

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A GREAT AMERICAN, SPEAKER JOHN W. McCORMACK, SPEAKS OUT ON AMERICA: TODAY AND YESTERDAY

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report, there is an extensive and excellent interview with one of the great Americans of our time—one of the great congressional leaders of all time—our beloved Speaker, JOHN W. McCORMACK.

In this interview and article Speaker McCORMACK, speaking from the historical perspective of 42 years as a Member of the House, recalls famous events and comments upon their effect and impact.

Speaker McCORMACK, for example, gave capsule impressions of our famous Presidents who served during his own service as Congressman.

These are his comments:

President Franklin D. Roosevelt—"The country needed strong leadership and he provided it."

President Harry S. Truman—"A man of strong and decisive mind and he had the capacity to make any decision, no matter how tough, that confronted him."

President Dwight D. Eisenhower—"Success as a great military leader carried that atmosphere and respect for him into the White House."

President John F. Kennedy—"A man of decisive mind with courage, as evidenced by his confrontation with Khrushchev in Berlin crisis and Cuban missile matter."

President Lyndon B. Johnson—"A man of vision, leadership—one of our outstanding Presidents."

President Richard M. Nixon—"Too early to make an appraisal—he showed courage in making decision on Cambodia."

In reviewing the highlights of his distinguished and remarkable career in the Congress, Speaker McCORMACK takes greatest pride in legislation he assisted in passing that has helped Americans realize their hopes and dreams of a better life.

Such legislation includes Social Security, minimum wage, low-cost housing, and personal service to tens of thousands of other persons who sought his assistance.

He concludes the interview:

I'm very thankful that the good Lord put me in a position where I could serve two constituencies—my people back home and the people of the United States.

Remarkable words by a remarkable man.

Because of the great interest of my colleagues and the American people in our beloved Speaker, I insert the article from U.S. News & World Report in the RECORD:

AMERICA: TODAY AND YESTERDAY AS SPEAKER McCORMACK SEES THINGS AFTER 42 YEARS IN CONGRESS

(NOTE.—What real dangers confront today's U.S.? How do they compare with the

days when John McCormack entered Congress more than four decades ago? What lessons have been learned? Mr. McCormack has spent more consecutive years as Speaker than any other man. Staff members of "U.S. News & World Report" interviewed the Speaker as he prepared for his forthcoming retirement at the close of this Congress.)

Question. Mr. Speaker, how has America changed in the 42 years since you first came to Washington?

Answer. When I came here in December, 1928, as a young Congressman filling out an unexpired term, there were no serious problems to speak of. The stock market was floating along nicely and Americans by and large were enjoying life. Some of us worried a little about an overextension in construction, but nobody believed that we were heading into a business recession that would rapidly develop into a deep depression. If anybody was worrying about foreign problems, he kept it pretty much to himself.

But then the Depression did come with all its severe problems. Only those of us who actually lived through those years can know what they were like. The country turned to Franklin D. Roosevelt's leadership.

Then a notorious figure in history by the name of Hitler came across the horizon, and the questions in the field of foreign affairs became more and more important. Finally, we were attacked at Pearl Harbor and we got into World War II in 1941, and met the problem of developing our great resources and our manpower, military and otherwise.

After World War II came this challenge that still confronts us: world unrest, with two great nations—Communist Russia and Communist China—trying to undermine other forms of government and further their own cause by any means that will serve their purposes.

So, world problems have increased tremendously in importance since I first came to Washington in 1928.

Question. Are you optimistic for the future of the U.S.?

Answer. Let me answer this way:

I saw what appeasement did in the '30s, when Britain and France let Hitler get away first, with the Rhineland—thinking he'd be satisfied—then Austria. Some of us in America saw to what this arrogant aggression was leading. Winston Churchill in England certainly saw what it meant, but he was like a voice crying in the wilderness. In those days before World War II, nobody agreed with Nazism or Hitler, but so many people in England and the rest of Europe and even in America said: "Well, we can live with him."

Today, I find that there is a tendency in America to misread the significance of international Communism and its designs upon our own country. Arrogant aggression, whether under Nazism or under international Communism, isn't something Americans can ignore and live with.

Question. Is appeasement a danger to the U.S. today?

Answer. I don't think it has reached the stage that prevailed in the '30s, although it's traveling in that direction. You find more and more people are thinking and saying: "Well, we can live with Communism."

I can live with the Communists if they will leave other countries alone. If the people of the Soviet Union want to have a Communist form of government, they have a perfect right to do so. But when they try to impose their form of government upon other nations—using any means, legal or illegal or otherwise—that is where I part with them.

It is possible to have a Communist form of government and get along with non-Com-

munist nations. We are getting along with Yugoslavia. It is a Communist nation, but also highly nationalistic.

But the Soviet and Chinese Communists are just as much bent on world domination today as they ever were. There may be tensions between the two, but they can get together overnight, and they'd both like to see the world dominated by Communism with America isolated.

Then they could fight it out to see who would be the No. 1 Communist nation.

Question. Do you see the Vietnam war as necessary to thwart the Communist strategy you have outlined?

Answer. I think you can argue whether or not we were justified in going in there in the first instance. But we are there, and we have to accept that fact.

If we leave South Vietnam under terms which constitute a peace at any price, the world will know it, no matter how we try to sugar-coat the terms. The effect on the future of the United States would be disastrous. It would be an open invitation to every nation in the free world to hedge its position by making the best terms possible with the Communist powers. And the closer a country is to Russia or China, the more that nation would have to hedge.

Few people realize that Southeast Asia is the first line of defense in the Far East for the United States. If we are forced out, it will be only a short time until we will be driven back to a continental defense line, which is Hawaii and Alaska. Some people can laugh that off. I cannot. That is why I stand for a just peace in South Vietnam—not peace at any price.

Question. Have you supported President Nixon's Southeast Asia policy generally?

Answer. I have taken the courses of action that I thought were in the national interests of the United States. I always try to support the President on foreign-policy matters, whether he is in my party or not. I would expect the same if I were in the White House. I was next in line to the President for 14 months after the tragic assassination of President Kennedy, and while I didn't want to think about those things, naturally I couldn't help asking myself during that time: "Well, what would you do, John?"

Question. Do you think the U.S. will be drawn into the Middle East conflict?

Answer. If we vacillate—take an uncertain position and show a lack of firmness—that could happen. Whether we like it or not, the free world is centered upon the leadership of the United States. If we fail to make decisions when they must be made, we will get into trouble.

I am convinced that you have to deal from strength when you are confronting the Kremlin. You can't flinch. I think President John Kennedy proved that in the Cuban missile crisis in 1962. The Russians backed down then. They have problems of their own. The people over there want to live, the same as we do.

So, I say that we've got to be powerfully strong and firm. If there is another Pearl Harbor, we won't have three or four or five years to recover. The next war would be a 24-hour or 48-hour one. I do not like to think this way, but I am realistic.

But, again, I am optimistic for the future. I can see 15, 20 years from now, with the changes taking place in the world, the Soviet Communists might be pleading with us to be their friend. I'm not banking on it, but it could happen. I want to be certain America is strong enough to preserve herself during those 15 or 20 years.

Question. Turning to domestic affairs, Mr. Speaker: The Federal Government has grown

tremendously during your 42 years in Congress. Has it become too big?

Answer. Government has got to bring justice to its people. That is one of its first duties. As the United States has grown and become more and more industrial, problems have multiplied until they are very serious and challenging.

I think we are meeting those problems with what I call dynamic democracy. The progressive legislation that Congress has passed—I have in mind such things as Social Security, minimum wage, low-cost housing, etc.—is necessary for social justice in our changing society.

I can see in the near future where our problems are going to grow more and more as a result of advances in the field of science, and their impact upon the nation's economy and the ability of an individual to get a job. That's why I was instrumental in establishing a Committee on Science and Astronautics in the House so we could have a group of legislative specialists—not scientists—to help direct the transition that is bound to take place.

Question. So you feel Congress has changed with the times—

Answer. Yes. The pressure of business has increased, the issues are more important, the number and scope of bills introduced have risen greatly, and the importance of committees has grown.

For all practical purposes, we've developed into committee government. Theoretically, Congress acts as a whole in enacting legislation. But the committees have become more and more prominent because of the pressures upon members and the legislative branch. That was inevitable, and it is a good thing.

Members of the Congress who are assigned to a committee become deeply interested and dedicated to the business of that committee. And the staff of any committee is very, very important to its success. Good staff members are invaluable.

Question. Does a Congressman have time today to serve the needs of his home district when he has to devote so much time to national and international affairs?

Answer. Well, that comes down to each individual. Some of us devote more time to study, some devote more time to their committees, some to the needs of their home districts.

The great majority of the members of Congress meet the challenges and the tasks that confront them. They give untiringly of their time in committee work, on the floor, in conferences, studying legislation—at night as well as during the day—studying in other areas—all in order to develop their thoughts on the important matters coming before the Congress.

Question. Should there be more members of Congress?

Answer. I wouldn't recommend more members of the House. As far as the Senate is concerned, the Constitution determines its size; we're wedded to two members from each of the States.

Question. Do you think the caliber of Congressmen has improved during your service in the House?

Answer. I don't want to say that the caliber of members has improved over the past. I'm very proud of the men I serve with and I respect them very much. It's not that they are of higher quality than members in the past. Rather, it's that they rise to and meet the greater demands and pressures of the present.

THE WAY SENIORITY REALLY WORKS

Question. Mr. Speaker, the seniority system is often criticized.

Answer. The seniority system, to begin with, is misunderstood. First, it is not a formal rule. It is a practice and a custom. It applies to both parties and in both the House and the Senate. Now, most people don't

realize that. When the chairmanship of a committee becomes vacant, the Committee on Committees recommends to the Democratic caucus that custom be followed and the next man in line—in terms of length of service—is designated as chairman. The full caucus has the power to overturn that recommendation. So the caucus is the master. The Committee on Committees is the servant.

Question. Does the caucus often overrule the Committee on Committees, Mr. Speaker?

Answer. No.

Question. Has it ever?

Answer. It has. It did in the case of a chairman and two or three members not long ago. It's unnecessary to mention their names. But it has been done—and in recent years, too—when a couple of men did not support the Democratic nominee for President, but openly supported the Republican nominee. Another case involved the chairman of an important committee.

Question. So the seniority system is sometimes suspended—

Answer. Yes. Very rarely, but the power exists. The fact that it hasn't been done often doesn't take away the power of the caucus to do it.

Question. What is your view of suggestions made recently that the seniority system be abolished, or at least modified?

Answer. I've always taken the position that, if anyone could show me a better method or practice or custom, I would support it. But I haven't seen one yet.

Under the seniority system, you know what your rights are—even those who want a change. Every member of a committee wants seniority up to the chairmanship. If you tried to take all seniority away, you'd have a revolution in Congress.

It really comes down to a question of chairmen. All the opposition to seniority revolves around one or two chairmen who have caused dissatisfaction among some members.

One of the methods suggested is that chairmen be selected from the first two or three men in seniority on a particular committee. If that practice were adopted, you'd have the worst kind of lobbying possible.

You can imagine what the bankers of the country and the big industrialists of the country would do if the present chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency—Wright Patman, of Texas—had to be elected. They'd do everything they could to defeat him.

You can imagine what the intense lobbying would be like on the election of a chairman of the Education and Labor Committee.

You can pick out any number of other committees—Ways and Means, Judiciary, Post Office and Civil Service, Federal employees are very much interested in the latter Committee. They would want to get their man in there. If they didn't think the one who's next in line was their man, there would be a tremendous pressure job.

But to go even deeper than that:

Back not so many years ago, the first Negro chairman in Congress—Bill Dawson, of Illinois—became chairman of the Committee on Government Operations. It happened I was senior to him on that Committee at the time. However, I returned as Majority Leader.

Now, I could have been Majority Leader and still stayed on as chairman of the Committee under the custom followed in those days. But I wouldn't do it. I stepped aside, and Congressman Dawson became chairman.

But I didn't resign from that Committee, as I did from the Ways and Means Committee some time before. I stayed on the Government Operations Committee to show how proud I was to step aside for Congressman Dawson, a great American of the Negro race, and how proud I was to serve under him as chairman.

Suppose we had elected a chairman, and Bill Dawson wasn't chosen. Do you think

there is any American of the Negro race or any other decent American who would not feel strongly that he was defeated because of the color of his skin?

Suppose a vacancy had occurred in a chairmanship in the days when the Klan was very strong. What if the man in line for the chair in seniority happened to be religiously a Catholic, and was defeated. You couldn't satisfy any decent American but that he was defeated because of his religion. Or suppose one was of Jewish blood—the same thing.

Events like that could cause very acute divisions among our people.

Any kind of rule we have—no matter how perfect it is in theory—is not going to be perfect in actual operation, because we're not perfect ourselves. The question is: Which system most nearly approximates perfection and fairness? As I see it—with complete respect for those who disagree with me—the seniority system is the best I've seen to date.

Question. Do many in Congress question the seniority rule seriously?

Answer. I don't think there are so many in Congress as there are among the public, because the other side of the case is not widely publicized: that a Democratic caucus is not bound by what the Democratic Committee on Committees recommends. I'll agree it's difficult to overrule, but the caucus has the power—always has.

Look at the high type of men you get under the seniority system: George Mahon, chairman of the Appropriations Committee; Bob Poage, Agriculture Committee; Mendel Rivers, Armed Services; Wright Patman, Banking and Currency; Carl Perkins, Education and Labor; Wayne Aspinall, Interior and Insular Affairs—no man knows interior and insular affairs better than Wayne Aspinall—these are all dedicated men—Harley Staggers, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, tremendous job; Melvin Price of Standards of Official Conduct; Olin Teague of the Veterans' Affairs Committee—those and all the other chairmen are top-rate men. And there is Wilbur Mills, Ways and Means Committee—everybody respects him as one of the most able men in Congress.

