the Registrar of Voters in either Los Angeles or Orange County.

PENTAGON AGREES TO SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS OF MILITARY MOTELS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Representative JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, chairman of the Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in Smaller Towns and Urban Areas, of the Select Committee on Small Business, of which I have the honor to be chairman, recently completed hearings and issued a report on the impact of Federal installations on small business. The report's recommendations were directed, in part, to the Department of Defense in connection with the services' announced plans to construct and operate Government motels on various military bases in competition with private enterprise.

Specifically, the subcommittee recommended:

That the Department of Defense:

a. Immediately review all temporary lodging projects for which contracts have been awarded, but construction not completed, with a view to determining if the projects should continue in light of the subcommittee's findings.

b. Consider the feasibility of giving small businessmen in the private sector an opportunity to manage and operate those temporary lodging units which have already been constructed.

c. Require each of the military departments to forward for review and approval all construction projects for temporary lodging quarters, regardless of method of funding.

d. Before approving temporary lodging projects, determine, by complete and accurate surveys, whether:

(i) There exists a need for such facilities (such as kitchenettes),

(ii) If private enterprise can meet the need, including the feasibility of leasing private units or having private enterprise construct and operate such facilities under contract with the Department.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the Department of Defense, in a letter to Representative KLUCZYNSKI from Assistant Secretary Barry J. Shillito, has agreed to, and is actively cooperating in implementing the subcommittee's recommendations. DOD, however, did take exception to one recommendation, but I believe that their conclusions in this matter are quite understandable and reasonable.

The Department of Defense is to be commended in this instance for its interest and concern for the small businessman of the Nation while at the same time attempting to alleviate the plight of servicemen who are required to move. I want to take this opportunity to commend Chairman KLUCZYNSKI's efforts and, in concert with him, to reiterate the subcommittee's position on this matter. I am pleased that the Department of Defense concurs with our committee that this should not be done at the expense of the Nation's free enterprise system.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I am placing Secretary Shillito's letter in the RECORD:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., May 2, 1972.

Hon. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in Smaller Towns and Urban Areas, Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter of March 24, 1972 to Secretary Laird which transmitted the Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in Smaller Towns and Urban Areas Report on the Impact of Federal Installations on Small Business and to an interim reply of March 31, 1972 from Mr. Rady A. Johnson, Assistant to the Secretary for Legislative Affairs.

The first recommendation of the Subcommittee's report concerning the Department of Defense is that we review all temporary lodging projects for which contracts have been awarded, but construction not completed, with a view to determining if the projects should continue. This office will conduct such a review of the temporary lodging projects currently under construction in accordance with the Subcommittee's recommendation.

A further recommendation was to consider the feasibility of giving small businessmen in the private sector an opportunity to manage and operate those temporary lodging units which have already been constructed. Although our military installations utilize a great many businesses to provide services on our installations, these are generally in functional areas such as banks, cafeterias, barber shops, or shoe repair shops where the businessman's particular expertise or service

is required. The temporary lodging program was developed to provide economical lodging for permanent change of station personnel. To have the private sector operate these on-base lodging facilities could only increase the cost of the lodging accommodations and is considered counterproductive to the intent of the program. The Department of Defense, therefore, does not consider it feasible to operate temporary lodging facilities in this manner.

The Subcommittee also recommended that the Department of Defense require each of the Military Departments to forward for review and approval all construction projects for temporary lodging quarters, regardless of method of funding. This office is currently writing a Directive which will be applicable to all Military Departments and Defense Agencies and which will establish policy and procedures in regard to the construction, acquisition, administration, operation, and use of temporary lodging facilities. The Directive will require review and approval of all future temporary lodging facilities by this office. The review will include an evaluation of the availability, adequacy, and cost of commercial facilities including the feasibility of leasing adequate commercial facilities.

We trust the above is responsive to the recommendations of the Subcommittee's report.

Sincerely,

BARRY J. SHILLITO,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics).

PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHES SELF-DISCIPLINE

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, not long ago, I had the privilege of speaking to the Eastern District Association of American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation at the invitation of Dr. Jean Berger. My remarks to their convention focused on the need for and advantages of incorporating physical education and recreation into the educational curriculum. It was my desire to convey my conviction that the hard lessons of life—the discipline, the dedication, and the human relationships emanating from athletics of all kinds—are indispensable in preparing an individual to face the demands of a free society.

Hopefully, I struck a responsive chord. As a result of that talk, I have come into the possession of some remarkable words spoken by Dr. Margaret C. Brown, president emeritus of Panzer College, dealing with the same subject. Prof. Hazel Wacker, who, along with Dr. Brown were honored by their colleagues, sent me a copy of Dr. Brown's remarks. I know her remarks will strike a responsive note as well—they certainly did with me. I submit her remarks so that they be included in the RECORD to focus attention on the fact that freedom requires self-discipline. As Edmund Burke warned long ago "men of intemperate minds can never be free, their passions forge their fetters."

DISCIPLINE AND TRAINING—AN ART
(Dr. Margaret C. Brown)

Tonight you have honored three graduates who exemplify the high ideals and traditions

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tions of both Panzer College and the Panzer School at Montclair State College. Many others in this group have been honored here or elsewhere or are worthy of honor for their achievements in education and community and social services of infinite variety.

These traditions are the traditions of teacher education which have evolved in the United States since the first normal school was founded in Lexington, Massachusetts, in 1839. They may fluctuate like the stock market but still hold true. On the contrary, methods do change with the growth of scientific foundations of education and with the rapid social changes.

Teaching is necessarily a profession, not labor, because it is concerned with human life. It is not too much to ask that teachers have good personal habits and integrity, good manners, scholarship, professional competence and concern for the creation of an environment in which the human organism can grow and develop normally. These are the disciplines of professional training and education.

I am quite aware that discipline and training are unmentionable words, and that all we hear or read about is freedom, rights, and privileges.

Indeed, I have failed to find an editorial or article in the news media which explains the close relation of freedom and discipline. Yet I must ask, is anyone who has not mastered the disciplines of his own actions truly free?

Without discipline or training, the regiment is not free to march, nor the orchestra to play. How well can the team play without the disciplines of sport, or how can people function socially without the disciplines of the social amenities? Of what value is free speech without the discipline of reason and judgment or even the pain of thinking?

People so often ask me, how would you like (a) to be president (b) how would you manage? The answer is simple: (a) I would not (b) I could not. But you can, and you do. When I think of the collective results of all your contributions, I feel that the country is safe, in spite of the endless marches for freedom.

I am so very proud of you. I have learned much from you and I keep track of you through alumni association. I am proud of you as parents, teachers, scholars, administrators, as community leaders, and also as people of consequence in the development and stability of American culture.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TENNESSEE CONSTITUENTS

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, this week I am sending a legislative questionnaire to all postal patrons in the First District of Tennessee, as well as in two additional counties which have been redistricted back into my district next year.

Nine issues are included in my questionnaire, and I feel I have covered areas of vital interest.

As soon as I have tabulated the responses to my questionnaire, I will report back the results to you and to the President. In the meantime, I would like to have my questionnaire made available for readers of the RECORD:

QUESTIONNAIRE

MAY 1972.

DEAR FRIENDS: As your Congressman, I am very interested in what you think about the

important issues of our times. I realize that time does not always give you an opportunity to write, so I have prepared this questionnaire which lists some of the key issues.

Of course, questions such as these are very complex. Sometimes it is difficult to answer with a simple "Yes" or "No," but this problem faces every Member of Congress when legislation comes up for a vote. Please take a few minutes to give me the benefit of your views.

In order to have the results tabulated as soon as possible, no individual acknowledgement that your questionnaire has been received will be made. Just as soon as the responses have been tabulated, I will send you the results in a special Report from Washington. In addition, I will report the results to the Congress and the President.

Sincerely,

JAMES H. QUILLEN.

Please check the appropriate box after the question, then detach this questionnaire at the fold and mail it as a post card or enclose it in an envelope to 102 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

(Boxes provided for "his" and "hers" for "yes" or "no" answers.)

1. Do you favor granting amnesty to draft dodgers and deserters?

2. Should persons who voluntarily strike be entitled to food stamps?

3. Should the U.S. place a fixed limit on imports of agricultural products to aid our farmers?

4. Are you in favor of the U.S. expanding diplomatic and trade relations with Mainland China?

5. Do you favor forced busing of school children to achieve racial balance?

6. Do you feel the present system of wage and price controls is working to end inflation?

7. Do you favor changing the term of a Member of Congress from two years to four years?

8. Do you favor eliminating the criminal penalties for possession of marijuana?

9. The so-called value added tax, in effect a national sales tax, is contemplated as a method to hold the line on property tax increases. Do you favor such a tax?

(Check one)—(Mr. & Mrs.); (Mr.); (Mrs.); (Miss).

Name _____

Address _____

EXPERT URGES STATUTORY SECURITY CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM TO END DANGEROUS OVERCLASSIFICATION AND ADMINISTRATION CHAOS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Operations and Government Information subcommittee has been holding hearings on the interrelationship between the Freedom of Information Act and problems resulting from the administrative breakdown of our security classification system. Such matters may be exempted under section 552(b)(1) of the act in the "interest of the national defense or foreign policy."

During our hearings last summer during the "Pentagon papers" controversy, Mr. William G. Florence, a recently retired Air Force official with 43 years of experience in the security classification

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

May 4, 1972

field testified that more than 99 percent of the information classified under Executive Order 10501 did not meet the secrecy criteria that warranted such protection in the national defense interest. He pointed out that overclassification on such a massive basis actually undermined and endangered the truly vital defense and foreign policy secrets.

Our hearings this year have focused on the President's new Executive Order 11652, which he issued on March 8. His statement acknowledged the security classification chaos uncovered last year in our hearings and proclaimed the new order as the solution. Mr. Speaker, as I repeatedly have told my House colleagues the new order is full of technical defects and loopholes. A section-by-section comparative analysis of the old and newly proposed security classification executive orders was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 21, page 9377. In my judgment, it is not the answer to the problem.

Yesterday, the subcommittee was privileged to receive new testimony from Mr. Florence on the sad state of the security classification system and the inadequacies of the new Executive Order. His conclusion is that the classification practice represents the greatest hoax of the century, and the new order itself does not require improvement. This expert also urged that Congress consider a statutory approach to the security classification system. He outlined certain criteria that he thought such a law should contain. Of course, the Atomic Energy Commission has for many years successfully operated its internal security classification system under a section of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the testimony of Mr. Florence to all Members and include it in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM G. FLORENCE, SECURITY CONSULTANT, ON ISSUES IN CLASSIFYING AND PROTECTING NATIONAL DEFENSE INFORMATION

Mr. Chairman, I consider it a privilege to respond to the invitation of this committee to testify regarding the effect that the President's Executive Order of March 8, 1972, will have on the economic and efficient operation of the Executive branch security classification system. My comments will also explore actions which Congress could take to provide for safeguarding official information vital to the national defense without abridging the freedom of speech or of the press.

These comments are made as a continuation of my testimony before this subcommittee June 24, 1971. I had retired from employment with the Federal government after 43 years of military and civilian service. The last 26 years of my service had involved responsibility in the Department of Defense for developing and implementing policy for classifying and safeguarding information relating to the national defense. Since June 1971, I have served as Security Consultant to Government contractors and others concerned with matters involving consideration of defense interests.

Mr. Chairman, secrecy in the Executive Branch of the Federal government has developed into one of the most serious problems of our time. There has been an increasing tendency of Federal bureaus to operate in secrecy. This has created a state of antagonism between the Executive branch and the people of this country, including the Congress.

Thousands of officials and employees view Members of Congress and other outsiders as adversaries. Denial of information to Congress and the public has become a way of life in the Federal bureaus. It is most significant that this subcommittee has received testimony from various departments and agencies within the past two months acknowledging the need for drastic changes in attitudes of personnel in those organizations before there can be any change in the practice of withholding information from the Congress and the people.

The greatest difficulty stems from misrepresenting the interests of national security as an excuse for secrecy. This assumption of censorship power in the name of national security has grown to the point where the Executive branch believes that it can deny any private citizen the right to discuss with other citizens the information he knows or possesses, if some official happens to object to the disclosure.

The attempt in June 1971 to stop newspaper publication of the Vietnam Study was clearly an act of arrogance. The subsequent allegation of criminal action on the part of private citizens in disseminating the information required a strained administrative interpretation of the espionage laws that is without precedent in our history. The freedom of men who published historical information of great interest to the Congress and the United States is at stake this very moment *solely* because they did not get some Executive branch functionary to cancel an outdated and unjustifiable security classification marking.

I frequently ask myself, "What on earth has happened to my fellow citizens that they put up with Executive branch officials who acted and still act so vindictively against Dr. Daniel Ellsberg for performing a service to all of us which at least equalled in importance most of the successes our heroic field generals ever achieved in battle." I also shudder at the thought of Executive branch officials going into Federal District Court for an injunction against Mr. Victor Marchetti publishing information involving Central Intelligence Agency matters of real interest to the people, but at the same time insisting to the Court that since the reasons were marked "Secret" they could not be disclosed to the defendant's counsel and witnesses. The Executive branch had to be ordered by the Court of Appeals to disclose the reasons so that the defendant's rights could be protected.

The several court cases of 1971 and 1972 show that the more secretive the Executive branch becomes, the more repressive it becomes. It has adopted the practice of honoring its own internal secrets more than the right of a free press or the right of a citizen to free speech. The gravity of the actions brings to mind the following words of James Madison: "I believe there are more instances of the abridgment of freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments of those in power than by violent or sudden usurpations."

Mr. Chairman, there is abundant proof that the administrative security classification system currently in Executive Order 10501 is the source of most of the secrecy evils in the Executive branch. Loose implementation at the outset, and incredibly inept administration of the policy in recent years, have invited and promoted widespread use of the three security classifications, "Top Secret," "Secret," and "Confidential." There is also a constant flow of propaganda reflected in slogans such as the Department of Defense distributes in an effort to convince every person that security is his responsibility. They include the threat of punishment as well as a plea to follow the security line.

Attitudes of literally millions of people everywhere have been influenced toward secrecy and the sanctity of the three classification markings. The people have been

so thoroughly misled that they accept as fact the gigantic falsification that a conflict exists in the Constitution between (a) the right of citizens to know and discuss the activities of their government and (b) a need for the Executive branch to keep information secret.

The contagion of the classification philosophy long ago reached the point where the security system in Executive Order 10501 represents the greatest hoax of this century. Officials occupying even the highest positions in our government have been conditioned to promote the belief that the words "Top Secret," "Secret" and "Confidential" on a paper automatically give it a substantive value of extraordinary importance, and beyond the ken of most people.

Two examples are given to show how deadly serious the misconceptions about classification markings have become:

(1) Shortly after the *New York Times* started publishing portions of the Vietnam Study last June, a statement attributed to the President by his press secretary reflected clearly the belief that prosecution was indicated on the basis of a classification marking having been assigned to the study. Criminal action stemming from the classification theory is still in process today.

(2) One of the most noted among the members of the United States Senate [Senator Goldwater] wrote in an article also published by the *New York Times* last summer that, "Government papers marked 'Secret' and 'Confidential' should remain secret and confidential until such time as the Government sees fit to declassify them. The laws governing classification of Government papers were enacted to protect the majority of our people." [Note: There is no such law.]

That same misunderstanding in the Senate of the meaning, or lack of meaning, of classification marks was reflected again just a few days ago, April 25, 1972, when a member [Senator Gravel] was prevented by another member [Senator Griffin] from entering information in the *Congressional Record* solely on the basis of an assigned classification marking. At this moment, the Senate has yet to agree that it must use knowledge as it sees fit, regardless of some self-serving censorship action represented by a bureaucratic secret marking.

To me, it is appalling that people do not realize just how much *counterfeit* classification and *fake* secrecy the Executive branch imposes on the country. Last June, it was my privilege to help call the nation's attention to the intolerable abuses in the secrecy system. I testified that at least 99 1/2% of the total documents in the country bearing security classifications did not qualify for classification and protection in the defense interests of the Nation. Later, in an article in the *Washington Post*, I expressed the conclusion that even at the Department of Defense headquarters level in the Pentagon, about 95% of the classified documents did not warrant any classification.

Since last summer it has been my personal observation that the rate of classification in the Department of Defense has increased, not decreased. Also, my observation of Department of Defense operations and contract work in the past 10 months has convinced me that at least 99.9% of the existing classified documents do not warrant any classification. In other words, only about one-tenth of one percent of them, or *one in a thousand*, contain information the unauthorized disclosure of which actually could be prejudicial to the defense interests of the Nation. I have seen holdings of many hundreds of documents with classification marking and not a single one of them with any security value in terms of national defense. A person might search through thousands of so-called classified documents in contractor facilities as well as military units without ever finding information the unauthorized disclosure of which could be harmful to our defense interests.

Many of my associates who are engaged in work involving the safeguarding of defense information recognize the same degree of unnecessary classification that I have reported. One of the most critical comments I heard last year about my testimony on secrecy practices was made by the chief of a Department of Defense office having responsibility for conducting security surveys at contractor facilities. He told me that I should have reflected the fact that more than 99 1/4% of all documents with a security marking were unnecessarily classified. A few days ago, one of the top security classification officials in the Federal government stated as his own conviction that no more than one-tenth of one per cent of the information normally considered for classification could possibly cause damage to the national defense if it was released to the public.

There is a massive wastage of money and manpower involved in protecting this mountainous volume of material with unwarranted classification markings. Last year, I estimated that about \$50 million was being spent on protective measures for classified documents which were unnecessarily classified. After further observation and inquiry, and including expenditures for the *useless clearances granted people for access to classified material*, it is my calculation that the annual wastage for safeguarding documents and equipment with counterfeit classification markings is over \$100 million.

Consider just the waste of funds spent on so-called classified holdings of contractors. There are about 13,000 contractor facilities cleared to recommend use classified information. Some do not retain any classified material. But a great many store thousands of documents and other items with classification markings. Almost none of it actually requires protection in the defense interests of the nation.

Some of the facilities have such a limited quantity of classified material that it can be protected by employees as an integral part of their regular duties. Other facilities employ dozens of people to handle and guard classified material. If there was no classification, those employees would not be needed.

If we assume that only half of the 13,000 facilities use, as an average, just one employee on duties related solely to protecting information because of an assigned classification marking, and that wages and other annual security costs amount to only \$10,000.00, the bill to the taxpayers for just those facilities alone would be \$65 million. The total bill for safeguarding classified information within and outside the government would certainly be tremendous. My estimate of an annual wastage of \$100 million, including protection of documents and equipment unnecessarily classified and the granting of worthless security clearances, is conservative.

The question often arises as to how the classification system could possibly get to be over 99 1/2% wrong. The plain truth is that our present-day national defense effort does not lend itself to being crammed into a narrow military control system represented by current Executive order classifications. The strength of our national defense is not limited to military effort. It is intermixed with a broad dedication of the Federal government, in and outside the country, involving legislative action, foreign relations, industrial and economic development, international trade, and social endeavor as well as conventional military functions. Also, planning for our national defense has become as much an international function as a national effort.

A commensurate interchange of information within and outside the country among those who contribute to the strength of our national defense is essential to its success. The imposition of security classification markings on documents containing informa-

tion which requires wide usage is absurd and extremely wasteful. The practice has proved frequently to be seriously damaging rather than helpful to the national defense.

However, counterfeit classifications are still being applied to information by hundreds of thousands of people today as in the past. The markings are apt to be put on any conceivable type of correspondence, data, plan, report, or other administrative material, without regard to whether the information has already been exposed or could not possibly be protected. Fantastic ideas and practices have evolved from this craze for classification, including the continuing classification of privately-owned information.

This subcommittee has an abundance of examples of unnecessary classification assignments showing that classification markings on a document usually are clearly unwarranted. I will describe only one at this time to emphasize how utterly ludicrous the classification system is in practice.

Compilations of *unclassified* information are still being *classified* frequently by individuals who seem to believe that multiplicity or complexity itself should be protected. The Department of Defense affidavit given the court last summer in the *Washington Post* case involving the Vietnam Study included the following: "it is sometimes necessary to classify a document in which no single piece or part is itself classified." This falsification of policy in Executive Order 10501 has led to unnecessary classification of millions of documents in the Department of Defense.

An example of compilation classification I gave last June was the RAND Corporation Memorandum RM-5684-PR, subject: Listing of Avionics for USAF Aircraft, February 1970. The Department of Defense assigned the Confidential classification to that document and carries it as being confidential today, notwithstanding the fact that the document contains nothing but listings of equipment published separately for each aircraft in pamphlets specifically marked "Unclassified" so as to facilitate widespread distribution.

Another example of the classification of unclassified information is a document prepared by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for the Air Force Space and Missile Systems Office, with the title, "Assembly Manual—Gyro Float." It was issued in February 1971 with the classification of confidential, which was the responsibility of the Air Force. This document, with its confidential classification marking, contains the following statement: "Each section of this volume is in itself unclassified. To protect the compilation of information contained in the complete volume, the complete volume is confidential." Also in the Foreword of the document is the following statement, which is required by Executive Order 10501 on all classified documents held by contractors: "This document contains information affecting the national defense of the United States within the meaning of the Espionage Laws. Title 18, U.S.C., Sections 793 and 794, the transmission or revelation of which in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law."

This nonsensical practice of the Department of Defense not only is outrageously expensive in terms of wasted money but it is atrocious in its application to individuals who happen to become involved in an allegation of mishandling the unclassified information. I have seen people in responsible positions blindly take punitive action against employees in the government and in industry for handling such *unclassified* information as being *unclassified*.

Mr. Chairman, I have discussed at length the existing classification operations so that a comparative analysis of the new Executive Order 11652 will be truly informative.

The administrative permissiveness of Executive Order 10501 for secrecy proved to be

fatalely defective. The President himself acknowledged in statements made March 8, 1972, that "the system of classification which has evolved in the United States has failed to meet the standards of an open and democratic society." He condemned the controls on classification authority as having "proved unworkable," and stated that "the many abuses of the security system can no longer be tolerated."

This brings us to the President's answer to the existing intolerable classification system. Mr. Chairman, somehow the President manages to get the worst possible advice about information-security matters. He accepted recommendations of the Executive branch people who have been and continue to be responsible for the current fiasco, and promulgated in Executive Order 11652 substantially the same system that is now in Executive Order 10501.

Here is an analysis of Executive Order 11652 which I originally prepared for publication [*Federal Times*]. It shows that the Order itself does nothing to stop the proliferation of classification authority or eliminate unnecessary classification of information. The organization of content reflects a compromise of views, with the defensive attitude toward secrecy the clear winner. The gaps in regulatory coverage, including restrictions of authority to classify, requirements for declassification, exemptions from automatic declassification, and vitally important procedural controls, show a lack of understanding of information-security principles sufficient to achieve the purpose indicated for the order. It is manifestly less than adequate. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the analysis be entered in the record at this point.

Of major interest to this committee is the effect that Executive Order 11652 could have in relation to Exemption (b)(1) of the Freedom of Information Act. That exemption now permits a government agency to withhold from a requesting citizen *matters that are "specifically required by Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of the national defense or foreign policy"* (italics supplied).

The first problem is the fact that effective June 1, 1972, the new Executive order will refer to "national security information" and "foreign relations" instead of "national defense information" and "foreign policy." That is a legal matter that I assume will be resolved.

As for the practical effect of the secrecy system in Executive Order 11652, this subcommittee and everyone else in the country can anticipate the same rate of refusals by government agencies to release documents that applies today. The agencies which lose classification authority are likely, of course, to loosen up in their practices. But those hundreds of thousands of people who can continue to classify information will continue to do so. And they will continue to exempt their information from automatic declassification if at all possible. There is no reason to believe that the classifiers will be more inclined under the new order to cancel the classification on a document for the benefit of a private citizen than they are now.

The Executive branch witnesses who testified before the Subcommittee on Intelligence of the House Armed Services Committee March 8-14, 1972 and before this committee May 2, 1972 demonstrated beyond any doubt that needless classification and false secrecy will continue under Executive Order 11652. Their testimony specifically showed and reflected the following:

(1) Refusal to consider any coordination with the Congress in implementing the order. The Department of Defense consistently reflected an effort to withhold facts about its contribution to the order, and showed an attitude of defiance in response to specific inquiries about the status of implementation.

(2) The Department of Defense representative on March 9, 1972, showed a significant lack of understanding of the need to eliminate unwarranted secrecy classifications. He

stated that consideration of "competing advantages and disadvantages" is the Department of Defense approach to a classification decision. The idea of applying the "damage to national defense" criterion was not included. He also reported as commendable the fact that over 13,500 security classification guides have been reviewed to see about doing some declassifying, which, of course, should be done on a continuing basis. The disturbing fact is that the Department has more than 13,500 separate guides *requiring the classification of information* in addition to all other classification instructions. Furthermore, he stated that in the politico-military area of information, which evidently qualifies for wide classification coverage is his opinion, automatic declassification is not suitable after any time period.

(3) The Department of Defense representative on May 2, 1972, strongly supported the classification of various types of information currently carrying unjustifiable classifications, including the general term, "weapon system characteristics."

(4) Virtually every suggestion made to Executive branch witnesses, especially those from the Department of Defense, for specific controls to preclude needless classification and assure timely declassification were rejected on the basis that there will be too much material requiring classification.

(5) Slightly accelerated automatic declassification was hailed as the answer to the secrecy problem. However, even greater emphasis was given the view that security interests of the Executive branch would justify keeping a large volume of material classified for 30 years, and some of it much longer. The Department of State testified to holding documents in secrecy for 75 years. Parthenetically, I submit that the practice of turning an official record into a mummy and keeping it from the people is as damaging to us as the practice of book-burning which we all deplored so much a few years ago.

Mr. Chairman, it is clearly within the responsibility of Congress to correct the abuses of administrative power now being exercised under the existing security classification system in Executive Order 10501, and which can be expected to continue under Executive Order 11652. It is an honor to have this opportunity to recommend certain legislative and procedural actions.