Thomas Morgan, Foreign Affairs; John McMillan, District of Columbia; Sam Friedel, House Administration; Emanuel Celler; Judiciary; Edward Garmatz, Merchant Marine and Fisheries; Thaddeus Dulski, Post Office and Civil Service; George Fallon, Public Works; William Colmer, Rules; Richard Ichord, Internal Security; Chet Hollifield, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—are all great chairmen, chairmen who do outstanding jobs.

Question. Mr. McCormack, how long have you served as Speaker of the House?

Answer. When I step down at the end of this Congress, I will have served nine years, starting in January, 1962.

Question. How does that compare with length of service by previous Speakers?

Answer. I have the longest continuous service of any Speaker in the history of the country. I rank second to Sam Rayburn in total years in the Speaker's chair. He became Speaker in September, 1940, but his service was interrupted by the 80th (1947-48) and the 83rd (1953-54) Congresses, when Republicans were in control.

All told, as Majority Leader and as majority whip—positions I held before becoming Speaker—I have had 30 years of continuous leadership in the House. That is the longest such service in the entire history of the United States.

WHAT THE SPEAKER DOES

Question. Just what are the duties and responsibilities of the Speaker?

Answer. The office of the Speaker of the House is one of four established by the Constitution of the United States. The other three are President, Vice President and Chief Justice. No other offices are specifically provided by the Constitution.

The Speaker is also an active member of the House. Unlike similar positions in many parliamentary governments, the Speaker can take the floor of the House and enter into debate, as I often do.

One of the Speaker's principal duties is as parliamentarian, to make sure that the rights of all members, regardless of party, are scrupulously protected. If I ever lean over backward, it is in protecting the rights of the minority.

The Speaker, by virtue of being the only legislative office established by the Constitution, occupies the No. 1 legislative position. It is his duty always to protect the prerogatives and responsibilities of the House of Representatives—and the entire Congress for that matter—under our form of government, calling for division of powers among the executive, legislative and judicial branches.

I think it is correct to say that the Speaker of the House does occupy the second most powerful position in our Government. In theory, the Vice President is second to the President, but in actual terms of power and influence in our Government, the Speaker ranks second. I don't say that to downgrade in any way the office of the Vice President. That is just the way it is.

Question. President Nixon the other day referred to you as the "first man in the first office in the land." What did he mean by that?

Answer. What he meant was that when our Government first met after the Constitution had been ratified, the first official to be sworn in was the Speaker of the House. The President was sworn in later.

Question. As Speaker, how do you exert your influence?

Answer. Through respect and friendship. Question. The personal touch with members?

Answer. Yes, that's involved, of course. A very important part of this job is communication.

Question. Do you handle the exercise of power differently than, say, Sam Rayburn did when he was Speaker?

Answer. Speaker Rayburn followed pretty much the same course as I do. I believe in the appeal to reason, in being firm in the performance of my duties, but not in being arbitrary or dictatorial. I believe in the affirmative approach—talking to the need for the legislation. If it is a party matter, I stress the importance of party loyalty. I have never had any difficulty in using this approach.

Question. How much control do you have over the legislation that comes before the House?

Answer. The programing of bills is very simple. When a bill is introduced, it goes to the appropriate committee. Hearings are held and the committee votes on the bill. If it is approved, the bill is reported out of committee. Then it goes to the Rules Committee, and finally is brought out on the floor of the House.

We—the Majority Leader and I—don't program a bill without consulting the chairman of the committee from which the bill came. If he prefers to have a bill come up a week later, we co-operate with him. It may be that you haven't got enough votes to pass the bill right away, but if you wait you probably could round up the necessary votes.

It is very, very seldom that there is any difficulty in the programing of legislation.

Question. Suppose some members challenge the leadership on an issue. How do you force them to back down? Is withholding favors one way?

Answer. No, that's not involved. If a man honestly entertains his views, I respect him even when we are in sharp disagreement. I do not believe in the punitive system.

When Joe Cannon was Speaker of the House (1903-11) things were different. In those days, the Speaker appointed members of committees and that led to an abuse of

power that brought about a revolution in the House. The members stood the abuse of power as long as they could; then a coalition of Republicans and Democrats came together and brought about reform. The lesson is that the Speaker should always be careful not to put himself in a position, even unintentionally, where he will misuse the power given to him as a trust.

COOPERATING WITH REPUBLICANS

Question. Do you co-operate at all with Republican leaders in the House?

Answer. Yes. Our relationship is friendly in every sense of the word. On a close vote, I'll often go to the Leader or the whip on the other side and say: "How many of your votes are we going to get on this bill?" If they know, they will tell me. And if it isn't enough—say, the Republican Leader says he thinks there will be 15 votes from his side of the aisle for the bill, and I know that we need 25—then I'll be hollering that we need 40 Republican votes to win. But I'll cash in for 30. That's all part of the game, and the relationship across the aisle is very cordial.

Question. Are the Republican estimates usually accurate?

Answer. Not always. As a matter of fact, I have one or two friends on the Republican side who are not in a position of leadership but whose estimates have been awfully good throughout the years. That is understandable, because it's difficult sometimes for leadership to get a good idea of just where all members stand.

Question. Do you tell the Republican leaders how you think Democrats are going to vote on a given issue?

Answer. Yes, certainly.

Question. By what process is the Speaker elected?

A. The Democrats pick a candidate in what we call our caucus and the Republicans pick one in their conference. If there is more than one candidate in either party's voting, the ballot is taken in secret so that members can vote their judgment and their conscience without hesitancy.

Of course, it is a foregone conclusion that the party in power will elect the Speaker when the two candidates come before the full House. That is one vote where all Democrats can agree. And the same goes for Republicans.

Question. So the Speaker is not chosen on the basis of seniority—

Answer. Oh, no.

Question. Were you opposed in the Democratic caucus for the Speaker's job?

Answer. Nobody ran against me until the last time, when we organized the new Congress in January, 1969. I figured that I would get about 180 or 181 votes in that contest. The final vote was 178 for me and 58 for my opponent.

WHY RETIREMENT WAS POSTPONED

Question. Mr. McCormack, why did you decide to retire from Congress?

Answer. Actually, I made that decision nearly two years ago at the time of the 1968 election. I very nearly decided not to run at that time for re-election. I have always thought there is no such thing as the indispensable man. There are a lot of fine public servants in my district who would render trustworthy service here. If we have to rely on the principle of indispensability, then we are in trouble.

Question. But you did decide to run in 1968—

Answer. Yes, and I made that decision because 1968 was a presidential-election year. Whether right or wrong, I felt that if the Speaker of the House, a Democrat, did not announce for re-election, it would look as though he was fearful of a Democratic defeat. To put it in plain language, I would have been walking out on my party. So I ran and was re-elected to the House, and I stood again for Speaker and was elected by the

Democrats in the House. But I made up my mind in 1968 that I would retire in 1970.

Question. Until you announced your retirement, though, you had given every indication that you planned to run in 1970—

Answer. You see, if I had announced my retirement too early, I wouldn't have been able to maintain a position of influence necessary to secure passage of legislation. That's why I waited as long as I did. I probably would have waited a little longer, except for the law in Massachusetts which requires candidates to take out nomination papers and get the necessary signatures by a certain date if they are going to run for office.

I felt in justice to those who might have the ambition to succeed me that I should announce when I did so that they could make their plans.

Question. Mr. Speaker, during your 42 years in the House, how many Presidents of the U.S. have come and gone?

Answer. When I came to Washington in December, 1928, Calvin Coolidge was in the White House and served three more months until Herbert Hoover was inaugurated in March, 1929. After that came Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, and now Richard Nixon.

So I have been in this House during all or part of the Administrations of eight Presidents.

Question. Which of those Presidents has made the greatest impression on you?

Answer. That would be a hard question to answer, because they all impressed me. Any man elected President of the United States is the choice of the people of our country. To merit that choice, he has to have impressive credentials.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected when the country was faced with its worst depression. We needed strong leadership, and he provided it. During his Presidency, Hitler rose to power and started World War II, and had to be put down—and Franklin Roosevelt met that test.

Question. How do you size up the other Presidents under whom you served?

Answer. Harry S. Truman, during his years as President, showed he was a man of strong and decisive mind, and he had the capacity to make any decision, no matter how tough, that confronted him.

The success of President Eisenhower as a great military leader carried that atmosphere and respect for him into the White House. He enjoyed my friendship and respect, as well as the other Democratic leaders of the House and Senate. We saved his recommendations on quite a few occasions.

The tragic death of President John F. Kennedy shortened his period of service as President. He was a man of decisive mind with courage, as evidenced by his confrontation with Khrushchev in the Berlin crisis and the Cuban missile matter. I strongly supported him in his decision.

President Johnson carried through extraordinarily the Kennedy-Johnson programs in civil rights, education, conservation—showing vision and leadership in co-operation with the Congress. In the field of foreign affairs, he indicated great courage and leadership, which place him as one of our outstanding Presidents.

President Nixon has been in office for 18 months—too early to make an appraisal. However, whether one agrees or disagrees with the Cambodian decision, he showed his courage in making it.

HIGHLIGHTS OF A LONG CAREER

Question. Looking back over your congressional career, what are your most vivid memories?

Answer. Standing out in my memory, of course, is the part that I was able to play in securing passage of important legislation

that involved the hopes and dreams of the average person. I'm proud, too, of standing up and voting for the defense of our country, because I think this is essential to assure America's preservation.

The greatest pleasure I get out of life is in serving people. That means not only in helping to pass legislation involving such things as Social Security, minimum wage, low-cost housing, but being in a position to serve the needs, in a personal way, of the tens of thousands of human beings in my district and elsewhere.

I'm very thankful that the good Lord put me in a position where I could serve two constituencies—my people back home and the people of the United States.

A NEED FOR MORE EFFECTIVE CONTROL OF DISRUPTIVE ELEMENTS IN OUR SOCIETY

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1970

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, in times of extreme chaos and change such as today, it is more necessary than ever for established authority to render itself effective in controlling disruptive elements. As the forces of anarchy grow ever shriller, as disruptions and confrontations take an increasingly larger toll of both property and life, it is imperative for Government to assert its authority and control.

From September 1969 to February 1970, according to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, there were over 375 demonstrations on 76 college campuses. Damage approached \$1,400,000. During a similar period, according to the same report, "incidents of violence throughout the country involving fire bombings, sniping, and unprovoked or ambush attacks on police officers" as a result of racial disturbances "markedly increased."

Numerous social and political commentators have pointed out the necessity for maintaining authority in the face of increasing vandalism. For this reason, therefore, I am especially concerned with the necessity for legislation making individuals who participate in civil disorders civilly liable for damages to persons who suffer loss. To this end I am introducing a bill to amend chapter 12 of title 18 of the United States Code by adding the following new section:

Whoever, as a result of his participating in a civil disorder, is convicted of a crime against the United States, shall be liable in a civil action for the full amount of damages sustained by any person who receives damage or injury to his person or property as a result of such civil disorder. Any person who receives such damage or injury to his person or property may bring such civil action in any district court of the United States in which the defendant resides or is found, without respect to the amount in controversy, and shall recover, in addition to the damages by him sustained, the cost of the suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee.

It is only a matter of justice that those individuals who suffer property loss by the destructive and disruptive actions of others be compensated for their loss by the offender. It is necessary to the sur-

vival of Government by law that those responsible for public disorder be held responsible for their actions.

I strongly suggest, therefore, that this legislation be given the most urgent and immediate consideration.

AGAINST SECRECY IN CONGRESS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial written on July 13, the Chicago Sun-Times placed into proper perspective the reasons why we should abolish secrecy in Congress.

The editorial appropriately points out the dilemmas facing many Members of Congress and the obstacles placed in their way in carrying out their duties. It points out also the need to abolish secrecy so that the public may be better informed on how their Representatives voted and why.

I believe that votes should be recorded and shall support passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act.

Many Americans have often said that they have taxation without representation. It is my hope that if we can pass the Legislative Reorganization Act and abolish secrecy, that our citizens will say that they have taxation with representation, and a better government in the process.

Mr. Speaker, the excellent Sun-Times editorial follows:

AGAINST SECRECY IN CONGRESS

For many years this newspaper has argued long and often for the public's right to see and hear the deliberations of its elected officials. Illinois now has on its statute book a law requiring all public meetings to be public, including committee meetings, with certain reasonable exceptions.

We therefore are particularly pleased that the anti-secrecy movement is taking hold in Congress where members have notoriously ignored the people's right to know.

This week action is scheduled in the House on H.R. 17654, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. A group of Congressmen, including Illinois Republicans John N. Erlenborn and Thomas F. Rallsback, are sponsoring amendments which would require a public recording of how members vote on major issues both in committee and the House floor. They would open committee hearings and meetings to the press and public, and require publication of committee reports and hearings a reasonable length of time before final House action is taken.

House members now can avoid putting themselves on record on a final vote on an issue by permitting passage by a voice vote (all in favor say "Aye") or by a standing vote in which members are counted but not recorded individually.

The public is entitled to know how its individual members vote on major issues and it is entitled to even more than that. It is entitled to know the reasons behind their votes and this means that the voters are entitled to hear the arguments made in committee meetings.

Unless there is such a free flow of information to the public, the democratic process is handicapped.

One of the most secret of the House com-

mittees is the one labelled Ways and Means, in which all government spending originates. (In the Senate, virtually all appropriations hearings are open.)

It has been argued that secrecy is needed in such House committees so that members may not be inhibited about speaking up and asking questions, thereby, perhaps, exposing ignorance of the subject.

Secrecy is argued for appropriations subcommittees on the grounds that it is necessary to prevent "raids on the treasury." We don't follow that argument. It seems to us that raids on the treasury might better be prevented by letting the public see what's going on.

In a special report, the Democratic Study Group, which has been working to modernize government and the political parties, noted that what the secrecy process does is concentrate the "power of the purse" in the hands of a few men. It denies the taxpayer public an opportunity effectively to influence national priorities and makes a farce of the principle of representative government. Even congressmen who are not members of the particular subcommittees are barred from them.

The Democratic Study Group says:

"The only real opportunity afforded other members of the House to influence an appropriations measure is during floor consideration. However, after months of closed-door committee consideration, this stage of the appropriations process is telescoped into a few days with the predictable result that members can do little more than rubber-stamp the committee decisions."

Surely the public expenditure of billions of dollars should not be the private business of a few influential congressmen. Nor should the public be held at arms length as the House debates life and death and dollar issues and then votes them up or down in virtual anonymity.

We salute the courageous band of innovating congressmen who are trying to let some light into the capitol.

KEEP GAS TAXES FOR ROADS

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, there has been a proposal offered by one of our colleagues to divert from the highway building program some of the funds collected from gasoline taxes on highway users.

I oppose such a proposal. I trust the committee will never move it to the floor of the House for consideration.

Our Federal system of highways still is far from complete. Let us keep the user funds for the purpose for which they are presently dedicated.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial on this subject which appeared in publisher Ed Morrison's Morris Tribune.

This editorial, I believe, is indicative of the feelings of our people in the Minnesota Sixth Congressional District:

KEEP GAS TAXES FOR ROADS

There is a move in Congress at the present time to divert from the highway building program some of the funds collected from gasoline taxes on highway users. The Minnesota Good Roads Association opposed the effort, as well they might.

Highway needs are such that taxes collected on gasoline should be spent for better roads, at least for the time being. Good highways are the solution to movement of traffic in and about the rural areas. Unfortunately, however, the same thing can not be said about highways in the metropolitan areas.

So while there is need to establish some expressways in and about and around metro areas, the experience of Los Angeles would indicate that simply building one freeway after another does not solve the problem. The congestion on the freeways when they get overloaded almost defies description. Traffic can grind to a virtual standstill for hours.

Nor can there be much doubt that exhausts from highway vehicles contribute substantially to the smog problem large cities are experiencing. On the basis that simply building freeways does not solve the traffic problems of metro areas and does contribute to the smog problem, there might be some justification for taking a portion of highway user taxes from those areas for work on abatement of automotive pollution as well as supporting alternate means of transportation.

What this all boils down to is that the original concept of an interstate system of super highways, by-passing all the congestion of major and minor communities, still makes as much sense as ever. The idea of super highways criss-crossing metro areas in order to provide commuter service in those areas appears to be of questionable merit. Seeking a better solution to this problem seems reasonable.

MOUNT VERNON: A LIVING MONUMENT

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the highlights of Prince Charles and Princess Anne's recent visit to Washington was their visit to Mount Vernon.

Mount Vernon, home of our first President, serves as both a monument to that great man and a living reminder of our country's beginnings. With its stately columns and majestic grounds, it gives us a glimpse of the quiet splendor which George Washington loved so much. Anyone who visits Mount Vernon is struck by its beauty, and at the same time, feels a closeness with the past—a harmony with history—which remains with him long after he has left the picturesque plantation.

Mount Vernon is more than an example of an age gone by, it is an inspiration to all Americans and, indeed, to all men who cherish freedom. It is inspiring because it reminds us that George Washington, despite all the fame and adulation he gained in his lifetime, remained a man who cherished peace and dignity—who treasured home and family. It is inspiring because, in its majestic simplicity, it symbolizes the Government, and the country, that its owner helped to build and lead.

Today, there is still another reason to praise Mount Vernon. The staff has

proven to be both courteous and efficient. Many of my guests who have visited Mount Vernon have remarked about the excellence of the personnel. I would like to single out for special praise Mr. Charles C. Wall, the resident director, and Mr. Frank H. Hammond, the administrative assistant, both of whom have been especially helpful.

A PERCEPTIVE GADFLY

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, for the past 18 years, Mr. I. F. Stone has been observing and reporting on our Government. Through his newsletter, I. F. Stone's Bi-weekly, he has diligently and effectively pointed out contradictions, inconsistencies, and misstatements on the part of elected and appointed officials, to the benefit of us all.

The Wall Street Journal on Tuesday, July 19, 1970, traced Mr. Stone's career in journalism in an article titled "Gadfly on the Left."

I congratulate Mr. Stone for his effectiveness and success and commend the article to all of my colleagues:

I. F. STONE ACHIEVES SUCCESS, RESPECTABILITY BUT KEEPS RAKING MUCK
(By A. Kent MacDougall)

WASHINGTON.—I. F. Stone, tireless pamphleteer and senior leftist, is at age 62 coming into success and respectability. He has sought neither and is uncomfortable with both.

"It's a little embarrassing," he says.

After toiling for 17 years in his newsletter, I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly, he is now being discovered by young and old alike. The liberal-radical young are looking to him as one of their few respected elders. Their moderate elders are saying perhaps he has been right all along in his ceaseless criticism of U.S. war and armaments policies.

The circulation of Mr. Stone's \$5-a-year newsletter has nearly tripled, to 60,000, in the past five years. He now is being read in all the best places. Forty subscriptions are sent to Capitol Hill offices, and the White House is among the recent subscribers.

Mr. Stone is no longer ignored by the people he attacks. Vice President Agnew, in criticizing the press, has lumped the newsletter with the New York Times and the Washington Post. The Bi-weekly, the Vice-President has said, is "another strident voice of illiberalism." David Eisenhower, the President's son-in-law, stayed away from his own graduation ceremonies at Amherst College last month because Mr. Stone was the commencement speaker.

Who's Who in America has recently reinstated Mr. Stone, after dropping him during the McCarthy era; a spokesman for the book says he doesn't know why Mr. Stone had been dropped. The New Yorker magazine recently quoted extensively from a speech he made last March at a Madison Square Garden peace rally. He now is a frequent guest on television talk shows. And a Canadian film-maker is producing a 25-minute documentary on him.

NO LUNCHES WITH VIPS

But success and respectability don't seem to be spoiling Isidor Feinstein Stone. The maverick muckraker continues to rake muck. Nearly every issue of the four-page Bi-Weekly punches a hole in some policy statement or

decision that much of the Washington press corps has taken at face value.

He still avoids friendships with Government officials. "They're all nice guys—even Nixon—but that's irrelevant," he says. He sees a danger in getting too cozy with news sources. "You've really got to wear a chastity belt in Washington to preserve your journalistic virginity. Once the Secretary of State invites you to lunch and asks your opinion, you're sunk."

Mr. Stone, who also writes frequently for the New York Review of Books, has two part-time editorial assistants now, but he puts out the Bi-Weekly almost singlehanded. Izzy Stone's forte has always been research, and he still spends much of every day reading periodicals and looking up facts. Each day he reads 10 newspapers, ranging from Le Monde to The Wall Street Journal, and he regularly culls dozens of magazines, including Air Force & Space Digest, the Economist and Peking Review. His home, a comfortable house in an upper-middle-class neighborhood in Washington's northwest side, is jammed with periodicals, Government documents and some 7,000 books. He works at home.

I. F. Stone remembers most of what he reads. Thus, when Defense Secretary Melvin Laird tells a Senate committee that Russia is "the only country in the world that has actually fired an ABM at a missile," Mr. Stone digs out an old hearing transcript that quotes Mr. Laird's predecessor, Clark Clifford, as telling the same committee that "as long as seven years ago we demonstrated we could with confidence destroy single incoming missiles." Mr. Stone also finds old newspaper clips disclosing an Army announcement of shooting down a missile with an ABM.

When he isn't pointing out contradictions, he is criticizing. He doesn't mince words. "Laird is Washington's biggest liar since John Foster Dulles," he wrote in May. And he is often eloquent. "... (President) Hoover like Nixon evaded decisions by appointing fact-finding commissions and then in turn evaded the facts when found," he wrote last month.

THE DEAF REPORTER

Mr. Stone attributes his habit of close reading and attention to detail to years of almost total deafness. "I went deaf in 1938, and it improved my reporting. I couldn't hear what was said at briefings and hearings, so I'd go around the next day to study the transcript. I'd catch things the guys who had listened and written on deadline had missed," he says. "Governments lie, but they don't like to lie literally. They use corkscrew sentences and disingenuous statements, and you have to read these documents as though they were mortgage contracts drawn by a shyster lawyer."

Operations in 1964 and 1965 restored Mr. Stone's hearing, and he doesn't even need a hearing aid today. He wears thick glasses—the steel-rimmed spectacles give the plump and rumpled Mr. Stone almost an owl's resemblance to Benjamin Franklin—and had to have a serious eye operation in 1967. He also suffered a heart attack in that year, but his health has been generally good since then and he vows to continue the Bi-Weekly for eight more years, until he is 70.

The world doesn't breathlessly await each new issue of the Bi-Weekly. Decision makers don't postpone decisions until reading Izzy Stone. Some respected people in Washington—liberals and conservatives—claim his words carry no weight.

Some other respected people here say that Mr. Stone is simply wrong on most counts. William S. White, syndicated political columnist and Pulitzer Prize-winning author, says: "I like and respect him. He's a man of complete sincerity and integrity. I just think he's terribly wrong. He has a manic obsession against the use of power, particularly military power."

Yet there is evidence that I. F. Stone is an influential voice, and is becoming ever more so. Tom Wicker, political columnist and associate editor of the New York Times, says the Bi-Weekly and the underground press have influenced the daily commercial press "to be less officially oriented than we once were." Mr. Wicker says Mr. Stone is "one of the best writers and most courageous and perceptive journalists in town. Before any of us had the courage to think for ourselves, rather than take what the President said (at face value), he was doing it."

Mr. Stone says many Washington reporters still swallow Government pronouncements whole. He isn't invited to background briefings, and he says, "I have a hell of a lot of time by not going." Briefings are usually brainwashings, he claims, "attempts to sell the Government line and to shape the news." And he adds: "Establishment reporters undoubtedly know a lot of things I don't. But a lot of what they know isn't true."

Mr. Wicker, a reader of the Bi-Weekly since the early 1960s, is clearly a fan of the publication and its editor. Mr. Wicker says that Mr. Stone "has shown, more than most, the profound influence that personal journalism, divorced from big organizations and expense accounts, can have." Mr. Wicker says he used to think that Mr. Stone "was fairly far out, but not anymore."

Mr. Stone admits that he is not as "far out" as he was as a youth. In his adolescent days, he read Jack London, Peter Kropotkin, Karl Marx and other revolutionary writers and considered himself "a communist-anarchist." Today he calls himself, "half a liberal, half a radical."

I. F. Stone has been involved in personal journalism ever since his adolescence. As a 14-year-old in Haddonfield, N.J., Izzy Feinstein (he added the "Stone" later) and a schoolmate published a five-cent monthly, *The Progress*. The paper was complete with ads, poetry and editorials attacking William Randolph Hearst and defending the League of Nations, and young Izzy peddled it around town on his bicycle. But his father, a Russian Jewish immigrant who owned a dry goods store in Haddonfield, ordered a halt after the third issue because it was hurting his son's school work.

Young Izzy was not a very good student. "I wanted to go to Harvard, but I finished 49th in my high school graduating class of '52," he says. "The University of Pennsylvania had open enrollment and had to take me." He was a philosophy major at Penn but dropped out in his junior year and never finished college.

"I was a New Lefty before there was a New Left," he says. "I didn't cut my hair, tie my ties or believe in college degrees. I believed you shouldn't do anything unless it was spontaneous and genuine."

Mr. Stone worked for Camden, N.J., and Philadelphia dailies in the late 1920s and early 1930s. After a stint on the New York Post, he went to Washington in 1940 as correspondent for the Nation magazine and subsequently for three ill-fated New York dailies—PM, the Star and the Compass.

When the Compass folded in 1952, Mr. Stone tried unsuccessfully to get his old job on the Nation back. Newspapers also seemed uninterested in hiring him. Inspired by the earlier success of crusading journalist George Seldes' newsletter *In Fact*, he launched the Weekly (changed to Bi-Weekly in 1967) with 5,300 customers obtained from his old newspapers' subscription lists.

A CHECK FROM EINSTEIN

Early subscribers included Eleanor Roosevelt, Bertrand Russell and Albert Einstein. Mr. Einstein's \$5 check for a one-year subscription is framed and on display in Mr. Stone's home.

Though the Cold War climate wasn't hospitable

to Mr. Stone's new venture, he experienced no McCarthyite-style harassment. "I was fortunate enough to be born in a country with a tradition of a free press," he says. "There are very few countries in which you can spit in the eye of the Government and get away with it. It's not possible in Moscow."

Mr. Stone is as harsh on the Communists as he is on the capitalists. "I used to think that abolition of private property was the answer," he says. "I lost that faith when I saw what has happened in the Soviet bloc. The worker is more exploited there than in Western welfare states." A recent Bi-Weekly charged that "the liberation of 1917 has become a new enslavement." Mr. Stone said: "The Soviet Union today is like a huge company town with company unions and a company press." After Mr. Stone's only trip to Russia in 1956, he wrote: "This is not a good society and it is not led by honest men." That verdict caused 400 readers to cancel their subscriptions.

He has infuriated other readers with his defense of the Warren Commission Report on the assassination of President Kennedy. "I don't believe in the conspiracy theory of history," he explains. "I rejected the rightist theory of a Communist conspiracy, and I couldn't accept the leftist theory of a plot to kill Kennedy."

But the worst shock Mr. Stone has given his readers was his criticism of Israel. He has visited Israel eight times and has written two books favorable to Zionism and Israel's fight for independence. But since the Arab-Israeli War of 1967, he has warned that the new nation is in danger of losing its soul. "A besieged and militaristic Israel, if not overwhelmed from without, will be destroyed spiritually from within," he wrote recently. His solution is compensation and resettlement of Arab refugees in an Arab Palestine that would be federated with Israel, with Jerusalem the joint capital.

NO SELF-HATE

Several American Jewish magazines have attacked Mr. Stone's stand on Israel, and some subscribers have accused him of feeling self-hate as a Jew. "That's not true," he says. "I feel quite comfortable about being a Jew."