First, each committee of the Congress should withdraw immediately from any existing agreement or understanding with an Executive branch agency for safeguarding information assigned a security classification, and give assurance that protection will be afforded only upon request by the head of the agency having jurisdiction, unless the committee agrees that secrecy is required. With deepest respect for Congress and each Member, I submit that the prevailing practice of treating Executive branch classifications as being valid serves the secrecy interests of the bureaucratic classifiers, not the defense interests of this nation or the needs of the people. I cannot imagine a Member of Congress being less qualified than the hordes of security-oriented Executive branch employees to assess the importance of information required by the Congress to perform its constitutional functions.

The most suitable legislative action would be the enactment of a law to accomplish the purpose of Executive Orders 10501 and 11652, and at the same time serve the interests of Congress and the people regarding access to information. Any reasonable legislation that would provide a framework of law instead of an administrative regulation in which to protect such national defense information as can and ought to be protected would be a very worthwhile improvement. It is my belief that a bill should be enacted to do the following:

(1) Establish precisely the authority for the President and the heads of a few speci-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

fied departments and agencies to designate certain official information as requiring protection against disclosure, so as to preclude actual damage to the national defense. The law would not force the designation of any information as requiring protection. But if an item of information is considered for designation, the procedures and restrictions would apply and be controlling *within the Executive branch*.

(2) Prescribe use of the single term "Secret Defense Data" for such information as may be designated for protection. No other classification would be permitted, but routing designators could be used to assist in restricting the distribution of specific items of information.

(3) Define as narrowly and clearly as practicable the criterion "would damage the national defense." Efforts in the past to define types of information requiring protection have always proved a failure. As reflected in our espionage laws, it is *injury* and *damage* to the national defense and to the United States that we are concerned about.

(4) Impose strict limitations on authority to designate information as Secret Defense Data. Only the head of an agency or an official designated by him could make the designation. His name and title would appear on documents containing the information. [He would have a "warrant" similar to a contracting officer.]

(5) Set practical limits for retaining information in the Secret Defense Data category, which would reflect the need to eliminate the current fiction about how this Nation would be harmed if its citizens should learn what the Executive branch is doing and has been doing in the name of national defense.

(6) Establish a specific standard for the dissemination within and by the Executive branch of Secret Defense Data. This would reflect the responsibility of the Executive branch itself to protect the information it considers important. That branch should not operate on the basis that it can make wide dissemination of classified information on the expectation that recipients would become subject to prosecution if they don't agree with the Executive branch ideas about security controls. A vitally important provision would make it *unlawful for any person to withhold or authorize the withholding of information from the Legislative branch* on the basis of its qualification for designation as Secret Defense Data.

(7) Direct that an official with appropriate staff be designated by the President to assist him monitor implementation of the law. A report of the various actions taken would be submitted to Congress semiannually.

Another legislative action of less complexity within the purview of this committee would be to amend the Freedom of Information Act by adding a subsection that would cancel or otherwise make inapplicable any restriction imposed in the name of national defense against public access to official records originated three years or more prior to enactment of the legislation. Exclusions could be made for Atomic Energy Restricted Data and any other type of information Congress might wish to specify. Experience indicates that three years is the limit of protection time for most information.

A third legislative action that this committee might initiate immediately, and quite possibly see enacted, would be to amend Exemption (b)(1) of the Freedom of Information Act so that it could apply only if the head of an agency or an official designated by him certifies that the material must be kept secret to preclude damage to the national defense. This action would be consistent with other proposals to limit classification authority to the head of an agency or to an official designated by him.

Mr. Chairman, I venture to suggest that action be taken as soon as possible to eliminate unjustifiable secrecy from our government. The people must have knowledge about

what is going on to make intelligent decisions for themselves.

I again express my deepest thanks for the invitation to come before the committee and present these facts and suggestions.

ANALYSIS OF EXECUTIVE ORDER 11652: CLASSIFICATION AND DECLASSIFICATION OF NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION AND MATERIAL

TYPE OF SYSTEM

The system for classifying information as top secret, secret, and confidential is outdated. It is substantially the same as the Army and Navy used before World War II to classify a very small volume of military information as secret or confidential. The system cannot work in a gigantic bureaucracy of millions of employees with millions of classification stamps.

SCOPE

A major improvement in Executive Order 10501 was substitution of the narrow terms "national defense" and "defense information" for the broader terms "national security" and "security information" that were used in Executive Order 10290. Reinstatement of the vague term "national security" in Executive Order 11652 invites wider classification coverage. (Also, the order is at variance with laws using the term "national defense".)

PREAMBLE

The claim that information classified under the order is exempted from public disclosure by the Freedom of Information Act is false. Exemptions are *permissive*, not mandatory. Also, the order misrepresents any "wrongful disclosure" of classified information as being a crime and subject to prosecutive action under the Federal Criminal Code. The truth is that there is no basis in law for an Executive order to threaten the press, members of Congress or anyone else for wrongful disclosure of information.

NUMBER OF CLASSIFICATIONS

Multiple classifications invite confusion, promote uncontrollable overclassification, and reduce the effectiveness of the security system. But the new order keeps three classifications. According to the Department of Defense General Counsel, adoption of a single classification was rejected because (1) NATO has a multi-category system, and (2) a top secret clearance would be expected for everybody, which would be too expensive. He did not reflect the fact that (1) we eliminated the restricted classification in 1953 after NATO had adopted it, and (2) clearances for access to classification categories are virtually worthless. Anyway, an individual's duties determine whether to permit him access to a given item of classified information.

CLASSIFICATION CATEGORIES

The top secret category in the new order is at least as broad as it is now. The secret category could include more information than at present. Programs need not be of vital importance any longer. The new confidential criterion "expected to cause damage to the national security" includes as much information as the existing "prejudicial to defense interests of the nation."

AUTHORITY TO CLASSIFY

Under Executive Order 10501, classification authority may be exercised only by a department head and such other persons as he or his representative designates. The delegation "shall be limited as severely as is consistent with the orderly and expeditious transaction of Government business." The new order only requires that (1) the head of a top secret classification department designate other persons who may classify as top secret, and (2) that the head of a secret classification department designate other persons who may classify as secret. In the top secret classification departments, *whoever* is delegated top secret classification authority may in turn designate *any or all* of his subordinates to classify as secret. In both

the top secret and secret classification departments, *whoever* is delegated secret classification authority may in turn designate as *many* "officials" as he wishes to classify as confidential. The new order will eliminate existing controls and proliferate classification authority far beyond that envisioned by Executive Order 10501.

DECLASSIFICATION

Executive Order 10501 states that when classified information or material *no longer* requires protection, *it shall be declassified*. Heads of departments were directed to establish effective declassification programs on a continuing basis. Executive Order 11652 only states *who shall exercise declassification authority*. It does not require or even suggest any declassification of *current* information. The people could be getting *less* information in the future to use in making their decisions.

SCHEDULE FOR AUTOMATIC DECLASSIFICATION

Administration spokesmen have represented the new 10-8-6-year *automatic* declassification schedule in the new Executive order for top secret-secret-confidential information as the answer to the public's right of access to *historical* material. But the various authorizations for exemptions from automatic declassification will permit at least as much information to be kept classified as at present. For example, the following exemption in the new order is as broad as its counterpart in the existing order: "Classified information or material disclosing a system, installation, project or foreign relations matter the continuing protection of which is essential to the national security."

DISSEMINATION CRITERIA

The existing order limits dissemination of classified information to persons for the performance of *official* duties in the interest of promoting the national defense. The new order *expands* the dissemination criteria to persons whose access "is necessary for the performance of his duties." The limitation to official purposes has been eliminated. This reflects the wider scope of the new order as compared with Executive Order 10501.

SPECIAL ACCESS PROGRAMS

The new order broadens the authority of departments to establish "special access" programs, with special stamps to keep the people from knowing about them. The additional restrictions exist only because the effectiveness of classification markings has been ruined by wide abuse. Evidently, improvement is not foreseen.

FORMER OFFICIALS

The new order will permit former Presidential appointees to have access to any classified material which they signed or approved, or which came into their respective offices. This unjustifiable special privilege policy could only have been adopted in anticipation of continued massive unnecessary classification and massive unnecessary exemption from declassification.

POSSIBLE SANCTIONS

The new order, for the first time, requires that a person who abuses the classification process be told that he has violated a Presidential instruction. "Repeated abuse" will be grounds for a possible administrative reprimand. This has been hailed as a step forward in controlling overclassification. But the requirement will have no effect on the blanket application of classifications assigned by departmental regulations or classification guides for specified programs. And there really is no basis in language such as "repeated abuse" to assume that individuals will get reprimanded. However, anyone unfortunate enough to be accused of mishandling documents with a counterfeit classification will probably get punished severely.

SEPARATE INSTRUCTIONS

Additional instructions will be issued by the President on access, marking, safekeep-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ing, accountability, transmission, disposition and destruction of classified information and material. The procedures will control the effectiveness of the new order. Unquestionably, the reason that they were not published with the other instructions was that the people who drafted and staffed the order could not agree on what was needed. When the procedures are issued they will reflect the different purposes and operations of the participating departments. The basic principle of that security is the responsibility of command will surely be sacrificed for committee compromise.

INTERAGENCY CLASSIFICATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

A committee of representatives of the Departments of State, Defense and Justice, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Council, plus a chairman, will be established. Its functions will be (1) to oversee department actions to ensure compliance with the new order, and (2) to review complaints and suggestions made by anyone and assure that affected departments take appropriate action. But, in truth, no committee of employees can require that a department head do anything that he does not choose to do.

ASSESSMENT

If the people want unnecessary secrecy eliminated regarding Executive branch operations, they must look somewhere other than Executive Order 11652 for the answer. The President changed the number and some of the language in the existing order. But he re-established the same system for administrative classification and censorship that he condemned as having failed to meet the standard of our open and democratic society.

CONGRESS MUST NOT TIE THE PRESIDENT'S HANDS

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, the President's decision to continue the military pressure on North Vietnam so long as the invasion of the South continues, combined with his insistence on serious negotiations in Paris, offers the best hope for an end to the war. I sincerely hope that the American people—and the Congress—will stand behind the President during the very trying weeks ahead. I am hopeful, therefore, that the Senate will strike title VII from the bill, S. 3526, now under consideration. There can be no justification for limiting the President's bargaining position at this critical time.

I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial from the Houston Chronicle of April 19, which further explains the dangers involved:

FUND CUTOFF PROPOSAL DANGEROUS

The move by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to cut off funds for all U.S. combat operations in Indochina after Dec. 31 is dangerous.

The committee would destroy the ability of the President to negotiate any peace settlement with the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese. It is difficult to believe the senators who favored this move gave full consideration to the consequences of the move they are supporting.

Any final solution to the Indochina dispute must be reached at a bargaining table. What

these senators propose to do is take all the cards out of the President's hand as he seeks agreement on a stable Indochina.

The fund cutoff is in the form of an amendment to a bill authorizing funds for the State Department.

We agree with Sen. Robert P. Griffin, R-Mich., who said a fund cutoff would simply "weaken the President's hand and encourage the enemy just when the President is moving toward serious negotiations with Moscow and Hanoi."

The amendment even produced a schism among those who have for many years called for a speedy end to the Vietnam conflict.

War critic George Aiken, R-Vt., dissented in the committee vote, declaring: "I vote against accepting the North Vietnamese terms. All the North Vietnamese have to do is back up behind the DMZ."

Sen. John Sherman Cooper, R-Ky., who has sponsored antiwar amendments in the past, said he abstained from voting because "we are in a battle right now."

The Senate panel is wrong to attempt to tie the President's hands as he seeks an end to this conflict. We urge the full Senate to remove this language from the bill.

J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with all Americans and freedom lovers throughout the world in expressing my feeling of deep personal loss at the sudden passing of J. Edgar Hoover, whom I consider one of the greatest and most unforgettable Americans of our time. For almost half a century, people in this country felt more secure, knowing this great man had the FBI at work, guarding our internal security against foes from within and without.

Directing one of the world's largest investigative law enforcement agencies is a demanding job, but J. Edgar Hoover rose to the challenge for 48 years with a sustaining power and presence that I daresay was never bent by political arm-twisting by anyone in the whole Federal Government, or the whole Nation for that matter. But just as this legendary American with the stony composure received countless recognitions for his passionate and unrelenting efforts to maintain law and order, he just as often came under unwarranted attack. But that, of course, would be the plight of any man whose relentless strive for perfection elevated him above harassment, and brought the highest level of police work this Nation has ever known.

So tireless and effective was his opposition to the forces of organized lawlessness, in fact, that it won him the confidence of eight Presidents, five of whom ultimately rested on the same draped bier where we honor him today. His devotion to his work left little time for a life of his own. For the FBI was his life, the well-spring of his being, and he took a relatively small body, just 16 years old, and turned it into a nationwide corps of highly trained officers that became the envy of several continents.

Since J. Edgar Hoover was a legendary man, we really cannot say he has died, for legends live on in extensions and reflections of their monumental meaning. Therefore, I hope and pray that whoever is permanently selected to continue his great work will have the vision and vigor to lead his men down the winding road of accomplishment which they walked under his tutelage.

My heartfelt sympathy goes to John Edgar Hoover's loved ones in this time of great grief, when most of the Nation is in a state of mourning. A great man is gone, but his accomplishments live on in a blaze of immortality.

AS AN INVESTOR, HE MAKES YOU WONDER—AS A PRODUCER, HE MAKES YOU MARVEL

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the New Holland Farm Equipment Co. has been running a series of advertisements in our Nation's newspapers pointing out the problems faced by our producers as they supply in abundance and at bargain prices, the food for America and much of the rest of the world.

For those of us from rural America, there is nothing new in these advertisements. I have enumerated them many times in my correspondence and in statements in the RECORD. But I want to commend New Holland for spending their money to get this message to the American people.

To reinforce my previous comments and to give wider scope to these statements of New Holland, I insert this advertisement into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

The average Class I farm in this country—one with farm-product sales of \$40,000 per year—represents a capital investment in land, buildings and equipment of \$300,000.

All of which probably sounds very impressive until you realize that the farmer owning all this nets an average of only \$14,000 from this sizeable investment.

Now consider this: By investing the same \$300,000 in government bonds, he could realize a greater income every year without so much as setting foot outside his front door.

Then why does a man continue to farm? Mostly because farming, for all its change and modernization, is still a way of life. A way of life some men enjoy and want to stick with. And because of this, they measure part of the return from farming in something other than money.

We're fortunate they do, because our farmers have wrought minor miracles in the production of food and fiber.

AVERAGE HOURLY RATES

Farmer, \$1.57.
Food Marketing Employee, \$2.83.
Factory Worker, \$3.19.

Item: Corn yield per acre has zoomed 180% since 1940 and wheat yield has doubled in that time.

How do all of us benefit from this bounty? Each year we are able to spend a smaller percentage of our income on food. In 1950, Americans earmarked 23.7% of income on food; in 1970, it dropped to 18.5%. A West

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

German, by comparison spends fully 1/3 of his income on food while a Russian spends a staggering 55%.

Thus unburdened, Americans find themselves with disposable income to support a wide range of consumer goods and services.

We can—and do—pour money into education, automobiles, household appliances, housing. It isn't stretching a point too much to say that our farm abundance gives a big boost to our national affluence.

It's something to think about next time you load up your basket at the supermarket.

Item: In 1945, one American farmer fed 15 people, today he feeds 45.

Item: An hour of farm labor produces seven times as much as it did in 1920.

Item: In the 1960's alone, productivity of the average farm worker increased by 6% a year vs. only 3% for nonagricultural workers.

CALIFORNIA WATER PROJECT NEARS GOAL

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, over a decade ago, the people of California committed themselves to a \$2.8 billion plan to transport water from northern California to southern California. The State was at that time confronted with the ironic problem of a severe water shortage in the south and frequent floods in the north. The future progress of the State hinged on a balanced distribution of the State's water resources.

I am happy to report that that balance is soon to be a reality. Industry, homes in Ventura, and Los Angeles Counties are now using northern California water, thus lessening the demand for water from the Colorado River. By 1976, 124 southern California communities will be using water from northern California.

The following article from the Los Angeles Times describes the project more fully, and it is with great pleasure that I bring it to the attention of my colleagues in the House:

NORTHERN WATER FLOWS THROUGH SOUTHLAND TAPS—INITIAL DISTRIBUTION GOES TO POPULATION OF 300,000 IN VENTURA AND LOS ANGELES COUNTIES

(By Ray Hebert)

Water from Northern California began flowing into Southland homes for the first time Monday.

More than 10 years after work started on the \$2.8 billion California Water Project, northern water reached nearly 300,000 persons in eastern Ventura and western Los Angeles counties.

Water officials said the first distribution of the new water supply came "barely in time" to stave off some shortages in a year of extreme drought.

The supply, they pointed out, eased a situation which threatened to create problems in providing water for agricultural use—and possibly for cities—in Orange, Riverside and San Diego counties.

Southern California's huge Metropolitan Water District made the first deliveries of northern water from Castaic Reservoir, 35 miles northwest of downtown Los Angeles.

IN USE WITHIN HOURS

And within hours it was being piped into homes, factories, businesses and ranches in

May 4, 1972

cities and communities served by the Calleguas and Las Virgenes municipal water districts.

The sprawling Calleguas district has a population of more than 250,000 and includes Oxnard, Camarillo, Conejo Valley, Simi Valley, Moorpark and other parts of Ventura County.

Las Virgenes serves an area with a population of about 20,000 in the western San Fernando Valley and the Santa Monica Mountains west of Topanga Canyon.

The two districts had shut off their supplies of Colorado River water, also provided by Metropolitan, before they started receiving the new water from the Feather River and other Northern California streams.

The new supply, transported south through more than 500 miles of state Water Project aqueducts, dams and other facilities, had been backing up behind Castaic Dam since mid-January.

PROCESSED AT NEW PLANT

In making its first distribution of northern water, Metropolitan processed the supply from Castaic at its new \$50 million Joseph Jensen Filtration Plant in the Granada Hills area.

From there it was fed into the district's Sepulveda Feeder which connects with a line across the San Fernando Valley through which Calleguas and Las Virgenes have been receiving Colorado River water.

Officials said residents using the new water from Northern California for the first time were not likely to notice any difference in taste from the Colorado River water they have been receiving.

The northern water, however, is much softer and they might notice it in washing.

Colorado River water has 360 parts per million of hardness compared to 100 for northern water, Metropolitan said.

The new water supply could be a stimulus for a resumption of growth some sections of the Calleguas district experienced during most of the 1960s.

The Simi Valley, for example, was one of the fastest growing areas in California.

Some officials have predicted the Calleguas area could hit a population of 1 million in less than 30 years if enough water is available.

The arrival of the new water supply in Ventura and western Los Angeles Counties will make it possible for Metropolitan to make more of its existing Colorado River supplies available for other cities in the six counties it serves.

It also resolves a drought problem which had prevented Metropolitan from filling Lake Mathews, terminal reservoir for Colorado River water, for the first time in the district's history.

Lake Mathews is about 30,000 acre-feet short. Metropolitan is expected to receive about 50,000 acre-feet of northern water this year.

AREAS SERVED

Much of this water, following the lead of Calleguas and Las Virgenes, will be distributed to the South Bay area and to such cities as San Fernando, Burbank, Glendale, Santa Monica, Beverly Hills, Culver City and Inglewood.

By 1976, Metropolitan officials pointed out, all 124 cities and communities it serves will be receiving some northern water.

"We would be running out of water in a very few years (without the state project) . . ." Frank M. Clinton, Metropolitan's general manager, said.

Metropolitan is the largest contractor for state water. It will be receiving about 75,000 acre-feet more each year until it reaches its annual contracted amount—2,011,500 acre-feet.

However, about one-third of the new Northern California supply will be used to replace an estimated 60,000 acre-feet Metropolitan will lose to Arizona when the multi-

million-dollar Central Arizona Project is completed.

A 1963 U.S. Supreme Court decision awarded half of Metropolitan's existing Colorado River supply to Arizona for the Phoenix-Tucson urban areas.

EFFECTS OF FORCED BUSING

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the disastrous effects of forced busing upon a school system were graphically outlined today in testimony before the House Judiciary Committee. Mr. Sam Buice, chairman of Parents Against Forced Busing, made an extremely effective presentation on what has happened because of court-mandated busing in my home community of Pinellas County, Fla.

Mr. Buice's testimony in support of a constitutional amendment to preserve neighborhood schools deserves our fullest attention. Here, in its entirety, is what he had to say:

TESTIMONY OF SAM BUICE

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the Judiciary Committee: Thank you for the opportunity of appearing before you to bring you the voice of Florida in general and Pinellas County in particular on this most important issue of forced busing of pupils to achieve racial balance in the public schools.

Parents against forced busing is a 50,000 member strong organization of parents and citizens dedicated to the neighborhood school concept and equal educational opportunity for all children, but adamantly opposed to forced busing of pupils to achieve racial balance.

We in Pinellas County are experiencing the evils of forced busing and can testify from first hand experience that nothing good has been accomplished by forced busing either socially, economically or educationally.

There is ample evidence that race relations rather than improving, are deteriorating rapidly. Riots in the schools are commonplace. Students describe the schools as powder kegs and educators admit that little or no learning is taking place in the classroom.

In Dixie Hollins High School an estimated 30,000 pupil days have been lost—thus far—in the 1971-72 school year because of racial strife.

In Boca Ciega High School an estimated 20,000 pupil days have been lost because of rioting.

Figures from the school administration's public records verify the following facts:

"In the school year 1970-71 there were 11 reported assaults. In the school year 1971-72, September through March, there were 195 reported assaults, an increase of 1772 percent. At the elementary school level prior to the 1971-72 school year, there were 7 suspensions—for serious misbehavior. This was considered normal. In the 1971-72 school year, September through March there have been 150 suspensions, an increase of 2143 percent.

At the junior, senior high level there were 100 suspensions in the 1970-71 school year. In the 1971-72 September through March there have been 1200 suspensions, an increase of 1200 percent. Our schools are in a state of rebellious confusion and chaos. I quote from the St. Petersburg Independent news-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

paper, Monday March 17, 1972 caption "Racial Harmony Aim of Park Group."

Describing conditions at Pinellas Park Junior High School, where 1,000 students walked out March 14th, quote "in a formal statement issued by both black and white students following the walkout and a meeting with Principal Thomas Wooley, the students said: "All this year Pinellas Park Junior High has been a school of constant and seemingly endless turmoil and friction."

The following morning, Tuesday, April 18, 1972, from the St. Petersburg Times newspaper, caption "Fence to Go Up at School." The story relates how the administration had decided to erect a six (6) foot chain link fence to keep pupils in and troublemakers out.

In a related story from the St. Petersburg Times dated Tuesday, April 18, 1972, caption "Dixie Hollins Gets Warning on Accreditations." This story relates how Dixie Hollins, because of its turmoil and strife has lost the interest of the pupils. The report from the accrediting team from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, as reported in the St. Petersburg Times states, "the report found fault with the schools activities programs and observed that the school spirit that once flourished here is now at a low ebb."

The report concludes, again I quote from the St. Petersburg Times, "Despite the fact that recent violent upheavals often brought about by circumstances beyond the control of school officials—can understandably cause a staff to be "gun shy" in regards to allowing more student activity. The faculty and staff must generate new enthusiasm and vigor so that young people will feel that they are a part of Dixie Hollins and not just students attending Dixie Hollins."

These are not isolated cases, they are ones which made news in April 1972.

Economically our school system is on the verge of bankruptcy. Florida statutes allow each school system 10 mills on which to operate without referendum. The Pinellas County School Board insists that to maintain quality education under the present court ordered forced busing plan to achieve racial balance, they need an additional 4 mills, or eight million dollars per year.

This referendum was submitted to the voters on September 14, 1971 who for the first time in the history of Pinellas County rejected it by a margin of 3 to 1. This was not a vote against quality education, but a protest against forced busing to achieve racial balance.

Parents against forced busing led the fight to defeat this millage election. However, we have stated publicly that we will also lead a drive to pass a millage levy for all the money needed for quality education for all children once we are assured this money will be spent for quality education for all children and not for forced busing to achieve racial balance. We will lead this drive once we are assured that our children will no longer be used as pawns in a socio-economic experiment by Federal judges in direct violation to existing laws and far in excess of any Supreme Court rulings.

From the educational standpoint, I submit a statement from a man very high in school administration here in Pinellas County, but who asked that his name not be used. "If an honest achievement study were made at the end of the 1971-72 school year it would be found that education is nil".

It is not necessary for me to trace the history of busing for you distinguished lawmakers. However, in the interest of pointing out the intolerable situation in Pinellas County, please bear with me as I briefly review the past and observe the present.

In the landmark decision of 1954 Brown versus the Board of Public Instruction, the Supreme Court ruled that under the equal protection of the law clause of the 14th

amendment no child could be assigned to any school because of race, color, creed, sex or national origin. The equal protection clause in its simplest form says that no State can treat one person in a given situation differently than it treats another person in the same situation.

Every subsequent Supreme Court decision including the most recent Charlotte, Mecklenberg case has held to this conclusion, yet has clouded the decision with legal jargon to the extent of allowing lower courts enough latitude to impose their own judgment on the people even to the extent of violating the mandate of the Congress and the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment. It is a fact that we are being forced to violate the 14th amendment under the guise of enforcing the 14th amendment.

As an example Pinellas County schools are operating under an exact black white ratio. One child in a neighborhood is allowed to walk to the neighborhood school, but his enrollment fills the quota for his race. The child next door is bussed across town in order to maintain the racial quota for another school.

I submit to you gentlemen that both children are in the same situation but one is denied access to the neighborhood school solely because of race. If it was unconstitutional to assign pupils by race in 1954 it is unconstitutional in 1972.