Readers also found surprising his attack on Ralph Ginzburg after the Supreme Court upheld his conviction as a publisher of pornography. Mr. Stone, long a champion of civil rights and First Amendment freedoms, now concedes, "I feel kind of bad about that." He says that what Mr. Ginzburg did "was so mild" compared with the sex publications flooding the country today. "We are getting more civilized about sex; on the other hand, so much of the stuff today is vile and horrible that I hate to have children see it. It's good for kids to learn something behind the barn," Mr. Stone says.

Mr. Stone admits to a generation gap between him and his three children, but it's not the usual kind of parent-child chasm. In this case Mr. Stone is the liberal. His children are political moderates, he says. (But a niece, Kathy Boudin, is a radical. Authorities have been seeking her since an explosion last March that destroyed a suspected bomb factory operated by radicals in Greenwich Village. The explosion killed three persons. Miss Boudin was said to have been seen leaving the site.)

If his own children don't embrace his every thought, some college youths do. His talk at Temple University last April had to be moved to bigger quarters because of an overflow crowd. The Amherst students picked him as commencement speaker (and the college gave him an honorary degree) and Penn's prestigious Philomatean Society chose him to give its annual oration this year, at which time he delighted in pointing out that the same group had turned down his bid for membership when he was a freshman at Penn.

AN I. F. STONE SAMPLER

WASHINGTON.—I. F. Stone is a master of the pithy putdown. A sampler:

Lyndon B. Johnson—"He was a New Dealer when that was the road to power, he became a conservative when that was the way to stay in."

Richard M. Nixon—"Indecisive, weak and tricky, with neither the statesman's vision nor the politician's finesse."

Eugene McCarthy—"A dilettante in politics as in poetry."

Attorney General John Mitchell and other Washington hardliners—"Nothing is more dangerous than weak men who think they are tough guys."

THE RADICALS' HERO HITS BOMB-THROWING TACTICS

WASHINGTON.—I. F. Stone is a favorite among college radicals—"a major hero in the radical pantheon," according to *Life* magazine—but he is critical of some radicals' bomb-throwing tactics.

"Burning America down is no way to Utopia," he says.

What is the solution? He seems less sure than ever. "Lifelong dissent has more than acclimated me cheerfully to defeat," he wrote not so long ago. "It has made me suspicious of victory. I feel uneasy at the very idea of a Movement. I see every insight degenerating into a dogma, and fresh thoughts freezing into lifeless party line. Those who set out nobly to be their brother's keeper sometimes end up by becoming his jailer."

"Every emancipation has in it the seeds of a new slavery, and every truth easily becomes a lie."

MRS. PETER DORN NAMED OUTSTANDING CITIZEN

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join the townsmen of Bloomfield in saluting Mrs. Peter Dorn for her selfless and able efforts in behalf of the entire community for which she was so deservedly named "Outstanding Citizen of the Year." And, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues a recent editorial from the Independent Press citing her achievement:

OUTSTANDING CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

As we looked at Mrs. Peter Dorn standing in the rain under an umbrella as she received the Outstanding Citizen of the Year Award from Carmine DiIorio, Commander of the Miles A. Saurez Post 711, V.F.W., our mind swept back over the years and recalled how faithfully this indefatigable woman of our town has handled the various projects she has been associated with.

Mrs. Dorn received the award at the Fourth of July celebration on Foley Field.

She has served as president of the Junior Woman's Club. She was vice-chairman of Bloomfield's 150th anniversary celebration. She was the designer and compiler of the Scrap Book which brought national awards to Bloomfield in 1967 and 1969. She was trustee of the United Fund and the Bloomfield Federation of Music, president of the Friends of the Library, president of the Bloomfield Historical Society, and organizer of the Sacred Heart Library Guild and the Bloomfield Historical Museum.

Mrs. Dorn was a wise choice of the committee selecting the Outstanding Citizen of the Year.

A UNIVERSAL OBSERVANCE: OFFICIAL SQUARE DANCE WEEK, SEPTEMBER 7-13, 1970

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, for generations now many of this Nation's ethnic groups have dedicated themselves to perpetuating the customs and traditions of their native lands. They have handed down from father to son, mother to daughter, the traditional dress and music of many lands. They schedule festivals or observances to commemorate their lineage and keep alive their heritage.

The United States, while still a relatively young nation in the history of the world, nonetheless has compiled its own special customs and traditions. In the world of music, for instance, we are credited with giving birth to the blues, New Orleans style. The square dance, historically linked with the opening of our western frontiers, is enjoyed by hundreds of thousands of Americans today and its popularity increases each year.

This year, for the first time, the American Square Dance Society, working in cooperation with member associations, is seeking formal recognition on the local, State, and national level. They have asked the week of September 7-13, be set aside and observed as "American Square Dance Week."

A constituent in my 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, Ronald Meisl of 1910 Ola Avenue, Glassport, has asked me to support the society's request for a national salute. Mr. Speaker, I do so with the greatest of pleasure and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

The article follows:

A UNIVERSAL OBSERVANCE: OFFICIAL SQUARE DANCE WEEK, SEPTEMBER 7-13, 1970

For many years, groups of square dancers in different parts of the United States have acted independently in requesting heads of local, city and state governments to proclaim an Official Square Dance Week. Some have met with success and square dance weeks and months have been declared in different areas and at various times throughout the year, ranging from several in February to quite a few in the late Summer and early Fall.

In an effort to consolidate energies and increase the effectiveness of this idea, The Sets in Order American Square Dance Society would like to suggest a combined effort for 1970. Just imagine the impact that would be felt if a majority of cities and states across the land all set aside the same time as a period in which to salute the national pastime, American Square Dancing.

Before settling on a plan, considerable study has been made of past efforts. While in some areas an entire month has been recognized, the majority of cases would indicate a weeklong observance. The question then: just which week might be most appropriate?

SELECTING A TIME

Over the past twenty years square dancers have come to realize that generally speaking the square dance year begins in the early Fall. Clubs in many areas, dormant over the warm summer months, open their doors with the end of the vacation season, coinciding perhaps with the beginning of

school in the various areas. This, too, appears to be the prime time for starting new dancer classes. To be sure, some classes start at other times during the year, however almost without exception when the warm weather begins to subside, callers and clubs start putting out the promotional material necessary to bring in new dancers.

SECOND WEEK IN SEPTEMBER

For this reason we would suggest that an ideal time would be the second week in September. This would mean an observance starting with Monday, September 7th and ending with Sunday, September 13th, 1970.

During this time the energies of square dancers through their clubs and associations could be directed by focusing the attention of non-dancers, of civic groups in the area, of church, recreational and educational bodies, to the purpose, fun and philosophies of the Great American Dance.

It is suggested that each area, working independently, solicit the mayor and city council and obtain proclamations on a local basis. Perhaps your mayor is already a square dancer. If not, make opportunities during the coming months to approach him, to invite him to a club dance and to drop the hint that his official proclamation for that second week in September will be most appreciated.

Quite frequently official declarations by local government heads receive prompt and impressive attention in the local newspapers, on radio and on television. So start your thinking in this direction.

Not stopping here, clubs and individuals working through their area associations would do well to start a similar drive aimed at their state's highest executive—the Governor. We are fortunate that several of our Governors are aware of American Square Dancing and in the past have indicated their interest by proclaiming a state-wide Official Square Dance Week. In other areas you may want to start your promotional build-up now. Invite the head of your State Government as well as members of your state's legislature to be guests of honor at your Spring festivals and other big dance events. In this way you will be setting a favorable impression that may lead to an official proclamation later on.

By working a minimum of six months ahead on a project of this magnitude you will be treating this promotion in a business-like manner. An official proclamation carries much weight with it. If you are ready to start new beginners classes during the week of September 13th or soon thereafter, you will find that the official proclamation, together with combined efforts of all square dancers, will indeed attract the attention of the press, radio and television in alerting the area's citizens.

A most effective procedure would be for various associations to plan an entire "square dance package" and then coordinate callers groups, clubs and individual dancers so that everyone may play a part in this all-out drive to stimulate the activity. A publicity program of this type is of little advantage if it is not followed up with action. What is the sense of a good sales talk on any product if we are not ready to make the product available?

There are many ways to set up a week's celebration. Perhaps your dancers groups may decide to start the week out with exhibitions to which the public is invited. One-night-stand type of dances, sponsored by various clubs in cooperation with area churches, local P.T.A.'s, or Service Groups, will bring all of these units into the official observance and will drum up enthusiasm that can lead to many new dancers enrolling in the classes.

Be sure that you are prepared with promotional material telling the non-dancers what

this activity holds in store for them. Make certain that posters project the idea of *friendly* square dancing. Hand out fliers and cards showing the newcomers *where, when and how* to sign up. Perhaps an open-house night at your regular club with a program built around a display of square dancing fun will do much to "sell" the idea. This affords you a great opportunity to explain that the club is the center and hub of this activity.

There are so many ways that a saturation program of this type can be effective. With groups everywhere participating wholeheartedly they can focus the general attention to this activity in a way that no independent project could hope to achieve.

Over the coming months we will publish additional "ammunition" designed to help build toward your official Square Dance Week. A committee from each area association could easily find itself occupied on almost a full-time basis between now and September in preparing for such a program.

Undoubtedly, in each square dance group are some who have special talents in the line of writing letters to local and State government officials. As a guide to them and to those who may lack confidence in writing this type of letter we have prepared samples which you'll find on these pages. You may use all or part of any of these as you wish, adapting them to fit your own area situations.

WHY STOP NOW?

As long as we're about it, let's at the same time consider tying this all together on a national basis with a direct request to President Nixon to proclaim this same period as American Square Dance Week.

The serious approach being given today by our government to the fields of recreation, physical fitness and national pride would indicate a ready-made acceptance for the idea of an observance for American Square Dancing. It's worth a try. So here is what we suggest.

On the official letterhead of your club, caller's group or dancer's association start your campaign now in requesting official recognition during that second week in September. Letters to your representatives in Congress and your Senators, telling them that you have written the President and perhaps enclosing a copy of the letter and asking that they get behind this project should bring positive results.

Never before have square dancers attempted such a comprehensive saturation program. By working together in this way we certainly have a far greater chance of success than we might enjoy by working independently.

We know what benefits square dancing has brought to all of us and to our friends. We know that there are many more like us who need and would enjoy this pastime. So, with this in mind and with the knowledge that a campaign of this type will bring square dancing into the lives of many not yet dancing let's act on this one and see if by working together we can't bring about miracles.

AN EXCHANGE IDEA

We would like to know if your club, group of clubs or association plans to take part in doing what it can toward recognition of this second week in September. Plans for posters and other promotional material are now in the works and will be sent to groups and publicized in this magazine in coming months. Your ideas and suggestions that will help to make this campaign a success are welcome.

PREPARE YOUR OWN CAMPAIGN

There are many ways to write to local and state and national leaders. This sample is but one hypothetical suggestion. The best results of course will occur when many varied and more personalized types of letters are utilized. Start now to collect the names

of your city and state officials to whom special letters may be directed. Do you know your representatives in Congress? Now is a good time to start your preplanning and prepare your own campaign in this direction:

YOUR TOWN SQUARE DANCE ASSOCIATION.

YOUR GOVERNOR,
Capitol City,
Your State.

DEAR SIR: American Square Dancing with its very special appeal for young and old alike is fast becoming the great, true, American participation activity. Here in (your State) more than (number) groups, large and small, representing (number) thousand dancers, enjoy this traditional American pastime in a spirit of friendliness and good will. In addition, unknown thousands of school children in this State enjoy Square Dancing as not only a great American pastime, but a recreation that is second to none.

In recognition of the growth of this activity, we are throughout the State observing American Square Dance Week, September 7 to 13, 1970. Because of the important part American Square Dancing plays in the lives of so many, we respectfully request that you, as the Chief Executive of (this State), proclaim this week, September 7 through 13, 1970 as "Official Square Dance Week".

Square Dancers everywhere will thank you for this recognition and, with open hearts, welcome you at any time to any of our activities, so that you may see first-hand the part it plays in the lives of so many.

Sincerely,

PUERTO RICAN CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1970

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 18th anniversary of the island of Puerto Rico's incorporation as a Commonwealth within the United States. On July 25, 1952, the Congress ratified a constitution, drawn up by representatives elected by the Puerto Rican people, which created the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, granting her a unique status in the American system of government.

In commemorating this holiday, we should all remember the ingenuity and determination of the Puerto Rican people in their centuries-old struggle to develop the resources of their island, the freedoms of their people and the growth of their economy.

Discovered by Columbus during his second voyage on November 19, 1493, Puerto Rico remained under the rule of Spain until ceded to the United States in 1898. Since that time, the island has made significant progress toward the eradication of the poverty and disease that has plagued the people for centuries. Let us also remember that much more is left to be done, and let us dedicate ourselves to the completion of that task.

Since the inception of "Operation Bootstrap," a program for industrial development put into effect in 1947, Puerto Rico has made impressive gains in her efforts to adjust to an industrialized world. Her factories are expanding and multiplying at an extremely rapid rate

and the careful planning that goes into their construction is keeping Puerto Rico largely free of the environmental problems that confront the mainland.

And so, I know that all Americans join me in saluting the people of Puerto Rico on this, their native holiday. I am sure that with the continued attention of American Government and business, Puerto Rico will continue to grow and prosper.

THE MILITARY DRAWS A BEAD ON DRUGS

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD a collection of three articles found in the July 22, 1970, edition of the Christian Science Monitor dealing with the problem of drug abuse in the military. This problem is of particular meaning and concern to me since it was one of the problems uncovered by the House Select Committee, of which I was a member, during our recent trip to Southeast Asia. As the report of that committee pointed out, although efforts are being made to control the availability of drugs, "a stick" of marijuana can be purchased for pennies on almost every Saigon street corner.

No doubt there are different reasons explaining the use of marijuana by combat soldiers as opposed to its use by young people at home; but whatever the reason, we must take appropriate measures to protect these young men from the dangers of drug abuse.

The articles follow:

AMERICA'S DRUG STRUGGLE: III—THE MILITARY DRAWS A BEAD ON DRUGS

(By Michel H. Mathis)

(NOTE.—Admission by the United States military services that they have a drug problem on their hands is an important step toward its solution. This page offers eyewitness looks at the problem in Vietnam and stateside, plus a report on what the services are doing about it.)

VIETNAM

BOSTON.—It was only my second night in Vietnam. An Army pickup truck had just delivered me and another private to the top of a sandy slope overlooking Cam Ranh Bay.

Halfway down the slope, a cluster of orange specks huddled beside a trail leading to the bay shore and our guard post.

Starlight soon revealed the vague outlines of United States soldiers and defined the orange specks as the glowing tips of cigarettes. A breeze brought the pungent smell of "pot."

Unsure how to handle the situation, I reported the pot party to our "officer of the guard" over the guard post telephone. He soon roared up to the crest of the slope in his jeep, shooed the off-duty soldiers away, and quickly disappeared in pursuit of other errands.

That was my first lesson on drug use in Vietnam: The Army didn't enforce its threats of fines, disciplinary action, and even court-martial for drug use—at least, not if it could avoid doing so.

The following day I learned that the participants in that evening "pot party" had disregarded orders to stand by for a jet flight scheduled to return them to the United

States. As a result, they had missed it. That was a quick second lesson: To some GIs, a drug experience becomes even more attractive than catching the "freedom bird" home.

Three weeks later I got my first infantry assignment. "Watch out," the veterans of even a few weeks' field experience warned. "Don't let anyone catch you fooling around with 'pot' out here."

They knew how quickly a "pot-caused" lapse of alertness could bring tragedy for both the careless soldier and his nearby companions. So a kind of "common law" among the foot soldiers in my unit banned marijuana from combat or field operations. Lesson No. 3.

But behavior in the more secure base camps was a different story. Despite the efforts of military police, local Vietnamese workers made "pot" readily available to anyone who wanted it.

Our commanding officers apparently felt they had little choice but to turn their backs on marijuana use. Soldiers knew their cooperation was essential to their commander in combat. Often they exacted a price for it—freedom to disregard authority when not in combat. Some translated that into freedom to smoke "pot."

This leniency pervaded even military courts. Only rarely did a commander press charges against a man accused only of using marijuana. Occasionally, in flagrant cases, our battalion's legal officer tried. But the courts repeatedly turned him away.

To discourage "pot" use, the Army issued a mild measure of propaganda—slogans, posters, occasional newspaper editorials, and briefings by officers. But in my unit marijuana was accepted as an inevitable part of noncombat life in Vietnam.

Many Vietnam veterans thus have returned with a radical new degree of tolerance—if not actual affection—for drugs.

STATESIDE

(By Curtis J. Sitomer)

MONTEREY, CALIF.—Private H.—an Army recruit here at Fort Ord—has been "shooting horse" since the ninth grade.

His heroin habit and a history of petty crime brought him in frequent conflict with the law before entering military service. In fact it was a juvenile judge who finally gave him a choice between detention and the Army.

Now Private H. is in the Fort Ord stockade. He was court-martialed for selling and using narcotics on base. At the end of his sentence, he will receive a bad-conduct discharge.

Cases like Private H., while not uncommon here, are atypical. The majority of drug abusers on the base, who tend toward the "softer" drugs like marijuana, don't get caught. GI users here say they experience little difficulty obtaining these drugs. The post is near Monterey, Big Sur, and San Francisco, all key drug markets on the West Coast.

Selective prosecution

According to Army regulations, possessors of marijuana are subject to general or special court-martial and could be sentenced to a maximum of five years' imprisonment. The penalties are more severe for peddling and possessing the "hard" stuff—heroin, opium, morphine.

But the Army is selective in its prosecution of drug users and employs maximum discretion in meting out punishment.

"A relatively small number are actually tried," reports Lt. Col. Orrin R. Strabley, staff judge advocate at Fort Ord.

"There's a lot of difference between a man who experiments with drugs and one who sells to another," Colonel Strabley points out. "We consider an offense involving sale more serious than possession," he adds. "And we also want to know if this is a first offense or a repeat."

Francis Heisler, a civilian attorney who de-

fends many drug cases at Fort Ord, says: "For simple possession of marijuana now, a soldier would probably get a summary rather than a general court-martial." While the latter carries a maximum jail sentence of three to five years, conviction in the summary court-martial results in 30 days in the stockade, at most.

Nonpunitive approaches

Military officials at Fort Ord are beginning to develop some nonpunitive approaches to the drug problem.

The installation maintains psychiatric and medical facilities to aid drug abusers. "We have the equivalent of a general hospital—with social workers, psychiatrists, as well as MDs," says Col. John L. Bradley, post surgeon. "And if a man is motivated toward overcoming, we'll give him every chance."

But Fort Ord does not screen the trainees for those in need of help. And the post surgeon admits that there is little time during the 12-16 week basic training operation to effect an extensive rehabilitation program. On occasion the Army has referred drug users seeking help to veterans hospitals in other areas after they have left Fort Ord.

The base also has a drug-information program. But Army officials and soldiers here seem equally unenthusiastic about it.

Film's worth questioned

"We show a 30-minute film to all units when they arrive," says a Fort Ord information officer. "It's scary—and only incidentally informational," he confides. "I'm against these things. They only tend to stir things up."

Lectures and panel discussions on drug abuse also are held from time to time—at the discretion of company commanders.

Mr. Heisler and some of his associates believe that known habitual drug users shouldn't be accepted into the military service in the first place.

Military brass here—although they hedge on this point—appear to lean to this view.

"Let's put it this way," says Provost Marshal E. W. Corcoran. "How would you like to be riding in an airplane with a pilot who was subject to LSD flashbacks?"

WHAT IS BEING DONE ABOUT IT?

(By George W. Ashworth)

WASHINGTON.—For years, the American military services have maintained that drug abusers were an insignificant portion of the service community. Now, with more reliable statistics filtering in, the services are becoming aware that this is just not true.

Defense Department officials estimate that between 25 and 30 percent of all United States servicemen worldwide have at least experimented with drugs. In Vietnam, estimates run up to 70 percent.

Certain the Vietnam war has aggravated the situation:

Many men enter the service already on drugs. Then they are sent to Vietnam, where "opium dens" abound and where some of the world's most potent marijuana is grown abundantly.

Last year, U.S. military investigations of marijuana use worldwide totaled 19,139. More than a third of these—6,490—were in Vietnam.

The figures for dangerous drugs (like amphetamines and barbiturates) were 3,357 worldwide and 833 in Vietnam—nearly one-quarter of the total.

The problem of hard narcotics (like heroin and other opiates) was less Vietnam-focused: Worldwide there were 1,871 investigations. Of those only 243 were in Vietnam.

Defense officials admit that, with many cases undetected, these figures disclose only a portion of users.

In any case, the number of investigations has been soaring annually.

In the case of marijuana, for example, there were only 522 investigations in calendar year 1965; 3,096 in 1966; 5,536 in 1967; 11,507 in 1968, and 19,139 in 1969.

RATE CONTINUES TO RISE

The rate is still going up, although the rise doubtless results to a certain degree from growing service awareness of the drug problem and increased endeavors to find its extent.

Dr. Joel Kaplan, the former commander of the 98th Medical Detachment Neuropsychiatric Team at Nha Trang in Vietnam, estimated to a congressional subcommittee:

"Toward the end of my tour in Vietnam we were becoming aware that some of the younger officers were beginning to use marijuana. I was informed by a number of patients, who were warrant officers and helicopter pilots, that there were quite a number of warrant officer pilots who were using marijuana and other drugs."

Dr. Kaplan estimated that between 50 and 80 percent of all Army personnel in Vietnam had used marijuana at least once:

"The hard figures show that approximately 3,500 of the soldiers that were seen during my year's tour in Vietnam were using marijuana and other drugs heavily. The other drugs that I refer to include barbiturates, opium, amphetamines such as "speed," LSD on occasion, sniffing glue, and using the pellet of the darvon capsule."

A total of 1,064 soldiers in the 173rd Airborne Brigade were surveyed by Maj. John J. Treanor, the brigade surgeon and chief medical officer. He found that 32 percent reported they had never used marijuana, and 37 percent said they had tried it once or twice but not since. Fifteen percent said they had used it once or more a week, and 16 percent said they had used it "about every day" or more often.

Major Treanor said, "What we have seen clinically is a majority of rather incapable, frustrated, poorly educated, passive-aggressive personalities complicating the many problems they already have by becoming involved with the use of marijuana."

Education programs

The services say they are engaged in troop education programs on the problems marijuana and other hard drugs can cause. Some of the harmful effects of marijuana are already apparent. But defense sources say the education programs are hampered somewhat because there is little solid research into the effects of marijuana on human beings. The National Institute of Mental Health is conducting research, but until the findings are available, officials say, the education program cannot be as concrete as desired.

According to defense sources, the drug-abuse problem may be handled in the future along these lines:

Education and refresher training programs for those vulnerable, as well as for commanders, leaders, and military families.

The disciplinary system will be revised to place much greater emphasis upon correction and reclamation of servicemen with drug problems, particularly casual users and experimenters.

If money can be made available, the services may do much more rehabilitation of hard users before dismissing them from service. For casual users and experimenters, the hope is to develop coordinated counseling programs that will allow them to remain in the service. Defense authorities hope for federal and state cooperation in rehabilitation.

So far, the Air Force has taken the lead in rehabilitation efforts. That service has one program to return to duty users who have been sentenced to confinement through court-martial action. Another program has been developed to rehabilitate drug offenders subject to administrative discharge.

More and more, the Air Force is treating experimenters in their own units or in other nearby units.

Punishment in the service has not been uniform. The Navy, which views shipboard drug use as use on duty, has taken the hardest line on drugs. Last year that service gave 3,800 honorable, general, and undesirable discharges to drug abusers. An additional 2,000 were kept in service if it appeared that they were experimenters, who generally were only involved with marijuana or amphetamines. Navy sources optimistically say that about 95 percent of the 2,000 stopped using drugs.

Rear Adm. J. W. Albrittain, the Navy deputy surgeon general, told a drug-abuse symposium that if early indications for 1970 remained constant, "we will have something over 11,000 cases, and approximately 4,500 people discharged from the Navy or Marine Corps for drug abuse in 1970."

"Privilege" talks prohibited

The services are telling their commanding officers that they have a moral obligation to educate the servicemen about drugs. Officials believe that as the knowledge and experience are gained, the depth and scope of the training now given will be improved. Aware that drug use is often an outgrowth of other personal problems, emphasis is being placed on what is called total person improvement. The idea is that if personal problems are relieved, much of the inclination to experiment with drugs will vanish.

At least at the highest levels, the emphasis now is upon counseling and rehabilitation. But many drug users in the service still face punishment and dishonorable discharge if they are found out.

Defense officials believe the crucial step in coming to grips with the drug-abuse problem will be to change the rules so that servicemen can feel free to seek help. At present, the drug user is assured a "privileged" discussion only with his chaplain. If a man goes to a doctor, the physician is obligated to make a report to the man's commanding officer.

The commanding general of Fort Bragg, Lt. Gen. John J. Polson, has taken a step that may be a harbinger of new approaches to come. In a unique experiment, the general has set aside two wards of the base hospital for the treatment of drug addicts. Ten drug users are currently being treated. The general is also considering opening a house on post where soldiers may meet to discuss their drug problems.

The services generally realize that punitive measures alone will not solve the drug problem. But just as military officials now are moving toward rehabilitation, they also are moving to cut off drug supplies.

In Vietnam, for instance, the services are working with other federal agencies to detect drugs being mailed to the U.S. So far the programs have yielded drugs as well as hand grenades and dangerous weapons.

Pictures taken

On some days, every package sent through military post offices in Vietnam is checked, and better records are being made of senders and their packages. The Air Force, for example, is taking pictures. According to defense officials, interception of contraband from GIs overseas has been reduced to a trickle. While 132 items were seized in a typical week in mid-March, that figure had been reduced to 18 in a recent week.

But while the general direction of defense efforts to cope with the drug problem are clear, the specifics remain to be determined. A special task group now is looking into the overall drug problem in the services and methods of prevention and rehabilitation. The report of that group will be finished in about a month.

MANY GIs EXPERIMENTED

(NOTE.—The following dispatch is not bylined in order to protect the identity of the soldier involved.)

BOSTON.—Ex-Private M. J. began smoking marijuana a few months after he was drafted. Midway through his Army tour of duty—which ended with an honorable discharge—he began selling "pot," too.

As a clerk at Fort Ord in California, he smoked marijuana first thing in the morning, on his way to and from the mess hall, during work breaks, and after supper until bedtime in his barracks. He says he was "perpetually stoned" for three months—and never got caught.

At another post one of his pot-smoking companions was a military policeman.

After M. J. bought his first kilogram (2.2 pounds) of marijuana in San Francisco, he was in business. He bought kilos in brick form for \$90 or \$100 from a middleman in the city, then broke it down into lids at Fort Ord and sold enough to cover his own costs.

"I wouldn't have sold at all if I hadn't been smoking so much," M. J. says. "I was an amateur. I smoked up most of my profits. I guess you could say I was addicted."

He stressed that there was no organized drug business at Fort Ord—just individual GIs selling, as he did, to support their habits. He said LSD was used by soldiers at Fort Ord and some opium was used at Camp Roberts on nearby Hunter Liggett Military Reservation.

According to M. J., many GIs experimented with pseudo drugs and with pills passed out surreptitiously by medics in the hospital dispensary.

"We'd try any pill we could get," he says, "even if we knew nothing about its effects. They were free, so we thought 'why not?' Some people were looking for 'better' means of escape from personal problems or Army hassles. People who are upset will do irrational things sometimes."