Further you gentlemen know that transportation of pupils for racial balance is expressly forbidden in the 1964 Civil Rights Act, yet, we are operating under Federal court orders in direct violation to this mandate of the Congress. I submit that portion of the order relating to black white ratios and orders to bus to achieve this ratio for your inspection:

EXHIBIT A

"The student assignment plans submitted to this court by the defendant School Board involve modification of existing zone lines, elimination of all pairing and clustering, implementation of the zone-within-a-zone or satellite zone concept and increased transportation of students. The plan submitted to this court for the senior high schools in Pinellas County desegregates every high school so that each high school in the entire system will have both black and white students and no high school will have a student body with a majority of black students. The percentage of black students in each high school student body ranges between approximately 3.1 per cent and 17.5 per cent. The senior high school plan involves only a very minor zoning change from that plan which it formerly contemplated using for the 1971-72 school year. The student assignment plan submitted to this court for the desegregation of every junior high school in Pinellas County will result in all junior high schools having student bodies consisting of both black and white students and no junior high having a student body with a majority of black students. The plan of student assignment creates a percentage of black students in junior high school student body composition between approximately 5.6 per cent and 22.2 per cent in all regular junior high schools. The student assignment plan for the elementary schools in the Pinellas County school system is designed so that each elementary school will have both black and white students and no elementary school will have a student body with a majority of black students. All elementary schools will return to the traditional concept of kindergarten through sixth grade. The student assignment plan submitted to this court by the defendant School Board is designed so that the percentage of black students in each elementary school will vary between approximately 3.1 per cent and 24.9 per cent. The court holds that the student assignment plans do not violate the constitutional rights of anyone, white or black."

Regarding the President's proposed legislation and moratorium on busing, we are pleased that the President has made his thinking known regarding the evils of forced busing and we have hope that this will arouse the Congress to the extent that the American public is aroused.

There is much confusion and disagreement among the highest officials in the Nation as to the effect of this proposed moratorium.

Secretary Elliot Richardson of the Health, Education and Welfare is quoted as testifying before this committee on April 13th, that only "recent" busing orders would be subject to review. Recent is a relative word, our question is what will it do for Florida?

Acting Attorney General Kleindienst is quoted as testifying on April 12th, that the moratorium would affect every case ordered in violation of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Congressman C. W. "Bill" Young of Florida, who is with me here today has called on President Nixon for an investigation of the Pinellas County case which is certainly in violation of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. We respectfully add our plea for relief under the law to that of Congressman Young.

The people of Florida made their sentiments abundantly clear in the March 14th presidential primary when they were given the opportunity to vote yes or no for a constitutional amendment to prevent forced busing to achieve racial balance. The vote was an overwhelming 4 to 1 yes. Every poll across the Nation has reflected like sentiment.

Gentlemen, with this type of evidence, with forced busing's proven track record of failure to achieve its stated goals in every area where it has been tried, with the overwhelming sentiment of America from the President down expressing disapproval of forced busing, how can you in good conscience do less than bring this matter out of committee and before the Congress who is elected as the voice of the people.

HON. J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of loss, that I rise to express my sorrow and shock at the sudden passing of J. Edgar Hoover. His passing has created a tremendous void, a void which will be difficult to fill. For, above all else, J. Edgar Hoover was a man who unselfishly and continually dedicated himself to the service of his country.

The accomplishments of the man were many and I am sure that history will duly record them. His work against organized crime and the Communist Party alone earned him the respect and admiration of his fellow citizens. In addition, he molded the FBI into the greatest law enforcement agency in the world.

However, to tell the story of the record that this man carved against crime without also speaking about the character of the man himself would render any eulogy incomplete. For J. Edgar Hoover was a man of almost unsurpassed integrity, character, and virtue.

It is not surprising then that the FBI during his tenure as Director has never been the subject of a scandal or ever

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

been questioned concerning the integrity or fairness of its administration. J. Edgar Hoover nurtured and developed this agency into one which reflected the qualities and virtues which he held so dear.

As Director of our Nation's largest and most efficient investigatory agency, he had at his disposal the potential to wield overwhelming power over the course of our domestic and international affairs. It is a mark of tribute to the man that he never succumbed to such temptations. On the contrary, he was scrupulously careful to insure that his position and the FBI remain aloof from the affairs of politics.

Mr. Speaker, it is ironic and sad that 1 week from today J. Edgar Hoover would have marked the 48th anniversary of service to his country as Director of the FBI. Fortunately, as with all great men, he has left his mark upon his country and we are better for it. I am confident that in the days ahead, the FBI will continue to emulate the ideals which this great American practiced throughout his distinguished career of public service.

THE LATE HONORABLE J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1972

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join my colleagues in expressing shock and sincere sadness at the sudden passing of a great American.

The passing of J. Edgar Hoover is the passing of an era in our Nation's history. The story of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is the story of this man for it was to the FBI that he devoted himself during most of his adult life.

The FBI began to develop into the tremendous organization it is today only after President Coolidge named him director and gave him full backing in putting operations on a professional and nonpolitical basis.

Mr. Hoover devoted 48 years of his life to public service. Few individuals in our history have served as long and with such determined and highly successful dedication as J. Edgar Hoover.

He was demanding and exacting with all who served under him, but no more so than in the demands and efficiency he imposed upon himself.

He had his critics, many of whom were unknowing and unreasonable about what Mr. Hoover and his organization were trying to do in the public interest. I have noted many of these same individuals are coming forth to praise him now that he is gone.

For myself, I always have had the greatest respect and admiration for both Mr. Hoover and the FBI. He has been in the forefront of efforts to enforce law and order.

His arena was national, but he was ever ready to devote as much time and staff as he possibly could spare to help State and local law enforcement agencies improve

May 4, 1972

their systems and train their men to meet ever-changing threats to our daily lives.

Mr. Speaker, a great American has left our worldly midst. But he has left behind for us a legacy of devotion to duty and country which should be an inspiration to all. He was on the job to the last.

CONGRESSMAN SHOUP'S DISTRICT MEETINGS ON PUBLIC LANDS MANAGEMENT

HON. RICHARD G. SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, I invited interested citizens for a meeting at Big Sky Village, Superior, Mont., to search for ways to protect the forest environment and the local economy. The meeting was held April 1, 1972. The following describes the results of the meeting:

SUMMARY OF MEETING

Congressman Shoup opened the meeting by stating a conflict of interest existed between those wishing to protect the environment and those whose jobs depended on the continued harvesting of timber. Shoup said previous meetings had demonstrated many areas of agreement between the two factions and expressed the hope that the problem could be solved to the satisfaction of both parties.

Shoup said expressions of concern had reached him regarding how a lack of timber sales on U.S. forest lands could force businesses to close and unemployment, which was already serious, to become a greater problem.

Shoup said he hoped to have a clearer picture of the entire problem, as a result of the meetings, to enable him to draw up corrective legislation. He then called on Mr. Jack Large, Forest Supervisor for the Lolo National Forest, to speak on the situation in his area of responsibility.

Mr. Large spoke of the problems involved in identification of candidate areas for wilderness. He said new disciplines: hydrologists, landscape architects, geologists, wildlife biologists, and others are now used in planning timber sales with the intent of meeting objections raised heretofore.

Large said 158 million board feet had been programmed for sale last year in the Lolo National Forest, 96 million board feet this year and 132 million board feet for the coming fiscal year. He related that sales had been scheduled for unroaded areas, which have since been withdrawn, and that much mature timber already has been logged off, leaving little for sales.

Shoup stated he would support line items in the budget which are intended for roads, rather than having them deducted from the proceeds of sales.

Mr. Large replied that frequently the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) holds up those types of appropriations. He said many sales are three years in the making, a year to acquire rights-of-way, another in reconnaissance and a final year to make the sale.

Shoup asked what effect the 96 million board feet would have on the economy of Mineral County.

Dave Owen, of the U.S. Forest Service, stated there is very little backlog now.

Jack Large stated that as sales grow smaller, costs go up.

Tom Phillips, Diamond Match Corpora-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tion, said they currently have 13 to 14 million board feet under contract and said the future looked bleak, although he felt other firms were in greater difficulty. He stated that Van Evan and Pack River would be strong competitors for the sales in Mineral County. If timber sales were to stop entirely, he said they could operate for possibly two years, and at the end of one year they would be starting to feel the pinch.

Dave Owen said the U.S. Forest Service was having some difficulty in meeting all environmental requirements, but he felt they would be able to keep up with their goals.

Jack Large said that the federal employee reduction may require the USFS to contract some services . . . such as building roads . . . which would cut back the proceeds from sales paid to the counties. He said he agreed with me that some roads had been built to standards higher than necessary, which caused sale prices to escalate while, in some cases causing a meager return to the counties.

Ken Sims, a logger, complained that the roads frequently were poorly designed. He cited an instance where they were able to demonstrate to a ranger a better routing and began to build the road as so agreed. In the meantime, the ranger was transferred and his replacement, not understanding the informal agreement, held up further construction causing a loss of \$30,000 in down time. Sims closed by saying that an experienced contractor, on the ground, could frequently build a better road.

Shoup said that, in conversation with Steve Yurich, Regional Forester, he had said the USFS policy required one good trunk road into each area.

Jack Large noted that it was difficult to allow contractors or dozer operators to willy-nilly build roads, since cuts and fills had to be mathematically balanced. He added that this was a USFS responsibility and said that if the dirt were to roll down a slope and into a creek, his agency would be required to account for it.

Shoup spoke of a bill pending in the House, introduced by Congressman John Kyl, Iowa, which would provide for reforestation. Funds would come from existing tariffs on imported wood products. He said immediate plantations in logged-over areas would have the effect of increasing the present allowable cut on a sustained yield basis.

Jack Large, responding to a question, from an unidentified individual, on restraints of mining activity, said mining had been less restricted than had logging operations. He noted that restrictions on the manner and use of heavy equipment have been implemented in line with new environmental constraints.

An unidentified individual asked if there was anything being done to assist western Montana counties with "in lieu of tax payments."

Shoup spoke of the difficulty counties have in budgeting on the basis of stumpage. He stated the Public Land Law Review Commission has been aware of the problem and has made recommendations and policies are now being worked out; however, Shoup said he wasn't aware of any time table other than that a bill would be introduced expressing the sense of Congress on the subject and the hope that it would pass during the current session.

David Owen stated that productive timber areas within the state have shown a high return, but that the state has used those monies as their share of the school foundation program. He felt that work should be done at the state level to alter the policy.

An unidentified individual asked why the USFS was trying to put large portions of the forests into wilderness status.

Shoup stated that in Region I there are about seven million acres, 1.5 million of which are being studied for possible inclusion into the wilderness system, while the

balance is not being considered. He noted that it had been suggested that all unroaded areas automatically be considered as wilderness candidate areas but this had not been done. He said that the USFS had been trying to feel the public pulse and manage the forests accordingly, and when conservationists brought pressure to bear, the USFS responded accordingly.

Elmer Tillotson asked how the USFS had arrived at the 1.5 million acre figure for wilderness candidate study.

Dave Owens of the USFS explained how, in the Lolo National Forest, they had considered 11 areas using a rating system combined with public meetings to receive inputs from the public as to their needs. Qualities such as solitude, scenic beauty, lack of man and his works, plant and animal life, and undisturbed water courses and other items were considered in the study, while also weighing the areas mineral, timber and water resources and their possible present and future use in the local and national economy. He noted that the potential mineral values were extremely difficult to measure and consider in their studies; forcing them to put heavy reliance on the U.S. Geological Survey's recommendations plus conclusions drawn from old mining activity in a given area. He noted that while the USFS can suggest an area to be included in wilderness, only Congress has the authority to do so. He said areas which had previously been designated as primitive areas, were being managed by the USFS as wilderness and would continue as such until final determination has been made.

John A. Anderson complained that he felt the freedoms of the people were being withdrawn by the USFS.

Elmer Tillotson asked for clarification on how a wilderness status is arrived at.

Shoup stated that in each instance, the area is judged solely on its merits. He said if the area under consideration was thought to have significant amounts of commercial timber, it probably wouldn't qualify as wilderness.

Donna McVey asked what the USFS intended to do about trash and litter management in back country areas.

Jack Large conceded that the USFS had not as yet been able to solve the problem and likened the situation to the ones faced by many cities.

Dave Owen said that the present approach to the problem was to educate the public to clean up after themselves, since enforcement was nearly impossible.

Shoup said that the sincerity of those who littered, while professing a love of the forest, was suspect.

Jack Large commented that management of wilderness was difficult because of its size and lack of personnel. He added that the USFS must solicit the assistance of back country users in their management roles.

Russell Corn asked how moths damaged fir trees.

Jack Large said that not enough is known on the subject other than the moth does debilitate the trees and some die. He said research is being conducted to better understand what actually happens and how to prevent it.

Sharon Procopio asked if there was anything new to report relative to a possible interchange location at the west end of Superior.

Shoup reported that he had requested the Federal Highway Administration (F.H.A.) to rule in the affirmative on the request. I noted that the Montana Highway Department had recommended the interchange and the F.H.A. Division Engineer for Montana had endorsed the project. He said they had reason for cautious optimism in light of a favorable ruling on a similar interchange request elsewhere in the district.

An unidentified individual stated that a request for a federal grant had been filed in

order for the community to build a hospital. He asked if writing letters to me and other members of the delegation would help in securing the grant.

Shoup said it would indicate public interest and support and urged them to write.

Ken Sims asked if there were figures available to demonstrate the worth to the national economy of each 1,000 board feet of timber processed.

Jack Large said he had seen such figures worked up to the economy of the Flathead Valley, but not for the nation as a whole. He said that it was commonly understood that each dollar, generated from forest products, went through the local community several times and the same product generated other dollars as it headed toward and reached its ultimate use. He cited the transportation industry, the building material dealers and craftsmen who all partake of the financial benefits.

Shoup stated he too had seen the Flathead Valley study and that, as best his memory served him, if the timber sales were held at the present schedule of 96 mbf with the current backlog, the Flathead Valley would lose \$8,000,000.

Ken Sims paid tribute to the dedication of both industry and ecologists but said if the latter group does not condone cutting, they are then, in effect, favoring waste because the timber will either rot or burn. He suggested that an educational program be instituted to explain what occurs when harvesting by man does not take place.

Mrs. John Howell stated that ecologists had conducted an effective publicity campaign while industry had defaulted.

Jack Large said the pendulum is swinging back toward the center. He urged the people to attend and participate in public meetings in order that their views become known to the USFS. He added that the economic future of Mineral County looked bright, based on the availability of natural resources. He cautioned, however, that the land must be wisely managed to maintain the productive capacity of the timber, fisheries and recreation.

Elmer Tillotson asked what consideration the USFS gives to the economy in their management in their management decisions.

Jack Large stated that if, in management, a decision is made resulting in loss of one percent of the soil, then that was a wrong decision. He said the land must be managed to retain 100% of its potential for the future. If we allow a clear cut sale in which there is a loss of the soil base, we have erred, he concluded.

Shoup stated that in the past the USFS made estimates on the quantities of wood fiber available annually and invited its harvest but, due to complaints, that management method is no longer used. He said that the old system had encouraged investment based on USFS estimates of availability of timber and those estimates have now been proven to be excessively high. The resultant cutback in the allowable cut has caused economic hardship. He urged those present to continue to attend public hearings and let their opinions be heard regarding land management.

There being no further questions or comments, the meeting closed.

OPERATION PUSH

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, there is a new organization dedicated to the economic, political, and cultural independ-

ence of black Americans. That organization is Operation PUSH led by the Reverend Jesse L. Jackson. Last month, PUSH held its outstanding New York soul picnic, a tribute to black heroes and heroines. As one who was privileged to attend this affair and as a strong supporter of Rev. Jackson's efforts on behalf of the black people of the United States, I am pleased to insert the platform of Operation PUSH in the RECORD at this time:

OPERATION PUSH PLATFORM

We, the People United to Save Humanity, believe that humanity will be saved and served only when justice is done for all people. We believe that we must challenge the economic, political, and social forces that make us subservient to others; and that we must assume the power (of being) given us by the Power of God. We believe that our worth as humane people is expressed in our united efforts to secure justice for all persons. We therefore, state our declaration of goals.

1. PUSH for a comprehensive economic plan for the development of Black and poor people. This plan will include status as underdeveloped enclaves entitled to consideration by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

2. PUSH for humane alternatives to the welfare system.

3. PUSH for the revival of the labor movement to protect organized workers and to organize unorganized workers.

4. PUSH for a survival Bill of Rights for all children up to the age of 18 guaranteeing their food, clothing, shelter, medical care and education.

5. PUSH for a survival Bill of Rights for the aging guaranteeing adequate food, clothing, shelter, medical care and meaningful programs.

6. PUSH for full political participation including an automatic voter registration as a right of citizenship.

7. PUSH to elect to local, state and federal offices persons committed to humane economic and social programs.

8. PUSH for humane conditions in prisons and sound rehabilitation programs.

9. PUSH for a Bill of Rights for veterans whose needs are ignored.

10. PUSH for adequate health care for all people based upon need.

11. PUSH for quality education regardless of race, religion or creed.

12. PUSH for economic and social relationships with the nations of Africa in order to build African/Afro-American unity.

13. PUSH for national unity among all organizations working for the humane economic, political and social development of people.

14. PUSH for a relevant theology geared to regenerating depressed and oppressed peoples.

15. PUSH for Black excellence. We are dedicated to reaching our goals through the research, education, development and execution of direct action programs that provide for economic, political and cultural independence.

**MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—
HOW LONG?**

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

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

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

RARICK'S TESTIMONY IN OPPOSITION TO POLITICAL ACTIVITY BY TAX-EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I testified this morning before the Ways and Means Committee in opposition to H.R. 13720 and related legislation seeking to extend further privileges to special interest groups already operating tax exempt under existing law.

The testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JOHN R. RARICK

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to testify today in opposition to legislation designed to quantify percentagewise the measure of legislative activity in which a section 501 (c) (3) organization may engage without jeopardizing its tax-exempt status.

I represent people, not special privilege groups or classes, some of whom already enjoy the benefit of tax exemption. This legislation would grant further special privilege by allowing organizations already enjoying tax exemptions to escape further responsibility.

Especially is this so when we consider that non-profit, tax-exempt organizations are authorized under many of the Federal programs to receive grants and Federal funds. The prospect that non-profit, tax-exempt organizations would be licensed to use taxpayers' money to lobby for further programs for greater participation and more Federal money to achieve their goals and objectives is unfair to say the least.

Examples of such action are: This large printed volume funded by an EPA grant of almost \$50,000 in taxpayers funds to the Institute for the Study of Health and Society. It is entitled "Engineering A Victory for our Environment: A Citizens Guide to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers." Any reasonable interpretation of the book shows it to be a manual for the mobilization of grassroots citizens—the environmentalists and ecologists—to deter or stop the U.S. Corps of Engineers water development projects. Projects which were also approved and funded by this Congress from the taxpayers dollars.

This is a paperback volume received gratuitously by every Member this week. It is called "Windows on Day Care" and acknowledges an OEO contract—OEO money authorized to help the poor and destitute.

Incidentally, both of these volumes are marked "Copyright" so despite tax subsidy they are limited in their distribution and reproduction without permission of the publisher.

Then the May 1st Washington Post reported the Meyer Foundation, started by its former board chairman, had made a \$100,000 grant as matching funds for federal support of a child development center in Washington, D.C. The Comprehensive Child Development program was vetoed by President Nixon last year, yet the taxpayers are now forced to bear continuation of the program by tax-exempt seed money to continue the experiment until such time as it may become federal law and funded directly by the taxpayers.

**THE PROVISIONS OF THE LEGISLATION
Affecting lobbying activities**

The legislation presently before this Commission would license organizations privileged by exemption from taxes under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code to devote 20% of their expenditures to communications with legislative bodies for the purpose of influencing legislation, 5% of which may be expended in communication with the general public for the purpose of influencing legislation. In other words, Mr. Chairman, this legislation would not only allow such an organization to lobby directly, up to 20% of its expenditures, but it would allow these organizations to, in effect, organize and influence the general public into a secondary lobbying force with far greater consequences.

Furthermore, this legislation which purports to place a 20% limitation on lobbying proceeds to exempt other activities in lobbying from any limitation.

(a) The dissemination of the results of nonpartisan analysis, study, or research;

(b) Appearances before or communications with a legislative body, at the request of the legislative body; and

(c) Appearances before or communications with a legislative body regarding matters affecting the existence of the organization, its powers and duties, or its tax-exempt status.

The inclusion of these exceptions renders the 20% limitation imposed by this legislation on lobbying expenses meaningless. Exception (a) would, in effect, exclude the cost of the only reasonable lobbying activity on the part of these organizations from the total amount allowed for communication with the general public. Tax-exempt organizations would be licensed to spend up to 5% of their total budget for emotional appeals to the American people inasmuch as it would place no restrictions whatsoever on expenditures to present so-called "non-partisan analysis, study, or research" to the American people. Exactly what makes such a study "nonpartisan," or objective, is not made clear, nor is it clear who will have ultimate jurisdiction over such a question.

Exceptions (b) and (c), in a similar manner, would exclude the cost of the only reasonable lobbying activity on the part of these organizations from the total amount allowed for communications with legislative bodies for lobbying purposes. In other words, Mr. Chairman, this legislation fails to quantify percentagewise the measure of lobbying activity in which a section 501 (c) (3) organization may engage without jeopardizing its tax-exempt status because it frees from any limitation the only reasonable lobbying activities available to these organizations. Presumably, the 20% limitation would be applicable only to those activities designed to manipulate public opinion to obtain the desired legislative action to please the tax-exempt organizations governing body.

Finally, the use of the word *normally* in lines 14 and 19 of page 2 of this legislation raises serious questions about the provisions of this bill applying any limitation to lobbying expenses or activities on the part of these organizations. This passage is worth noting in its entirety because it appears to render invalid any action against these organizations:

"Exemption from taxation . . . shall not be denied because a substantial part of the activities of such organization consists of carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation, unless, with respect to the total of the amounts . . . paid by such organization . . . during each taxable year to influence legislation . . . normally exceed 20 percent, or (B) amounts paid or incurred by such organization . . . normally exceed 5 percent."

There is no attempt in this legislation to define the word *normally*; if, for example, it

means an average over, say a five year span, then an organization could reasonably expect to spend 10% of its budget on lobbying activities for four of the five years and, all within the law, spend 60% of its budget for lobbying activities in the 5th year of the span. This possibility is certainly within reason as it is generally true that the legislative bodies of this country will not consider legislation affecting the same topic every year during a five year span, thus these organizations would not be affected except occasionally by legislation. Such a situation raises insurmountable obstacles to any attempt to maintain an objective legislative process in the representation of our people.

Affecting tax deductions for contributions

Mr. Chairman, the provisions of this legislation relative to tax deductions for contributions to these tax-exempt organizations appears to be totally unworkable. The bill reads, page 6, lines 17ff, "No deduction shall be allowed under this section for a contribution for the use of an organization described in subsection (c) if the contribution is made for the purpose of influencing legislation (as defined in section 501(f) (5))."

If this section of the legislation is enacted into law, two possibilities can occur: (1) either the charitable organization must ask that all donations be made for a specified purpose, in which case, the organization's ability to raise money will be seriously affected; or (2) an individual who makes an unspecified contribution to one of these charitable organizations or institutions covered by this legislation will be able to claim only that portion of his contribution that corresponds to the percentage of the organization's budget not expended for lobbying purposes. The absurdity of such a situation is evident, especially in the light of the recent hue and cry for simplified tax forms. The alternative—allowing a tax deduction for all such contributions regardless of use by the organization—is even more abhorrent and contrary to the American system.

THE EFFECTS OF THIS LEGISLATION

Enactment of this legislation could only result in increasing the power of the rich and super rich and their control over the life of the American citizen. This is not populist legislation; it cannot benefit the people in general. On the contrary, this is elitist legislation that can only benefit the ultra wealthy already in power in this country. This legislation would only legalize the pressure activities of the minority rule of those already in control of our society.

Consider, for example, the decision-making process of the organizations affected by this legislation. Usually this power rests with a governing board which is either made up of or controlled by the largest contributors to the organization. This is generally true on all levels of government.

As usual, money talks; and those people who, by virtue of their success in the public sector, can afford to make large, tax-free contributions to these organizations have considerable power and control over their activities. Not content with their already considerable power in public sector resulting from their economic power, they would now be licensed to further their influence while veiling their strength behind "charitable" causes.

Enactment of this legislation could but further increase the power of those men already in control of much of our lives by virtue of their economic power. Furthermore, passage of this legislation would enlarge existing tax loopholes by which the rich and super rich avoid their fair share of the cost of running our government and living in our free society. This legislation is doubly discriminatory. First, it discriminates against the taxpayer who receives no tax-exempt loophole; and, secondly, it discriminates against the taxpayer who is limited to a \$50 "campaign contribution," yet is denied any

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

voice in lobbying to influence the nation's political activity. If the Committee seriously considers this bill, I would suggest a 20% tax deduction to every American taxpayer and with similar exemption from the limitation as would be herein granted to the tax-exempt organization—all to be tax deductible. If we are going to open the doors for tax-exempt lobbying, let us at least give the taxpayer a chance in the fight for his Congressman's and Senator's votes.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to return "power to the people, this legislation should be stopped in Committee. I urge this Committee give every consideration of the evils of this legislation and then for the good of the American people kill it.

The War for Independence was fought over "taxation without representation"—Let's not go to the extreme of government-supported representation without taxation. I personally feel that the Committee would better spend its time and serve the American people by considering legislation to close the tax loopholes and tax all of the wealth of our land.

Thank you for this opportunity to appear before you this morning.

HON. J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to J. Edgar Hoover who has passed away from our midst in the Government of the United States. It will be a loss that will long be remembered and history should record his efforts in life with due respect. But, rather than mourn in sorrow, I believe Mr. Hoover, the departed Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, would have us look ahead, and take heed.

I, personally, would like to bring out those qualities in his life which should be a model for our present generation of young Americans, the qualities which will always enhance rather than retard that American way which has been the envy of other nations. For it is of individuals that our Nation is composed, individuals who pave way for others to follow and emanate. And J. Edgar Hoover was such an example.

Born on New Year's Day, 77 years ago in Washington, D.C., J. Edgar Hoover grew up in the Nation's Capital City. Although he was the smallest boy in his high school's cadet company, he soon became their captain. And guided by the ideal of doing one's best all of the time, "Speed" as he was nicknamed, "chastised" all his friends with a certain morality which was to become his hallmark in everything he did. There was never any question of honor and justice about him.