The availability of drugs and the desire to be sociable do more to encourage drug use among servicemen than loose discipline does, M. J. says. But he adds that the latter is an important factor.

"Fort Ord was an open post, and discipline was loose. Every guy in my barracks either smoked marijuana or could be trusted not to tell, and most of the smoking was done in the squad leaders' rooms."

MANHASSET, N.Y., MAIL CELEBRATES ANNIVERSARY

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues recognize, as I do, the important role that weekly newspapers play in the lives of thousands of communities across this Nation.

One such paper that is well read and appreciated by its neighbors is the Manhasset, N.Y., Mail which is ably edited and published by Mrs. Florence Luther. The Mail is celebrating its 44th anniversary this month and Mrs. Luther has written a timely editorial for the anniversary.

Because the Manhasset Mail is a fine example of a vital and popular weekly newspaper and so much a part of its community, I would like to extend my remarks and include Mrs. Luther's editorial in the RECORD at this point:

CXVI—1625—Part 19

YEAR NO. 44

The Manhasset Mail this month began its 44th year of publication. The first issue appeared on July 8, 1927, under Editor and Publisher Donald Cooper. In the fall of 1930, Mitchell Luther purchased the Mail and was editor and publisher until his death in February 1957, at which time his wife Florence M. Luther, present editor and publisher, assumed ownership. In 1960 the sister paper, The Port Mail, was started and in 1961, the two papers changed to offset publication.

A weekly newspaper is an integral part of a community. A weekly newspaper takes pride in its faithful coverage of local events and the residents it serves. The Mail also takes pride in never having missed an issue in 44 years—although an occasional issue caused a red face here and there.

A much talked-about incident concerned Mitchell Luther, highly respected editor who campaigned often for the betterment of the community, and who, after a successful battle for a stop sign, at a busy intersection, was forced to report that he was given a ticket for failing to stop at said sign.

Another incident the staff would rather forget was an announcement of a wedding, complete with description of the bride's dress, which appeared a week early.

Last year the Board of Education "loosed" retiring member Mrs. William G. Story—and did so in a three column banner headline.

There were good times, too. For instance, in 1957 when the Miracle Mile by-pass was cancelled, the Mail put out an extra edition and rushed it down to the station for the convenience of evening commuters (the Luther children helped) only to find that the news had been announced on commuter radios and had traveled from car to car.

However, considering everything, it's been a good 44 years and we hope subscribers enjoy the weekly editions as much as the Mail enjoys serving the public.

We look forward to many more years—with pride.

SANDOVAL STANDS SEIGE AT THE SBA

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1970

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today in my office, I received the annual report for 1969 of the Small Business Administration. The report, like most Government reports, describes with a great deal of praise the work of the Small Business Administration and their accomplishments in 1969. It seems ironic to me that this came into my office today, for very recently an administrative farce came to my attention, a situation in the Boston Regional Small Business Administration Office that has the markings of high comedy, except that it is not in the least bit funny.

On April 21, 1970, Anthony Chase, General Counsel of SBA, indicated that there was a surplus of attorney positions in the Boston region of SBA. He also noted that region 4, with headquarters in Atlanta, Ga., was understaffed. The recommendation was made that four of the attorney positions in Boston be reassigned to the Atlanta region. The foregoing sounds like a very reasonable administrative decision. Perhaps a bit callous in transferring four people from one end of the country to another. However,

it is much more than callous, it is hypocritical and stupid.

We all know the great deal of criticism of the SBA, of its funding and backing of some useless ventures and of businesses that could in no way be classified as small. We know equally well that the needs of small businesses in this country are great, and that a truly efficient SBA could accomplish a great deal of good.

The Boston Regional Office of SBA is acknowledged to be a very fine organization. The attorneys and the entire staff are very able and knowledgeable people and are very much concerned about the problems of small business and the small businessman. However, if people were needed in the Atlanta region and not in Boston, and the latter part I doubt, perhaps an argument could be made for transferring some of these extremely able people to region 4 if they were willing to be reassigned. However, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to some developments of this reassignment. One lawyer in Boston was terminated and four were reassigned. Of those that were reassigned, one man, 67 years old, had served 12 years with SBA, has been a grade 14 for the past 4 years and is considered the finest lawyer in or out of Government. He has had more than 24 years of Government service and at one time was the head of the legal staff of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. He left Government in 1950 to go into private practice and returned to the SBA in 1958 at the request of that Administration.

Another lawyer, a woman, age 63, has had more than 35 years in Government service, 22 of them with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and 13 years with the SBA. She has handled all types of legal cases for the SBA and everyone in the region is backing her complaint against reassignment because she is acknowledged to be an experienced, skilled and able attorney and extremely knowledgeable in real estate law. The other two attorneys are equally qualified and experienced.

I mentioned that one lawyer has complained about reassignment. Because of this complaint, reports had to be given explaining the reason for reassignment and the choice of personnel. This is the material I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues. It is farcical and an insult to all civil service employees and contrary to every rule of fair treatment in Government service. The four people chosen for reassignment had all had long experience in the Boston region and had roots in the Boston area. The youngest of these men is 62. As the report states, "This was by design, not coincidence." "We never expected that any of the individuals would accept reassignment to region IV. However, we thought that offering them reassignment would be a good face-saving device to allow them to retire gracefully without the onus of having been kicked out."

I find this insulting and the actions of the SBA arrogant. There is duplicity in this action and cowardice, and I find this extremely offensive. A statement of Winifred Jeffers, personnel specialist, reorganization task force, supports the action taken by SBA and tries to justify

the decision to reassign these four lawyers. Miss Jeffers tries to make a good case for this action, but unfortunately the last paragraph of her statement ruins her entire argument and grants that the entire action was useless. Her report ends "Subsequent to the reorganization of region IV, we discover that they were not prepared to accept the transfer of the four lawyers from Boston. It was necessary, therefore, to grant extensions on the reassignment dates of all the lawyers affected. The reassignment date of all four lawyers has been extended to September 1, 1970."

It has further come to my attention that the SBA in Washington is attempting to avoid complaints to the Civil Service Commission by the Boston lawyers by offering positions in SBA regional offices around the country. The SBA knows that the Boston attorneys have a very strong and valid case against reassignment and it is using lucrative offers in an attempt to prevent this case from being appealed any further.

I am going to discuss this action with members of appropriate committees in the Congress, but I would like to call the attention of all my colleagues at this time to this ridiculous action.

I think my colleagues would also find an article from Business Week very interesting. I enclose the article from the July 18 issue of Business Week describing the very serious difficulties in the SBA:

SANDOVAL STANDS SIEGE AT THE SBA

At a recent public gathering, Senator Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.) hailed Hilary Sandoval, Jr., as "the greatest administrator in the history of the Small Business Administration." Few others have expressed such enthusiasm, however, since Sandoval took over more than a year ago.

The agency's traditional constituents, the white small businessmen, complain to Congress that "you can't get a loan if you aren't black" (though two-thirds of the loans still go to whites). Blacks, however, complain the Administration programs for black capitalism is "peanuts," despite a definite increase in loans.

Democrats on the House Select Committee on Small Business are holding hearings next week to size up Sandoval's record, and they are loaded for bear. Among other things the committee will probe, says Chairman Joe L. Ewins (D-Tenn.), is "whether the SBA's energies and resources are being frittered away, as recent reports to the committee indicate, on inefficient fringe programs." The group is disturbed that Sandoval has gone through four deputy administrators in little more than a year.

And the signs are unmistakable that the White House has not been much happier with Sandoval, a former newspaper distributor from El Paso, Tex.

UNDER WRAPS

Sandoval got off to a bad start when his hand-picked special assistant, Albert M. Fuentes, was sentenced to five years on a charge of trying to take a \$50,000 kickback on a loan. (The case is still on appeal.) And Phillip Pruitt, a Negro whom Sandoval picked to head the minority lending program, resigned with a blast that the Administration was not really interested in black capitalism.

Since then, the White House has kept Sandoval more or less under wraps. When a package of three new proposals to aid small business was unveiled, it was Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans, not Sandoval, who held the press conference. The proposals had actually been drafted at Commerce; SBA was

not even told about its own legislative program until the day before the announcement. And Commerce, rather than the SBA, has gotten much of the credit for the two programs that the Administration cites as its showpieces for black capitalism, even though the SBA has all the authority to make the actual loans.

The new Minority Enterprise Small Business Investment Company program (MESBIC), designed to attract big corporate investment in minority companies, is run by Stans while the SBA puts up the money. (Even so, only 11 of the 100 MESBICs that Stans expected to have in business by June 30 have materialized.) The program to get franchisees for minorities is split between Commerce and the SBA, with both agencies trying to persuade big franchisers to take on black businessmen. Public announcements about the program usually come from the Commerce Dept., though, again, it is the SBA that actually makes the loans, and the rivalry between the two agencies appears to be hurting the black capitalism effort. Only a couple of hundred franchisees went to minority businessmen in the fiscal year just ended.

"Something has to be done about it," says a source in Congress familiar with the situation.

POWDER KEG

The White House's effort to keep a check on the SBA led to a real blowup earlier this year. The Administration assigned a Stans lieutenant, W. Donald Brewer, to be deputy administrator of the SBA and for months nobody could figure who was in charge. One junior official caught between conflicting orders from Sandoval and Brewer got it point-blank from Brewer. "Are you working for Sandoval or for me?"

Finally, according to reports, Sandoval decided to have it out with the White House. Either he or Brewer would have to go, he said. About that time, a full-page ad appeared in the *Los Angeles Times* from a group of Mexican-Americans thanking President Nixon for appointing one of them, Sandoval, to a top Administration job. And Senator John G. Tower (R-Tex.) warned the White House that his dismissal would seriously hurt Republicans with the large Spanish-American electorate in Texas. Brewer was promptly appointed to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

"Sandoval would have been in a lot of trouble right from the beginning if it hadn't been for Tower," says Representative Silvio Conte of Massachusetts, top Republican on the House Small Business Committee. "Tower is chairman of the Senate GOP Campaign Committee and nobody's going to touch his boy." He adds, however, that "over-all," he thinks Sandoval has done "a pretty good job."

LIQUIDATION

A prime cause of the internal turmoil in the SBA has stemmed from Sandoval's almost Gilbert-and-Sullivan efforts to get rid of entrenched career appointees, many of whom are protected by civil service.

Wilfred J. Garvin, the agency's chief economist, arrived one morning to find all his pictures of previous administrators stacked on his desk. On top of the stack was an application for retirement. Garvin is still there and Sandoval is now trying to abolish the whole economic research office. Congress is fighting it.

Directors of regional offices have been offered lower-level jobs or transfers to distant cities. The director of the Columbus (Ohio) office, son of the city's Democratic mayor, was transferred to Salt Lake City. He quit. The Salt Lake City chief, who had once run against a Republican congressman, was shipped to Cleveland. Altogether, about half the 60 regional directors have departed one way or another. Moving expenses have amounted to \$250,000, and the House committee wants to ask Sandoval about this.

"Morale around this place is really lousy," says Joseph Foster, who heads the agency's local of the government employees union. Membership in the union has doubled since Sandoval became administrator.

Sandoval's distrust of career employees has sometimes seemed a bit excessive. Employees not in his inner circle, for instance, were ordered to turn in the magnetic cards that enable them to get into the building after hours. When one top Democratic holdover was removed, the lock on his office was changed before nightfall.

GOOFS

Nor have relations with Congress been very smooth. When the SBA's citizens advisory committee met in Washington, Sandoval invited Representative George Bush, a Texas Republican who is not on any small business committees, to address the group and neglected to invite the top committee Republican, Conte, until later. When Conte learned he was second choice, he declined. And Sandoval bitterly attacked Democratic Senator Ralph Yarborough, chairman of the Senate Labor Committee, in a speech to a Texas GOP county convention. That was all right, except that a release about the strictly political speech was distributed on government stationery, which is illegal. "Somebody goofed," a spokesman acknowledged.

Stories of other peculiar goings-on circulate in the agency. Sandoval brought his personal priest with him from Texas for a few months and installed him in an office next to his own, in full clerical garb, as an unpaid consultant. A Sandoval aide who briefed the staff on how to set up regional meetings emphasized that one job was to arrange a complimentary hotel suite for the administrator; General Accounting Office agents have been investigating those arrangements. And armed Pinkerton guards were hired to cover a meeting hall (to guard the movie projectors, a spokesman said); now the bills cannot be paid because hiring private guards is forbidden.

"Actually, it's too bad about all the Mickey Mouse stuff going on," says one defender of the Sandoval regime, "because Sandoval really is working terribly hard." He has stumped the country, driving home to directors of local offices the point that their futures depend on how well they perform on minority lending. And he is credited with speeding up aid to businesses wiped out by Hurricane Camille.

HIGH MARKS

The banking community has found some satisfaction, too, in Sandoval's efforts to give local offices more authority to approve loans. The delays in loan processing have been a perennial gripe with bankers. Sandoval is trying out a pilot program in several cities to speed delivery; if the SBA does not veto loan applications within three days, they are considered approved.

Much of the SBA's success depends on persuading banks to make loans with SBA guarantees, since the agency has little money of its own to lend. But bankers have not been overly impressed with Sandoval personally. "He's terribly bland," says one top representative. The House committee feels that Sandoval's lack of rapport with bankers is a serious problem.

Just how good the agency's loan record is will be disputed in the committee. The total amount of loans going to small business has averaged about \$61-million a month in 1970, about the same rate as when Sandoval took office in March, 1969. Critics charge that since the agency has moved from lending its own money to simply guaranteeing bank loans, it should be possible to increase the flow. Agency spokesmen counter that in a period of tight money, keeping the loan rate from falling constitutes a good performance.

And Sandoval can point to a one-third increase in the rate of loans going to mi-

norities, up from about \$10-million a month to an average of \$13-million for the first five months of 1970. Loans to Spanish-Americans have doubled; loans to blacks are up 18%. About one-third of all loans are now going to minorities.

Sandoval can expect to face some questioning from the committee on the agency's program of procuring government contracts for minority companies. He has succeeded in getting a larger number of contracts set aside for minority businesses. But the Defense Dept. is complaining that of \$32-million assigned to the SBA for letting, only \$15-million has been placed. "With 60 staff people working on the program there haven't been many results," says a Congressional source. "The basic trouble," says a Republican in Congress who declines to be identified, "is that the black capitalism program has yet to get much priority attention from the White House."

CONSERVATIONIST SAYS EROSION IS NATIONAL MENACE

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1970

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has many unsung heroes whose day-to-day work is done with dedication and concern and goes largely unrecognized by the rest of us.

Such a man is Mr. Law Helmick who is a district conservationist with the U.S. Soil Conservation Service in Fairmont, W. Va.

Mr. Helmick handles all types of problems in Marion County and is well respected and thought highly of by the people he serves.

The following article appeared in the West Virginian and was written by Frannie Hoffman.

It is a fine column, honoring distinguished persons from the Fairmont area, and Miss Hoffman could not have chosen a finer subject for this column than Mr. Helmick.

My congratulations and sincere thanks to both Mr. Helmick for his dedicated service and to Miss Hoffman for telling the public about this distinguished conservationist:

CONSERVATIONIST SAYS EROSION IS NATIONAL MENACE

Question. In the matter of conservation, what would you say is the most important problem in this country?

Answer. In my estimation, it's the stabilization and conservation of our top soil. This has been our prime purpose since the SCS was started in 1935. It actually was started in 1933 with the old soil erosion program.

Question. Please explain.

Answer. Soil erosion is a menace to our national welfare, and the SCS was set up to provide permanently for the control and prevention of soil erosion and thereby preserve our national resources.

Question. What's being done about it?

Answer. This is being handled by flood control measures, reforestation and revegetation of all areas subject to erosion by any cause, as well as a conservation education program.

Question. Who handles this in Marion County?

Answer. Our staff is responsible for the work here.

Question. Does your program involve water pollution and air pollution, as well?

Answer. Water pollution, yes. Air pollution, no.

Question. With what type of water pollution is the SCS concerned?

Answer. The pollution that's caused by siltation. This involves silt washed into the streams from such bare areas as strip mines, road construction, eroded farmlands, and residential building developments.

Question. What's done to prevent this?

Answer. Working through the Monongahela Soil Conservation District, we developed plans for stabilization of these areas, usually through tree planting and-or

Question. Who actually carries out these plans?

Answer. The landowner, or the land developer or operator.

Question. About how large an acreage would you say has been covered in this program in Marion County?

Answer. At least half the Marion County acreage.

Question. What about your watershed program?

Answer. We are presently working on a flood control program for the Upper Buffalo Creek watershed establishment of a good vegetative cover.

This involves 12 earth-fill dams. We have one completed, are working on the second, and making plans for starting the third in the near future.

Question. When will the entire project be finished?

Answer. It's scheduled for completion in 1975.

Question. What benefits will be derived from this project?

Answer. It will prevent the annual flooding of Mannington, Rachel, Farmington and other areas along Buffalo Creek extending into Fairmont.

Question. Are any other watershed projects planned for this area?

Answer. Yes, the Prickett's Creek watershed program. In about two months we should have the work plan for this project completed.

Question. What do the plans call for?

Answer. Construction of an earth-fill dam at a location which will prevent flooding of communities along the creek which includes Winfield, Meadowdale and Viola.

Question. What are the estimated costs for both these projects?

Answer. The Upper Buffalo Creek project will cost about \$3.5 million. We won't have an estimate of the total cost for Prickett's Creek until the work plan is completed.

Question. Are federal and state funds involved in these projects?

Answer. Both federal and state funds are being expended in the Upper Buffalo Creek project and will be involved in the Prickett's Creek project, as well. In addition, the Marion County Court and the City of Mannington, as well as various individuals, are contributing toward the Buffalo Creek project.

Question. Do you work in cooperation with other agencies in regard to conservation?

Answer. Yes. We work closely with the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, the cooperative extension service of West Virginia University, and the Farmers Home Administration.

Question. How does the conservation picture in Marion County appear now?

Answer. In my estimation, it is very bright. This type of service has increased over the years since we first started working with farmers. It now includes all land users, urban as well as rural, and recreation areas as well as farms. I think most Marion County residents are conservation-conscious and, fortunately, have the financial ability to carry

out good conservation practices. There are other counties in the state which are not as fortunate in this respect.

Question. Are SCS services available to everyone in the county?

Answer. Yes. We are willing and able to offer assistance in the way of soil information and assistance in soil conservation to groups and individuals.

Question. How large a staff does the Marion County office have?

Answer. In addition to myself, we have another soil conservationist, a conservation technician, part-time student helpers in the summer, and an engineer and two assistants in a project office devoted to the Upper Buffalo Creek Watershed and Prickett's Creek Watershed projects.

Question. How long have you been with the SCS?

Answer. Since 1953. I was assigned to the office in Braxton County when I joined the service. From there I was sent to Clay County in 1954, then to Marion County in 1957.

Question. What did you do before you joined the SCS?

Answer. I was with the cooperative extension service in Roane County for about three years.

Question. What sort of training have you had for this work?

Answer. To start with, I grew up on a farm. Then I attended West Virginia University where I took courses pertaining to agronomy and soils, and was graduated from there in 1950 with a bachelor's degree in agriculture. I have also taken graduate courses in agriculture at WVU.

PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW REPORT STRESSES NEED FOR EXPLORATION BY PRIVATE FIRMS

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues an article in the July 1970 issue of the Independent Petroleum Monthly, and an article from the American Mining Congress' news bulletin dated June 26, 1970, both of which comment on the public land law review commission report. The articles follow:

PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW REPORT STRESSES NEED FOR EXPLORATION BY PRIVATE FIRMS

(Historic study says U.S. should encourage mineral search on domain in preference "over some or all other uses," and rely on private sector. Federal control of Shelf production rates urged)

The Public Land Law Review Commission last month submitted its monumental report to the President and the Congress. In the area of Mineral Resources, it recommended that:

1. Public land mineral policy should encourage exploration, development, and production of minerals on the public lands.

2. Mineral exploration and development should have a preference over some or all other uses on much of public lands.

3. The Federal Government generally should rely on the private sector for mineral exploration, development, and production by maintaining a continuing invitation to explore for and develop minerals on the public lands.

In the case of national parks and national monuments, the Commission recommended continued exclusion, with development of

mineral reserves there to come only in future emergencies.

Slap at noncompetitive bidding. The report recommended changes that would broaden the range of competitive bidding for mineral leases on public lands. At present, public lands outside of known geologic structures are leased noncompetitively.

The Commission would extend competitive bidding to land on which there have been relinquished or forfeited leases or permits, or where there is a reasonable indication of "good prospects for success."

In the so-called "upland" federal areas, as distinct from the Outer Continental Shelf, the Commission said leases should be awarded on a "competitive" basis "whenever competitive interest can reasonably be expected."

Thus, the Commission proposes eliminating known geologic structures as the lone standard for competitive bidding.

WOULD ASSERT SHELF PRORATION

In the Outer Continental Shelf area, the Commission called for federal prorationing. It urged the Secretary of Interior to follow through with federal prorationing procedures first suggested in the late 1960's by Stewart L. Udall, at that time Secretary of Interior.

Limitation of the rate of production is "an integral part of mineral production management," the Commission said. While prorationing has been frequently attacked on charges that it is a "system of price fixing by states," the Commission said, "the courts have sustained the systems on the grounds that they serve a legitimate conservation purpose, even though they have had an incidental effect on prices."

HISTORIC STUDY

The Commission, since July 1965, has been studying laws and policies, as well as practices and procedures in their administration, concerning public lands in the United States.

Representative Wayne N. Aspinall (D-Colo.) has served from the inception of the Commission as chairman. H. Byron Mock, a presidential appointee from Salt Lake City, Utah, has been vice chairman, and Milton A. Pearl has been director of the Commission's day-to-day activities.

The Independent Petroleum Association of America has cooperated with the Commission. H. A. (Dave) True, Jr., former IPAA president, and an independent operator in Casper, Wyo., has been a member of the advisory committee to the Commission during its 5 years of deliberation.

IPAA's Public Lands Committee at its midyear meeting in Denver authorized a 5-man subcommittee to review and consider the Commission report, and make pertinent recommendations to the full committee covering the issues raised concerning the oil and gas industry and the public domain.

David Schaenen, Billings, Mont., is chairman of the subcommittee. Other members are: Bruce Anderson, Houston, Tex.; W. T. Blackburn, Denver; John M. Kelley, Washington, D.C.; and Edward N. Litman, Casper, Wyo. Warren A. Morton, also of Casper, is chairman of the Public Lands Committee, and is an ex officio member of the subcommittee. Dave True is an adviser. William I. Powell, IPAA administrative vice-president, is committee secretary.

VITAL ROLE OF DOMAIN

The Commission said the American people today are "feeling the pressures of an enlarging population, burgeoning growth, and expanding demand for land and natural resources." They "have an almost desperate need to determine the best purposes to which

their public lands and the wealth and opportunities of those lands should be dedicated.

"Through the timely action of Congress, and through the work of this Commission, a rare opportunity is offered to answer that need."

Federally owned land amounts to 755,368,055 acres, or 33.3 percent of the total U.S. land area of 2,271,343,360 acres. Oil production on Federal land (other than the Outer Continental Shelf) in 1968 amounted to between 6 percent and 7 percent of the national total and was valued at over \$570 million. This figure does not include recent discoveries in Alaska which are not on Federal lands.

"Perhaps of even more importance," said the Commission, "is the fact that large areas of the public lands not yet drilled are deemed favorable to the occurrence of oil and gas. Over 64 million acres of Federal land were under lease for oil and gas in 1968, of which over 90 percent was in the Western contiguous states and Alaska."

COMPETITIVE LEASING

The Commission said that where certain mineral conditions are known to exist, the present leasing system requires competitive sale of exploration and development rights.

"We have concluded that these competitive sale requirements are too narrow in scope," the report said, "particularly in the case of oil and gas. It appears to the Commission that competitive leasing would be appropriate:

- "1. In the general area of producing wells.
- "2. For land covered by relinquished or forfeited leases or permits.
- "3. Where past activities and general knowledge suggest reasonably good prospects for success."

And the Commission added: "To achieve the objective of this recommendation, the administrator should have the authority to segregate public land from mineral exploration for a short period of time. At the end of the prescribed period exploration rights should be available noncompetitively in the same manner that we have recommended with regard to other minerals.

"Adoption of this recommendation would eliminate the need for the simultaneous filing system currently in effect. Similarly, this would eliminate the known geologic structure as a standard for competitive allocation of oil and gas leasing rights."

(Leasing recommendations—in Chapter Seven, "Mineral Resources"—will be one of the many areas of the report to be analyzed thoroughly by the IPAA subcommittee.)

DEPEND ON PRIVATE INDUSTRY

The Commission said it is "satisfied that private enterprise has succeeded well in meeting our national mineral needs, and we see no reason to change this traditional policy. Existing Federal programs to develop nationwide geological information should be continued and strengthened."

These Federal programs should serve, the report added, to identify general areas favorable to mineral occurrence with detailed exploration and development left to private enterprise.

"The efforts of private enterprise will be effective only if Federal policy, law, and administrative practices provide a continuing invitation to explore and develop minerals on public lands."

And the report added: "We recognize that mineral exploration and development, and production will, in most cases, have an impact on the environment or be incompatible with some other uses. By its very nature, mineral activity alters the natural environment to some degree, and if no such impact were to be tolerated, it would be necessary

to prohibit the activity. Mineral exploration, development, and production are essential to our national economic and strategic well-being, however, and such activities cannot be barred completely.

"We believe that the environment must be given consideration, but regulations must not be arbitrarily applied if the national importance of the minerals is properly weighed."

WANTS FEDERAL CONTROL OF OIL, GAS PRODUCTION IN SHELF AREAS

In discussing the Outer Continental Shelf, the report recommends "that in the interest of conservation the Federal Government promulgate and administer its own rules for controlling the rate of production from Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas fields."

It noted that in January 1967 the Secretary of Interior announced his intention to promulgate rules for the regulation of oil and gas production from the Shelf, including independent prorationing. The announcement has never been implemented, "and the Commission urges that it be done."

Outer Continental Shelf crude oil production now exceeds 8 percent of the U.S. total. Proved reserves are 2.9 billion barrels of oil and natural gas liquids and 30.3 trillion cubic feet of gas. Estimates suggest that undiscovered recoverable reserves are in a range of 34 to 220 billion barrels of liquids and 170 to 1,100 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. And in dollar value, the Shelf has already contributed substantially to the U.S. Treasury. Receipts as of June 30, 1968, from the sale of leases on the Shelf and from rentals and royalties totaled over \$2.7 billion.

And the Commission recommended: "Complete authority over all activities on the Outer Continental Shelf should continue to be vested by statute in the Federal Government. Moreover, all Federal functions pertaining to that authority, including navigational safety, safety on or about structures and islands used for mineral activities, pollution control and supervision, mapping and charting, oceanographic and other scientific research, preservation and protection of the living resources of the sea, and occupancy uses of the Outer Continental Shelf, should be consolidated within the Government to the greatest possible degree."

COORDINATION WITH STATES

The Commission noted that in its deliberations there was a strong sense of need for coordination between the Federal Government and the affected states. This concern is reiterated in many parts of the report.

"While asserting the need for Federal conservation control of the Outer Continental Shelf, we recognize that there must be close coordination between the Federal Government and the adjacent states."

"Any limitations proposed by adjacent states should be taken into consideration by the Federal Government in determining the amount of production allowable from wells on federal leases.

"But, state production regulations have been developed from data related to dry land and shallow tidewater regulation. As Outer Continental Shelf production moves into deeper waters, economic and technical comparability between state production, which is in shallow waters or on dry land, and deep water production becomes more remote.