Graduated as valedictorian of his class, his determination to prove himself and succeed was always evident. He began as messenger in the Library of Congress, and evenings studied law at George Washington University. In due time he achieved the bachelor of laws and master of laws degrees and was admitted to the bar and practiced law.

After World War I, following some experiences in wartime counter espionage,

he was appointed special assistant to then Attorney General Palmer, directing a newly created General Intelligence Division. In 1921 he was appointed assistant director of the FBI and 3 years later became its chief, which he has been ever since. It is no doubt the longest period that any public servant of his stature has served our Nation—over half a century.

Upon becoming the Director of the FBI, he found that it was a "sloppy, demoralized agency" which in a short time Hoover turned into "one of the finest, most efficient law enforcement agencies the world has ever known," according to Time magazine. Seeking other dedicated public servants to work with him he soon filled his staff with qualified members of the bar and experienced accountants. New departments of training were instituted, new scientific methods of criminal detection studies and a central bureau for fingerprints set up.

It was through these efforts and organizational skill that "public enemies" such as Baby Face Nelson, John Dillinger, and Pretty Boy Floyd were apprehended and solutions of a large number of kidnapping cases solved. He was indeed the man for those times, and admiration for J. Edgar Hoover by the public and Government officials grew daily. At the same time he became a target for those who feared law and order, and who belittled his efforts to maintain the safety and security of our Nation.

During this era of the 1930's, 1940's, and even mid-1950's, the idol of the American boy and girl was the "fighting G-man, destroying the forces of crime and evil." It was a healthy image for our youngsters—certainly much healthier and saner than ones being promoted from some quarters in this day—polluting the minds of our posterity and confusing them to no end.

The charges of his critics have been as unsupported as the denunciations against a truly dedicated public servant. His work was his life and the morality he adopted as young cadet in high school guided all his years of life. He said:

In every field of human endeavor, he that is first must perpetually live in the white light of publicity. . . . When a man's work becomes a standard for the whole world, it also becomes a target for the shafts of the envious few.

The record of the Justice Department's Federal Bureau of Investigation is almost perfect—a yearly average of over 90 percent of cases brought to court.

When World War II came, Mr. Hoover again set about to organize his General Intelligence Division in the Bureau, viewing with clear perspective the menace communism posed to all free governments. This, naturally, only intensified the enmity and vengeance of this, and our Nation's detractors. All sorts of stories were aired about Hoover's personal life and the methods he used—for it was a do-or-die struggle to get Hoover out. Much like the "War of the Roses," it became obvious that Mr. Hoover had treaded on something "very touchy"—for which he would never be forgiven—much like our President Nixon.

To be an unremitting foe of corruption in politics will earn any decent man a

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"badge of courage," and Mr. Hoover has earned it every day, to his dying day. Serving under eight Presidents—from Coolidge to Mr. Nixon, who had their utmost confidence in his work, dedication to his country and its system of government. J. Edgar Hoover stands out well as a fighter for freedom—also much like our President Richard M. Nixon.

My fellow colleagues in the Congress, I could certainly go on and on extolling the virtues of our departed public servant, but after all is said, one should remember the most important attribute of this man "the quality of life and service he promoted and which we should understand and promote among ourselves and with our posterity. Like Plato the Greek philosopher whose motto was to seek perfection in every act one undertakes, so did Mr. Hoover promote and instill the need for excellence in performance. He realized that "a law enforcement agency is only as good as the support it receives from the public. And over the long run, the public cannot be fooled. Only demonstrated performance produces the respect and cooperation necessary to achieve the results FBI responsibilities demand—and which the public has every right to expect."

Particularly in this, "our age," when the call for excellence and doing one's best, has been so circumvented: When the encouragement for mediocrity and free handouts without effort is being promulgated—we should take heed of this departed man's goals in his own lifetime. Unless we do take heed, seriously, and begin propagating the morality which has always been the standard of our American way of life; unless each individual does every day to really "earn his keep" rather than demand something which rightfully he or she has not earned, then I can see only a downfall of the system which has offered so much to so many in the past; a system which is the unrealized ideal of those compelled to live under totalitarian regimes. The cornucopia of life cannot produce endlessly. There is a need for rededication to the ideals which made this country great so that we can continue developing the quality of life we all seek.

Rest in peace, J. Edgar Hoover. I believe that the ideals by which you were guided will take form with us and with our posterity as we are reminded of your life and your passing.

PENSION RELIEF FOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a situation involving our World War I veterans which urgently needs correction.

Several of my constituents who are World War I veterans have lost their veterans pensions when social security

and another retirement pension were increased. This causes a great hardship to these individuals who rely on this money for basic necessities.

The purpose of increasing pensions and social security benefits is to account for increases in the cost of living. By cutting off veterans pensions when others are increased, this purpose is negated. The veteran is still in the position of trying to maintain a decent standard of living in an inflated economy—and, in fact, he is often worse off than before pension increases.

There is legislation pending in the Veterans' Affairs Committee which would exempt increases in social security, railroad retirement, and Federal retirement pensions as income in determining pensions for World War I veterans. I urge my colleagues on the committee to give this matter their immediate attention to help the veterans who gave their efforts when the country was in need.

FINAL REPORT OF THE AMERICAN ASSEMBLY ON THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED NATIONS, 1972

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, April 13 to 16, 1972, I joined 35 others at Arden House, Harriman, N.Y., in the American Assembly on the United States and the United Nations. The final report of this assembly is now available.

My colleagues will be interested in this product of our 4 days of discussion. The report follows, preceded by a brief description of the American Assembly and a listing of the trustees and officers of this affiliate of Columbia University:

THE AMERICAN ASSEMBLY ON THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED NATIONS, 1972

PREFACE

These pages contain the views of a group of 36 Americans who met April 13-16, 1972, at Arden House, Harriman, New York, to consider the United States role in the United Nations in the face of public and Congressional controversy over that organization greater than at any previous time in its history. Among the principal issues discussed were: use of the U.N. in American foreign policy; U.N. decision-making arrangements; financial and management problems; and federal government organization for U.N. affairs.

The meeting was held under the auspices of The American Assembly of Columbia University, which regularly convenes for the purpose of focusing attention on issues of public importance. The recommendations of this Assembly were adopted in a final plenary session on April 16 after two full days of discussion at a committee of the whole. There were also three evening sessions: an address by Justice Arthur Goldberg; and panel sessions with Assistant Secretary of State Samuel DePalma and Ambassador Charles Yost, and Congressmen John Culver, F. Bradford Morse, and James Scheuer.

The Assembly was directed by Richard N. Gardner, Henry L. Moses Professor of Law and International Organization at Columbia University and former Deputy Assistant Sec-

retary of State Professor Bardner led the daily deliberations and prepared the draft report.

As a non-partisan educational forum The American Assembly takes no official stand on matters it presents for public discussion. The opinions herein belong to the participants, who represented themselves and not necessarily the institutions or persons with whom they are affiliated. The Charles F. Kettering Foundation, which provided generous financial support for this Assembly, is also neutral toward this report and is not to be associated with its findings and recommendations.

CLIFFORD C. NELSON,
President,
The American Assembly.

FINAL REPORT OF THE AMERICAN ASSEMBLY ON THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED NATIONS

(At the close of their discussions the participants in the American Assembly on *The United States and the United Nations*, at Arden House, Harriman, New York, April 13-16, 1972, reviewed as a group the following report. The report represents general agreement; however no one was asked to sign it; and not every participant supported every statement in it.)

The time has come for a major recommitment by the United States to the United Nations and the processes of multilateral diplomacy. Our government has already taken a number of initiatives to adjust our foreign policies to a world in which the United States no longer exercises preponderant power. The Nixon Doctrine embodies the principle that the United States should do less by itself and more in cooperation with others. The President has further called for a new "structure of peace" based on five major power centers—the United States, the Soviet Union, China, Japan and an enlarged European community.

While the search for a new power balance is a legitimate objective, a balance of power alone is not good enough. Balance of power politics, by itself, has never brought peace in the past. It will not do so in the future unless it is accompanied by institutional arrangements to accommodate the interests of the competing power centers. Moreover, countries outside the five centers of power will demand—and rightly so—a fair measure of participation in the world political process. The "structure of peace" which the President calls for needs a strong institutional foundation and expression—centered in the United Nations.

Balance of power politics, by itself, is inadequate in the face of the unprecedented situation in which mankind now finds itself. As a result of revolutionary developments in science, technology, economics and communications, the nations of the world face a series of common challenges that require common responses. These challenges include the expensive and dangerous arms race, the explosion of the world's population, the pollution of the common biosphere, and the rising demands of impoverished masses for a decent standard of life. New forms of global cooperation and even planetary planning are essential to insure the well-being and perhaps the survival of the human race.

We have reached a critical point in our country's relations with the United Nations—a situation that endangers the best interests of the United States. We have a vital interest in the development of international institutions to deal with mankind's common problems. Yet we appear to be on a collision course with the very international agencies in whose future we have an important stake.

We are defaulting on our multilateral commitments:

We have imported chrome from Rhodesia in violation of a legally binding embargo for which we voted in the Security Council.

We have refused to pay our assessments to the International Labor Organization.

We have failed to appropriate promised funds for the expansion of the U.N. headquarters in New York.

We have neglected to perform our part of internationally agreed arrangements to grant tariff preferences to developing countries, and we have so far neglected to provide promised additional resources for multilateral development banks.

Although these defaults are of recent origin, they are the culmination of a process of erosion in our multilateral diplomacy during recent years under both Democratic and Republican Administrations. While taking laudable initiative in areas such as disaster relief, population, the environment, narcotics, and seabeds, we have shown diminishing interest in the U.N.'s basic Charter functions of peacekeeping, development, and human rights. At the same time, our military actions in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic have further weakened the U.N. and respect for international law.

Other countries have often behaved even less responsibly toward international organizations than the United States. But the failures of others and the shortcomings of the U.N. system are no reason for us not to support international institutions and programs vital to our own and to the general interest. Moreover, the future of the U.N. and of the other great world agencies inevitably depends in large measure on what we do.

I

A major effort is needed to revive and improve the United Nations as a peacekeeping and peacemaking agency. The new tasks which the United Nations has assumed in such areas as environment, population and drug control are no substitutes for the United Nations' political role. Indeed there are limits to which these functions can be performed effectively by the U.N. if the political functions continue to atrophy. Without more effective peacekeeping and peacemaking, the U.N. is unlikely to command the public support and the institutional vitality required for the discharge of its non-political functions. Equally important, global functional cooperation cannot long endure in a world of violence and disorder.

The United Nations, with all its disappointments, has already made important contributions to international peace and security—in Korea, in the Congo, in Cyprus and elsewhere. Yet confidence in its peacekeeping and peacemaking role is now at a low ebb. Some critics see the cause in certain institutional difficulties—disparity between voting power and capacity to act, defects in the functioning of the Security Council and General Assembly, and weaknesses in the administration of the Secretariat.

Without denying many of these deficiencies, this American Assembly does not believe that they can be remedied by attempts at sweeping Charter revision. If a second San Francisco Conference were held today, it is doubtful that we could achieve as good a documentation as we have now. Most of the steps needed to strengthen the U.N.'s political role can be achieved without a change in the Charter by fundamental alterations in the policies of member states.

The most obvious change required in national policy is the willingness to apply the Charter limitations on the unilateral use of armed force and the willingness to submit political issues to the processes of peaceful settlement. It may be many years before certain members are willing to implement these fundamental obligations. Yet there is much that the United States can do to strengthen the United Nations by improving its own standards of international conduct and by taking initiatives in the U.N.

This American Assembly recommends:

1. We should apply Charter standards on

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

use of force and peaceful settlement to our own behavior as well as to the behavior of others.

2. We should seek, at the highest political level, a resolution of the Charter issues over the initiation, financing and effective management of U.N. peacemaking operations. We urge the President to underline our concern with this question in his meetings with the leaders of the Soviet Union and other world powers.

3. We should support improved arrangements for preventive diplomacy under the auspices of the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Secretary-General, including strengthened fact-finding and mediation procedures. We should agree to accept such procedures in any dispute to which we are a party. Except in the most vital areas of national security, we should accept third-party judgment by a procedural majority in the Security Council, by a General Assembly majority including a specified majority of countries specially interested in the matter at issue or by decision of the International Court of Justice. Our self-judging Connally Amendment to the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court should be withdrawn.

4. We should seek the creation, at the earliest date feasible, and in concert with others, of those measures for peacekeeping and peacemaking which have been proposed by the Lodge Commission and recent policy panels of the United Nations Association, notably a standby U.N. peace force, a U.N. peace fund, a U.N. corps for humanitarian and relief missions and an enlarged group of military observers.

5. We should make available to the U.N. the most modern communications equipment and earmark airlift facilities for use in future peacekeeping emergencies. We should also urge the International Telecommunication Satellite Consortium (Intelsat) to make voice channels available without charge for U.N. operational requirements.

6. We urge the President and the Congress to observe the U.N.'s embargo on trade with Rhodesia.

II

We call for enlarged participation by the United States in multilateral economic and social cooperation. We should recognize that our interests in environmental protection and population control will not be achieved without a massive increase in the quantity and quality of global assistance efforts. Action in these areas will cost large sums of money that the developing countries do not have. Moreover, many of them will resist action in environmental and population control if international development assistance is static or declining.

We view with concern the tendency to regard some U.N. programs as exclusively favoring one group of nations or another. It is understandable that individual nations and groups of nations will attach priority to particular programs. However, it is essential to recognize that mutual support is necessary if all nations are to enjoy the mutual benefits that inevitably flow from effective international cooperation.

Until the middle of the 1960's, the basic limitation on the increase in multilateral efforts lay in the willingness of other countries to match U.S. assistance efforts. Today the situation is reversed. The volume of multilateral aid is limited by the unwillingness of the United States to put up its fair share. Such assistance should not be considered "foreign aid"; it is our investment in civilization.

The time has come to press much more vigorously for improvements in the administration of multilateral aid programs. The time has also come for the United States to be a recipient of, as well as a contributor to, U.N. assistance efforts.

We feel that it is essential for the United

Nations to have the technical structure to research and develop models of systems which reflect the interrelationship of national human and environmental factors throughout our own global system.

Therefore:

1. We call upon the President to seek immediate Congressional action to appropriate our promised share of the funds for the International Development Association and the regional development banks.

2. We urge the President and the Congress to approve annual increases in our contributions to the U.N. development program, so that our yearly contribution reaches a minimum of \$200 million by 1975.

3. We urge our government to condition these increases in our assistance on improvements in the headquarters and field operations of the UNDP, including the more rigorous application of performance standards.

4. We should seek advice and technical assistance from international agencies in dealing with pressing domestic problems, such as urbanization and mass transportation.

5. We urge our government to take steps to restore the vitality of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the International Monetary Fund so that they may become the principal forums for decision-making on trade and monetary questions. In place of the group of developed countries known as the Group of Ten, we propose the creation within the IMF of a policy group of finance ministers from both developed and developing countries.

6. We urge continued U.S. leadership at the forthcoming Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment, the 1973 Conference on the Law of the Sea, and the 1974 World Population Conference. To this end we propose the appointment of special ambassadors to direct our preparations for the Law of the Sea and population conferences.

III

The crisis in our relations to the United Nations finds acute expression in pressing financial issues.

It is indefensible that the United States should withhold funds from the U.N. system in violation of its legal obligations. There is no justification for refusing to pay our assessed dues to the International Labor Organization. Withdrawal from the ILO unless the Congress appropriates the necessary funds could deal a death blow to an organization needed to deal with world-wide problems in whose solution we have an important stake—mass unemployment and the achievement of fair labor standards.

Also indefensible is Congressional insistence that a portion of our U.N. assessments be paid in U.S. owned foreign currencies. Congress should appropriate as soon as possible the dollar amounts to liquidate our indebtedness on this account.

The U.N. faces a desperate cash shortage due in part to failure of members to pay their due assessments at the beginning of each calendar year. In this regard the United States is a major offender. We must pay our assessments on time.

Capacity to perform peacekeeping and other functions is also jeopardized by the large and growing deficit resulting from refusal to certain members to pay their assessed obligations, particularly the Soviet Union and France. These countries, together with the Peoples Republic of China, are also withholding that portion of their current budget assessments for certain contested items in the regular budget, such as payment of interest and principal on the U.N. bonds. Although we bear no responsibility for this part of the U.N.'s financial problem, it would be in our interest to make a reasonable contribution to a comprehensive financial settlement, provided the Soviet Union and France made substantial contributions.

Most serious of all is the controversy over

fair shares of money and influence. Our country currently pays 31.52 percent of the regular budget of the U.N. There is some merit in the recommendation that the U.S. share of the U.N.'s regular budget be reduced to 25 percent "over a period of years." It is not in the interest of the world community for the U.N.'s basic operations to be overly dependent on any one nation's contribution. Taking into account the probable entry of the two Germanys into the U.N. in 1973 and the increases already agreed to in the assessments of other members, the U.S. share of the budget will be reduced to between 28 and 29 percent for the period 1974-76.

But we believe an effort to achieve a reduction to 25 percent in the immediate future is both impractical and unwise. It could be effectively achieved only by persuading virtually all of the developed non-Communist countries to forego the full amount of the reduction in assessments to which they would be entitled as a result of the admission of new members. We have no case for asking them to do this, since even after devaluation we represent more than 30 percent of the national income of the total membership. We could succeed in this effort only by the threat of unilateral Congressional action—a threat which could undermine their willingness to cooperate with us on other questions.

An effort to apply the 25 percent limitation at the next General Assembly would involve a misuse of our bargaining power in the U.N. for comparatively trifling amounts—approximately \$6 million annual in the U.N. regular budget and less than \$20 million in the assessed budgets of other U.N. agencies. We have bigger interests at stake on which to apply our limited negotiating leverage. The United States should be focusing on the question of how to achieve greater influence in the U.N.'s budget and policy-making process and how to persuade the organization to improve its financial and management practices. We can only compromise our chances for reaching these objectives through an abrupt reduction in financial support which polarizes U.N. attitudes and throws the organization into political crisis. As President Nixon declared in his "State of the World" message: "In view of the U.N.'s current financial difficulties, and of the requirements of international law, we must proceed in an orderly way in reaching this goal. It is unrealistic to expect that it can be done immediately."

Therefore:

1. Congress should without delay appropriate the funds owned by our country to the International Labor Organization and to the other U.N. agencies.

2. The U.S. should pay its dues at the beginning of each calendar year as called for in the U.N.'s financial regulations. The Executive Branch could take a step in this direction by paying the dues as soon as the funds are appropriated, but full compliance would require a double appropriation from Congress in one year. We urge the Executive Branch to seek such a double appropriation in the spring of 1973.

3. The United States should seek actively a comprehensive settlement of the United Nations deficit which would include retirement of the U.N. bond issue and removal of certain controversial items from the regular budget. We should also be prepared to waive monies owed us by the U.N. and be willing to make a modest cash contribution provided the Soviet Union, France, and other countries make substantial contributions.

4. The United States should not insist on establishing the 25 percent ceiling at the forthcoming General Assembly or for the 1974-76 triennium. We should, of course, receive our share of the reductions in our assessment to which we are entitled as a result of the admission of new members and the

increases already agreed to in the assessments of other countries.

5. We should make every effort to increase our influence and the influence of other major contributors to U.N. budgets in the decisionmaking process on budgets and programs. We should seek such basic reforms as (a) creating a budget bureau within the Secretariat and (b) enhancing the authority of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

IV

To participate more effectively in international organizations we shall need to reform our domestic arrangements for shaping and implementing policy in multilateral diplomacy. Reforms are needed in the Department of State, and the White House, in the U.S. Missions to International Organizations, in the Congress, in the recruitment of Americans for the international secretariats, in techniques for mobilizing public support, and in performing our hostship obligations in New York City.

Responsibility for multilateral policy-making is now scattered through a wide variety of executive agencies in Washington. Some progress has been made in strengthening the machinery for coordination, but more could be done. Moreover, we need new arrangements to assert the importance of international institutions at the highest level of the Department of State and in the White House itself.

Our missions to international agencies must be strengthened if they are to become adequate instruments for an effective multilateral diplomacy. The U.S. Mission to the United Nations has been weakened by staff cuts, the departure of experienced personnel, and the difficulty of finding adequate replacements. For years our mission to the European headquarters to the United Nations at Geneva has been treated as an inferior foreign service assignment or as a resting ground for the politically deserving. In neither mission do we have sufficient personnel with the specialized professional skills to handle the U.N.'s complex new activities in trade and development, population and environment, science and technology, and the law of the sea. The problem of recruiting for the U.S. Mission to the U.N. is complicated further by a lack of housing allowances to compensate for the high cost of living in New York City.

We are gratified by the selection of Bradford Morse and Rudolph Peterson for the two most senior posts in the United Nations occupied by American citizens. These appointments are encouraging evidence that our government does give serious attention to recruitment for international organizations when it comes to the highest posts. But neither the Department of State nor the U.S. Mission to the U.N. is devoting adequate attention to recruitment at lower levels. More needs to be done to recruit from the scientific, academic and business communities and to interest outstanding young people in international service.

We are also concerned about the failure of Congressional leadership. We condemn the arbitrary and irresponsible treatment that has been given in recent years to certain appropriations for international organizations. We appeal to the Congress to take a more enlightened attitude toward the international institutions and programs so important to our national interest.

We commend the excellent work of the United Nations Association and other organizations which have contributed to public understanding and scholarly analysis of the United Nations. But they are not enough. We need new ways to develop effective political support for international institutions.

We have seen a resurgence of public participation in highly effective activist citi-

zens groups in areas of environmental and other concerns. Many of these problems can be resolved only through international cooperation. The UNA should reach out to such organizations in an attempt to elicit their collective energies in support of international efforts to solve them. In addition, comparable groups without benefit of tax exemption should be formed to mobilize pressure on Congressmen, decision-makers in the Executive Branch, and other elements in the political process.

It is desirable that the headquarters of the United Nations remain in New York. To that end the Federal Government must provide adequate security to U.N. delegations. Congress should also promptly provide its share of the funds necessary to develop the facilities of the New York headquarters site. If some relocation of U.N. functions becomes necessary, a movement to the environs of New York City should be the first choice; the second choice is Geneva. In the interests of efficiency and coordination, U.N. functions should remain concentrated as far as possible in New York and Geneva and their surrounding areas.

There are a wide variety of measures that should be taken to strengthen U.S. participation in international organizations. Among them, this American Assembly recommends that:

1. A new post of Undersecretary of State for Multilateral Affairs should be created in the Department of State to assume overall responsibility for U.S. participation in all multilateral organizations, political and economic, global and regional.

2. A senior official should be appointed to the staff of the National Security Council to concern himself exclusively with multilateral affairs.

3. The U.S. Permanent Representative to the U.N. should be made a member of the National Security Council. Either he or the new Undersecretary of State for Multilateral Affairs should sit with the Council when it deals with matters with important implications for our participation in the United Nations and other international agencies.

Many of the measures advocated in this report may seem difficult to achieve. They are. For most of these proposals an unprecedented effort of leadership will be needed both in the Executive Branch and in the Congress.

Accordingly, this American Assembly appeals for a fundamental change in our foreign policy priorities. The President must use the full powers of his office to build the institutions necessary to promote a decent world order, and the Congress must lend its support to the process.

PARTICIPANTS IN THE AMERICAN ASSEMBLY ON THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED NATIONS—1972

Richard N. Gardner, Professor of Law and International Organization, Columbia University (Discussion Leader and Director of Drafting).

Frank Altschul, Council on Foreign Relations, New York.

Harry S. Ashmore, President, Center for Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara.

Stuart Awbrey, Editor and Publisher, The Hutchinson News, Kansas.

Landrum R. Boiling, President, Earlham College, Indiana.

Dorothy A. Brizill, Harriman Scholar, Columbia University.

Courtney C. Brown, Chairman, Editorial Board, Columbia Journal of World Business, New York.

James P. Brown, Editorial Board, The New York Times.

Colin C. Cameron, President, Maui Land & Pineapple Co., Inc., Hawaii.

Archibald J. Carey, Jr., Judge, Circuit Court of Cook County, Chicago.

R. G. Chollar, President & Chairman, Charles F. Kettering Foundation, Dayton.

Myer Cohen, Acting Deputy Administrator, United Nations Development Program, New York.

John C. Culver, Representative from Iowa, Congress of the United States.

Samuel De Palma, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs.

Most Rev. John J. Dougherty, Auxiliary Bishop of Newark, New Jersey.

Richard A. Falk, Millbank Professor of International Law, Princeton University.

Philip Foisie, Assistant Managing Editor, The Washington Post.

Donald M. Fraser, Representative from Minnesota, Congress of the United States.

Arthur J. Goldberg, Washington, D.C.

Abbott C. Greenleaf, Brigadier General, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff, Hq. Air Forces Systems Command, Washington, D.C.

Ernest A. Gross, Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt & Mosle, New York.

Alexander Hehmeyer, Executive Vice President, Field Enterprises, Inc., Chicago.

Elmore Jackson, Vice President for Policy Studies, United Nations Association of the USA, New York.

David A. Kay, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, New York.

Reynold Levy, Harriman Scholar, Columbia University.

F. Bradford Morse, Representative from Massachusetts, Congress of the United States.

Nathan A. Pelcovits, Director for Policy Planning, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Department of State.

Francis T. P. Plimpton, Debevoise, Plimpton, Lyons & Gates, New York.

Hyman Judah Schachtel, Rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel, Houston.

William E. Schaufele, United States Mission to the United Nations, New York.

James H. Scheuer, Representative from New York, Congress of the United States.

Stephen M. Schwebel, Professor of International Law, School of Advanced International Studies, The Johns Hopkins University, Washington, D.C.

Georgiana G. Stevens, *Atlantic Monthly*, San Francisco.

Griffith Way, Attorney at Law, Seattle.

Watson W. Wise, Tyler, Texas.

Charles W. Yost, Distinguished Lecturer in Foreign Policy, School of International Affairs, Columbia University.

ABOUT THE AMERICAN ASSEMBLY

The American Assembly was established by Dwight D. Eisenhower at Columbia University in 1950. It holds nonpartisan meetings and publishes authoritative books to illuminate issues of United States policy.