"At some point, it becomes doubtful that it will be in the interest of the Federal Government or the lessee to require compliance with state allowances. Therefore, the Federal Government should have an independent, flexible system of allowances to meet the variety of conditions which may be experienced."

OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE COMMISSION ON PUBLIC LANDS

The Commission report, entitled "One Third of the Nation's Land," lays down 17 recommendations of basic underlying principles to guide future policy concerning public lands. They are:

1. The policy of large-scale disposal of public lands reflected by the majority of statutes in force today be revised and that future disposal should be of only those lands that will achieve maximum benefit for the general public in non-Federal ownership, while retaining in Federal ownership those whose values must be preserved so that they may be used and enjoyed by all Americans.

2. An immediate review should be undertaken of all lands not previously designated for any specific use, and of all existing withdrawals, set asides, and classifications of public domain lands that were effected by Executive action to determine the type of use that would provide the maximum benefit for the general public in accordance with standards set forth in this report.

3. Congress should establish national policy in all public land laws by prescribing the controlling standards, guidelines, and criteria for the exercise of authority delegated to executive agencies.

4. Congress assert its constitutional authority by enacting legislation reserving unto itself exclusive authority to withdraw or otherwise set aside public lands for specified limited-purpose uses and delineating specific delegation of authority to the Executive as to the types of withdrawals and set asides that may be effected without legislative action.

5. Public land management agencies should be required by statute to promulgate comprehensive rules and regulations after full consideration of all points of view, including protests, with provisions for a simplified administrative appeals procedure in a manner that will restore public confidence in the impartiality and fairness of administrative decisions. Judicial review should generally be available.

6. Statutory goals and objectives should be established as guidelines for land-use planning under the general principle that within a specific unit, consideration should be given to all possible uses and the maximum number of compatible uses permitted. This should be subject to the qualification that where a unit, within an area managed for many uses, can contribute maximum benefit through one particular use, that use should be recognized as the dominant use, and the land should be managed to avoid interference with full fulfillment of such dominant use.

7. Federal statutory guidelines should be established to assure that Federal public lands are managed in a manner that not only will not endanger the quality of the environment, but will, where feasible, enhance the quality of the environment, both on and off public lands, and that federal control of the lands should never be used as a shield to permit lower standards than those required by the laws of the state in which the lands are located. The Federal licensing power should be used, under statutory guidelines, to assure these results.

8. Statutory guidelines be established providing generally that the United States receive full value for the use of the public lands and their resources retained in federal ownership, except that monetary payment need not represent full value, or so-called market value, in instances where there is no consumptive use of the land or its resources.

9. Statutory provision be made to assure that when public lands or their resources are made available for use, firm tenure and

security of investment be provided so that if the use must be interrupted because of a Federal Government need before the end of the lease, permit, or other contractual arrangement, the user will be equitably compensated for the resulting losses.

10. The United States make payments in lieu of taxes for the burdens imposed upon state and local governments by reason of the Federal ownership of public lands without regard to the revenues generated therefrom. Such payments should not represent full tax equivalency and the state and local tax effort should be a factor in determining the exact amount to be paid.

11. Statutory authority be provided for the sale at full value of public domain lands required for certain mining activities or where suitable only for dryland farming, grazing, domestic livestock, or residential, commercial, or industrial uses, where such sale is in the public interest and important public values will not thereby be lost.

12. Legislation be enacted to provide a framework within which large units of land may be made available for the expansion of existing communities or the development of new cities.

Until some experience has been gained in the various mechanisms that might be utilized and a national policy adopted concerning the establishment of new cities generally, Congress should consider proposals for the sale of land for new cities on a case-by-case basis.

13. Statutory authority be granted for the limited disposition of lands administered by the Forest Service where such lands are needed to meet a non-Federal but public purpose, or where disposition would result in the lands being placed in a higher use than if continued in Federal ownership.

14. Legislation be enacted to provide flexible mechanisms, including transfer of title at less than full value, to make any federally owned lands available to state and local governments when not required for a Federal purpose if the lands will be utilized for a public purpose.

15. Generally, in both legislation and administration, the artificial distinctions public domain and acquired lands of the Federal Government should be eliminated.

16. Responsibility for public land policy and programs within the Federal Government in both the legislative and executive branches should be consolidated to the maximum practicable extent in order to eliminate, or at least reduce, differences in policies concerning the administration of similar public land programs.

17. In making public land decisions, the Federal Government should take into consideration the interests of the national public, the regional public, the Federal Government as the sovereign, the Federal proprietor, the users of public lands and resources, and the state and local governmental entities within which the lands are located in order to assure, to the extent possible, that the maximum benefit for the general public of the United States is achieved.

BROAD APPROACH URGED

The Commission is composed of six persons having no connection with the Federal Government, appointed by President Johnson; six members appointed by the Senate; and six appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The 18 members appointed Representative Aspinall as their chairman.

In a joint statement, Chairman Aspinall, Vice-Chairman Mock, and Director Pearl said that they are "satisfied" with the Commission's report and recommendations because "we can now move forward to modernize and simplify the public land laws while at the same time assuring equity both to all those

directly interested in the public lands and to the Nation as a whole."

[From American Mining Congress' News Bulletin, June 26, 1970]

UTAH MINING ASSOCIATION: PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION SUBMITS ITS REPORT

After almost six years and the expenditure of over \$7 million, the Public Land Law Review Commission on June 23 submitted its Report to the President and to Congress. The report, which is some 342 pages in length, is available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, at \$4.50 per copy. It contains 18 statements that the commission lists as "basic concepts and recommendations for long-range goals," 137 specific recommendations that are numbered and over 200 unnumbered, supplemental recommendations that appear in italics.

The commission recommends that the policy of large-scale disposal of public lands be revised and that, in the future, disposals be made only to achieve maximum benefit for the general public. As another basic principle, the commission states that the United States shall receive full value for the use of the public lands.

In its recommendations regarding mineral resources, the commission states that federal policy "should encourage exploration, development and production of minerals on the public lands. . . . Minerals exploration and development should have a preference over some or all other uses on much of our public lands." However, Congress should continue to exclude some classes of public lands, such as national parks, from future mineral development, but federal agencies should make mineral examinations which will provide reliable information on lands recommended for exclusion as well as those where mineral activity is already excluded.

The commission recommends that the Mining Law of 1872 be modified to establish a system which incorporates the desirable features of this Act as well as the leasing laws. "Unless a public land area is closed to all mineral activity, we believe that all public lands should be open without charge for nonexclusive exploration. . . . However . . . different conditions should prevail if the prospector desires an exclusive right," or if significant surface damage may result.

In this regard, the commission recommends the following:

"Whether a prospector has done preliminary exploration work or not, he should, by giving written notice to the appropriate federal land management agency, obtain an exclusive right to explore a claim of sufficient size to permit the use of advanced methods of exploration. As a means of assuring exploration, reasonable rentals should be charged for such claims, but actual expenditures for exploration and development work should be credited against the rentals.

"Upon receipt of the notice of location, a permit should be issued to the claimholder, including measures specifically authorized by statute necessary to maintain the quality of the environment, together with the type of rehabilitation that is required.

"When the claimholder is satisfied that he has discovered a commercially minable deposit, he should obtain firm development and production rights by entering into a contract with the United States to satisfy specified work or investment requirements over a reasonable period of time.

"When a claimholder begins to produce and market minerals, he should have the right to obtain a patent only to the mineral deposit, along with the right to utilize surface for production. He should have the option of acquiring title or lease to surface upon payment of market value.

"Patent fees should be increased and equitable royalties should be paid to the United States on all minerals produced and marketed whether before or after patent."

Additional and clarifying commission recommendations—

In regard to legal requirements for the discovery of valuable minerals: "Federal land agencies are poorly equipped to judge what is a prudent mining investment, and this issue should be closed when the mineral explorer is prepared to commit himself by contract to expend substantial effort and funds in the development of a mineral property."

State claims: "Congress should establish a fair notice procedure to clear the public lands of long-dormant mining claims."

Uniform federal requirements: Discovery work required by state law often serves no useful purpose. "Federal statutes should fully prescribe uniform methods."

Common varieties: "Congress should define or list those minerals to which the location-claim and leasing systems apply and provide that all other minerals be subject to sale under an act similar to the Materials Act."

In regard to the mineral leasing system, the commission recommends that:

Competitive sale of exploration permits or leases should be held whenever competitive interests can reasonably be expected.

Prospecting permits and leases should apply to all leaseable minerals unless expressly excluded by the administrator in accordance with legislative guidelines.

All rights and obligations, including those related to maintenance of the environment, of mineral explorers and developers be clearly defined at the outset of their undertakings.

Provisions of existing law prohibiting the apportionment of royalties and imposing minimum production requirements on each lease should be modified to permit unitization of public land coal leases.

Restrictions upon the leasing of public land coal deposits to railroad companies should be removed.

The commission also recommended that legislation be enacted to authorize legal actions by the government to acquire outstanding claims or interests in public land oil shale subject to judicial determination of value. It also urged that some oil shale public lands be made available now for experimental commercial development by private industry.

In regard to geothermal steam resources, the report states that "Congress should provide a specific policy of leasing geothermal resources in which fair and reasonable consideration is given to the equities of holders of asserted prior rights who expended money and effort."

The report urges that "restrictions on public land mineral activity that are no longer relevant to existing conditions should be eliminated so as to encourage mineral exploration and development and long-standing claims should be disposed of expeditiously."

The commission recommends that the Forest Service be merged with the Department of the Interior into a new Department of Natural Resources.

As a parallel to the consolidation of public lands programs in the executive branch, the report recommends a consolidation of congressional committee jurisdiction over public land programs into a single committee in each house of Congress.

A major chapter of the report is devoted to "Public Land Policy and the Environment." The report states that "those who use the public lands and resources should be re-

quired by statute to conduct their activities in a manner that avoids or minimizes adverse environmental impacts, and should be responsible for restoring areas to an acceptable standard."

As to withdrawals, the commission recommends that "large scale limited or single-use withdrawals of a permanent or indefinite term should be accomplished only by act of Congress. All other withdrawal authority should be expressly delegated with statutory guidelines to insure proper justification for proposed withdrawals, provide for public participation in their consideration, and establish criteria for Executive action."

Rep. Wayne N. Aspinall (D-Colo.) is chairman of the commission and chairman of the House Interior Committee. He has indicated that his committee intends to hold hearings in 1971 on legislation designed to implement the commission's report.

THE LONG BINH BOONDOGGLE

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, CBS radio and television carried a very informative report by Morley Safer from Vietnam on July 17, 1970. These reports concerned the swollen number of support troops at Long Binh base and the "lovely war" which these support troops are fighting. As Mr. Safer quite correctly points out, the two field hospitals at Long Binh have saved the lives of thousands of men evacuated to Long Binh from the field. Yet, there is an amazing story of the useless activities and plain Army waste of taxpayers' money which is going on at Long Binh.

It seems incredible that it takes 22,000 native Vietnamese employees, trucked and driven to the base every day, to take care of the many needs of the 27,000 American support troops "to help out with kitchen duties, act as chambermaids, telephone operators and even as prostitutes in Long Binh's two on-base brothels." Mr. Safer somewhat more delicately referred to the massage establishments in his television broadcast covering the same subject.

The story of Long Binh underlines the fact that there are many support troops there or elsewhere in Vietnam who really ought to be sent home, even though the comforts of Long Binh with its air-conditioned bowling alleys, swimming pools, and many facilities no doubt are far superior to what the average GI will return to when he is rotated back. There are hardships, of course, such as the shortage of football referees which prompted the advertised appeal for referees aired by the Armed Forces Radio Network. No doubt the broadcast of these details will result in some changes, hopefully, when the Army discovers that the searchlight is being directed at some of this surplus manpower and the high fashion in which tax money is being expended to keep them happy. The follow-

ing is the text of Morley Safer's July 17 radio report:

CBS REPORT

I am Morley Safer, CBS News, Long Binh. As the U.S. withdrawal continues on schedule, they are building bowling alleys in the combat zone of Long Binh. I'll be back with more details of just what a lovely war a fighting man can have in Vietnam . . .

Bowling alleys are the least of their problems here. The more serious one is the problem of finding qualified football referees. That's so acute they have taken to the Armed Forces Radio network to appeal for referees and are now offering a course in refereeing to anyone interested. Football is just one of the activities offered to the 27,000 who live the air conditioned combat life at Long Binh. The men at Long Binh are part of the huge support system that the U.S. Army feels is necessary to keep a modern military machine functioning.

But support soon ceases to be support and becomes an almost absurd Parkinsonian nightmare. For example: A platoon will need, let's say, x number of men to support it, give it bullets, rations, the vitals of warfare. But x times two support troops are needed to support the support troops. By the time you have support for the support for the support troops you have, roughly speaking, Long Binh Base. Twenty-seven thousand men live in Long Binh. They are supported by 22,000 Vietnamese who come on the base each day to help out with kitchen duties, act as chamber maids, telephone operators and even as prostitutes in Long Binh's two on base brothels. In turn, the Vietnamese need a support system to keep their support system functioning. Many people of Long Binh do jobs that are vital. They do them courageously, efficiently and quietly. The two field hospitals have saved the lives of thousands of men "med-evaced" from the field into Long Binh, but many more are boondoggling. For examples, the information officer here, a colonel, has a staff of 45, two of whom put out Long Binh's magazine called "Up Tight". The good colonel admits that the other 43 have very little to do. But somewhere there's a paper that says Long Binh must have a staff of 45 in the I-O shop.

Webster's International Dictionary defines a boondoggle as a trivial, useless or wasteful activity. It would be a mistake to condemn Long Binh as a gigantic boondoggle, but if someone wanted to compile a big glossary of small boondoggles, he need search no further than the air conditioned jungles of Long Binh.

I'm Morley Safer and this has been Correspondents' Report on CBS radio.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 23, 1970

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

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

How long?