An affiliate of Columbia, with offices in the Graduate School of Business, the Assembly is a national, educational institution incorporated in the state of New York.

The Assembly seeks to provide information, stimulate discussion, and evoke independent conclusions in matters of vital public interest.

American Assembly Sessions

At least two national programs are initiated each year. Authorities are retained to write background papers presenting essential data and defining the main issues in each subject.

About 60 men and women representing a broad range of experience, competence, and American leadership meet for several days to discuss the Assembly topic and consider alternatives for national policy.

All Assemblies follow the same procedure. The background papers are sent to participants in advance of the Assembly. The Assembly meets in small groups for four or five lengthy periods. All groups use the same agenda. At the close of these informal sessions participants adopt in plenary session a final report of findings and recommendations.

Regional, state, and local Assemblies are held following the national session at Arden

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

House. Assemblies have also been held in England, Switzerland, Malaysia, Canada, the Caribbean, South America, Central America, the Philippines, and Japan. Over one hundred institutions have cosponsored one or more Assemblies.

Arden House

Home of The American Assembly and scene of the national sessions is Arden House, which was given to Columbia University in 1950 by W. Averell Harriman. E. Roland Harriman joined his brother in contributing toward adaptation of the property for conference purposes. The buildings and surrounding land, known as the Harriman Campus of Columbia University, are 50 miles north of New York City.

Arden House is a distinguished conference center. It is self-supporting and operates throughout the year for use by organizations with educational objectives. The American Assembly is a tenant of this Columbia University facility only during Assembly sessions.

THE AMERICAN ASSEMBLY, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY Trustees

Arthur G. Altschul, New York.
Robert O. Anderson, New Mexico.
George W. Ball, New York.
William Benton, Connecticut.
Courtney C. Brown, Chairman, New York.
William P. Bundy, Massachusetts.
Josephine Young Case, New York.
John Cowles, Minnesota.
George S. Craft, Georgia.
Marriner S. Eccles, Utah.
Milton S. Eisenhower, Maryland.
Arthur S. Flemming, Virginia.
Katharine Graham, District of Columbia.
W. Averell Harriman, New York.
Hubert H. Humphrey, Minnesota.
George F. James, ex officio, New York.
J. Erik Jonsson, Texas.
Sol M. Linowitz, New York.
William J. McGill, ex officio, New York.
Clifford C. Nelson, ex officio, New Jersey.
Chester W. Nimitz, Jr., Connecticut.

Officers

Clifford C. Nelson, President.
Kurt Ludwig, Secretary.
George M. Phillips, Treasurer.
Mary M. McLeod, Assistant to the President.
Chairman Emeritus: Henry M. Wriston, New York.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. NORMAN F. LENT OF NEW YORK IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, today I join all Americans in mourning the death of a fine public servant, a man who devoted his entire life to the service of this country—the late J. Edgar Hoover.

Mr. Hoover, in the span of 48 years, singlehandedly took a Government bureau beset with problems and turned it into the finest and most widely respected law enforcement agency in the world. J. Edgar Hoover's direction of the Federal Bureau of Investigation spanned the service of eight Presidents, truly a remarkable career. The continuingly high standards he set for the operation of the FBI resulted in public accolades for the law enforcer rather than the lawbreaker, and his outstanding administration of the Bureau will be difficult to approach.

So in paying tribute today, Mr. Speaker, we can pay the ultimate compliment in saying that J. Edgar Hoover's shoes will be hard to fill at the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

EULOGY FOR THE LATE HONORABLE ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR.

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL OF NEW YORK IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the death of former Representative Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., left the entire Nation saddened at the loss of a champion of the rights of the poor and minorities in America.

One of the most moving tributes paid to Adam was the eulogy by Dr. Samuel D. Proctor. I know that my colleagues who worked with Adam over the past years share Dr. Proctor's sentiments:

A EULOGY FOR ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR. (By Samuel D. Proctor)

The Second Epistle of Timothy is the benediction of a tired warrior who had come to the end of his days. Paul writes to his young disciple and fellow-laborer, Timothy. Let me paraphrase that Epistle.

He starts out by saying, Timothy, I think about you night and day. I remember how you cried when you learned of my sorrows.

Timothy, I remember the great faith of Lois, your grandmother and of Eunice, your mother. True believers. I remember ordaining you and I hope you will keep your gift alive.

Never be ashamed of being a preacher, Timothy, and don't be ashamed of me because I am in jail for the Gospel. Be honored when you can suffer for the Gospel.

I do indeed suffer but, I am not ashamed: "I know whom I have believed and am persuaded that he is able. . . ."

And then, after other admonitions he said to him, "I am now ready." Ready. "Ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. . . ."

Then he went on and laid his soul bare. He was saying that he didn't mind dying but what he couldn't stand was the loneliness that went before death. He said, Timothy come to see me as soon as you can. Everybody has left me alone. Demas is gone back to Thessalonika, Crescens has gone to Galatia, Titus to Dalmatia. Everybody has left. Only Luke has stuck with me. Find John Mark. Bring him with you when you come, and when you come through Troas, pick up a coat and some books I left there at the home of Carpus.

Remember Alexander the coopersmith? He was awfully cruel to me. At my first trial, in fact, no man stood with me. Nobody! But the Lord was by my side and was strengthening me every minute.

Come to see me. Try to get here before winter. But remember. . . . I am ready, anytime now. "I have fought a good fight. I have finished my course, I have kept the faith."

To the bereaved family, to Skipper, to the officers and members of Abyssinian, to the friends and mourners who have gathered, we are here to bid farewell to another warrior.

I received word shortly after his passing from his devoted friend, Dr. Aaron Wells, and I began immediately to reflect on his enormous contributions.

Later, his trusted associate for many years, Odell Clark, called and as we reviewed some of his victories for the people, hardly have so many people ever owed so much to one man.

Every once in a while history has to clear the way for a giant who is prepared to stride across the stage of time. Once in a generation we can expect a Frederick Douglas, an Adam Powell or a Martin Luther King, one who is sensitive to injustice, perceptive of institutional evil and who is prepared to fling himself into confrontation with the forces of oppression.

These men move with selfless abandon because their actions originate with an early response to the call of God. They are propelled by a strange urge from within that is like the feeling that Jeremiah had when he said, "his word was in mine heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was weary with forbearing and I could not stay."

You see, good religion, like love, is a many splendid thing. It has several manifestations. When the light of God shines in the human soul, it reflects itself prismatically like a diamond with several facets. On one side there is the element of ecstasy, just sheer ecstasy, the feeling of overflowing that makes one cry "Glory!" It made the Psalmist sing: "I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills, whence cometh me my help." Overflowing ecstasy.

Ecstasy! It made the prophet Isaiah cry when he had his vision, "Woe is me! for I am undone . . ." Ecstasy. It made Charles Wesley write, "O, for a thousand tongues to sing, my Great Redeemer's praise!"

Ecstasy. It used to make my grandmother close her eyes and tighten her lips and whisper, "Praise the Lord!" That is one side of religion.

On another side we find simplicity, getting life uncluttered, withdrawal from the world, asceticism, contemplation and serenity. This is what religion means to some. The simple, quiet life.

Saint Francis, for example, was born the son of a cloth merchant and became an ascetic. He was of noble lineage. As a young soldier-adventurer he joined one crusade after another until a vision obsessed him. He gave himself to solitude and prayer. He renounced his wealth and went in rags, mingling with the beggars and asking alms. When he tried to seize his father's wealth and give it away, he was arrested.

Having adopted a life of poverty and simplicity, he organized a new order, the Franciscans, with 12 disciples and won the approval of Pope Innocent III.

Now, let's face it, the simple life of poverty and withdrawal does have its rewards. From such living enormous spiritual wealth can accrue. Listen to the prayer of Saint Francis, for example:

"O Lord
Make me an instrument of thy peace,
Where there is hatred let me sow love,
Where there is injury, pardon,
Where there is darkness, light,
Where there is sadness, joy,
Where there is doubt, faith,
And where there is despair, hope.

"O Divine Master,
Grant that I may not so much seek
To be consoled as to console,
To be understood as to understand,
To be loved as to love.

For
It is in giving that we receive,
It is in forgiving that we are pardoned,
And it is in dying that we are born to
eternal life."

On another side we find charity, pure altruism, self-giving. This has always been an important criterion of good religion.

When John the Baptist sent his followers to ask Jesus for his credentials, Jesus sent

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

word back to John, Charity! Meeting human needs!

"The blind see,
The lame walk,
The lepers are cleansed,
The deaf hear,
The dead are raised,
The poor are hearing the Gospel."

Charity. St. Paul said that this was the greatest spiritual gift. He said if you don't have it you are a mere noise maker. It won't make any difference if you can move a mountain, feed the poor, commit suicide. Nothing. . . . You need real charity! He said that the things that will last the longest are faith, hope and charity, but the greatest was charity.

The list could be longer, but the only other side of good religion that calls for attention today is justice. In the earliest documents of the Old Testament, we find a craving for justice.

When Nathan the prophet found David the king wrong, in the name of justice, he told him, "Thou art the man."

Justice is that human virtue that does not wait for volitional, spontaneous, unscheduled charity. Justice says that a certain kind of fair play should be counted on, expected, scheduled and without which some penalty is sure to follow.

Justice says that if you plan to do right, write it down, tell everybody, make it known, commit yourself, let us all be in it together. Justice is blind, impartial, persistent, even-handed, plays no favorites.

The prophet Micah said that this was among the highest priorities of religion. He said, "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy and to walk humbly with God."

The prophet Amos gave it an even higher priority. He said that God would not listen to their violin music or be deceived by the sweet fragrance of their incense. He said, "Let justice roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream."

Jesus applied the principles of justice when he found people eager to judge the lives of others. He said you can't see a mote in your brother's eye if you have a big splinter in your own. When they wanted to stone a woman to death who was alleged to be unfaithful, He asked the one who had no sin at all to cast the first stone.

Justice. It is an ancient concept found in the Code of Hammurabi 2,000 years before Christ, but a very simple one. It says don't ask a privilege for yourself that you would not grant to everyone similarly situated. On the other hand, it says don't do to another person what you would not want done to you. It is even-handedness.

But my friends, lying behind the notion of justice is the assumption that someone will be around to see that it is done, to supervise it, to monitor it, to guarantee it, to give it force. There just has to be someone who has the fine tuning, the understanding to know when a situation is out of balance, and that somebody must have the courage, the brains, the audaciousness, the cool bravery and the passionate zeal, the size, the voice, the looks, the energy, the following to force an issue in the name of justice.

This is where the work and the ministry of Adam Clayton Powell, Jr. comes to the fore. If Charles Wesley was a man of ecstasy; if St. Francis was a man of simplicity; if St. Paul was a man of charity, then Adam Powell stands in the train of Amos and Micah who were men of justice.

In 1941, when he was elected to the City Council of New York City, I was a college senior in Virginia. I was proud of my progress and I was burdened with ambition. The campus of Virginia Union University, where his father received his education, was located on a hill on the edge of the north end of Richmond. We revelled in our youthful ex-

May 4, 1972

uberance in that Confederate citadel, and we were inspired by our Black heroes. Adam Powell was our new hero. He had defied the power structure, had created a black political base and, had given us our first evidence that American institutions were capable of any change at all.

This new fact that he flashed before us burned itself into the consciousness of a young college boy. I had no assurance at all that my degree, my sacrifices, my new learning would be an avenue to success or to freedom. We lived behind a thick wall of segregation. There was no hint of change in 1941. The churches were segregated, the unions were segregated, the colleges and universities were segregated, the hospitals and cemeteries, restaurants and hotels, buses and trains—in every way possible my country screamed at me making me think I was nobody, in 1941. But Adam Clayton Powell Jr. was marching up and down Seventh Avenue telling us we were somebody.

That was the beginning of one of the most colorful and significant careers that any man has had in the 20th century. We pause today to bid him farewell as the drama closes, the curtain falls, the lights grow dim and the script is finished.

Come now and see that as a prophet of social justice he put the plight of the urban black and poor on the nation's agenda as no one had done before.

Our problems remain so largely unsolved. But no one can deny that the plight of the urban poor—the black poor—is before the attention of America. And those who know the history will remember that it was Adam Powell who brought the issue out in the open, carried it to City Hall and then to Washington.

President Johnson and President Kennedy wrote him letters and thanked him for handling the work of the House Committee on Education and Labor more productively than any other chairman had ever done. The major social legislation of both Kennedy and Johnson had to go through that committee and there had not been any social legislation at all in the hundred years before him.

What do we owe to Adam? Federal manpower training, Head Start, Job Corps, higher minimum wage, federal aid to education, loans for college students and federal dollars for school equipment, new training for Indians, new help for migrant laborers, new opportunities for the handicapped, the deaf, the blind, the aged and the mentally retarded.

In other words, that entire procession of persons whom Jesus met on the hills of Judea and on the road through Samaria and around the Sea of Galilee, all of those who had been beaten and broken by poverty and disease, whose lives were being snuffed out slowly by steady oppression—that's the crowd of persons in modern terms who were on Adam's mind. He roared like a lion and snapped like a cobra in their defense.

Come further and see that as a prophet of social justice he awakened with a one sided version of Christianity. We paid a lot of attention to the minutia of religion. Who should be baptized, who could take communion, how to debate on the Bible, who could be saved, etc. We were reared around Southern Methodists, Episcopalians, and Baptists. They kept us singing about heaven with our condition on earth unchanged. They had rigid teachings about Christ but they forgot the teachings of Christ. It all had to do with his birth and death, but they forgot entirely about his life.

Nevertheless, the black churches played an indispensable role. Men like Adam Powell Sr. had the ability to bring people together, to inspire them to improve their lot and to protect their gains. Dr. Powell Sr. was one of the real champions of the people in New Haven and in New York. His fiery preaching caused the hearts of men to be strangely

warmed and after the respite of the Sabbath they could return to face a week of hard work.

They were also educated in civic and political affairs by the pastors. But organized social action, coming out of the sanctuary to face the enemy of righteousness—that was something new. And it had to come. The black church was the only free agency we had and if the church did not eventually become the focal point of social justice, it would have been delayed much longer than it has been. After Adam began, church after church caught the spirit. Thus, when King began his movement, churches and preachers all over the country acknowledged that social justice was nothing more than the Gospel applied to modern life. He began a tradition that later spawned Leon Sullivan, Channing Philips, Walter Fauntroy, Wyatt T. Walker, Andrew Young, Ralph Abernathy, Jesse Jackson, and many others. Of course, Martin Luther King was his prize progeny. This church, Abyssinian, and her officers and members, deserves the highest praise for standing by him with unfailing loyalty.

Finally, as a prophet of social justice he followed a long and lonely path. When a man is burdened with a passion to ameliorate social conditions he steps on a lot of tender feelings, like romping through a bed of roses. The petals fall on all sides.

Every time he made a move he scared away another group of friends. Every time he lifted his voice in defense of one group, it was in offense to another. Follow that program for 35 years and see what it gets you, loneliness, enemies, detractors, and false friends. So many people are beholden to the power structure that when you make relentless assaults upon it you shake a lot of friends loose. Your cause becomes too risky. Jesus lost his family, his followers, and finally his closest colleague, Simon Peter.

Adam Powell was the first black leader in America whose financial support came from the people he served. His money was indigenous. Homegrown. Right here. And he was therefore free to speak his mind, and this did not make friends among those in power.

He took out after the dime stores, the hospitals, the department stores, the telephone company, the City of New York, the State of New York, the labor unions, the construction industry, the colleges and universities, and the United States Marine Corps. He was unafraid. The chemistry of defiance was in his blood and he responded to it until he was weakened by illness.

But each of these battles caused his enemies to vow that at the right time they would make their assault.

When he was denied a chance to take his congressional seat, it was one of the most blatant examples of a double standard and of the height of contempt for bold black men that the nation has seen. The men who excluded him had sat in the House for years allowing racism to run rampant, subsidizing their favorite industries at the expense of the poor, denying Constitutional rights to black people, maintaining segregation in Washington, D.C., allowing the states to go to any lengths to deny black people rights, giving grants to contractors who discriminated against black folks, giving money to hospitals who didn't allow black doctors to practice, and giving money to universities that didn't allow black folks to study. They supported a segregated Army, Navy, Air Force, National Guard, FBI, and State Police.

Adam took out after the whole crowd. He threw down the foul flag every time he saw one and they couldn't stand him.

So they tightened the noose and when they thought they had him they sprang the trap.

All this he did, remember now, for a people who had been in the country for 350 years and who were only half free. It was our cause

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

that he gave himself to serve. Life is vastly different today because of his valiant fight in our behalf.

Like St. Paul, facing his end, he came down to the shores of time a lonesome man.

But as St. Paul said to Timothy, I can hear Adam answering the moment. "I am not ashamed. I know whom I have believed, and he is able. . . ."

"The time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith."

Farewell Adam. We'll never forget you. You made a big difference among us. God speed you on your journey. You don't want us to weep but parting is such sweet sorrow.

But Adam, our sorrow is assuaged by one strong truth that won't let us go. Although you depart from us alone and leave for the other shore, lost from sight in the dim horizon, somehow we can't help but believe that Jesus was right when he said that in our Father's house there were many mansions. You won't be alone, Adam.

In that land of sweet forever, where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest, you will find other arrivals who have left just a little while ago. There is a great company whom we have bidden farewell, who wait for you on the other side! Medgar Evers from Jackson is there; Whitney Young just left; young Mike King is there; Ralph Bunche hasn't been long gone. You'll find others there, Adam. Malcolm has made the journey. There are more.

John said he saw a hundred and forty-four thousand who sang a new song. No one could sing the song but the hundred and forty-four thousand whom God had redeemed from the earth.

He fought a good fight, he finished his course. He kept the faith.

FOR THE PRESIDENT'S AGENDA

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation, under its copresident, Istvan B. Gereben, wrote recently to President Nixon supporting the passage by the House of Representatives of House Concurrent Resolution 471 which asks the President to support the cause of Soviet Jews. Mr. Gereben requests the President to bring the matter of Soviet Jews before the Soviet officials whom he will meet on his coming trip to Moscow.

I include below Mr. Gereben's excellent letter to the President, which also supports the cause of Hungary, as well as the organization's letter to me as chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe which held hearings on Soviet Jewry and which reported House Concurrent Resolution 471:

HUNGARIAN FREEDOM FIGHTERS' FEDERATION,
Rockville, Md., April 25, 1972.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The House of Representatives on April 17, with a 360 to 2 vote, passed House Concurrent Resolution 471, urging you Mr. President to call upon the Government of the Soviet Union during your forthcoming visit to the Kremlin, to apply the principles and rights to the Jewish and other religious minorities of the Soviet Union

as they are expressed by the Soviet Constitution and the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. The members of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation U.S.A. fully support this resolution.

We are aware of your clear commitment to the basic human rights. We hope that during your talks with the leaders of the Soviet Union, you will have not only the oppressed Russian Jews in mind, but you will not forget the countries which are occupied and thereby denied independence and sovereignty by the Soviet Union. We also respectfully petition you on behalf of the many millions of Americans with East European background to exert your influence to convince the Soviet leaders that their ruthless oppression of individuals and nations in the captive countries is not only violating the internationally endorsed principles of Human Rights, but also creating an image of the Soviet Union which is damaging to its own and the world's best interest.

We present a special plea for Hungary, our beloved native land, the land which contributed so much to the cultural, scientific and social progress of the world and of the United States. You, Mr. President, who personally witnessed at the Bridge of Andau, the results of the bloody suppression of the Hungarian October, do not need specific justification of our plea. The hopes, humble requests and strong demands of the Hungarian people are still the same as they were in 1956. If your visit to Moscow brings the ideals, concepts and principles expressed by a free people one step closer to realization, we will be grateful.

We pray for you and for the success of your trip. May God guide you in your difficult mission for peace with justice, on the battlefield and in the halls of Diplomacy, but above all for peace of mind for everyone: the Jews of Russia, the downtrodden of Hungary, the hopeful of Vietnam and the troubled of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

ISTVAN B. GERELEN.

HUNGARIAN FREEDOM FIGHTERS' FEDERATION,

Rockville, Md., April 26, 1972.

Hon. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROSENTHAL: The Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation congratulates you for introducing House Concurrent Resolution 471. The overwhelming vote in favor of that resolution is a credit to your legislative abilities.

We informed the President of our support of your resolution. I enclose my letter to the President for your information and use.

It is reassuring to know that there are so many distinguished public figures like you and your colleagues who care about the oppressed, the downtrodden millions who's only hope are us, the free and concerned here in the United States.

Thanking you to keep the torch of hope high I remain,

Sincerely yours,

ISTVAN B. GERELEN.

A LONGSHOREMAN FROM SOUTH BOSTON SUPPORTS SENATOR McGOVERN

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the strong vote appeal of Senator GEORGE

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

McGOVERN among the blue-collar workers in this year's presidential primaries, starting in New Hampshire and continuing in Wisconsin, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, has stunned and confounded the Nation's political pundits, particularly those who sought to belittle the McGovern campaign for the presidency from the outset.

Time magazine sent correspondent John Stacks to investigate the McGovern popularity in a working-class area of Boston, Mass., and I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the Stacks interview in the May 8 issue of Time with Basil Quirk, a longshoreman from South Boston, who supports Senator McGovern:

A BOSTON LONGSHOREMAN EXPLAINS McGovern

(NOTE.—The early-form charts on this election would have placed Basil Quirk, 48, an Irish Catholic longshoreman from South Boston, in the camp of Edmund Muskie, the Polish Catholic from Maine. Or perhaps Hubert Humphrey, who dotes on organized labor. Maybe even George Wallace, the sometime Horatio of the hardhats. Those charts have been proved wrong a number of times. Basil Quirk, boxing fan, father of five, proud owner of a three-decker in one of Boston's most solidly working-class areas, is a firm and enthusiastic supporter of McGovern. Over a dinner of roast beef, baked potatoes, rolls and pastries, Quirk told Time Correspondent John Stacks why:)

I was a little bit mistaken about McGovern. I thought he had just a following of the kids. But I went to hear him speak over at the Lithuanian club. He can talk to you on the local level. He picks up on things real quick, and he doesn't seem to need a lot of counselors blowing in his ear.

You know these other guys seem to forget where they come from. They form a kind of political royalty. They think they never can get licked. All the wise guys and all the smart money lined up with Muskie. Now McGovern, he's gone around on a pretty short bankroll. If he can put this thing together, who will he owe? Who'd have ever figured McGovern? He's set them all on their ear.

Today I'm working on a ship from Poland. I talk to foreign nationals all the time. The other day this Norwegian guy says to me: "You know, Basil, America is so big, it can do anything it wants. But it's so big, it don't listen to the small people." That hit me kind of good.

These people forget they spend money to sell themselves to us. To beg to represent us. But when they get a position, they forget they represent people here and that we're the ones that count.

Now McGovern, he started down at the lower levels. At the grass roots so to speak. He's got a realistic understanding of what politics is. He's got to be an honorable guy.

Here in Southie, we got a feeling for each other you don't find many other places. McGovern seems to be a guy who fits in the middle of Southie. You could bring him in and have him to dinner and feel like he's part of the family. I think these farm-state guys are more conservative, more down to earth. I don't think McGovern is that far from his origins.

They say he's left wing. Hey, who's what today? When he gets in there, it's what he is that matters. He's got the kids. And when he's in there, he's got to do the right thing. They'll put a picket line on his lawn if he doesn't. These kids are hard to crap.

What's the future of America? The kids—right? You've got to show them there is something worthwhile here. If he can get these kids in line, maybe it's work out for all of us. Maybe he can make America be-

come a country these kids would think was worth fighting for.

Now, I want you to write this down. I firmly object to a representative of a top Government agency saying on TV that the country doesn't have the resources to get a true audit on the phone company. That's wrong.

America is the greatest possible place for the average guy. But big business—when we send a representative down to Washington, they send down a lobbyist, and they take all these guys by the hand. I've worked 25 years on the docks. My kids actually think they're in the middle class. But I'm about two months away from the poverty stricken. We need someone with guts, which I think McGovern has got.

Muskie? If he couldn't handle that guy Loeb, what will he do when he's really in trouble. He knew Loeb; he's lived next door. I'd have liked it better if he'd gone to Loeb's house, rung the bell and whacked him in the nose.

Some of the guys where I work are Wallace guys. They're going for McGovern. He's a class guy. He's got guts.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT—KNBC EDITORIAL

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial of April 6, 1972, San Francisco radio station KNBC aired the longstanding problem of job discrimination to the Members of Congress. This time though, the charge of discriminatory hiring practices is not aimed at the private sector, but rather, in Federal Government agencies.

I feel this apparent exclusion from the job market of Mexican Americans in Federal agencies is disgraceful, particularly since we have legislated and enforced, as best we could, equal employment opportunities in the remaining job market.

I here register my protest at this turn of events and wish to include the following editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to facilitate exposure and corrective action of this situation which might also be found in other agencies of the Federal Government:

[KNBC editorial]

WHO WATCHES WASHINGTON?

APRIL 6, 1972.

For at least two years, the federal government has been putting the heat on its suppliers and contractors to do a better job of recruiting and hiring Blacks, Mexican-Americans and members of other ethnic minority groups. In many industries, the heat has been effective. But apparently the federal bureaucracy hasn't felt any of its own heat, because the federal government itself is lagging far behind everyone else in employment equality.

The feds has done pretty well pressuring the private sector. Ethnic minority groups in Southern California, with 27 percent of the total population, hold over 24 percent of the area's 5 million jobs. By the way, these two statistics alone don't show the great recent progress, nor do they show some pretty impressive moves up the ladder of job responsibility for minority workers.

It's just too bad federal pressure doesn't

change hiring practices within the federal government itself.

In the employment of Southern California's biggest minority group, Mexican-Americans, for example, the federal government is far behind. Spanish-speaking people make up 17 percent of this area's population, yet they hold less than 6 percent of the 150,000 federal jobs here. Worse, they almost never wind up in the top jobs. Nine big federal agencies have zero percent of their top management posts filled by Spanish-speaking people.

If this great employment disparity were based on education, training or skill deficiencies, it might be excusable. No one wants or expects government to hire the unqualified.

But the federal bureaucracy's pattern of exclusion is too obvious to be accidental; it goes clearly beyond any possible skill or training reason.

It's our view the federal government's hiring patterns give convincing evidence of an occupational caste system—a pattern of unlawful job exclusion within the same government body charged with enforcing fair hiring. We look now to Congress to recognize this wrong and to right it.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1186

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced House Joint Resolution 1186, an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would specifically affirm the right of all our citizens to their lives, from the moment of their conception. Coincidentally, my amendment was introduced just 1 day after the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. ABZUG) introduced her bill to deny the right to life to our citizens who have been conceived, but are not yet born.

I have no intention of following her costly example of filling 137 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with interminable arguments on this issue. But her verbose case for killing unborn babies cannot be allowed to go unanswered.

The testimony immediately following, presented to the Committee on Public Health, Welfare, and Social Security of the Indiana State Senate by Charles E. Rice, professor of law at Notre Dame University, in opposition to an "abortion on demand" bill, includes a specific recommendation of a U.S. constitutional amendment such as I introduced yesterday. After that, I call to your attention a brief statement of the reasons why abortion is in truth murder, prepared by Christians for Life in New York; a graphic description by a doctor of what an abortion really is, excerpts from "A Pro-Life Report on Population Growth and the American Future," prepared by Randy Engel, who is demographic advisor for Women Concerned for the Unborn Child, columnist for Pennsylvanians for Human Life, and executive director of National Vietnam Refugee Services; and excerpts from "Handbook on Abortion" by Dr. and Mrs. J. C. Willke, nationally known lecturers and writers on human sexuality and reproduction, which decisively refute the three arguments most

May 4, 1972

commonly used to justify abortions—"mental health" of the mother, eliminating "unwanted children," and the alleged "population explosion":

TESTIMONY OF CHARLES E. RICE

THE ISSUE

The critical issue is whether an abortion involves the destruction of a human life. If one concedes that it does, then one can hardly support a proposal to kill existing human beings to suit the convenience or comfort of others (even in the most aggravated circumstances of rape and incest) or because those others consider the victim unfit to live.

More precisely, the critical issue revolves around the benefit of the doubt. Our law and civilization have rested on the premise that the benefit of the doubt should always be accorded to life rather than death. Thus we require proof beyond all reasonable doubt before we execute a criminal or even subject him to fine or imprisonment. I believe that I could prove to the satisfaction of an impartial observer that human life actually begins at the moment of conception. However, I do not have to sustain this burden. Rather, those who support liberalized abortion can do so only if they can say that, beyond any and all reasonable doubt, human life does not begin at the moment of conception. If there is any doubt whatever, our tradition and civilization dictate the resolution of that doubt in favor of innocent life rather than death.

THE CHILD IN THE WOMB IS A LIVING HUMAN BEING

The child in the womb is in fact a human being from the moment of his conception. This could easily be demonstrated at length. It is so clearly a scientific fact that we teach it as such in our schools. As the fifth grade sex education text in the New York City school system flatly says, "Human life begins when the sperm cells of the father and the egg cells of the mother unite." On the eighteenth day after his conception his heart begins to beat. At 6½ weeks, when he weighs only 1/30 of an ounce, he has, in being, every internal organ he will ever have as an adult. He then has a mouth with lips, a tongue and buds for 20 milk teeth.

At eight weeks his skeleton begins to form, with real bone replacing the earlier cartilage, and the electrical activity in his brain is detectable by electroencephalograph (EEG). Incidentally, the lack of such detectable brain activity is increasingly accepted as the conclusive proof of death in the case of donors of heart transplants and in other cases. If an adult is considered alive as long as the EEG shows activity, how can the child in the womb be considered anything less than a living human being when his brain activity is similarly detectable? Nor does the detection of brain activity at eight weeks mean that the child's life begins then. Brain activity is the last sign of life to go, but it is not the first to come. Human life is a continual process of development from conception to death.

At eleven weeks the child's nerves and muscles begin to synchronize with his bones. His arms and legs begin to move.

At twelve weeks hair begins to grow on his scalp and his teeth are forming in his gums.

At sixteen weeks his mother feels him move. He kicks her with his feet, knees and elbows. He can already scratch himself, suck his thumb and even cry although he makes no sound because there is no air in the womb.

He can feel pain. If a needle is inserted in the womb for any purpose and it touches him, he will jump.

Clearly, the target of abortion is a living human being. It might be useful here to canvass some of the scientific opinion on the matter. Modern science has established that the life of every human being begins at conception. Dr. Herbert Ratner, a noted

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

medical authority, affirmed this in an article in the April, 1966 issue of *Report*:

"It is now of unquestionable certainty that a human being comes into existence precisely at the moment when the sperm combines with the egg. How do we know this? From everything we know about genetics. When the sperm and egg nuclei unite, all of the characteristics, such as the color of the eyes, hair, skin, that make a unique personality, are laid down determinatively. That's why a physician—even without any kind of formal ethical education, moral teaching or even philosophical sophistification—relying solely on medical science, knows, when he performs an abortion, that he is killing another human being. After all, the fetus isn't mineral or vegetable or dog or cat; nor is it part of mama, the way a leg or a tumor is part of mama." (Rather, *A Doctor Talks About Abortion*, 2-3)

Dr. Bradley M. Patten of the University of Michigan Medical School described the process by which "a new individual life history" is begun:

"The reproductive cells which units to initiate the development of a new individual are known as gametes . . . the small, actively motile gametes from the male being called spermatozoa or spermia, and the larger, food laden gametes formed within the female being termed ova. . . . The growth and maturation of the sex cells, the liberation of the ovum, and the transportation of the sperm are all factors leading toward the actual union of the gametes. It is the penetration of the ovum by a spermatozoon and the resultant mingling of the chromosomal material each brings to the union, that culminates the process of fertilization and *initiates the life of a new individual*." (emphasis added) (Patten, *Foundations of Embryology* (1964), 35, 82; see Mietus, *The Therapeutic Abortion Act; A Statement in Opposition* (1967), 12)

THE REALITIES OF ABORTION

But people sometimes support abortion because they do not realize what it is. Until the twelfth week after conception, a common procedure is dilation of the entrance to the uterus and curettage. Dr. Alan Guttmacher detailed this method in the *Clinical Obstetrics and Gynecology Journal*:

"A sharp curette is then inserted to the top of the fundus with very little force, for it is during this phase that the uterus is most likely to be perforated. Moderate force can be safely exerted on the down stroke. The whole uterine cavity is curetted with short strokes, by visualizing a clock and making a stroke at each hour. The curette is then withdrawn several times bringing out pieces of placenta and sac. A small ovum forceps is then inserted and the cavity tonged for tissue, much like an oysterman tonging for oysters. . . . In pregnancies beyond the seventh week, fetal parts are recognizable as they are removed piecemeal."

When Dr. Guttmacher mentions "fetal parts," he means an arm, a leg, a head and other parts of what moments before was a living, though small, human body.

Beyond the fourteenth week of pregnancy, the child can be killed in two ways. One is to inject a salt or glucose solution into the womb. As Dr. H. P. Dunn described it, "The baby can be felt to make a few convulsive movements, and within a few minutes it dies. In about twenty-four hours labor starts and the already disintegrating baby is delivered." By this means, of course, the baby is simply pickled alive. Sometimes the child is still alive when he emerges from the womb in this type of "salting out" abortion. He then dies as intended, although at least one child in New York has survived this attempted murder and has been placed for adoption.

The other technique of abortion is hysterotomy, where an incision is made in the mother's abdomen and the child is lifted out. Frequently the child is kicking and crying when he is lifted from the womb. In all cases

there is a disposal problem. And it is not surprising that in an abortion room the dignity of life is not highly regarded. One widely circulated photograph, which I show you here, shows the fully formed body of an aborted child lying in the bottom of a surgical bucket on a bed of gauze pads soaked in his own blood. And you recall, of course, the recent discovery of the bodies of aborted children in a Los Angeles dump where they had been thrown after they had been experimented upon in a medical laboratory.

THE UNDERLYING PRINCIPLE

It is sometimes argued that, although the life of the child in the womb begins at conception, his life is not a human life. However, the child in the womb is the living offspring of human parents. What else can he be but human? He is neither dog nor cat nor turnip. If we define him out of the human race, we will have embarked on the same road as the tyrannical regime of Nazi Germany.

The basic principle of the abortion movement is precisely the principle that underlay the Nazi extermination of the Jews. It is the principle that an innocent human being can be killed if his existence is inconvenient or uncomfortable to others or if those others deem him unfit to live. And if somehow you do not concede that he is human you ought at least to give him the benefit of the doubt. If an innocent human being can be killed because he is too young, that is, he has not lived nine months from his conception, there is no reason in principle why he cannot be killed because he is too old. Or too retarded. Or too black. Or too politically undesirable. The philosophy is Nazi Germany's. And this nation is adopting it.

Incidentally, it is increasingly clear that the fusion of the abortion and population control movements involves the implicit coercion of welfare clients and other poor persons to undergo abortion. The overtones of coercion are unmistakable when welfare caseworkers "suggest" that their pregnant clients consider abortion to resolve their problems and to ease the taxpayers' burden. The idea seems to be to eliminate poverty by eliminating the poor. Of course this is a form of genocide. Instead of working constructively to alleviate poverty, the abortion proponents turn to the mindless and cruel solution of death for the helpless child in the womb. Moreover, the experience in Japan, Sweden and Hungary indicates that legalization of abortion does not decrease the number of "back-street" illegal abortions.

TWO AFFIRMATIVE PROPOSALS

First. The Constitution of the United States can be amended if two-thirds of the states propose an amendment and it is then submitted by Congress to the states and ratified by three-fourths of the states. It is time to propose an amendment to the United States Constitution to make its guarantees of due process of law and the equal protection of the laws applicable to the child in the womb. This could be done by inserting "from the moment of conception" into the relevant clauses of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments. For example, "No person, from the moment of conception, shall be . . . deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law." And, "nor shall any State deprive any person, from the moment of conception, of life, liberty or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person, from the moment of conception, within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." Under any proper construction, the Constitution already gives this protection to the child in the womb. But it ought to be made specific for two reasons: First, to prevent any possible misconstruction that would permit the child in the womb, unlike his elder brethren, to be killed for the convenience of others. Second, and more important, to serve an educational purpose through the

campaign for amendment to carry the issue clearly to the American people and to afford them a clear opportunity to choose life over death.

Second. Article I, Section 23, of the Indiana Constitution, provides that "The General Assembly shall not grant to any citizen, or class of citizens, privileges or immunities which, upon the same terms, shall not equally belong to all citizens." If the proposed abortion liberalization is enacted, then those who have lived nine months from their conception will be granted an immunity to being killed which will be denied to citizens who have not lived nine months from their conception. It would be desirable to add to Article I, Section 23, a provision as follows, "nor shall any person, from the moment of his conception, be denied the equal protection of the laws."

These proposed constitutional amendments would not prevent the law from making reasonable distinctions on such matters as inheritance rights and the right to sue. But they would ensure that the child in the womb, as with older persons, would not be subject to being killed for the convenience or comfort of others or because those others consider him unfit to live. They would conform the law to the realities of science. And their proposal by the Indiana legislature would affirm the determination of our state to protect the liberty of all regardless of age or condition.

Recently, *California Medicine*, the "Official Journal of the California Medical Association", editorialized that the "traditional Western ethic" is being supplanted by a new ethic that will emphasize "the quality of life" and that "it will become necessary and acceptable to place relative rather than absolute values on such things as human lives." Then the editorial uncovered the reason why abortion proponents have evaded the real issue and have clouded their case in subterfuge:

"Since the old ethic has not yet been fully displaced it has been necessary to separate the idea of abortion from the idea of killing, which continues to be socially abhorrent. The result has been a curious avoidance of the scientific fact, which everyone really knows, that human life begins at conception and is continuous whether intra- or extra-uterine until death. The very considerable semantic gymnastics which are required to rationalize abortion as anything but taking a human life would be ludicrous if they were not often put forth under socially impeccable auspices. It is suggested that this schizophrenic sort of subterfuge is necessary because while a new ethic is being accepted the old one has not yet been rejected." (Emphasis added) (*California Medicine*, Sept. 1970, 67-68)

The acceptance by society of what is essentially the Nazi ethic is neither progressive nor inevitable. The abortion trend, the legalization of the killing of innocents for convenience, can be reversed. We can begin that reversal here in Indiana. We can affirm that innocent life is not negotiable. And we can reestablish the basic equality of all before the law.

THE TREND OF THE LAW, APART FROM ABORTION LIBERALIZATION, IS TO RECOGNIZE THE HUMANITY AND RIGHTS OF THE CHILD IN THE WOMB

As the highest court of New Jersey summarized the state of scientific knowledge, "Medical authorities have long recognized that a child is in existence from the moment of conception." (*Smith v. Brennan*, 31 N.J. 353, 362, 157 A.2d 497, 502 (1960)). These and other authorities bear witness to the scientific facts that the child in the womb is a human being from the moment of conception and that, in the words of a pamphlet issued in 1963 by the Planned Parent-

hood Association, an abortion "kills the life of a baby after it has begun."

And this finding of modern science, that life begins at conception, has been recognized in the development of the civil law of property and torts. As the New York Appellate Division said in 1953.

"We ought to be safe in this respect in saying that legal separability should begin where there is biological separability. We know something more of the actual process of conception and fetal development now than when some of the common-law cases were decided; and what we know makes it possible to demonstrate clearly that separability begins at conception."

* * * * *

"If the child born after an injury sustained at any period of his prenatal life can prove the effect on him of the tort . . . we held he makes out a right to recover." (*Kelly v. Gregory*, 282 App. Div. 542, 544, 545 (3rd Dept., 1953)).

Other scientific authorities are analyzed in the District of Columbia case of *Bonbrest v. Kotz*, where the court noted that, "From the viewpoint of the civil law and the law of property, a child *en ventre sa mere* is not only regarded as a human being, but as such from the moment of conception—which it is in fact." (*Bonbrest v. Kotz*, 65 F. Supp. 138, 140 (D.C. Dist. Col., 1946); see the subsequent authorities collected in *Byrne, A Critical Look at Legalized Abortion*, 41 Los Angeles Bar Bulletin 320 (1966))

Nor is this recognition limited to cases where the child is ultimately born alive. The majority of states that have considered this question have ruled, for example, that a stillborn child may, through his representative, maintain a legal action for his wrongful death caused by injuries inflicted on him while he was in the womb. (See *Maledon, Note, The Law and the Unborn Child: The Legal and Logical Inconsistencies*, *Notre Dame Lawyer*, Vol. 46, 349, 359 (1971); *Byrn, Abortion-on-Demand: Whose Morality?*, *Notre Dame Lawyer*, Vol. 46, 5 (1970))

Surely, therefore, the thrust of the law has been to keep pace with increased scientific knowledge and to recognize the child in the womb for what he is—a living human being. Seen in this light, the abortion movement is a retrogressive throwback running counter to the modernizing trend of the law.

ABORTION IS MURDER (By Christians for Life)

If you think God Failed to inform us as to when the soul enters into life, then speculate on the following passages from the Old Testament Jeremiah 1,5, "before I formed you in the womb I knew you, before you came to birth I consecrated you." Job 31, 15 "God shaped us all within our mother" Jeremiah and Job credited God with our creation in the womb. Eve also credits God in Genesis 4,2 "I have acquired a man with help of Yahew" (God).

God does not credit human life that is not bound to eternity, therefore, the soul must be present at conception. To prove this we refer to David in the Old Testament who claimed he was A Sinner From The Moment of Conception. Psalms 51, 5.

* * * * *

To be in sin indicates the presence of a soul. According to the New Testament, Jesus is conceived at once. He did not become Jesus, a week, a month, or many months later. He is Jesus at once. (you are you at once).

Mary the Mother of Jesus immediately goes to Elizabeth who is six months pregnant. Elizabeth rejoices in the presence of her Lord. Even though Mary is pregnant only a matter of days. In unmistakable terms the

bible proves both Life and Soul present at (as David said) The Moment of Conception.

* * * * *

Abortion is murder. The right to life comes directly from GOD. Do not fight deformity by deforming your soul. Poverty is no license to kill your son or daughter in the womb. Doctors who perform abortions are paid Assassins.

* * * * *

In the words of St. Paul, "You are not your own property. You have been bought and paid for. That is why you should use your body for the Glory of God." Corin. 6, 20.

It is, indeed, the very matter of life which is at stake. Medical science has informed us that at the moment of conception, there comes into being a unique human life in the microscopically tiny egg cell. Contained in this cell is the blueprint for the development of the whole human person, factors which will influence the temperament, physique, eye, hair and skin color, and even intellectual capacity. This cell's tissue composition is distinct from its mother's tissue and would be rejected from her body were it not to be enclosed in the amniotic sac.

The unborn child's civil rights have increasingly been recognized by the law. We recall, in particular, that case in which the mother was forced by the courts against her religious convictions to have a blood transfusion to maintain her baby's life. Likewise, the unborn child's rights of inheritance and medical or economic support, his right to recover damages for injury suffered in the womb are affirmed by the courts. In short, the law has cast itself in the role of safeguarding the rights of the unborn.

Law is an educator. If it allows the destruction of unwanted life, it unavoidably teaches that life is cheap.

A final quote from Isaiah, "Woe to the legislators of infamous laws, to those who issue tyrannical decrees, who refuse justice to the unfortunate."

Isaiah 10, 1

THE REALITY OF ABORTION (By Tom Pawlick)

What is the reality of abortion—the reality on which legislators are being called upon to determine by their vote?

"I've performed two abortions," said Dr. Richard V. Jaynes, an obstetrician-gynecologist in private practice in Detroit for 19 years.

"Both were accidents resulting from errors in diagnosis.

"Every doctor is bound to make an error sometime. I admit mine," he concluded.

"In one of them, I had no idea there was a fetus inside the patient's uterus until I drew out a detached arm, still moving at the elbow. Personally, it was one of the most sickening experiences I've had in practicing medicine," he said.

In standard abortion procedure however, it's normal. There are two methods commonly used to destroy an unborn child—a suction apparatus procedure used to about four-weeks after conception, and curettage.

"The suction apparatus involved the creation of a powerful vacuum in a tube. The tube is inserted in the woman's uterus and what's inside is drawn through it into a bottle.

"The vacuum is so powerful that the process is almost instantaneous. You hardly see the fetus as it zips through the tube."

"After about 10 to 12 weeks, however, the developing child has grown too large and solid to pass through the suction apparatus. After that point curettage is generally used," he continued.

LIMB BY LIMB

"A roughly spoon-shaped instrument called the curette about 10 inches long and with

sharp edges is inserted into the uterus. The child inside is cut into pieces and pulled or scooped out limb by limb." Dr. Jaynes said.

"In order for the members to be removed, of course, the doctor must stretch the uterine opening. It isn't dilating of its own accord as it would in a normal birth.

"It can't be stretched too far, however, and in order to pass larger parts like the head, they must be crushed. Some doctors use a ring forceps.

"After a legal abortion, in a hospital, the pieces are sent to the pathology lab for study. In illegal abortions, the most common practice is to throw the parts in a sink's garbage disposal.

"Curettage is rarely used after 14 weeks of pregnancy. At that stage of development a hysterotomy is used as a kind of abdominal surgery similar to Caesarean section.

"Technically, however, by 24 weeks you have to call it a premature birth, not an abortion. There have been instances where babies born that early have survived. I think 2 percent do.

"I know personally, in my own practice, of three babies born that early who survived to live normal lives. In abortion, of course, the premature child is not permitted to survive.

"As far as the child's development is concerned it, of course, varies. No two are alike.

"From about two weeks after conception onwards, the fetus is in almost constant motion. It can respond to moments of stress, a decrease in its oxygen for example, by moving faster. If you stick a needle into the bag of water to remove a little sample fluid and touch the baby—it jumps.

"By eight weeks it has all its organs, legs, arms, feet, hands, ears and looks like a human being. It often sucks its thumb at this stage.

"There is a definite heart beat. It waves its arms and legs and, if removed from the uterus, often struggles to take a breath into its lungs. It answers all the ordinary criteria for life.

TWO HOURS TO DIE

"Frequently a three-month-old-fetus removed from the uterus will struggle for life as long as two or three hours. It won't be too long before we'll be able to put that fetus in an artificial placenta and save it. "Researchers have already done it with sheep.

"At about five months, or shortly after, the child is capable of making feeble cries. They make them when they're being destroyed sometimes."

"These, obviously, are the only defense mechanism an infant has, visibility and audibility."

What about the mother in an abortion operation?

"An abortion is major surgery," said Dr. Jaynes. "It requires anesthesia, which is always somewhat dangerous. But the most serious danger is that of hemorrhage. Especially with curettage you run the risk of puncturing the uterus.

DANGEROUS

"This is a common accident in illegal abortions, performed by men who aren't even doctors. There is also danger of infection, although that's lessened in legal abortions performed in a reputable hospital.

"But legal or illegal, statistics show it is definitely more dangerous than childbirth to the mother. To the child, of course, it is the ultimate danger—death."

A PRO-LIFE REPORT ON POPULATION GROWTH AND THE AMERICAN FUTURE

(By Randy Engel)

For behold, days are coming in which men will say "Blessed are the barren, and the wombs that never bore, and breasts that never nursed. . . . Luke, 23:29

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Federal Government and Abortion—Clearly, there is ample evidence to substantiate the charge that the Federal government is promoting and financing a Malthusian ideology which views abortion as a legitimate birth control technique for omitted contraception or contraception failure, or to control "unwanted fertility, and that there is in fact a very real relationship between abortion and other anti-life activities, and an explicit government population policy of 'stabilization' or reduced population growth, which the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future will propose in its final report.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

"Planned Parenthood Federation of America (also known as Planned Parenthood-World Population) is the largest private organization in the family planning field" states the Dept. of HEW in its Five Year Plan (emphasis added).

"Over the past few years, our organization (PP-WP) has entered a new and invigorating era of *public-private partnership*. The passage of the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970 signalled a milestone in the development of this partnership, dovetailing the efforts of public agencies with our own in a framework of a greatly-expanded commitment of Federal funds. And a second milestone was reached in the past several months with preparation by the Dept. of HEW of the first nationwide five-year plan for family planning services . . ." (testimony of John C. Robbins, Chief Executive Officer, Planned Parenthood-World Population in favor of S.J. Res. 108 on October 14, 1971) (emphasis added).

Government Grants

Which of these two statements comes closer to the truth?

Is Planned Parenthood primarily a private organization with limited governmental funding, or is it in fact a quasi-governmental agency with a shrinking public support in the form of unrestricted contributions?

Since Planned Parenthood not only engages in abortion referral and counseling, but also operates abortion clinics of its own, the question of the extent of the use of taxpayer's money is of considerable importance.

In 1970, PPFA, Inc., (not including affiliates) received the following amounts:

Approx. \$2.6 million in unrestricted contributions; \$2.4 million in restricted contributions; and \$8 million in other sources which equals \$5.8 million in total public support and \$1 million in grants from Government agencies.

According to Planned Parenthood's president, Dr. Alan Guttmacher, reporting in his personal newsletter of June 18, 1971,

"Government funding has permitted affiliates (PP) to open numerous satellite clinics and employ indigenous people as Planned Parenthood workers to teach family planning in their own neighborhood. The Washington office reports that in 1970-71, 125 affiliate projects shared \$10,057,273, *exclusive of Medicaid payments*. The lion's share (over \$9.25 million) was provided by the Federal government in a roughly 5 to 3 ratio between OEO and HED"

Dr. Guttmacher goes on to state that governmental funding on each occasion requires new matching funds, usually 25%, and that "these government grants free unrestricted citizens' contributions to finance new areas of service excluded from government subsidy." (emphasis added).

Planned Parenthood Finances Lagging

In *Planned Parenthood Report*, issued in March-April 1971, Dr. Guttmacher highlighted the activities of PP-WP and its affiliates for 1970 and took note of their increased services and expanded activities, and the need

for greater financial support from government.

"For the first time in a decade," he reported, "gifts to affiliates failed to grow, and gifts to national headquarters fell off."

Big Money in Abortion

To what extent Planned Parenthood's activities in abortion will help boost its lagging financial resources is, of course, unanswerable at the time.

Clearly, however, abortion in general is a very lucrative field, as Dr. Irwin H. Kaiser, chief of obstetrics-gynecology at Lincoln Hospital in New York ("famous" for its large out-patient abortion facilities) pointed out to the abortion establishment at the Los Angeles symposium mentioned earlier.

When asked about the financing and costs of the out-patient clinic, Kaiser said that it was impossible to give an accurate accounting of who got what from where and that they did a certain amount of midnight requisitioning. He then went on to say "We have vastly more than recouped this (about \$65,000) by now. At \$160 per patient, this is a substantial money-maker for the hospital and, obviously, if we were prepared to step into the competitive New York market, where abortions go as high as \$1,500, we probably would make a substantial killing, if I may use that expression. (Great laughter from audience!)

Planned Parenthood Abortion Clinics

As of 1971, Planned Parenthood was operating at least three abortion clinics, including an out-patient center in Alameda-San Francisco area for "low-income" patients, a clinic in Syracuse, and one in New York which will perform 9,000-10,000 low cost abortions per year.

In New York City, Planned Parenthood operates a Family Planning Services Information Service for the city, which gives information and makes referrals for birth control, voluntary sterilization, and abortion for city residents.

Abortion Counseling

"Across the nation, 181 Planned Parenthood affiliates were involved in abortion counseling," says PP-WP medical director (NY) Dr. George Langmyhr.²⁴ Planned Parenthood, Milwaukee, for example has received a \$150,000 grant from HEW which was matched by \$75,000. This permitted PP to increase its services by 50% to include contraception, sterilization and "abortion referral".

According to PP, abortion counseling and referral are "educational and political" as well as purely "service", that is, a total program aimed at educating the public so as to "mold a new attitude" toward abortion; to "increase the number of therapeutic abortions performed under the law in the Bay area and throughout California; and to work for further liberalization of the law" and other objectives.

The *Center for Family Planning Program Development* is a key Planned Parenthood agency established in 1968 to pioneer methods of program planning for community-wide family planning programs and is financed primarily through foundation grants.

Last year the Center conducted a survey in the Pittsburgh metropolitan area and revealed that there were an estimated 57,000 women who want and/or need family planning services. This survey resulted in a \$1,000,000 grant from the Dept. of HEW to the Family Planning Council of Southwestern Pennsylvania, Inc.

Magee-Womens Hospital, in Pittsburgh, is one of the 25 health related agencies associated with the Council.

According to its 1971 Annual Report, Magee-Womens Hospital is dedicated to "the conception, gestation and birth of a healthy, wanted baby in an environment where he

can develop to his maximum potential." (emphasis added). Toward this end, Magee-Womens, the largest non-governmental maternity service hospital in the country, aborted 1,709 unborn children last year.

ABORTIFACIENT RESEARCH

This filtering down of Federal funds to hospitals performing abortions-on-demand is in keeping with HEW Secretary Elliott Richardson's 1970 statement that "I don't anticipate that we (HEW) would take a position on this (legalized abortion) as a Federal agency, beyond saying, in effect that, one; it is primarily a matter for state action and, two; that in general we believe that medical services in cases where a pregnancy is unwanted or where it is medically undesirable should be available to women without undue legislative restrictions." (emphasis added)

In the area of abortion research, federal funds are being funneled into the Contraceptive Development Branch (CDB) of the Center for Population Research (CPR)—a unit of the National Institute for Child Health and Human Development (NHI) of the Department of HEW.

The CDB, which last year received a full time director according to Science Magazine (March 26, 1971) is reviewing a number of contracts relating to abortion including one "to explore the use of microwaves and ultrasound in performing abortions."

The development of prostaglandins, i.e., for use as abortifacients, which according to Dr. Reimert Ravenholt of the Agency for International Development will be very suitable in developing countries because they act through "post-conceptive (hindsight) means of fertility control," has been given top priority in AID, which invested some three million dollars in prostaglandin research in 1969. (Population Council).

This is presented as being only a small portion of the Federal government's involvement in abortion which is being subsidized by the American taxpayer—an involvement which will increase, as Dr. Hellman suggests, if the government adopts a population policy, and if HEW's Five Year Family Planning and Population Research program goes unchallenged.

OEO CONTROVERSY

Since the root of the abortion problem is the government's promotion of Neo-Malthusianism or Planned Parenthood ethics as a matter of PUBLIC POLICY, I will therefore address myself to this problem—even while abortion is excluded as a method of family planning.

By 1971, the Office of Economic Opportunities had received some 26 million dollars for programs relating to family planning, a portion of which has been given to PP affiliates to carry on such programs.

In one specific case, Planned Parenthood of San Diego rejected a sum of \$150,000 for 1972 from the OEO through its OEO office. According to a report in a San Diego press release, the Executive Director of the Economic Opportunity Center said, "The organization (PP) is in non-compliance because one-third of the board is supposed to represent the poor of the community. This is hardly the case." He also stated, "PP has always ignored OEO guidelines to adequately represent the poor. They would not follow the guidelines for a 'racially balanced district', to which a PP representative answered that PP does not intend to do so and therefore it plans to reject the OEO grant.

What we see in effect here is a "democratization" of birth control techniques intended to limit the poor while the power remains in the hands of the Malthusian elite.

Must the poor be guinea pigs?

Another specific injustice relating to federally sponsored family planning programs

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

involves the use of welfare recipients and minority poor for human guinea pigs without informed consent.

The Southwest Foundation has received from the Federal government a three year grant of \$913,000 for the study of steroids.

A portion of the research, carried on by Dr. Joseph Goldzieher, involved the physiological or psychologically induced effects of the Pill.

In a Hasting Center report published in the Spring of 1971 by the Institute of Society, Ethics and the Life Sciences, an article written by Robert M. Veatch, entitled "Experimental Pregnancy" explained Dr. Goldzieher's mode of operation.

Poor, multiparous Mexican-American women had come to the San Antonio, Texas, clinic for birth prevention devices and instructions. Seventy-six of these who were told they were reacting to the Pill were given placebos while others received a variety of hormonal compounds including some containing chlormadinore acetate progestin (recently banned from all further human investigation because of bad side effects in beagles). Of the women on placebos, ten became pregnant and remained so because, according to Dr. Goldzieher, "We could have aborted them if the abortion statute in Texas weren't in limbo right now!"

The Hastings Report raised many excellent ethical questions relating to the injustice of uninformed consent and asked why it is always the poor that must be the subject of experiments of this kind instead of the researchers' wives and daughters.

PRIVATE OR PUBLIC MORALITY?

But the dangers of Neo-Malthusianism are not only related to the poor, for the ideology which it promotes is a challenge to the entire Judeo-Christian community—regardless of economic circumstance.

Neo-Malthusians can never deliver on their promises—to ensure only wanted children in a family, to build marital happiness, to eradicate "illegal" abortions and venereal disease, and to promote the welfare of the community. For theirs is an ideology based only on secular humanism and crass hedonism—the adoption of which gnaws away at the backbone of moral virtue and strong family life based on fidelity and sacrifice and love.

Not a sacred cow

The Federal government has no right to adopt it as a national credo without first fully debating all the implications for society, particularly those relating to family stability which Neo-Malthusianism tends to break down, rather than build up. Instead of increasing its involvement in family planning, the Federal government must begin phasing itself out, starting with a divorce of all family planning policies from welfare. Government programs in the area tend inherently to invade privacy and, ultimately, the right to live.

At the Second World Population Conference, held in Belgrade in 1965, a Korean official pointed out the relationship between government promotion of family limitation and abortion when he stated that a nation which launches a birth control campaign owes it to the citizens to liberalize abortion laws to a certain extent. There will be many unwanted pregnancies, he explained, and the people should have a method of meeting this problem (emphasis added). The fact is that once the government puts itself into the business of promoting contraception, it will be held responsible for subsequent failures. The establishment of tax-supported nationwide abortoria, which has already been proposed by the abortion establishment, is a very real possibility in the not-too-distant future.

The problem is further complicated by the fact that anti-population propaganda tends to increase the reluctance of parents to bear

May 4, 1972

children who, under more normal circumstances, would be accepted and welcomed into the family. Hence, it is likely that government promotion of family limitation will result in more, not fewer, unwanted children.

This is the case in contemporary Japan, where prior to 1948, a pro-natalist policy was in effect and "unwanted children" were practically non-existent. Today, there are many fewer births in Japan but the number of "unwanted children" has increased, as evidenced by an increasing number of child beatings, exposures and parental neglect by mothers and fathers who are busy with other things.

ABORTION & GOVERNMENT BIRTH CONTROL PROGRAMS

This may also help to account for the fact that massive government programs of contraception, intended in part to reduce national abortion rates, do just the opposite.

This has been the experience of Chile (Santiago region), Korea, and Taiwan—all of which have, since the early 1960s, been taking part in massive IUD programs promoted and financed by the United States' Agency for International Development (AID), the Rockefeller Foundation, the Population Council, and the Ford Foundation.

According to a special ASA report, International Consultants' Report 1970, in greater urban Santiago, Chile, the abortion rate in 1961 was 15.5% of all pregnancies. By 1966, the rate had increased to 20.1% of all pregnancies "in spite of the use of contraception."

Asian abortions on the increase

In Korea, 74% of patients on oral contraceptives have had induced abortions . . . and 58% who have discontinued use of the IUD have also experienced induced abortion . . . the article then notes "The proportion of wives practicing contraception prior to and/or after induced abortion is much higher than those who have never had an induced abortion."

Taiwan over the last three years has experienced an increase in the number of induced abortions. *"These findings lead to an impression that promotion of family planning may in fact increase abortion, particularly at the initial stage of the program when a large proportion of women are anxious to keep their families small, yet are unable to avoid unwanted pregnancies completely."* (emphasis added) (pg. 4).

"VOLUNTARY" FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAMS FOR THE POOR

As for the argument that prohibiting government promoted birth control programs rob the poor of the "freedom" to limit their numbers, it should be noted that under title 19 of the Social Security Act, mothers are free to go to their own physicians, and free to get family planning advice under total medical care, which is as it should be.

The constant problem of the Malthusians since the days of Thomas Malthus is not getting birth control information to the poor but convincing the poor "that they need to limit births, as evidenced by the candid statement of Dr. David L. Crane of the Sarasota County Health Department which was entered into the hearing report of *Family Planning Services*.

"I speak for every area, not just for this county. I do not know any areas in the county where anyone has found a formula that will get more than 25% of the needy patients served at an acceptable cost which could be applied nationwide. Meanwhile, the other 75% who are not served are inundating us with another generation of indigents. This indeed is a serious problem! I hope some of the one billion to be provided will be utilized (\$1,100 million allocated in 1970 Family Planning Act) to find solutions to the

problem of how to get patients to accept our free service!"

ABORTION OPENS DOOR TO ANTI-LIFE FORCES

Given the "nature of the beast", I believe the Commission on Population Growth will come out in favor of an explicit population policy directed at 'stabilizing' the American population rather than a report centered on the ways in which America can accommodate a very moderate, indeed a very low level, of population growth if immigration is taken into consideration. In turn, an acceptance of the Commission's recommendations will in fact be an acceptance of Neo-Malthusianism as an American way of life—with all of its attendant evils including permissive abortion, contraceptive sterilization, euthanasia, infanticide, and genetic engineering.

Coming—compulsory population control

It is not merely co-incidence that one of Planned Parenthood's most zealous leaders is also a board member of the Abortion Rights Association of New York, Inc., a member of the Medical and Public Health Committee of the Association for Voluntary Sterilization, Inc., is on the Advisory Council of the Euthanasia Education Fund, and is a board member of the Pathfinder Fund. Abortion—Contraceptive Sterilization—Euthanasia—Population Control—all are closely related anti-life activities which will be promoted and financed by the Federal government unless steps are taken now to divorce Malthusianism from government policy. The eventuality of *compulsory* birth control, abortion, sterilization and death control also must be considered, once such "voluntary" programs are put into effect and protected by law.

HANDBOOK ON ABORTION

(By Dr. & Mrs. J. C. Wilke)

MENTAL HEALTH

"Maternal mental health was the commonest indications for hospital abortion in 1969, accounting for 93.7% of all cases."—Abortion Surveillance Report, Annual Summary U.S. Dept. of Health, Education & Welfare.

Q. How new is mental health as an indication for abortion?

A. It is quite new and has been spoken of only in the last few years. Since the decline and virtual disappearance of therapeutic abortion of the type that once was necessary to save the life of the mother, many major university hospitals have gone a decade or more without doing a single therapeutic abortion. For instance, the University Hospital of the College of Medicine at the University of Cincinnati did not do a single therapeutic abortion for fifteen years prior to 1968. This experience is not unusual. (W. Stone, Dept. of Psychiatry, U. of C., Feb., 1971.)

Already in 1951, Dr. R. J. Heffernan, of Tufts University, speaking to the Congress of the American College of Surgeons, said: "Anyone who performs a therapeutic abortion (for physical disease) is either ignorant of modern methods of treating the complications of pregnancy, or is unwilling to take time to use them."

Q. So abortion is rarely necessary today to save a mother's life?

A. Yes, abortion is almost never necessary anymore.

Q. But isn't it sometimes necessary to preserve her mental health?

A. The word "mental health" is so broad and vague as to be almost meaningless. In fact, in the last few years, it has become a catch-all reason for which all sorts of abortions have been justified, only rarely in

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

fact being done for serious psychiatric reasons.

Q. What would be a serious psychiatric reason?

A. Frank Ayd, M.D., medical editor and nationally known psychiatrist has said: "True psychiatric reasons for abortion have become practically non-existent. Modern psychiatric therapy has made it possible to carry a mentally ill woman to term."

It can be flatly stated that no mental disease known to man can be cured by abortion. The most that can be said is that possible mental breakdowns or complications might be prevented by abortion. To predict this accurately, however, is quite frankly beyond the competence of ordinary men, and we include psychiatrists in this group. There are so many variables, people are so different, and react in so many different ways, that no one, no matter what his training, can accurately predict what effect a pregnancy or an abortion will have on a woman.

Q. That's one opinion. Can you cite other authorities?

A. Dr. Theodore Litz, Yale University Psychiatrist, has said: "It is practically impossible to predict when an abortion will not be more detrimental to the mental health of the mother than carrying her child to birth."

Dr. R. Bruce Sloan of Temple University (who would permit abortions), writing in the New England Journal of Medicine, May 29, 1969, said: "There are no unequivocal psychiatric indications for abortion." He stated further that if the pregnancy is not interrupted, "The risk of flare-up or precipitation of psychosis is small and unpredictable, and suicide is rare."

Q. Suicide is rare? I thought it was common in women who were refused abortion.

A. This is an oft-repeated fallacy. Suicide among pregnant women is extremely rare. Several well-controlled studies have shown conclusively that the actual incidence of suicide among pregnant women is less than one-fourth that of the general female population of the same age. (See p. 45 Minnesota).

Q. That's hard to believe.

A. A good example comes from Sweden. In a series of 344 women who were refused legal abortion in Sweden for a variety of reasons, 62 specifically stated that they would commit suicide. It was determined that none of them did. (Abortion and Psychiatry, Richard Vaughan, Dept. of Psychology, Univ. of San Francisco.)

Q. But does Sweden's experience compare to that of the United States?

A. It would certainly be comparable to the experience of many of our states or large cities. Perhaps a good comparison would be to compare Sweden with Minnesota. Both have relatively similar population groups; both have generally excellent medical care.

Q. But some pregnant women do commit suicide, don't they?

A. Minnesota is the source of some of the figures on maternal suicides. Their suicides of pregnant women have averaged about one per year. It is interesting to note that almost three-fourths of these have occurred in women who have not seen a psychiatrist. As Dr. Frank Ayd mentioned in the question above, when women are under competent psychiatric care, they can be adequately supported through their pregnancies. Abortion for "mental health" is in some areas frequently approved by psychiatrists, which adds one more paradox to the confusing abortion scene in this country.

What occurs at times today is that the psychiatrist, who should be capable of helping the woman through her pregnancy by virtue of his skill, may advise an abortion. This doesn't cure the psychiatric illness, being at best only symptomatic treatment. Most commonly, after such an encounter, there is no follow-up psychiatric treatment. To most inquiring minds, this would seem to confirm

the fact that there was no major mental illness in the first place.

Q. Are you saying that mental illness is usually just an excuse for an abortion?

A. We are saying exactly that.

Q. But don't several physicians usually have to certify that there is mental illness?

A. In practice, the need for certification by several physicians (psychiatrists or non-psychiatrists) to authorize an abortion has been a blatant, premeditated, open-door vehicle by which abortion-on-demand has come to be a reality in several states. Any physician can find three other physicians who will sign a document testifying to the need for an abortion for mental health. Any physician can also find three other physicians who would never sign such a document. This requirement has proved to be totally meaningless.

Medical opinion is deeply divided as to whether psychiatric reasons can ever justify an abortion.

Q. What if a woman has a psychosis, is pregnant, and needs shock treatments. Shouldn't she be aborted?

A. Pregnancy does not rule out the use of almost any known psychiatric therapy, including electric shock.

Q. But don't some women have psychotic breakdowns after delivering a baby?

A. Yes. Post partum psychosis is relatively common following childbirth. It, however, is almost entirely unpredictable. It does not bear any particular relationship to whether or not a woman had mental trouble during her pregnancy. It frequently occurs in a woman who was entirely mentally stable during her pregnancy.

Q. Are there any bad mental after-effects from abortion?

A. There certainly are. In Chapter Ten we quoted a recent British study reporting on eight maternal abortion deaths, noting that two of them were suicide deaths after the abortion had been performed.

Q. Is this common?

A. In your authors' experience, we have seen no cases of suicide from refused abortion, but do know of one suicide produced by guilt feelings after an abortion.

Q. Do these guilt feelings come from religious beliefs?

A. Certainly there are guilt feelings relating to religious beliefs, but most guilt feelings subsequent to abortion have little to do with sectarian religious beliefs. Abortion violates something very basic in a woman's nature. She normally is the giver of life. Most women who are pregnant are quite aware of the fact that they have a baby growing within them. Most women who have an abortion feel that they have killed their baby. Sometimes there is an almost irresolvable guilt, continuing self reproach, and depression. A good counselor would be of help to a woman during a trying time like this, but the woman who has had an abortion doesn't always come to a counselor.

A wise psychiatrist has said that it is easier to scrape the baby out of the mother's womb than to scrape the thought of that baby out of her mind.

Q. Most guilt feelings aren't religious then?

A. No. This was well expressed in a letter to the Editor of the A.M.A. News, Aug. 1970, by Mrs. Brian McGivern:

"If guilt feelings are not always permanent, how often? How often and how long will a woman be thankful for the abortionist's action: through menopause? If she has no more children? when she sees a child whose age would have been her own? If she had the abortion under emotional stress, will she be grateful to the doctors who refused to refer her to a decent agency which could have helped her rather? I would not."

You might not have to hospitalize me for my severe guilt feelings but I'd never forget, after getting out of the stressful situation, that some abortionists have encouraged me to

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

May 4, 1972

take the easy way out and let me pay the penalty."

Q. Are there any good studies reporting on mental health damage from abortion?

A. In 1966, the Council of the Royal College of Obstetrics and Gynecology in England reported on a survey of this problem at that time, and said:

"The incidence of serious permanent psychiatric aftermath (from abortion) is variously reported as being from 9 and 59%."

Q. How about in the United States?

A. Dr. Paul Gebhart, who did the pioneering work in human sexuality with Dr. Alfred Kinsey and who is known as one of the foremost authorities in this field in the United States, in testifying before the New Jersey legislature in 1968, said that there was evidence of prolonged psychiatric trauma in 9% of a sample of American women who had abortion induced therapeutically or criminally.

Q. I'm not sure that much of this guilt business isn't an unconscious replay of old Christian ethics. How about a non-Christian culture?

A. Japan has had abortion-on-demand for 22 years and is certainly not a Christian culture. A number of major surveys have been done there in recent years.

In 1963, the Aichi survey reported that 73.1% of women who had been aborted felt "anguish" about what they did.

In 1964, Dr. Tatsuo Kaseki's report stated that 59% felt that abortion was something "very evil" and only 8% thought that it was not "something bad."

In 1969, a major survey by the Prime Minister's Office reported that 88% of women answered that abortion is "bad."

Q. Can you predict who will have psychiatric problems resulting from abortion?

A. A good evaluation of this comes from Dr. M. Ekblad, whose study in 1955 was reported in *Acta Scandinavica*, the Swedish medical journal. Sweden, as we know, is a country with very liberal sexual morality standards, and abortion there is not subject to any moral stigma. Dr. Ekblad, however, found that 25% of women having had legal abortions later had "serious regret." In evaluating who might have emotional problems because of abortion, he found a clear relationship. "The psychiatrically abnormal woman finds it more difficult than the psychologically normal woman to stand the stress of abortion."

Q. Then the woman in poor mental health is more likely to suffer further psychological harm than the woman who is not upset?

A. That is exactly what Dr. Ekblad found.

This truism has been a rather well-kept secret from most of our state legislators. While purporting to do abortions for reasons of preserving mental health, in fact, if done on women who are actually psychologically ill, they are being done on the very people to whom they probably will do the most damage psychologically.

Emotional upset, anxiety, fear, strain, and mixed feelings about pregnancy are common, even under the best of circumstances. Pregnancy is not a minor event. Feelings of depression in the early stages of pregnancy are very common. Judgments that the pregnancy and child are unwanted are very common. What is absolutely crucial to understand, however, is that how a woman feels in the first three months of her pregnancy and how she will feel in the last three months of her pregnancy, are commonly totally different. If all upset women with unwanted pregnancies had been aborted in years past, at least one-third of our readers would not be living today. (p 38)

Competent medical opinion is deeply divided as to whether psychiatric reasons ever justify an abortion. The phrase "mental health," written into some of our state laws,

has opened a Pandora's box of abortion-on-demand. It bears serious reconsideration by those states that have incorporated this phrase into their laws, and almost certainly it should be stricken from them.

Q. Give more details on Minnesota?

A. In a detailed report of the Minnesota experience from 1950-65 (Minnesota Maternal Mortality Committee, Dept. of OB & Gyn, University of Minnesota,) entitled "Criminal Abortion Deaths, Illegitimate Pregnancy Deaths, and Suicides in Pregnancy (American Journal of OB & Gyn, 6/1/67) the following facts are reported:

There were only 14 suicides of pregnant women in the state of Minnesota in 15 years, or one for every 93,000 live births. Four were first pregnancies. None were illegitimately pregnant.

Ten of these women committed suicide after delivery, only four while pregnant, leading to the author's comment, "The fetus in utero must be a protective mechanism. Perhaps women are reluctant to take another life with them when they do this."

Twelve of the 14 were psychotic depressions. Two were schizophrenics. Only four had seen a psychiatrist.

Male suicides during these years averaged 16 per 100,000 population. Non-pregnant female suicides averaged 3.5 per 100,000 and pregnant female suicides 0.6 per 100,000.

The authors conclude that therapeutic abortion for psychiatric reasons "seems a most nebulous, non-objective, non-scientific approach to medicine. It would seem that psychiatrists would accomplish more by using the available modalities of their specialty in the treatment or rehabilitation of the patient instead of recommending the destruction of another one."

UNWANTED CHILD—RIGHT TO HER OWN BODY

"EDITOR: I would like to write to you to let you know that I am in full accord with the abortions that are being performed in New York City. For every early physiologic process interrupted, we are preventing a candidate for our relief rolls, our prison population, and our growing list of unwanted and frequently battered children."

The above, taken from a letter to the editor of the A.M.A. News, reflects the thinking of some people today. If the above were true, the proponents of abortion at the mother's request would certainly have added weight to their side of the balance arm of the scale weighing the value of the life of the unborn child. If the above is not true, then pro-abortionists have deluded themselves with more wishful thinking.

Q. I believe every child should be a wanted child, don't you?

A. We agree that every child should be wanted. A world without unwanted children would be an idyllic place in which to live. No one could quarrel with that as an idealistic goal. Wouldn't it also be a wonderful world if there were no unwanted wives by husbands, no unwanted aging parents by their children, no unwanted Jews, Black People, Catholics, Chicanos, or ever again a person who at one time or place finds himself unwanted or persecuted. Let's all try to achieve this, but also remember that people have clay feet and, sadly, the unwanted will always be with us.

The measure of our humanity is not that there aren't unwanted ones, but what we do with them. Shall we care for them or kill them?

Q. But why should a mother carry to term an unwanted pregnancy?

A. Physicians who deliver babies will all agree that a significant percentage of all pregnancies are not planned, and, at the time these women are first seen in the doctor's office, they definitely have "unwanted pregnancies." Overwhelmingly, however, a mother adjusts to the initial surprise and shock, accepts the baby growing within her,

and comes to anticipate the birth of her child. After more than twenty years of medical practice, your author personally can say without hesitancy that he has seen many unwanted pregnancies, but has yet to see the first unwanted newborn child. If we permit abortion for an unwanted pregnancy, we will be destroying vast numbers of children, who, by the time of their birth and through their childhood would have been very dearly wanted and deeply loved children indeed. If the judgment of being wanted at an early stage of pregnancy were a final judgment, and abortions were permitted freely, a high percentage of everyone reading this book would never have been born.

Q. But what if a mother delivered a baby that she really didn't want?

A. The federal judges who, in January, 1971, ruled the Ohio abortion law to be unconstitutional spoke very eloquently to this. They said:

"Equating the necessity of giving birth to a child with the necessity of rearing the child has no foundation in law or fact. The law may take permanently from its natural parents a child who is neglected by them, and the frequent hesitancy of courts and social agencies in this regard does not change the legal situation. Statutes of practically all states provide for the voluntary surrender of children. When the statutes are complied with, the child is legally and practically as dead to its natural parents as if it had been aborted, stillborn, or had died in infancy. The validity and effectiveness of surrender statutes has been upheld in every case in which they have been questioned. There is no need for parents to terminate an undesired pregnancy by killing the unborn child physically when with less risk to themselves, its legal death can so easily be procured."

Q. The opening letter assumes that all unwanted pregnancies will be neglected children. Is that a valid assumption?

A. That assumption is almost too naive and simplistic to be given any serious consideration. The fact that it has been mentioned again and again is almost beyond comprehension. Most unwanted pregnancies become wanted babies. Some wanted children become unwanted ones. Unloved babies sometimes become dearly loved and vice versa. To make the assumption that because a woman is unwillingly pregnant, the child in every case, in most cases, or even in many cases will be unwanted and therefore neglected and abused, is totally inaccurate and wildly unrealistic. Some will, of course, but many will not. Why kill them all before birth? Why not sort them out after birth, strengthen our laws that the court mentions above, and take unwanted children from parents who are unworthy to raise them?

Q. The woman in the Ohio court case said that if her baby was delivered that she would batter it. What about that?

A. The logical answer, of course, is to take the child from her at birth and to give the baby to adoptive parents who would love and care for him.

Q. But don't many unwanted pregnancies become battered children?

A. Many would think so. In fact, this is not true. Dr. Edward Lenoski, Professor of Pediatrics at the University of Southern California, did a four-and-a-half year study of 400 battered children. He determined that 90% of the battered children in his study were planned pregnancies. Ninety percent is far above average for planned pregnancies. Most of our readers undoubtedly deeply cherish and love the children that they have been given. How many of you, however, actually planned the conception of 90% of them? We could apparently kill all "unwanted" babies in the early stages of pregnancy, but still not significantly reduce the numbers of battered children.

Dr. Lenoski has also determined that since

the advent of the contraceptive pill (which has certainly reduced unwanted pregnancies), child beating is up threefold.

What of the right of a woman to the privacy of her own body?

A. At least one pro-abortion court decision has referred to this. We think it is an entirely fallacious bit of reasoning. If you, as a citizen, stand outside of a door and listen to a mother battering her child, even to the point of killing it, what would you do? Would you respect the privacy of her home? You would not! You would open or break down the door and rescue the child. By virtue of her assault upon and abuse of another human person, she has surrendered her constitutional right to privacy in this case. The same analogy applies to abortion. The right of the child to live is greater than and supersedes any right that a woman may have to the privacy of her own body.

Q. But a woman does have a right to her own body. Isn't the child, at least in the early stages of pregnancy, part of her body?

A. A woman's appendix, obviously a part of her body, can be removed for sufficient reason. The cells of the appendix, however, carry the identical genetic code that is present in every other cell in the mother's body. They are, for this reason, undeniably part of her body. The single-celled fertilized ovum or the multi-celled zygote or later developing embryonic human being within her uterus cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be considered part of her body. This new living being has a genetic code that is totally different from the cells of the mother's body. It is, in truth, a completely separate growing organism and can never be considered part of the mother's body. Does she have a right to her own body? Yes. But this is not part of her own body. It is another person's body.

Q. No right at all?

A. The Rev. Charles Carroll, Protestant chaplain of the University of California at Berkeley, student of International Law at Yale, Harvard, and the University of Berlin during the Hitler period, and officer of the United States military government in Germany at the trial of the Nazi doctors at Nuremberg, has stated:

"As I would reject the law of paterfamilias of ancient Rome, so I would also reject the proposed law of materfamilias in present day America. As I would not sympathize with the grant by the state of the power of life and death of his offspring to the Roman father, so I cannot sympathize with the grant by any state of the power of life and death over her offspring to the American mother. Surely I would hope our legislators would be as humane as the Emperor Hadrian, who abolished that article of the Roman Law."

POPULATION EXPLOSION?

"The Census Bureau announced yesterday a major downward revision of its population projections for the next thirty years.

"It is possible, the Bureau said, that there will be nearly 100,000,000 fewer Americans in the year 2000 than had been forecast in one maximum projection made just three years ago.

"The revised projections are based on the dramatic decline in U.S. birth rates experienced in the United States in the Sixties. The birth rate in 1968, for example, was the lowest in American history."—Washington Post, August 13, 1970.

Most people's reaction to the above was, "What's going on here? For years we've been told that it won't be long until there's standing room only on the earth."

Population explosion very definitely has a place in our discussion about abortion. One of the major reasons given to justify new and liberalized abortion laws is the pressure of unwanted population. Let's look at some of these facts.

Q. What is the population of the United States?

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A. The 1970 U.S. Census count placed the U.S. population at 204.7 million.

Q. Isn't this a substantial increase in the last decade?

A. In total numbers of people, it was the second largest in U.S. history, having declined from the total number added between 1950 and 1960. In the percentage of gain, however, it was the second lowest rate of increase of any decade in the history of the United States. Only the depression years of the 1930's were lower.

Q. How many children should the average family have in order to stabilize population growth?

A. In 1850, the average number of children per family in the United States was 6.0. In 1970, the average number of children per family was 2.45, and dropping. Taking into account a slowly increasing death rate in this country, as our population bulge approaches old age, population growth will stop altogether between 2.1 and 2.2 children per family. This would be zero growth rate.

Q. What about population trends? Can't they tell us accurately what will happen?

A. Population trends are notoriously subject to both mistakes and abuse in predicting any distance in the future.

In 1910, there were 30.1 children born in the United States for every 1000 people. In 1936, this had dropped to 18.4. If this trend had continued, births in the United States would have ceased altogether by 1975.

In 1936, the birth rate was 18.4 per 1000. In 1957, the birth rate had risen to 25.3 per 1000. If this trend had continued, we would have had over 400 million people by the year 2000, almost a billion by 2050, and two-and-a-half billion by 2100.

In 1957, the birth rate was 25.3 per 1000. By 1970, it had dropped to 17.0. If this trend continues, the last baby in the United States to ever utter its first cry after birth, will be born in the year 1992, and further births will cease totally.

It seems obvious that extending any population trend very far into the future can prove to be quite inaccurate.

Q. But can't we make some kind of prediction?

A. As you can see from the above, predictions are hazardous. It would seem safe, however, and it is the general consensus of opinion among almost everyone, that births per family and per woman in the United States will continue to decline in the next five to ten years. It is on the basis of this that Mr. George Brown, Director of the United States Census Bureau, said in October of 1970: "Instead of the loudly proclaimed people explosion in the United States, current population trends could result in a zero growth rate."

President Nixon appointed a group to study this. What did they find out?

President Nixon's National Goals Research Staff released its report in July, 1970, entitled, "Toward Balanced Growth: Quantity With Quality" (U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20042, \$1.50 per copy). It reported that, "If present trends continue for just ten more years, our national population growth will stop altogether. The question of population size in the United States is not Malthusian. The issue is not whether we can feed and clothe a population of any size we can realistically envisage, or even supply it with the expanding amount of energy it may demand."

Q. What of the death rate? Does this influence population size?

A. The U.S. death rate is now 9.6 per 1,000 people per year. As our population grows older and more people reach old age, the death rate will eventually rise to about fifteen per 1,000 per year, assuming our life expectancy holds at 70 years.

Q. How many people will we have in the United States in the year 2000?

A. If our current birth rate stabilizes at its present level, we will have a population of 281

million in the year 2000. If it continues to decline, it could be much less.

Q. Since the rate is dropping, then why this rather substantial increase from our present 204 million?

A. This is because the babies born during the postwar baby boom of the early Fifties constitute a population "bulge" as they now come of marriageable age. This excess in numbers of people of this one age group will be forming their families and having children, thus producing an overall jump in total number of people, even though the percentage per family continues to drop. When this bulge, however, is past, if current trends continue, the population growth will flatten and probably reach zero growth rate.

Q. How many babies are actually born in the United States in a year?

A. In 1957, there were 4,308,000 babies born. In 1968, there were 3,470,000 babies born. We are already educating that excess of births from the late Fifties. Our schools are crowded with them. This bulge is passing, however. In 1976, for instance, there will be 800,000 fewer third graders in the nation's classrooms than there are today. This, at least, is not guesswork. These babies have already been born. We can look forward to an overabundance of teachers, schools, and educational facilities in the decade of the Seventies.

Q. You believe that families will be smaller in the future?

A. In a Gallup Poll (Feb., 1971) the question was asked: "Would you like four or more children in your family?"

In 1967—40% answered "Yes"

In 1971—23% answered "Yes"

Of great importance was that, of all the college-educated, only 14% wanted four or more. Of those with only a grade school education, 33% wanted four or more.

This is further confirmation, if any is needed, that the only way to effectively limit population growth is to raise a group's standard of living and education.

Q. Abortion is being spoken of as a means of population control. What does the medical profession think of this?

A. The official statement of the American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology in 1968 said: "It is firmly stated that the College will not condone nor support the concept that abortion be considered or performed as a means of population control."

Q. Isn't the increase of population in our cities the cause for the rise in violent crime, illegitimacy, etc.?

A. Our cities have a population implosion. This is due to a poor distribution of people, not the simple fact of natural over-population itself.

In Holland, the population density is 1,000 people per square mile. In the United States it is 57 people per square mile. Even taking into account the vast waste areas of mountains, etc., in the United States, the only areas that approach Holland in population density are those of our crowded cities. Yet it is well known that Holland has only a fraction of the crime rate and social upset of our major cities.

As another example, Great Britain has 50 million people living in an area smaller than California. Why is it then, that there are fewer murders on the entire British Isles annually than there are in the city of Chicago, or Cleveland, or even of Greater Kansas City? Obviously, population density in itself does not produce high crime rates and social upset.

Q. Won't too many people increase the problem of pollution?

A. Certainly, more people produce more pollution. Certainly, more affluent people produce more pollution per person than poor people. However, more wealthy and more educated people also produce the wealth and technology to combat pollution. The basic problem is not the simple fact of people

existing, but of education, of methods of industrial production, of self-discipline, etc.

Q. What will remedy our pollution problems?

A. Not merely the simplistic answer of reducing the number of children per family. We could stop population growth, and our rivers would still be ecological slums, the air over our cities would still remain unbreathable, and our environment would continue to deteriorate. What is needed is massive efforts, great sums of money, educational campaigns, and in many ways, a substantial change in the way we live, not in how many of us are alive.

Q. What will the effects of population growth in our country do to the economics of this country?

A. The Wall Street Journal (Dec., 1970) said: "Population projections for the 1970's indicate a further decline in the growth rate. Our big population explosion is in the past, but the echo effects will reverberate strongly throughout the economy for many years to come. Census experts believe American families in general will enjoy rapidly rising incomes in the years ahead. Median family income is expected to rise from around \$9,900 today to \$15,000 in 1985, measured in dollars of constant purchasing power."

The other thing the Journal pointed out was that the labor force in the United States will be increasing much faster than the population, as the bulge of young people moves into their working, productive adult years. A Labor Department report says of this: "The large numbers of young workers may provide an abundance of new ideas. The eagerness, imagination, and flexibility of the young will contribute to developing new ways of business organization, production, and marketing." Needless to say, they will also find new ways of attacking and solving our pollution problems.

Q. How much space is there actually existing at this time for every person who lives in the United States?

A. If we divide the number of people presently living in the United States by its total acreage, each individual has ten acres.

Q. What percentage of the population of the U.S. is needed to produce the food we eat?

A. Less than 5%.

Q. What of the world population? Will it follow the same trends as the United States?

A. One thing is certain. Neither voluntary birth control nor abortion has ever stopped the population growth of an economically underdeveloped and underprivileged country. One sure way to slow down population growth of underdeveloped countries is to bring them up to an increased standard of living. As we increase the standard of living of a nation, its people will voluntarily limit their family size. This is the major problem for the rest of the world in the decades ahead.

Q. Won't the rest of the world outgrow its food supply?

A. A few years ago, dire predictions of this were being made. Within the last several years, however, a "green revolution" has occurred. Hybrid wheat, corn, and rice have been developed that have radically changed the outlook in these hungry lands. In Pakistan, wheat output has soared from four-and-a-half to twelve-and-a-half million tons in just five years. In India, wheat production has gone from twelve-and-a-half to nineteen-and-a-half million tons in five years. The same has happened to rice within several years. At present rates, most of the teeming sub-continent of Asia will be exporting grain rather than needing our help to stave off starvation. Their remaining problem is distribution of food, not production of it.

Q. What is the opinion of major candidates for the 1972 Presidential election?

A. President Richard Nixon on April 3, 1971, said:

"I consider abortion an unacceptable form

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

of population control. Further, unrestricted abortion policies, or abortion on demand, I cannot square with my personal belief in the sanctity of human life—including the life of the yet unborn. For, surely, the unborn have rights also, recognized in law, recognized even in principles expounded by the United Nations.

"Ours is a nation with a Judeo-Christian heritage. It is also a nation with serious social problems—problems of malnutrition, of broken homes, of poverty and of delinquency. But none of these problems justifies such a solution.

"A good and generous people will not opt, in my view, for this kind of alternative to its social dilemmas. Rather, it will open its hearts and homes to the unwanted children of its own, as it has done for the unwanted millions of other lands."

Senator Edmund Muskie, the same week said on a T.V. show:

"I'm concerned about diluting in any way the concept of the sanctity of life."

"First of all, we're not entirely sure of the psychological impact upon mothers themselves who become free or indiscriminate in the use of this way of avoiding the consequences of sexual relations.

"A life has been taken away from them, and it's the very nature of motherhood, you know, to shield and protect life, not to destroy it . . . If it becomes all right to take a life in that stage, then how easy will it be to slip into the next step. Should people in old age who are senile—does it then become legitimate to take their lives? And there is the medical question of when does life begin to quicken. That, I guess is about six weeks . . . it's when you get beyond that point that I begin to have trouble."

RECOGNITION OF JAMAICA BAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1972, CANARSIE PARK MALL, BROOKLYN, N.Y.

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, at the request of my constituent and friend, Mr. Jerome J. Hipscher, president, Jamaica Bay Council, Arverne, N.Y., I wish to join with him to remind others of the beauty of wetlands throughout America, and at the same time extend an invitation to Members of Congress, their families, and those interested to attend the environmental pageant on September 24, 1972, to see firsthand the importance of a Gateway National Park through visual arts and history; performing arts and environmental programs.

Jamaica Bay is an environmental paradise situated in the Boroughs of Brooklyn, Queens and Nassau Counties, going from Coney Island to Inwood Park. The Gateway National Park will include a part of the Jamaica Bay. The bay has a natural wildlife refuge situated in Broad Channel area and under the supervision of the Department of Parks of New York City. Gateway National Park can be reached by a system of buses.

New York City needs the Gateway National Park, as an area for relaxation, recreation, environmental education, research, and preservation. Those citizens who by virtue of being poor are locked into an urban city with no relaxation, poor recreational facilities, and no open space and clean air to breathe. Sen-

ior citizens likewise become locked in. This park can serve to bring clean air and a place where citizens can enjoy the beauty of America whether they be poor, senior citizens, youth or a traveling American or foreign visitor to New York.

To celebrate this coming event and hopes for early development of the Gateway National Park, the Jamaica Bay council are planning a fall Jamaica Bay pageant on Sunday, September 24, 1972, at Canarsie Park Mall in Brooklyn from the hours of 11 a.m. to 5 p.m. Please set this date aside and join those interested in this celebration and expression of love for the wetlands.

J. EDGAR HOOVER: INDOMITABLE, INCORRUPTIBLE

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, a part of America passed from the scene with the death of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. Hoover took his place in America in the era of the tough prohibition-rich, power-mad, gangsters who were threatening the very structure of our American Republic.

Bank robberies, kidnapings, and gangland executions had so intimidated the American people that some of our cities had made truces with gangland chiefs, guaranteeing them safe sanctuary in return for freedom from their predations.

No public figure ever stepped into a more disheartening situation, but as his later life proved, J. Edgar Hoover was indomitable.

First he sought laws to give his bureau authority, and then he sought stiffer penalties for the crimes peculiar to that era, bank robbery, kidnaping, bootlegging, and crossing State lines to avoid prosecution.

Thus armed, he cut an exciting swath through the American crime hierarchy and soon had it all but erased from the American scene.

Mr. Hoover built his department from one of inept anonymity to one of the world's most famous criminal investigative agencies.

Smart, incorruptible, tenacious, J. Edgar Hoover's foresight and ability resulted in an almost complete roundup of enemy spies at the outbreak of World War II. When German submarines attempted to land saboteurs on our shores, the FBI was waiting for them at water's edge.

J. Edgar Hoover was a legend in his own time, immortalized on the screen and television.

His service of 48 years, under eight different Presidents is unique and probably never will be equaled in American history. This was the mark of his true worth. He was unshakable, untouched by politics.

Mr. Hoover's passing should be mourned by every American. They owe him more than most will ever realize.

May 4, 1972

NEWSMAN'S DILEMMA

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the tremendous amount of information overclassified by the executive branch bureaucrats has created some real problems for the Nation's news media.

There are no doubt some who believe that every piece of information which is classified is overclassified and therefore fair game to be printed if the item falls into their hands. At the other extreme, there are those newsmen who believe that everything classified is done so for the best of reasons and to print the document or to discuss its contents is tantamount to treason.

Between these extremes is the great mass of newsmen who try to cast an independent judgment on each issue—or document—as it arises, asking themselves, "If I got hold of this item would I print it?"

Regardless of their decision, there is little doubt that the classification stamp, used irreverently and illogically, is at the bottom of a great crisis among newsmen.

A newsman whom I respect greatly has written recently of this problem.

At this time, I would like to introduce into the RECORD a column by John Troan, editor of the Pittsburgh Press:

NEWS MEDIA'S DILEMMA
(By John Troan)

In Washington, the Nixon administration has sprung a sieve—and government documents of various sorts are leaking out to the public.

In Cambridge, Mass., an anti-war group is peddling to the news media what it claims to be secret information about U.S. troop movements and military plans.

In Virginia, a former high official of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) has written a magazine article which purports to reveal how U.S. spies throughout the world gather secret information for our government.

To some newsmen, this is a dream—reflecting the ultimate in freedom of the press. To me, this is a nightmare—reflecting the dilemma of balancing a basic right against a basic responsibility.

For, unlike some of my brethren, I do not believe the right of freedom of the press absolves us from the responsibility of protecting the national security.

SECURITY DANGER

I don't mean protecting the national government from mere embarrassment—such as that which followed publication of the "Pentagon Papers" on the Vietnam war or the "Anderson papers" on the India-Pakistan war.

I mean protecting the national security from being undermined—as by advance publication of battle plans or troop movements, or by disclosure of the men or methods our government employs to ferret out from foreign sources information vital to our country's welfare and even to our survival.

Roger Fisher, a Harvard University law professor, pointed up this conflict between press rights and press responsibilities at the meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington the other week.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

He confessed he himself doesn't know where to draw the line. Nor does anybody else.

But certainly we have a responsibility to draw it somewhere short of jeopardizing the lives of our fighting men. Or foreclosing our government's access to information needed for self-protection in a civilized world that still resorts to jungle rules too often.

BOMBING PLANS?

The anti-war group in Massachusetts is bragging, for instance, that it tipped off some of the news media about U. S. plans to bomb Hanoi and Haiphong the week before.

I don't know what truth there is to this, or whether anyone actually published or broadcast the information.

But I think anybody who would deliberately seek to have a fellow American shot down by enemy guns should himself be shot at sunrise.

And the same goes for anyone who would condemn U.S. espionage agents to almost certain death by exposing who they are or how they work.

This is not freedom of speech or freedom of the press. This is treason.

And if the news media don't exercise their responsibilities in this area, it won't be long before they won't be able to exercise their rights either.

DISCRIMINATORY REVENUE PROVISION SHOULD BE ELIMINATED

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, on April 26, the Ways and Means Committee reported a long awaited revenue sharing proposal which is expected to come before the House in the near future. While I question the propriety of several of the provisions contained in the bill, one in particular has drawn strong criticism from the citizens of my home State of Texas—and rightly so.

The provision penalizing the 10 States which do not have an income tax does great injustice to the spirit of federalism, which has long been a cornerstone of our republican form of government.

Mr. Speaker, there is no overriding Federal interest that would justify legislation dictating the system of taxation practiced by the several States. Moreover, the fiscal condition of the Federal Government is certainly no shining example for the States to follow. As one of my constituents aptly explained in a recent letter:

Our State is run in a manner far more sound fiscally than is the Federal government. Our budgets ultimately balance. We have no debt. We pay our way.

I sincerely hope that the House is afforded an opportunity to strike this discriminatory section from the bill. If a closed rule is granted, thus providing no such opportunity, then I must urge my colleagues to vote "no" when H.R. 14370 is brought before the House for a vote.

For the benefit of all Members of Congress, I would like to insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the April 19 edition of the Houston Chronicle.

INCOME TAX PROVISO HAS GOT TO GO

The revenue-sharing bill approved this week by the House Ways and Means Com-

mittee still contains the proviso penalizing Texas and the nine other states that do not have a state income tax.

If approved as it came out of the committee, the bill would deny the 10 states a share in the \$900 million of revenue allocated to states. Under the committee formula, half of the \$1.8 billion going to the states would be distributed on the basis of state income tax collections, the other half on basis of total revenue.

There is no justification for linking the states' share with a state income tax, just as there would be no reason for tying the funds to any other source of revenue. In doing this, the federal government in effect would be telling the states how to collect their taxes. Allocation of the entire \$1.8 billion should be based solely on total state revenue.

When Lt. Gov. Ben Barnes went to Washington in March to protest the income tax matter, committee chairman Wilbur Mills, D-Ark., pledged total opposition to the proviso. Mills said his committee staff drew up the bill based on wishes of a cross section of governors and mayors. He indicated that governors whose states have an income tax favored an allocation tied to the income tax to encourage the other 10 states to join the fold and thereby erase any advantage they might hold in attracting industry.

Rep. Mills, of course, still can honor his pledge to fight the income tax proviso when the bill comes before the House, and he should do so. The Chronicle urges all members of Congress to make this a fair revenue-sharing bill and remove any connection with an income tax.

J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we all mourn the loss of J. Edgar Hoover, a public servant, serving under eight Presidents of the United States. I join my colleagues in paying tribute to this great American who became the Nation's No. 1 policeman 48 years ago.

J. Edgar Hoover created a national police force of high competence whose members have been of such exalted morale that the Bureau has been untouched by scandal for 48 years.

It has been said of J. Edgar Hoover "he is a hero to millions of decent citizens and anathema to evil men." No other man has fought so long or so hard for a safer and better national life.

Upon acceptance as Director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover set up the criteria for appointments to the Bureau:

The Bureau must be divorced from politics, appointments and promotions must be based on merit and the Bureau must be responsible to the Attorney General only.

J. Edgar Hoover molded the FBI into a model law enforcement agency, setting a rigid standard of personal behavior for himself. His creed to attain a goal of excellence: Integrity of self and deed with absolutely no compromise.

His passing will be mourned by all those who search for law and order. His passing marks the end of an era of dedicated, courageous service. He truly was a great American patriot.

REPRESENTATIVE LONG'S ACTIVITIES IN BEHALF OF ISRAEL

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, during his 10 years in the House of Representatives, CLARENCE D. LONG has worked to strengthen Israel by supporting programs to improve agricultural and industrial development, to keep Israel strong militarily, and to aid the emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel.

As a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee—which initiates congressional action on U.S. foreign aid programs—Dr. LONG has introduced and supported programs to aid Israeli educational institutions, including the Weismann Institute and the Feinberg Graduate School of Hebrew University; medical centers, such as the Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center; and homes for the aged, such as Zichron-Yaakov. In addition, the Maryland Representative has worked for the passage of legislation to express the sense of Congress with respect to peace in the Middle East, to urge the President to intercede with Soviet leaders to obtain better living conditions for Soviet Jewry, and to allow Soviet Jews to emigrate freely to Israel or to any other nation of their choice.

In 1967 and 1971, Dr. LONG visited Israel to consult with Levi Eshkol, Golda Meir, Abba Eban, David Horowitz, Finance Minister Phinhas Sapir and other Israeli leaders.

Following the 1971 trip, during which Congressman LONG also conferred with President Sadat of Egypt—the first American Congressman to do so—he reported his views to the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Near East.

Representative LONG pointed out that his principal conclusion—based on observations, conversations, and economic analysis—is that time is very much on Israel's side. That nation is producing about the same gross national product as Egypt, although it has only one-eleventh the population, and is moving ahead at one of the fastest rates economically of any country in the world.

Israel looks for a doubling of popula-

tion in the next 20 years from natural growth and immigration. If Israel continues her 6-percent annual growth in real output per capita, this will mean a six-fold increase in total output in the next 20 years. Thus, in another two decades, there will be the economic equivalent of six Israels. In contrast, Egypt is growing slowly—barely keeping ahead of a population growth which is a hindrance rather than a help since Egypt is already bursting with unabsorbed labor.

The Maryland Congressman observed at the hearing which I attended, that the American people can take pride in Israel's progress, for they have given Israel nearly \$8 billion in economic and military aid—through the U.S. Government and the American Jewish Community.

PASSING OF J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1972

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, J. Edgar Hoover's passing at the age of 77 and after 48 unbroken years of public service, has deeply saddened those of us in America who had a deep and abiding respect for both the man and the law. I say this because, for as long as I can remember, the two have been accepted as one and the same by all Americans familiar with his extraordinary and unparalleled record of service.

I know of no citizen of this great country who has served his Nation so ably and so loyally, as has J. Edgar Hoover. Some have said that he was incorruptible, but that does not reflect the true measure of this great man. In the recorded history of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, there is not a single known instance of an FBI agent ever accepting a bribe or otherwise defaming the Bureau. That, in my judgment, is but one example of the greatness that was J. Edgar Hoover the leader, the Director, and the man that we all referred to as an institution unto himself.

From the lawlessness and corruption of the 1920's, the subversion and intrigue of the 1940's, to the bombers and dissenters of the 1960's—J. Edgar Hoover

remained true to his profession, to enforcing the law, to upholding justice, and to the many Presidents he served along the way. And throughout it all, he remained above partisan politics, above revenge to his critics, and above reproach in directing the activities of what is recognized through the world as the epitome of a national crime-fighting organization—an organization that always supplemented and supported the State and local peace officers and their efforts—an organization that gave us more internal security and freedom than any country in the world.

I should like to conclude my remarks by quoting a line I read today by noted columnist David Lawrence about Mr. Hoover—

He died while in office, so it can be said he retired peacefully.

When you trust a man and respect him as much as we all trusted and respected J. Edgar Hoover, there can be no question that he is going to be missed. When a man remains in public office and at the same job for nearly half a century, there can be no doubt that his departure is going to leave a great void. As a boy he was my hero and as a man, he remained my hero. And he always will be.

A G-Man, when I was a boy was a man that gave me something to trust, something to cling to, as I sought assurances of security, something I could believe in.

J. Edgar Hoover projected an image of fairness and firmness and he directed and built the great organization we commonly accept and respectfully refer to as the FBI.

America desperately needs to recognize and adhere to the principles of honesty, integrity, and justice that this great man practiced each day of his life.

J. Edgar Hoover was truly a Christian soldier for peace in America.

Today he is resting in peace, but his memory and his name will linger on forever in the hearts and minds of all Americans privileged to live in his time and under his protective shield of service.

When we as individuals have accomplished our daily tasks, we can go to sleep in peace—knowing that God is always awake and aware.

J. Edgar Hoover, with a lifetime of fulfillment and accomplishments has earned his right to sleep in peace.

May the good Lord look kindly upon this man, my hero.

SENATE—Friday, May 5, 1972

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON III, a Senator from the State of Illinois.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we thank Thee for Thy providential care over this Nation, for watching over us in peace and in war, in prosperity and adversity, and for leading us to this very hour. Guide us to a new high destiny of spiritual power,

moral rectitude, and strength in the quest for peace and justice. Equip us in mind and nourish us in spirit.

"To serve the present age

Our calling to fulfill

O, may it all our powers engage,

To do the Master's will."

We pray in His name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the

Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter.

U.S. SENATE,

PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1972.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. ADLAI E. STEVENSON III, a Senator from the State of Illinois, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. STEVENSON thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.